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Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Since World War II, American industry has been plagued by low productivity, poor quality, excessive absenteeism, high employee turnover, and labor disputes. The dilemma facing the American industrial manager appears to be worsening, and some rather radical changes are being made by management in an effort to eliminate or reduce these problems. These changes include the redesign of jobs as well as experiments in behavior modification, mutual goal setting, and participative management.

Numerous observations have been made with respect to reasons for these "people problems" which have become so severe in the industrial sector. Some feel that these problems are created by the thousands of well-educated young workers who are entering the labor market each year, and closing the wide educational gap which once existed between management and the worker. Others feel that the accelerating advancements in technology is leaving in its wake hoardes of frustrated unemployed or underemployed workers. Another cause might be the widespread social changes of the sixties that have left virtually no one untouched. Long
accepted and traditional values toward work, materialism, and the capitalistic society as a whole have come under fire by thousands of inquiring young people who, in turn, have influenced their senior colleagues. The search for meaning and purpose in work is a major goal for thousands of individuals entering the labor market for the first time.

Educational administration is not immune to forces which have contributed to the dilemma of the industrial sector. Manifestations of the problems may be different, but they are present whether or not managers are sensitive to them. Educational personnel who are denied the opportunity for satisfaction and fulfillment in work may react differently from their industrial counterparts, but the total effect upon job satisfaction may be equally as destructive.

This researcher has been fascinated by the observed differences in the levels of performance by different groups. What factors, present in some organizations, which seem to enhance the performance of individuals or groups, are missing in other organizations where there is little evidence of either individual or group achievement? It is interesting that some community college faculties appear to be noncreative, unwilling to do anything beyond that which is required, concerned about compensatory time, unconcerned about professional development, and generally committed to traditional methods of teaching. Other faculties appear to
represent the opposite extreme, while many fall somewhere between the two. In the end, it is the student who either benefits or suffers from these differences in faculty performance and attitudes.

The literature is inconsistent as to the relationships, if any, that exist between employee job satisfaction and job performance. There do appear to be, however, several desired results which managers might hope to realize from a work group which is receiving a high degree of satisfaction from the work it performs. Among these are reduced turnover, less absenteeism, and, hopefully, increased willingness and desire to do the work at hand. For the teaching profession, one might also hypothesize that a high degree of job satisfaction could result in a teacher's overall desire for greater professional development so that he might become better at what he enjoys doing most.

Regardless of the inconsistencies which are found in the literature, it would be difficult to find a substantial number of managers who would deny the importance of high job satisfaction of a majority of their employees. It would appear that the cost of poor human relations, which may produce strikes, absenteeism, turnover, and grievances, would be too high for most organizations to bear.

Such manifestations of low job satisfaction, unfortunately, are not reserved solely for the industrial sector.
Increasing reports of teacher strikes, grievances, and turnover are beginning to clutter the pages of educational journals, newspapers, and the television media. Consequently, it would seem that rational and sensible educational administrators should strive to develop work environments which would enhance faculty satisfaction with their work and be conducive to positive manifestations of job satisfaction.

Because of the complexities of human nature and personalities, though, there appears to be no general formula which will consistently produce high job satisfaction in every individual or organization. Individual differences appear too great for any prescription to have universal validity. However, educational administrators should have some understanding of the possibilities for increasing the job satisfaction of their faculties and staffs. If the community college manager is to be effective in developing an organization that possesses high levels of job satisfaction, he needs to have a better knowledge of the personal and organizational variables or factors which might have a substantial effect on job satisfaction in the community college environment.

Statement of the Problem

The central problem in this investigation was to provide further information that would be useful to the
community college manager in attempting to develop an organization with high levels of faculty job satisfaction. Specifically, this study was planned to explore the following questions:

1. To what extent is satisfaction with specific dimensions of the job predictive of overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to Holland's six personality types?

2. What is the relationship between person-environment congruence and the overall job satisfaction of six personality types of community college faculty classified according to Holland?

Objectives of the Study

The primary objectives of this study were these:

1. To determine the extent to which satisfaction with different dimensions of the job are predictive of the overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to Holland's six personality types.

2. To determine if there is a relationship between person-environment congruence and overall job satisfaction of six personality groupings of community college faculty and professional staff.

Need for the Study

The need for this study was based upon the assumption that high levels of job satisfaction among community
college faculty is a desirable organizational characteristic. If this assumption is accepted, providing satisfying and fulfilling work for faculty becomes an important task of the community college administrator.

The need for this study was established also in the research of other investigators. Nicholson and Miljus (1972) have made several observations regarding the importance of faculty job satisfaction, what it is, and its effect upon faculty, both positive and negative. Their observations follow:

1. The satisfying work role provides high pay, promotional opportunities, participative supervision, opportunity to interact with peers, varied duties and a high degree of control over work method.

2. Professors, like other employees, seek tangible evidence of achievement, desire organizational recognition for their accomplishments, and seek equitable treatment from their superiors.

3. It has not been shown that the college professor has become like the stereotype of the businessman, a kind of insidious money grubber.

4. If professors are satisfied with the work itself, they are much less satisfied with tangible rewards, especially salary and promotion.

5. The task (of the educational administrator) is to avoid or remedy situations which result in undesirable faculty turnover, while at the same time providing opportunities for faculty advancement and professional growth.
6. To control faculty turnover, it is important that personnel policies and practice be based upon a thorough knowledge of the attitudes, values and aspirations of the academic man.

7. Granted that some faculty turnover is needed, the present high rate of turnover is most alarming. It is costly both to the reputation of the college and to the well-being of the students. Promotion and salary policies, as well as administrative practices seem to form the core of the turnover problem. It is suggested that administrators need to rationalize salary and promotion factors in a justifiable manner in order to assure a diminution of the apparent faculty dissatisfaction. (pp. 840-845)

Dunn, Stephens and Kelly (1973) have elaborated further on the importance of employee job satisfaction. While they were unable to develop a direct relationship between employee job satisfaction and performance, they did suggest that "flight or fight" patterns of behavior often result from low levels of employee job satisfaction. According to their theory, dissatisfied employees tend either to leave organizations or to develop such types of "fight" behavior patterns as forming a union, refusing total commitment to the job, or engaging in other types of behavior which generally has a negative impact upon the attainment of organizational goals. One might hypothesize that in a tight labor market where faculty mobility is restricted, there would be an increase in such "fight" behavior patterns resulting from frustrated and dissatisfied faculties, being locked into undesirable positions. This possibility would
appear to increase the importance of job satisfaction within the organization. Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) suggested that "much of the concern of management and unions with areas such as supervisory training, organizational structure, job enrichment, automation, level and method of payment, retirement counseling, pension plans, and retirement-age policy is based on the assumption that such factors affect the feelings and attitudes and, in turn, the behavior of the employees." (p. 2)

This investigation was based upon a second assumption: that educational managers must allow for individual differences among subordinates. Every subordinate is a distinct personality, a unique being with a behavior pattern based upon his own life experiences. Consequently, methods of dealing with subordinates may vary according to personality types, situations, and many other complex factors which involve the human personality. Sartain and Baker (1972) observed that the unique supervisor who deals with unique subordinates in a unique set of circumstances must usually seek unique solutions. Reber and Terry (1975), in commenting upon behavioral approaches to modern supervision, suggested the following:

"That there are no "sure-fire" formulas or "tried-and-true" techniques for dealing with people. Each individual is a unique personality with different exposures to different people, things, situations and learning experiences which make every individual different from every other person in the world."
Therefore, the supervisor must try to understand and work with the distinct personalities and behavior patterns of each of his subordinates. This, of course, reinforces the desirability of knowing each employee individually and attempting to understand his unique attitudes, values, aspirations, habits, fears, frustrations, and so on. Only through understanding these factors can the supervisor deal with the variable -- not the fixed -- responses of each individual." (p. 11)

A review of the literature on job satisfaction revealed a number of inconsistent findings. Results from similar studies vary from situation to situation with very few conclusions which can be stated with any degree of certainty that are applicable to a substantial percentage of managerial situations. One problem which appears to have major impact on these findings is the differences that are found in individuals in different situations. Yet, McGregor (1960) concluded that human behavior is predictable and that successful management is dependent to a great degree upon the manager's ability to predict and control it.

One of the background principles of Holland's theory (1973) is that: "Vocational satisfaction, stability and achievement depend on the congruence between one's personality and the environment (composed largely of other people) in which one works." Holland suggested that:

"Just as we are more comfortable among friends whose tastes, talents and values are similar to our own, so we are more likely to perform well at a vocation in which we "fit" psychologically. The Strong and other generally accepted vocational inventories are based
in part on this assumption. Moreover, the vocational literature is filled with evidence that supports the assumption, although that evidence is not usually interpreted as relating to the interaction between a particular personality and a particular environment. In the present theory, the congruence of a person and his environment is defined in terms of the structure of personality types and environment models. For example, a person is in a congruent or fitting environment when the environment calls for the activities he prefers, demands his special competencies, and reinforces his personal disposition and its associated characteristics -- a special outlook on the world, role preferences, values, and personal traits." (pp. 9-10)

If this particular principle in Holland's theory is correct, additional research concerning the relationship or interaction between a particular personality type and a particular environment is needed to determine what effect the degree of congruence might have on overall faculty job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Such research would be of particular value in a community college setting where, because of the broad nature of curricular offerings, it is highly probable that most personality types are present. A test of this principle in Holland's theory might help to explain why there often appears to be dissatisfaction among certain community college faculty elements when the particular elements happen to represent a minority within the organization. For example, college-parallel faculty might be dissatisfied in a community college organization where there is very heavy emphasis on vocational-technical programs with a sizable majority of students and faculty
concentrated in these programs. A better understanding by educational administrators of why such a phenomena might occur probably would not solve the problem, but at least additional research might provide some insight that would be of value to the manager in working with the problem.

One of the weaknesses in the job satisfaction research literature identified by Ronan (1970) and Cornell and Wild (1974) is the lack of study of personality and individuals. It was this author's hope that the present investigation would advance the theoretical knowledge of job satisfaction with regard to the personality variable. Such a study might be useful for several applied purposes including these:

1. It could be used for the grouping of people and the assignment of activities so that the activities can be executed effectively. If the research should show a positive relationship between congruency of personality types with their environments and job satisfaction, community college managers might take this into account when forming departments and divisions or other organizational units.

2. An understanding of the relationship of personality and model environments to job satisfaction might also be used for emphasizing different dimensions of job satisfaction for various personality groupings. If the research should suggest that different personality groupings of faculty respond differently to job satisfaction dimensions,
the community college manager might increase the job satisfaction for a particular group by recognizing the group's dominant need and by responding to that need as much as possible. A clear distinction among personality groupings and their requirements for achieving job satisfaction would provide the manager with a theoretical basis for recognizing, understanding, and working with individual differences.

Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) offered other reasons for additional research in measuring job satisfaction, including the mental health of employees, improved behavioral patterns of employees, as well as for humanitarian reasons. This writer would strongly agree with all of these reasons.

In summary, research results have implied that job satisfaction is an important organizational concern and that various types of employee behavior, both positive and negative, apparently result from the level of satisfaction employees within the organization are receiving from their work. Consequently, it is important for the manager to know about factors which may tend to influence satisfaction and dissatisfaction of those persons under his supervision.

The literature also revealed that all employees do not respond similarly to the various determinants of job satisfaction. Individuals are different because of differences in ability, personality, interests, intelligence, needs, and total life experiences. Additional research is
needed to provide the community college manager with better bases for understanding individual differences in faculty and for predicting what correlates of job satisfaction might be more important to the various personality types employed in the organization.

Definition of Terms

Terms requiring clarification for use in this study are defined as follows:

**Job satisfaction:** The attitudes of individuals and groups toward their work environment and toward voluntary cooperation to the full extent of their ability in the best interests of the organization. Davis (1972).

**Model environment:** The situation or atmosphere created by the people who dominate a given environment. Holland (1973).

**Personality type:** A model against which the real person can be measured with regard to activities, interests, competencies, and disposition. Holland (1973).

Limitations of the Study

One limiting factor of this research is that it encompassed only those faculty members at one technical institute and ten community colleges in Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, and New Mexico. Sampling was
non-probability in nature; the population was chosen because of convenience. Any generalization which might be drawn from the study should recognize this limitation.

Holland (1966) identified a limitation of his theory which presents a limitation in this research. He cited the failure of the theory to account for personality changes and observed the susceptibility of some personality types to change more than others. Any assessment of personality types for applied purposes might require frequent re-evaluation.

Basic Assumptions

Based on logical reasoning and empirical evidence it was assumed that:

1. High levels of faculty job satisfaction is a desirable organizational characteristic.

2. Educational managers should allow for individual and organizational differences among subordinates.

3. The choice of a vocation is an expression of personality.

4. Persons may be categorized as one of six personality types according to their resemblance to clusters of personal attributes normally associated with a particular type.
5. Environmental models can be categorized as one of six models analogous with the personality types in the preceding assumption.

6. For each personality type, there is a related environment that is compatible with that type.

7. Congruent person-environment relationships lead to outcomes that are predictable and understandable from the knowledge of the personality types and the environmental models.

8. Some pairs of personality types are more closely related than others, thus having more in common.

9. Different personality types do best in environments which offer rewards and opportunities to satisfy the needs of their particular type.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are presented in null form:

Hypothesis I: There is no statistically significant difference in the extent to which satisfaction with different dimensions of the job are predictive of overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to Holland’s six personality types.

Hypothesis II: There is no statistically significant difference in the overall job satisfaction of
individuals classified according to their level of congruence with their environment.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

McGregor (1957) suggested to American industry that management had acquired the fundamental know-how to utilize physical science and technology for the material benefit of mankind, but that more effective utilization of the social sciences was necessary to make organizations more effective. He acknowledged further that it would require years of exploration, costly development, research, and substantial creative imagination by management to apply the growing knowledge of the social sciences to the organization of human effort in industry. These observations have presented a new viewpoint or perspective for management the world over, and considerable research investigations have been conducted since the last fifties which are either directly or indirectly applicable to the management of people in organizations. These studies have presented considerable variation in outcomes, and as a result, there is widespread disagreement among researchers as to the actual dimensions of job satisfaction.

Despite the fact that conflicting evidence has been reported in the various studies, employee job satisfaction appears to be an important concern of most management theorists. This observation is supported, in part, by the
amount of time, effort, and money which is being committed to investigating the topic. Even though conflicting viewpoints are expressed frequently in the literature, no study that was reviewed discounted the importance of job satisfaction as a desired organizational characteristic.

Two Prominent Job Satisfaction Theories

One of the first and most prominent theories of job satisfaction was presented by Maslow (1943). Maslow suggested that human needs are arranged in a hierarchy of five broad classes or levels including (1) physiological needs, (2) security or safety needs, (3) social, belonging, or membership needs, (4) esteem needs, and (5) self-actualization or self-fulfillment needs. A major proposition of the Maslow theory is that:

Human needs arrange themselves in hierarchies of potency. That is to say, the appearance of one need usually rests on the prior satisfaction of another, a more pre-potent need. Man is a perpetually wanting animal. Also no need or drive can be treated as if it were isolated or discrete; every drive is related to the state of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of other drives. (p. 155)

Maslow presented his theory primarily as a framework or suggestion for future research. Since the initial presentation of the theory, numerous related investigations have been conducted, and it is the opinion of this investigator that the theory has stimulated considerable research which has contributed substantially to the literature.
From this standpoint, it appears that Maslow's original intent has been well served.

Wolf (1970) provided a number of experimentally testable research hypotheses relating to the Maslow need gratification theory in an effort to advance the understanding of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and of job motivation. According to Wolf the empirical testing of these hypotheses offer possibilities for further development and explanation of the Maslow theory. The hypotheses are:

1. Persons whose lower level needs are conditionally gratified receive both their satisfaction and their dissatisfaction solely from fluctuations in the degree of gratification of their lower level needs (primarily context elements).

2. (a) Persons whose lower level needs are conditionally gratified receive both their satisfaction and their dissatisfaction from fluctuations in the degree of gratification of their higher level needs (primarily content elements). (b) For these persons, dissatisfaction can also come when continued gratification of their lower level needs is disrupted or threatened with disruption.

3. Persons whose lower level needs are unconditionally gratified obtain both their satisfaction and their dissatisfaction solely from fluctuations in the degree of gratification of their higher level needs.

4. Dissatisfaction results from the frustrations of the gratification of an active need.

5. Dissatisfaction results from an interruption to the continued gratification of previously gratified (lower level) needs.
6. Satisfaction results from the gratification of any need.

7. Satisfaction is greater when a previously ungratified need is gratified than when previously gratified on an on-going basis.

8. (a) For persons whose lower level needs are largely gratified and whose higher level needs are active, context elements are essentially unrelated to increased satisfaction since the associated lower level needs have been gratified on an on-going basis. (b) For such persons, context elements are strongly related to decreased satisfaction whenever the level of on-going gratification of the related lower level needs is threatened. (c) For these persons, content elements are strongly related to both increased and decreased satisfaction, the level of satisfaction fluctuating directly with the degree to which the related higher level needs are gratified.

9. (a) Job motivation occurs when an individual perceives an opportunity to gratify an active need through job-related behaviours. (b) The strength of this job motivation is a function of the individual's subjective probability estimate of the likelihood that the desired consequences will follow job-related behaviours.

10. (a) Salary acts as a motivator only when an individual has a high expectancy that he can increase his salary through job-related behaviours, that is, when he sees a direct relationship between pay and job performance. (b) When an individual does not perceive this direct relationship, salary acts to lower satisfaction to the extent that the individual perceives his salary as reducing or preventing the gratification of his active needs. (pp. 92-93)

An extensive review of the job satisfaction literature by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) provided the framework for another prominent job satisfaction
theory. These researchers were particularly interested in two dimensions of job satisfaction:

1. The first dimension involves job content factors which relate to the performance of the job itself and they include recognition, achievement, the work itself, advancement, and responsibility. These job content factors are often referred to as motivator factors, intrinsic factors, and satisfiers.

2. Also involved are job context factors which relate to the environment. They include salary, company policies and practices, inter-personal relations in supervision, technical aspects of supervision, and working conditions. Job context factors are often referred to as hygiene factors, maintenance factors, extrinsic factors, and dissatisfiers.

Following their review, Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) concluded that "one of the most consistent findings is that intrinsic aspects of the job are more important to employees at higher occupational levels. On the other hand, security appears to be least important to these same employees." (p. 54)

This conclusion led to the Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) dual-factor theory which states essentially that there is a major distinction between job content factors and job context factors as correlates of job satisfaction. The major implication of the Herzberg theory is that
there are two sets of attitudinal variables: (a) those which lead to high job satisfaction but do not contribute appreciably to dissatisfaction (job content factors), and (b) those which lead to job dissatisfaction but contribute little to satisfaction (job context factors).

The Herzberg model has some obvious similarities to the Maslow model, but it also presents some substantial differences. These differences include Herzberg's categorization of some of Maslow's higher level needs as hygiene factors. There is also considerable overlapping of Herzberg's hygiene factors and Maslow's first three levels of human needs. Figure 2.1 provides further insight into these differences.

Research Non-Supportive of the Dual-Factor Theory

The dual-factor theory has been the source of considerable controversy among investigators who have examined the research and who have attempted to replicate the studies. Vroom and Maier (1961) questioned the legitimacy of the Herzberg conclusions that qualitatively different conditions act as satisfiers from those acting as dissatisfiers. They concluded that:

There is a risk in inferring the actual causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction from descriptions of events by individuals. It seems possible that the obtained differences between events may reflect defensive processes at work within the individual. Individuals may be more likely to perceive the causes of satisfaction within the self and hence describe experiences

Figure 2.1

Maslow's Need-Priority Model Compared with Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Model
invoking their own achievement, recognition or advancement in their job. On the other hand, they may tend to attribute dissatisfaction not to personal inadequacies or deficiencies but to factors in the work environment, i.e., obstacles presented by company policies and supervision. (p. 433)

Lahiri and Srivastva (1967) administered a questionnaire to 93 middle managers to determine the extent to which 13 job content factors and 13 job context factors contribute to the feeling of satisfaction and dissatisfaction in present and imaginary job situations. The results of their study indicate that satisfaction and dissatisfaction represent two distinct feelings, and that both groups of factors may act as satisfiers and dissatisfiers.

Research by Malinovsky and Barry (1965) offered only partial support for the two-factor theory. The purpose of their study was to examine the assumptions underlying the theory, giving specific concern to the analysis of the elements within the work environment which contribute to job satisfied and dissatisfied work attitudes. Their survey of 117 of 270 white male blue-collar workers employed on the grounds of a large southern state university revealed that motivator and hygiene factors related in a similar way to both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Other critics of the dual-factor theory include Dunnette, Campbell, and Hakel (1967) and House and Wigdor (1967), who have discounted the theory as lacking supportive data.
Research Supportive of the Dual-Factor Theory

The results of research by Cornwall and Wild (1974) were more favorable to the Herzberg theory. Their study of 79 male and 90 female shop floor workers employed in the various departments of a company engaged in the manufacture of kitchen tools revealed that, for most groups, self-actualization characteristics of the job are dominant as a determinant of job satisfaction.

Whitsett and Winslow (1967), in defense of the Herzberg studies, suggested that many of the studies critical of the two-factor theory are weak in method and are guilty of misrepresentation of results.

Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) tested the two-factor theory using job involvement as the dependent variable. Their research population consisted of 96 male supervisors of a state (civil service) department employing approximately 5,000 workers. Results of the study indicated that increased job involvement did appear to be related to satisfaction with motivator variables but that both hygiene and motivator variables contributed linearly to overall job satisfaction. Generally, the results were supportive of the dual-factor model.

Kerr, Harlan, and Stogdill (1974) offered two explanations which might provide insight as to why there is such conflict between believers and non-believers of the Herzberg
research. They suggested that (1) the theory is method-bound, almost always requiring Herzberg's method to replicate his results. They cited Solimon's studies (1972) in which only three of more than 20 studies using a different method were found to support the theory, and they noted that (2) something happens when Herzberg's method is employed, and it almost always happens in the same way. Citing further Solimon studies in support of their observations, Kerr et. al. related that only three of 20 studies using the Herzberg technique failed to support the theory.

Regardless of the criticisms of the Herzberg and Maslow theories, however, they do represent frameworks for considerable exploration and research in the area of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Some questions concerning job satisfaction appear to have received at least partial explanation resulting from the original Herzberg studies and those that followed as a result of the theory.

In summary, major frameworks for job satisfaction research have been presented by Maslow and Herzberg. These frameworks are based upon the gratification of needs (Maslow) and upon the assumption that two classes of needs, intrinsic and extrinsic, have different effects upon job satisfaction (Herzberg). The major frameworks are strengthened by McGregor's work which strongly suggests that the social sciences offer supplementary and complementary possibilities for organizational effectiveness.
Dimensions of Job Satisfaction

Numerous studies have been conducted which examine a variety of possible dimensions or variables which could relate to job satisfaction. For example, Ronan (1970), in reviewing individual and situational variables relating to job satisfaction, cited seven dimensions which he observed as appearing most frequently in the literature. These included: (1) the content of the work, actual tasks performed, and control of work; (2) supervision of the direct sort; (3) the organization and its management; (4) opportunities for advancement; (5) pay and other financial benefits; (6) co-workers; and (7) working conditions.

Occupational Level - Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors:
The effect of occupational level upon job content, job context, and job satisfaction factors has been of interest to a number of researchers. A popular hypothesis has been that persons at higher occupational levels are affected more by job content (intrinsic) factors, while individuals at lower occupational levels are influenced more by job context (extrinsic) factors.

Starcevich (1972) explored two questions concerning the effect of occupational level on the judged importance of job factors as sources of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction: (a) Does occupational level affect those job factors that provide the greatest source of job satisfaction
and those that provide the greatest source of job dissatisfaction, and (b) would occupational level affect the relationship between the importance of each job factor as a contributor to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Studying 155 first line managers, 182 middle managers, and 181 professional employees who judged the importance of 18 job factors as contributing separately to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, Starcevich found that the occupational level of the respondents did not significantly affect the judged order of importance of the job factors for either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Job content factors were found to be more important in contributing both to satisfaction and dissatisfaction, while job context factors were of less importance in contributing to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Studies by Hinricks (1968) and Ronan (1970) were generally supportive of the conclusions drawn by Starcevich. However, research by Locke and Whiting (1974), Friedlander (1965), Centers and Bugenthal (1966), and Armstrong (1971) suggested a relationship between occupational level and the manner in which individuals respond to intrinsic and extrinsic job factors.

Hueber (1965) studied the relationship between occupational skill levels, pride of workmanship, and job satisfaction. Using 119 clerical personnel, 33 mechanics, and 6 supervisory employees from a civilian work group of
the National Guard at the regimental level, he found more job pride and considerable less turnover among mechanics. Hueber attributed his findings to an assumption that mechanical jobs are more suited to pride of workmanship.

**Job Enlargement--Functional Specialization:**
Several studies examined the relationship of job enlargement and functional specialization to employee job satisfaction. The results of all studies were generally supportive of job enlargement as a correlate of job satisfaction.

Shepard (1970) tested the relationship between the degree of functional specialization and job satisfaction, taking work backgrounds and alienation into account. After interviewing three samples of workers from the oil and automobile industry consisting of 96 assemblers and 117 craftsmen, he concluded that worker job satisfaction increases with job size regardless of the degree of alienation from middle-class work norms. Pelissier (1965), in a review of job enlargement in three federal agencies, reported findings similar to those of Shepard. In all three agencies, employee job satisfaction increased after jobs were enlarged. Myers (1968) at Texas Instruments and Cozan (1959) at Sears and Roebuck also observed positive relationships between job enlargement and job satisfaction.
Supervision: Leader consideration as a correlate of employee satisfaction was the topic of research conducted by House, Filley, and Kerr (1971). The purpose of their research was to test the hypothesis that the satisfaction of subordinates was positively related to leader consideration, with "leader" being defined as the one who was perceived by subordinates as considerate of their needs, willing to explain his actions and who is warm, supportive, and friendly. Studying 456 employees from research and design departments of three large organizations, House, Filley, and Kerr found wide variations from company to company, but found positive relationships between perceived leaders consideration and subordinate role satisfactions in all three companies.

Misshauk (1971) conducted a study to examine the relationship between supervisory skills of the supervisor and employee satisfaction. Studying a population consisting of 25 employees each from three occupational areas--industrial manufacturing and mechanical design engineers, mechanics and machine operators, and assembly line workers--Misshauk found that the supervisor's skill in human relations was more important to employees in higher level skill areas. Engineers placed greater emphasis on human relations skills than did the assembly line workers, which Misshauk explained as the result of the "unique" relationship that prevails between engineer and supervisor.
Burke and Wilcox (1969) explored the relationship between perceived openness of superior-subordinate communications and several aspects of subordinate satisfaction, including satisfaction with the company, job, supervision, climate for growth during performance reviews and development interviews, and climate for growth in day-to-day interactions with supervisors. In general, they found that greater openness of communication by one or both members of the relationship was associated with increased satisfaction. They also found that openness of one member of the pair was significantly related to openness of the other member.

Organizational Structure: The effect of formal organizational structure upon job satisfaction has been explored by Carpenter (1971) who attempted to determine whether there was a relationship between formal structural types of school organizations and the perceived job satisfaction of classroom teachers. His population included a random selection of 20 teachers from six school systems classified according to three types of formal organizations--tall, medium, or flat. Based upon his research, Carpenter concluded that formal organizational factors did affect teachers' job perceptions and satisfaction. He further concluded that teachers in tall organizations were less satisfied in almost all the self-actualization related areas, including opportunity for professional growth and
feelings of self-fulfillment and accomplishment. As the number of administrative levels between higher administrative positions and teaching positions increased, teachers were more likely to perceive the organization as being restrictive, regimented, and formalized. Worthy (1950) reported findings from his studies which tend to support Carpenter's conclusions that employees in flat organizational structures tend to have a higher level of job satisfaction than employees in taller structural types.

**Group Cohesiveness:** Slocum and Adams (1971) studied 142 operative employees from a glass works in central Pennsylvania to test the relationship between the cohesiveness of the work group and the satisfaction of its members. Twelve distinct work groups were studied. These included eight groups performing routine repetitive tasks, three groups of machine operators, and one group of skilled trades employees. The groups were said to have a high degree of cohesiveness if members (1) perceived themselves to be part of a group, (2) preferred to remain in the group rather than leave, and (3) perceived their group to be better than other groups with respect to the way the men get along together, the way they help each other and the way they stick together. From their research, Slocum and Adams concluded that highly cohesive groups were more satisfied with their job, more satisfied with the freedom to perform
their job, and more satisfied with their employee benefits than were low cohesive groups.

**Age:** Saleh and Otis (1964) examined age as a dimension of job satisfaction, covering five age periods of the subjects examined as follows: up to 29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and 60 and over. They found positive increments in job satisfaction up to the preretirement years with decrements in satisfaction levels beyond that point. Saleh and Otis attributed the reduction in job satisfaction at preretirement to (a) blocking of channels for self actualization as preretirees are passed by in favor of younger men and (b) mounting job pressures as the preretiree finds himself unable to do his assigned task as easily as he once could. Research by Klein (1969) and Burke (1969) tends to support the conclusions of Saleh and Otis.

Gibson and Klein (1970) studied 2,067 blue-collar employees in two distinctly different firms which shared important common characteristics. The purpose of their study was to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and employee age and length of service. They found that as people grow older their relationships to authority tends to change because of underlying need structures and that cognitive structures tend to change also. They (Gibson and Klein) also found a negative relationship between tenure and satisfaction.
Status Congruency: Erickson, Pugh, and Gunderson (1972) evaluated a model of status congruency in relation to life stress and job satisfaction. Included in the congruency model were variables of pay grade (level of advancement), duty time (job experience), age, and marital status. The model was used to determine the degree to which an individual might be in step with peers within his occupational category. The results of the study showed an individual's score to be significantly and uniquely predictive of his reported life stress and job satisfaction.

Sex Differences: Hulin and Smith (1964) found evidence that sex differences are significantly related to job satisfaction. Using a systematic sample, stratified by age and consisting of 295 male workers and 163 female workers from four plants in three companies, they found that female workers were significantly less satisfied than their male counterparts in three of the four plants.

Race: Using national samples from five Gallup Polls covering a span of six years, Weaver (1974) investigated job satisfaction differences between Negroes and whites. The samples included men who were 21 years of age or older and who were living in noninstitutionalized arrangements. Measures of job satisfaction were determined for Negroes and whites and cross tabulated against independent variables of income, satisfaction with family income, education,
occupation, age, religion, church attendance, and number in household. The following results were noted:

1. Negroes were consistently less satisfied—from 5.9 to 30.4 percent with a mean of 19.4 percent.

2. Negroes and whites tend to be more satisfied at higher income levels, but association appears to be stronger for Negroes.

3. Negroes report less satisfaction than whites regardless of whether they are satisfied with incomes they earn, but satisfaction is much lower when there is dissatisfaction with income.

4. Reports by Negroes are lower regardless of the characteristic or dimension by which they are compared with whites.

5. Income and education variables reveal that the greatest difference in satisfaction between the two groups occurs at the lower level of both variables. (pp. 71-72)

**Noise:** Noise and employee morale was the subject of a report in the March, 1965, issue of Administrative Management. Based upon engineering surveys involving office noise in industrial firms, the studies indicated that noise, under certain conditions, can affect morale and result in lowered efficiency and output and increased absenteeism. Several conclusions are presented in the study as follows:

1. Steady or expected noises do not necessarily affect efficiency. Noise may, in fact, "insulate workers."

2. Intermittent noises tend to weaken morale. They keep workers on edge against sudden impact.
3. There is a limit to the loudness level of even steady noises. Individual reaction to noise intensity varies.

4. Tolerable noise levels are related to the nature of the work. Habit may raise the permissible loudness. (pp. 48-49)

The Relationship of Job Satisfaction to Performance

Another of the controversial correlates of job satisfaction is that of employee performance. The literature, again, is inconclusive as to the relationship, if any, that exists between levels of job satisfaction and performance. Greene (1972) presented two possible theories regarding the relationship, one suggesting that satisfaction causes performance and another suggesting that performance causes satisfaction. Greene cited Vroom's Valence Force Model in support of the first theory and the work of Lawler and Porter (1968) in support of the second.

Cotham (1968) used simple correlational measures to investigate the relationship between successful selling performance of 63 full-time major appliance salesmen and the possession of high morale. The results of his work showed little evidence of a statistical association between job satisfaction measures and sales performance.

Slocum and Misshauk (1970) conducted a study to examine the satisfaction and productivity of two operative work groups differing in skill and job autonomy. Group I consisted of 56 engineers and technicians performing a
variety of complex and technical jobs. This group was considered to represent high skill employees with high levels of autonomy. Group II consisted of 91 laborers performing routinized and repetitive tasks. This group was considered to represent low skill employees with low autonomy. Of specific interest to Slocum and Mishauk were factors considered important to operative employees with respect to their environment, their satisfaction with these environmental work factors, and their relationship between satisfaction and productivity. From their studies, they concluded that:

1. There was a need of highly skilled employees to seek job duties that require them to use their abilities.

2. There was a positive relationship between utilization of skills and job satisfaction.

3. Highly skilled employees attach more importance to their job than do lesser skilled employees.

4. Job satisfaction is not dependent on pay and is not seen as a motivator or as having an impact on performance.

5. Job satisfaction is negatively related to job performance for skilled employees.

6. Job satisfaction is positively related to productivity of unskilled workers. (pp. 57)

Vroom (1964) was unable to find a consistent relationship between performance and job satisfaction in his review of the literature. Ronan (1970) suggested that
despite the fact that the performance/satisfaction relationship has been thoroughly researched, the outcomes have been vague or in dispute.

Conclusions

The assumption that employee job satisfaction is an important organizational concern is generally supported in the literature, but there are conflicting views as to its effect upon employee behavior. The only consistent finding is the inverse relationship that apparently exists between job satisfaction and turnover (Vroom, 1964; Nicholson and Miljus, 1972; and Ronan, 1968). The relationships of content and context factors to job satisfaction and satisfaction to productivity represent areas where considerable variations in research outcomes are present. Numerous dimensions of job satisfaction have been explored, but again, research findings are either vague or in conflict.

Some researchers have recognized weaknesses of past studies and have suggested other dimensions for future studies. Among these, Cornall and Wild (1974) have noted that research dealing with personality as a variable has been extremely limited, and they suggested that future studies be concerned with the individual rather than anonymous groups. Ronan (1970) made similar recommendations with regard to the need for the study of individuals.
Because of the inconclusive nature of the results of past job satisfaction research, it would appear that there is a need for more study of other possible correlates of job satisfaction. The personality variable offers one such possibility for additional research.
Chapter 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

The lack of job satisfaction research dealing with personality and the individual was identified as a major weakness in the literature by Ronan (1970) and Cornall and Wild (1974). Thus, the major emphasis of the present study was to examine the relationship of job satisfaction and personality. To accomplish this, the Holland (1966) theory of personality types and model environments (1966) was used as the primary means of assessing the personality types of individuals and the environment of organizations.

Assumptions of the Holland Theory

Central to the Holland theory is an assumption that the choice of a vocation is an expression of personality; therefore, members of a particular vocation have similar personalities and may be expected to respond similarly to many different situations. Further, the more congruent an individual's personality type is with the personality types of those around him (model environment), the more likely he is to realize vocational satisfaction, achievement, and personal stability.
Holland (1973) proposed that individuals can be categorized as one of six basic personality types. He further theorized that there are six analogous environmental models, each of which is dominated by a given personality type. Four working assumptions of the theory follow:

1. Persons may be categorized as one of six personality types according to their resemblance to clusters of personal attributes associated with a particular type. The basic personality types are: realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising and conventional. Most individuals can be expected to possess some attributes of each of the six personality types but with stronger resemblances to one or two types. By comparing the personal attributes of the individual with those of each of the model personality types, it is possible to determine which type he resembles most, thus assessing his given personality type. Consequently, the more closely an individual resembles a particular type, the more likely he is to exhibit the personality characteristics and behaviors attributed to that type.

Several methods are provided by Holland (1973) for estimating an individual's personality pattern, including scores on selected scales from interest and personality inventories, vocational choice, field of training, work
history, or combinations of methods. A description of each personality type follows later in this chapter.

2. There are six analogous environmental models, each of which can be determined by the domination of a given personality type. For example, conventional environments are dominated by conventional personality types; realistic, by realistic personality types. Domination is determined by the largest percentage of any personality type in a given population. Dominant environments form because different personality types tend to surround themselves with people whose interests, competencies, and dispositions are congruent with their own. A given model environment is characterized by the situation or atmosphere of the personality type who dominates it.

3. For each personality type, there is a related environment. The assumption is that people will seek out those environments which are most congruent with their own attitudes, values, problems and rules and which will permit utilization of their given skills and abilities. That is, realistic personality types will seek out realistic environments, and enterprising types will seek out enterprising environments.

4. Walsh (1973) paraphrased the last of the working assumptions of the theory:

Congruent person-environment relationships (a realistic type in a realistic environment) lead to outcomes that are predictable and
understandable from the knowledge of the personality types and the environmental models. These outcomes include vocational choice, vocational stability and achievement, personal stability, creative performance, and personal development.

For purposes of this research, two secondary assumptions of the theory will be discussed as follows:

1. Consistency. Whether the relationship is between individuals or between an individual and his environment, some pairs of personality types are more closely related than others, and are assumed to have more in common. The Hexagonal Model presented in Figure 3.1 is helpful in understanding the relationship of the various pairings of personality types. For example, the correlation between conventional types and enterprising types is .68 and they are relatively consistent with each other. There is a much less consistent relationship between conventional and artistic types (r=.11).

A further assumption of Holland's with regard to consistency is that if a person with a consistent personality type enters an environment that is congruent, he will tend to be more productive, satisfied, and will possess more personal stability. Incongruency with the environment will tend to produce opposite outcomes.

2. Congruence. Different personality types do best in environments which offer rewards and opportunities to satisfy needs of their particular type. For example, an enterprising person in an enterprising environment would be likely
Figure 3.1

A Hexagonal Model for Defining the psychological resemblances among types and environments and their interactions

Source: J. L. Holland (1973, p. 23)
to receive opportunities and rewards that would complement his preferences and abilities. However, an enterprising type in an investigative environment would present a degree of relatively greater incongruence (.16) which would likely offer rewards and opportunities that would be incompatible with the individual's preferences and abilities.

Descriptions of Personality Types

Holland (1973) described each of the six personality types according to its preference for various activities, behavioral tendencies, patterns of activities, competencies, and interests. Holland (1973) provided the following description of each personality type:

**Realistic (laboring, skilled and technical occupations):**

The special heredity and experiences of the realistic person lead to a preference for activities that entail the explicit, ordered, or systematic manipulation of objects, tools, machines, animals; and to an aversion to educational or therapeutic activities. These behavioral tendencies lead in turn to the acquisition of manual, mechanical, agricultural, electrical, and technical competencies and to a deficit in social and educational competencies.

This development of a realistic pattern of activities, competencies, and interests creates a person who is predisposed to exhibit the following behavior.

1. He prefers realistic occupations or situations in which he can engage in preferred activities and avoid the activities demanded by social occupations or situations.
2. He uses realistic competencies to solve problems at work and in other settings.

3. He perceives himself as having mechanical and athletic ability and lacking ability in human relations.

4. He values concrete things or tangible personal characteristics - money, power, status.

Because he possesses these preferences, competencies, self-perceptions, and values, the realistic person is apt to show himself to be: asocial, confirming, frank, genuine, masculine, materialistic, natural, normal, persistent, practical, self-effacing, stable, thrifty, uninsightful, and uninvolved. (p.14)

For a complete list of Realistic occupations, see Holland (1973, pp. 111-113).

Investigative (scientific occupations):

The special heredity and experiences of the investigative person lead to a preference for activities that entail the observational, symbolic, systematic, and creative investigation of physical, biological, and cultural phenomena in order to control such phenomena; and to an aversion to persuasive, social and repetitive activities. These behavioral tendencies lead in turn to an acquisition of scientific and mathematical competencies and to a deficit in persuasive competencies.

This development of an investigative pattern of activities, competencies, and interests creates a person who is predisposed to exhibit the following behavior:

1. He prefers investigative occupations or situations in which he can engage in his preferred activities and competencies and avoid the activities demanded by enterprising occupations or situations.
2. He uses investigative competencies to solve problems at work and in other settings.

3. He perceives himself as scholarly, intellectually self-confident, having mathematical and scientific ability, and lacking in leadership ability.

4. He values science.

Because he possesses these preferences, competencies, self-perceptions, and values, the investigative person is apt to show himself to be: analytical, cautious, critical, curious, independent, intellectual, introspective, introverted, methodical, passive, pessimistic, precise, rational, reserved, unassuming, and unpopular. (pp. 14-15)

For a complete list of Investigative occupations, see Holland (1973, pp. 113-114).

Artistic (artistic, literary, and musical occupations):

The special heredity and experience of the artistic person lead to a preference for ambiguous, free, unsystematized activities that entail the manipulation of physical, verbal, or human materials to create art forms or products; and to an aversion to explicit, systematic, and ordered activities. These behavioral tendencies lead, in turn, to an acquisition of artistic competencies--language, art, music, drama, writing--and to a deficit in clerical or business system competencies.

The development of an artistic pattern of activities, competencies, and interests creates a person who is predisposed to exhibit the following behavior:

1. He prefers artistic occupations or situations in which he can engage in preferred activities and
competencies and avoid the activities demanded by conventional occupations or situations.

2. He uses artistic competencies to solve problems at work and in other settings.

3. He perceives himself as expressive, original, intuitive, feminine, non-conforming, introspective, independent, disorderly, having artistic and musical ability (acting, writing, speaking).

4. He values esthetic qualities.

Because he possesses these preferences, competencies, self-perceptions, and values, the artistic person is apt to show himself to be: complicated, disorderly, emotional, feminine, idealistic, imaginative, impractical, impulsive, independent, introspective, intuitive, nonconforming and original. (pp. 15-16)

For a complete list of Artistic occupations, see Holland (1973, p. 14).

Social (educational and social welfare occupations):

The special heredity and experiences of the social person lead to a preference for activities that entail the manipulation of others to inform, train, develop, cure, or enlighten; and an aversion to explicit, ordered, systematic activities involving materials, tools, or machines. These behavioral tendencies lead in turn to an acquisition of human relations competencies such as interpersonal and educational competencies and to a deficit in manual and technical competencies.

This development of a social pattern of activities, competencies, and interests creates a person who is predisposed to exhibit the following behavior:
1. He prefers social occupations and situations in which he can engage in his preferred activities and competencies and avoid the activities demanded by realistic occupations and situations.

2. He uses social competencies to solve problems at work and in other settings.

3. He perceives himself as liking to help others, having teaching ability, and lacking mechanical and scientific ability.

4. He values social and ethical activities and problems.

Because he possesses these preferences, competencies, self-perceptions, and values, the social person is apt to show himself to be: ascendant, cooperative, feminine, friendly, generous, helpful, idealistic, insightful, kind, persuasive, responsible, sociable, tactful, and understanding. (pp. 16-17)

For a complete list of Social occupations, see Holland (1973, pp. 114-115).

Enterprising (sales and managerial occupations):

The special heredity and experiences of the enterprising person lead to a preference for activities that entail the manipulation of others to attain organizational goals or economic gain; and an aversion to observational, symbolic, and systematic activities. These behavioral tendencies lead in turn to an acquisition of leadership, interpersonal, and persuasive competencies, and to a deficit in scientific competencies.

This development of an enterprising pattern of activities, competencies and interests creates a person who is predisposed to exhibit the following behavior:

1. He prefers enterprising occupations or situations in which he can engage in
his preferred activities and avoid the activities demanded by investigative occupations or situations.

2. He uses enterprising competencies to solve problems at work and in other situations.

3. He perceives himself as aggressive, popular, self-confident, sociable, possessing leadership and speaking abilities, and lacking scientific ability.

4. He values political and economic achievement.

Because he possesses these preferences, competencies, self-perceptions, and values, the enterprising person is apt to show himself to be: acquisitive, adventurous, ambitious, argumentative, dependent, domineering, energetic, exhibitionistic, flirtatious, impulsive, optimistic, pleasure-seeking, self-confident, sociable, and talkative. (pp. 16-17)

For a complete list of Enterprising occupations, see Holland (1973, pp. 115-116).

Conventional (office and clerical occupations):

The special heredity and experiences of the conventional person lead to a preference for activities that entail the explicit, ordered, systematic manipulation of data, such as keeping records, filing materials, reproducing materials, organizing written and numerical data according to a prescribed plan, operating business machines and data processing machines to attain organizational or economic goals; and to an aversion to ambiguous free exploratory, or unsystematized activities. These behavioral tendencies lead in turn to an acquisition of clerical, computational, and business system competencies and to a deficit in artistic competencies.
This development of a conventional pattern of activities, competencies, and interests creates a person who is predisposed to exhibit the following behavior:

1. He prefers conventional occupations or situations in which he can engage in his preferred activities and avoid the activities demanded by artistic occupations or situations.

2. He uses conventional competencies to solve problems at work and in other situations.

3. He perceives himself as conforming, orderly, and as having clerical and numerical ability.

4. He values business and economic achievement.

Because he possesses these preferences, competencies, self-perceptions, and values, the conventional person is apt to show himself to be: conforming, conscientious, defensive, efficient, inflexible, inhibited, obedient, orderly, persistent, practical, prudish, self-controlled (calm), and unimaginative. (pp. 17-18).

For a complete list of Conventional occupations, see Holland (1973, pp. 116-117).

The Person-Environment Interaction

The present investigation was concerned with the personality variable as it relates to job satisfaction in two specific ways: (1) the manner in which six different personality groupings of community college faculty would respond to five separate dimensions of job satisfaction including the work itself, pay, supervision, promotions, and co-workers, and (2) the effect of six model environments
as proposed by Holland upon the overall job satisfaction level of six personality types of community college faculty classified according to Holland's theory. Other than research conducted by Smart (1975), this researcher was unable to find prior studies of relationships between job satisfaction dimensions and personality types. However, several studies were reviewed which relate to person-environment interaction with satisfaction as a variable. Summaries of these follow.

Williams (1967) studied 156 freshman male roommates in two groups of 39 pairs. The personality types of students were assessed using Holland's Vocational Preference Inventory (VPI). One group consisted of student pairs whose personality types were in conflict, and the other group consisted of student pairs whose personality types were compatible. Results showed the degree of congruency of personalities to be positively associated with lack of conflict.

Rand (1968) tested an hypothesis that students who choose colleges with student populations compatible with their personalities and interests will be more satisfied. Studying 24 colleges and 7,257 students, Rand found only a slight relationship between satisfaction and congruency.

Brown (1968) conducted a study similar to the Rand study, using the residence hall as the model environment. He noted a positive relationship between satisfaction with
the college and the student's congruency with his environment in the residence hall (containing other students with similar college majors).

Morrow's studies (1971) offered support for Holland's assumption that person-environment congruency is positively related to satisfaction. Using the Vocational Preference Inventory to assess personality types, Morrow compared students' college majors with personality type to establish levels of congruency. Students were then asked to complete a questionnaire about their satisfaction with their majors. The results showed that when college majors were more congruent with students' personality types, there was a higher level of student satisfaction with the majors.

Other related studies by Walsh and Russell (1969), and Walsh and Lewis (1972) appear to support Holland's theory of personality types and environmental models. There is also support in the literature for the validity and reliability of the Vocational Preference Inventory as a method of assessing personality types, and for the Environmental Assessment Technique (EAT) as a means of determining environmental models. The reliability and validity of both techniques will be more fully covered in the methodology chapter of this research.

It was within the theoretical framework of Holland's personality types and model environments that this research was conducted.
Chapter 4

METHODOLOGY

The central problem in this investigation was to provide further information that would be useful to the community college manager as he attempts to develop an organization with high levels of job satisfaction. Two specific questions were identified for exploration: (1) to what extent is satisfaction with specific dimensions of the job predictive of overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to Holland's six personality types, and (2) what is the relationship between person-environment congruence and the overall job satisfaction of six personality types of community college faculty classified according to Holland?

This chapter describes the methods used to explore both the questions presented, including the selection of the study sample, a description of the instruments utilized in collecting the data, and the methods by which the data were analyzed.

Population and Sample

All full-time professional staff and faculty in ten community colleges and one technical institute were invited to participate in the study. To be eligible for
participation, a professional staff or faculty member must have been in employment at their respective institution during the 1974-75 academic year. Institutions included in the study were: New River Community College, Dublin, Virginia; Patrick Henry Community College, Martinsville, Virginia; Lord Fairfax Community College, Middletown, Virginia; Dabney Lancaster Community College, Clifton Forge, Virginia; J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College, Richmond, Virginia; Southeastern Community College, Whiteville, North Carolina; Rockingham Community College, Wentworth, North Carolina; Caldwell Community College and Technical Institute, Lenoir, North Carolina; Prestonsburg Community College, Prestonsburg, Kentucky; The Technical Institute of Alamance, Burlington, North Carolina; and New Mexico State University at Alamogordo, Alamogordo, New Mexico. All schools included in the population were two-year, post-secondary institutions. The sample consisted of 515 professional staff and faculty which represented 73.7 percent of those who were invited to participate (N=699).

Participating institutions were selected on the basis of convenience. Factors which were considered in selecting schools were familiarity of the researcher with the presidents of the institutions, geographical accessibility, and willingness of the institution to participate.

A brief description of each institution is included in Appendix A.
Research Design

The research design utilized in this study can best be described as correlational. No attempt was made by the researcher to control the variables under examination. These included one dependent variable, overall job satisfaction, and five independent variables: the work itself, co-workers, pay, supervision, and promotion. The variables which were examined may be classified as ordinal.

Instrumentation

Two instruments for measuring job satisfaction and assessing personality types and one technique for determining environmental models were used in the study. The particular technique and instruments used were selected because of their validity and reliability, successful use by prior researchers, and appropriateness to the problem which the study investigated.

The instrument chosen for measuring dimensions of job satisfaction was the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). Holland's Vocational Preference Inventory (VPI) was used to assess personality types of faculty, and the environmental models were defined using the Environmental Assessment Technique (EAT). Descriptions of these instruments follow:

The Job Descriptive Index: The JDI is a cumulative-point, adjective checklist. It is designed to measure five
aspects of job satisfaction including the work itself, pay, promotions, supervision, and co-workers. (See Appendix D.) Dunn, Stephens, and Kelley (1973) described the JDI as a major breakthrough and a landmark accomplishment in the field of job satisfaction measurement.

Imparto (1972) discussed the Job Descriptive Index as follows:

The job areas investigated by the JDI were selected from a review of previous satisfaction research. Smith et. al. (1969) contend that other aspects of the job might also be important but that the five aspects included in their questionnaire are those that most consistently appear in studies designed to identify the underlying dimensions of job satisfaction. The items for each scale were obtained from critical-incident interviews and the early job attitude literature. The items were rewritten, deleted or retained on the basis of an extensive series of item analyses. The scales have shown high reliability, as well as discriminant and convergent validity with interviews and other rating methods. Similarly, the JDI appears free of response set, acquiescence, and scale order effects. (pp. 397-398)

Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) studied the discriminant and convergent validity of the Job Descriptive Index. Their preliminary studies with small groups of janitors, secretaries, and cafeteria workers at Cornell University (N=58) indicated significant correlations with supervisory ratings and rankings of job satisfaction. Studying 148 Cornell undergraduates who had held a full-time job for at least two months and 18 people in the community who currently held full-time jobs, Smith, Kendall, and Hulin found that the JDI measures possess very good
discriminant and convergent validity (correlations of .68 between interview ratings and the JDI Direct). Similarly, when they studied randomly selected employees of a farmers' cooperative (N=80) and used the JDI Direct Method, Smith, Kendall, and Hulin found excellent discriminant and convergent validity. Complete validation data on the JDI are presented by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969, pp. 32-68).

Using Cornell students as subjects (N=168), preliminary studies of split-half estimates of internal consistency of the JDI Direct showed an average corrected reliability estimate of .79. In another study of 80 male employees from two electronics plants, the estimated split-half internal consistencies for the JDI scales with correlations corrected to full length by the Spearman-Brown formula were as follows: work, .84; pay, .80; promotions, .86; supervision, .87; and co-workers, .88. All corrected estimates of the five scales were over .80.

Complete reliability data on the JDI is presented by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969, pp. 74-75).

**Vocational Preference Inventory:** The VPI (Appendix C) is a self-administering personality and interest inventory consisting of 160 occupational titles. Its development is based upon the assumption that vocational preferences are expressions of personality. It is therefore possible, according to Holland (1973), to
categorize persons according to their resemblance to one or more of six personality types by recording their occupational preference from the list of titles included on the inventory. Descriptions of each of the six personality types, including patterns of activities, competencies and, interests are included in the theoretical framework section of this research.

The validity of the VPI is discussed by Walsh (1973) as follows:

"Holland and others have conducted a number of studies which help to assess the validity of the VPI. These studies of concurrent and predictive validity have generally used one of four empirical approaches. One approach has investigated the relationship between personal orientation as measured by the VPI and either other inventories or educational choices (Folsom, 1969; Holland, 1960, 1962, 1963a, 1968; Wall, Osipow, and Ashby, 1967). These studies show that the scores on the scales of the VPI are moderately correlated with scores on corresponding scales of other inventories (measuring similar constructs). Among the instruments used for purposes of validation have been the California Psychological Inventory; the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule; Barron’s Independence of Judgment, Originality, Complexity - Simplicity; and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. The results generally tend to support the validity (concurrent) and interpretative meaning of the VPI Scales.

Fairweather et. al. (1960) conducted concurrent validity studies which focused on the assessment of the range of personal orientation of Social categories and groups. The findings suggested that the VPI describes and differentiates among groups such as men and women; salesmen,
advertising and scientific personnel; normal, psychiatric, TB patients, and psychopaths; and psychotic and non-psychotic patients.

Lacey (1971) studied the concurrent validity of the VPI for 230 male workers in eight different occupational environments. The sample consisted of six personality groupings as follows: Realistic--project engineers (N=29); Investigative--research chemists (N=31) and computer programmers (N=29); Social--high school teachers (N=28); Conventional--actuaries (N=29); Enterprising--bank executives (N=30) and insurance company executives (N=30); and Artistic--college English professors and music teachers (N=24). Subjects responded to the VPI in the occupational environments in which they worked. Results showed that five VPI scales (Investigative, Social, Conventional, Enterprising, and Artistic) successfully differentiated each of the eight occupational groups.

The results of concurrent validity studies by Walsh and Gaffey (1974) supported the findings of Lacey. Their sample, consisting of 153 male workers in eight different occupational environments, was subdivided into six groups matching Holland's vocational orientations: Realistic--industrial engineers (N=31); Investigative--medical doctors (N=27); Social--ministers (N=22); Conventional--morticians (N=27); Enterprising--insurance company salesmen (N=31) and real estate salesmen (N=9); and Artistic--artists (N=8) and
art teachers (N=10). The results of the study revealed that five scales of the VPI successfully differentiated the occupational groups consistent with Holland's theoretical framework. Only one, the Investigative, failed to differentiate the occupational groups.

Reliability studies on the VPI by Holland (1965) showed coefficients ranging from .57 to .89 for 6,289 male college freshmen and from .50 to .89 for 6,143 females. Holland (1965) illustrates the test-retest reliability for each scale of the VPI (third and sixth revisions) using student and adult samples (Figure 4.1). The illustration suggests moderate to high reliability with higher reliabilities for samples retested over shorter intervals of time.

Baird (1970) investigated the relationship between VPI scores and self-ratings or self-descriptions of students. The student self-descriptions and life goals were found to be consistent with the VPI scores.

**Environmental Assessment Technique (EAT):** The Environmental Assessment Technique (EAT) was developed by Astin and Holland (1961) to characterize an environment by assessing its population. According to these authors, environments may be classified as one or more of six environmental models which are analogous to the six personality
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>3d Rev.</th>
<th>3d Rev.</th>
<th>6th Rev.</th>
<th>6th Rev.</th>
<th>6th Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this sample, the fourth revision administered in 1958 was rescored for the sixth revision, or the common items in both forms. The sixth revision was administered in 1962.

Time interval

types discussed previously in this research. Holland (1973) described the technique as follows:

"The technique entails taking a census of the occupations, training preferences, or vocational preferences of a population. These preferences or occupations are categorized according to the criteria for class membership as belonging to one of the six environments. This classification results in a six-variable profile. The absolute members for each type are then converted to percentages of the total population for the particular environment or institution." (p. 34)

Figure 4.2 provides an example of how the Environmental Assessment Technique is used to assess an organizational environment. In this example, the model environment would be classified as Conventional.

Astin and Holland (1961) examined the EAT's concurrent validity using the College Characteristics Index (CCI) (Pace and Stern, 1958). After developing EAT profiles on 335 colleges, Astin and Holland correlated the scores of eight EAT measures with the ratings by other groups of students as indicated by scores on the CCI scales. Twenty-three percent of the 240 correlation coefficients examined were found to be significant at the .01 level and 39 percent at the .05 level. The results generally supported the validity of the EAT.

Astin (1963) studied National Merit Scholarship students at 76 institutions in an effort to examine the concurrent validity of the EAT. He designed specific items
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Holland (1973, p. 34)

Figure 4.2

The Environmental Assessment Technique
to test the proposed interpretations of each EAT variable. The final questionnaire consisted of 18 items asking students to describe their college environments and 21 items asking them to describe the effects of their four years at the college. Responses to 14 of the 18 environment items were found statistically significant in the predicted direction. Eighty-one (56%) of 144 correlations among the EAT variables and the ratings of college environment were significant. Fifty-seven (34%) of the 168 correlations computed between EAT variables and college effects ratings were found to be significant. The concurrent validity of the EAT as a method of assessing the college environment was supported by the results of the study.

Walsh (1973) summarized with regard to concurrent and construct validity studies of the EAT:

"The few existing studies do lend support to the concurrent and construct validity of the EAT. In essence, these studies suggested that a census of the kinds of people found in college environments provides a certain amount of information about the environmental climates of the colleges."

Reliability studies of the EAT by Astin and Holland (1961) indicated coefficients ranging from .81 to .99 for retest reliability over a one-year interval. Using a random sample of 31 institutions from their original sample of 335 to study test-retest reliability of the six EAT variables for intervals of 1, 3, and 6 years, Astin and Holland
also found high retest reliability for the three and six year periods for all but the investigative variables.

Data Collection

For the present study, the presidents of each of the eleven institutions were contacted by letter to describe the project and to request the participation of their respective schools. In this letter, an attempt was made to secure time at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting to administer the test instruments. All but two of the presidents agreed to allow an adequate amount of time at a faculty meeting for the purpose of the research. The two presidents who declined the request for time at a faculty meeting to administer the test instruments were both agreeable to permitting the distribution of the instruments in faculty mailboxes. In both instances, the Deans of Instruction were responsible for the distribution and collection of the instruments. Instruments were distributed in faculty mailboxes at a third school under the supervision of the Dean of Student Services. Geographical inaccessibility to this institution made it impractical to consider meeting with the faculty and professional staff. It might be noted that the response rate was substantially higher at those institutions where the researcher met with the respondents. A description of each institution, including the response rate, may be found in Appendix A.
Data were collected during a four-month period beginning in late May, 1975, and ending in mid-September, 1975.

Analysis of Data

Data collected in this study were analyzed by statistical techniques selected because of their appropriateness for the analyses required. Descriptions of statistical techniques used in testing each hypothesis follow:

Hypothesis I: Respondents were assigned to one of six personality types based upon occupational preferences expressed on the Vocational Preference Inventory. Occupational preferences were classified under six categories analogous with Holland's six personality types. Personality types were then identified by determining the category with the largest number of expressed occupational preferences.

Six separate stepwise, multiple regression equations were developed to determine the degree to which each Job Descriptive Index (JDI) scale contributed to the prediction of overall job satisfaction of all individuals classified according to Holland's personality types.

From the six separate regression equations, rank order correlation coefficients were computed to assess the
degree to which the order of the five Job Descriptive Index (JDI) scales contribute to the prediction of the overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to the six personality types. (See Figure 4.3)

**Hypothesis II:** Respondents were assigned to one of four groups based upon the congruency of their personality type with their environment. (See Figures 4.4 and 4.5) One-way multivariate analyses of variance procedures were used to assess differences in the overall job satisfaction of individuals classified into the four groups previously described.
Figure 4.3

JDI Job Dimensions As Predictors Of Overall Job Satisfaction
For Each Of The Six Holland Groups
### Congruency Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruency Level</th>
<th>Individual Personality Type</th>
<th>Environmental Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4- Excellent</td>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>Realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>Investigative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Artistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>Enterprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>Conventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Good</td>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>Investigative/Conventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>Realistic/Artistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Investigative/Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Enterprising/Artistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>Conventional/Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>Realistic/Enterprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Fair</td>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>Enterprising/Artistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>Conventional/Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Enterprising/Realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Investigative/Conventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>Artistic/Realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>Social/Investigative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- Poor</td>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>Enterprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Conventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>Investigative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>Artistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 4.4**

Descriptions of Four Levels of Person-Environment Congruency
Figure 4.5

Schematic Comparison of Person-Environment Congruence And Overall Job Satisfaction For Four Congruence Levels As Described In Figure 4.4
The central problem in this investigation was to provide further information that would be useful to the community college manager in his attempts to develop an organization with high levels of job satisfaction among his faculty and professional staff. Two specific objectives were presented.

For the first objective, which was to determine the extent to which specific dimensions of the job are predictive of overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to Holland's six personality types, six separate stepwise, multiple regression equations were developed. These were used to determine the degree to which each Job Descriptive Index (JDI) scale contributes to the prediction of overall job satisfaction of all individuals classified according to Holland's personality types.

From the six separate regression equations, rank order correlation coefficients were computed to assess the degree to which the order of the five JDI scales contributes to the prediction of the overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to the six personality types. Table 5.1 presents the means and standard deviations for
Table 5.1

Means and Standard Deviations for Each Of
The Five Specific Satisfaction Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Satisfaction Scale</th>
<th>Realistic (N=53)</th>
<th>Investigative (N=117)</th>
<th>Social (N=113)</th>
<th>Conventional (N=50)</th>
<th>Enterprising (N=72)</th>
<th>Artistic (N=110)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>39.11</td>
<td>39.50</td>
<td>39.93</td>
<td>37.98</td>
<td>39.03</td>
<td>38.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>44.17</td>
<td>44.20</td>
<td>44.60</td>
<td>45.78</td>
<td>46.13</td>
<td>44.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>10.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td>22.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>39.70</td>
<td>41.93</td>
<td>43.52</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>12.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>24.41</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>22.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>16.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
each of the JDI scales and overall job satisfaction by personality type.

Table 5.2 presents the product-moment correlation coefficients between overall job satisfaction and the five specific satisfaction items. The correlations shown in Table 5.2 range from \(-.04\) to \(.45\), with a median of \(.40\) for the Realistic type; from \(.25\) to \(.41\), with a median of \(.30\) for the Investigative type; from \(.35\) to \(.53\), with a median of \(.41\) for the Social type; from \(.12\) to \(.40\), with a median of \(.36\) for the Conventional type; from \(.42\) to \(.67\), with a median of \(.50\) for the Enterprising type; and from \(.25\) to \(.57\), with a median of \(.35\) for the Artistic type. The correlations for the entire group ranged from \(.26\) to \(.50\), with a median of \(.41\). None of the specific satisfaction items correlated \(.40\) or higher with overall job satisfaction for all six types. One item, the work itself, was correlated \(.40\) or higher in five of the six environments. Two other items, supervision and promotions, were correlated \(.40\) or better in four of the six types. All correlations for the Enterprising type were \(.40\) or higher, and in all instances except one, supervision in the Social type, correlations were higher on every specific satisfaction scale for Enterprising types than for any other type.

Table 5.3 presents the partial regression coefficients for the five-variable regression equations to predict
Table 5.2

Correlation of Specific Satisfaction Scales With Overall Satisfaction
For Professional Staff and Faculty by Personality Type
And by Total Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3

Partial Regression Coefficients for a Five-Variable Regression Equation
Regressing Specific Satisfaction on Overall Satisfaction
By Holland Model Environments *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.07(1)</td>
<td>.05(1)</td>
<td>.04(4)</td>
<td>.04(4)</td>
<td>.08(1)</td>
<td>.09(1)</td>
<td>.06(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>-.03(5)</td>
<td>.00(5)</td>
<td>.01(1)</td>
<td>-.01(5)</td>
<td>.03(5)</td>
<td>-.01(5)</td>
<td>.02(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.01(2)</td>
<td>.01(3)</td>
<td>.02(3)</td>
<td>-.01(1)</td>
<td>.02(2)</td>
<td>.01(4)</td>
<td>.01(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.03(4)</td>
<td>.01(4)</td>
<td>.04(2)</td>
<td>.05(3)</td>
<td>.01(3)</td>
<td>.02(3)</td>
<td>.02(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.02(3)</td>
<td>.02(2)</td>
<td>.01(5)</td>
<td>.02(2)</td>
<td>.02(4)</td>
<td>.02(2)</td>
<td>.02(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The order in which each item entered the five-variable regression equations of each environment is indicated in parentheses.
overall job satisfaction for each personality type. It also shows the order in which the variables entered these equations.

The patterns of the partial regression coefficients for the six personality types shown in Table 5.3 indicate little variation in the relative contribution of the five predictor variables to the prediction of overall job satisfaction of the individuals classified according to Holland. Further, the rank ordering of the specific satisfaction items according to the order in which they entered the five-variable regression equations to predict overall job satisfaction of the six personality types were found to be generally similar across all types. One variable, the work itself, was found to enter the equations first for four of the six personality types with another variable, promotions, entering second in five of the six types.

For the second objective of the study, which was to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between person-environment congruence and overall job satisfaction of six personality groupings of community college professional staff and faculty, faculty and professional staff from the sample were assigned to one of four groups based upon the congruency of their personality type with their environment. (See Figure 4.4, Chapter 4.) One-way multivariate analyses of variance procedures were
used to assess differences in the overall job satisfaction of individuals classified into the four groups.

Table 5.4 presents the means and standard deviations for each of the specific satisfaction scales and overall job satisfaction by congruency level.

The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to test the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference in the overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to their level of congruence with their environment. The overall test of significance produced a multivariate F-ratio of 1.143 (df 18/1432, p < .303). This result did not lead to rejection of the null hypothesis.
Table 5.4
Means And Standard Deviations for Each of the Specific Satisfaction Scales and Overall Job Satisfaction By Congruency Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruency Level</th>
<th>Work Itself</th>
<th>Co-workers</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Overall Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (N=149) Mean</td>
<td>39.85</td>
<td>45.86</td>
<td>23.34</td>
<td>41.28</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good (N=157)     Mean</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>43.43</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>40.87</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>15.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair (N=143)     Mean</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>41.74</td>
<td>21.27</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>16.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (N=66)      Mean</td>
<td>37.36</td>
<td>43.71</td>
<td>22.39</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>16.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 6

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study attempted to examine the extent to which specific dimensions of the job are predictive of the overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to Holland's six personality types. There was further examination to determine if there is a relationship between person-environment congruence and overall job satisfaction of six personality groupings of individuals classified according to Holland (1973).

Summary

The Problem: The central problem in this investigation was to provide further information that would be useful to the community college manager in attempting to develop an organization with high levels of faculty job satisfaction. Specifically, this study was planned to explore the following questions:

1. To what extent is satisfaction with specific dimensions of the job predictive of overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to Holland's six personality types?
2. What is the relationship between person-environment congruence and the overall job satisfaction of six personality types of community college faculty classified according to Holland?

Methodology: All full-time professional staff and faculty in ten community colleges and one technical institute were invited to participate in the study. All schools included in the investigation were two-year, post-secondary institutions. The sample consisted of 515 professional staff and faculty which presented 73.7 percent of those who were invited to participate (N=699).

The research design was correlational with no attempt being made by the researcher to control the variables under examination. There was one dependent variable, overall job satisfaction, and five independent variables: The work itself, co-workers, pay, supervision, and promotion.

The instrument chosen for measuring dimensions of job satisfaction was the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). Holland's Vocational Preference Inventory (VPI) was used to assess personality types of faculty, and the environmental models were defined using Holland's Environmental Assessment Technique (EAT).

The presidents of each of the eleven institutions were contacted by letter to describe the project and to request the participation of their respective schools.
In this letter, an attempt was made to secure time at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting to administer the test instruments. All but two of the presidents agreed to allow an adequate amount of time at a faculty meeting for the purpose of the research. The two presidents who declined the request for time at a faculty meeting to administer the test instruments were both agreeable to permitting the distribution of the instruments in faculty mailboxes with their respective deans of instruction being responsible for distribution and collection of the data.

For the first objective of the study, which was to determine the extent to which specific dimensions of the job are predictive of overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to Holland's six personality types, six separate stepwise, multiple regression equations were developed. These were used to determine the degree to which each Job Descriptive Index (JDI) scale contributes to the prediction of overall job satisfaction of all individuals classified according to Holland's personality types.

For the second objective of the study, which was to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between person-environment congruence and overall job satisfaction of six personality groupings of community college professional staff and faculty, faculty and professional staff from the sample were assigned to one of four
groups based upon the congruency of their personality type with their environment. One-way multivariate analyses of variance procedures were used to assess differences in the overall job satisfaction of individuals classified into the four groups.

Results: The research did not produce the expected relationships for either of the objectives of the study. For the first objective, the results indicated little variation in the relative contribution of the five predictor variables to the prediction of overall job satisfaction of the individuals classified according to Holland. For the second objective of the study, the results did not suggest a positive relationship between person-environment congruence and overall job satisfaction.

Discussion

The study posed two specific questions with regard to overall job satisfaction of professional staff and faculty in the community college. The questions and appropriate comments follow:

1. To what extent is satisfaction with specific dimensions of the job predictive of overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to Holland's six personality types?

There was much similarity in the manner in which individuals in all personality groupings responded to the
specific satisfaction scales. Two personality groupings, Social and Conventional, did appear to show some differences from the other four types. With reference to the Social Type, the differences were not unexpected. Table 5.3 shows that satisfaction with co-workers was the first variable to enter the five-variable regression equation for Social types. This ordering of variables is consistent with the Holland propositions concerning the Social personality. It is interesting to note that the co-worker variable entered the equation last for every other type. This is not to suggest that the variable, co-workers, is not important to the community college professional, but that relative to the other four variables in this study, it was found to be less important.

Despite the fact that substantial differences did not emerge among the personality groupings in this study, there were enough differences to suggest the need for additional study. Perhaps such studies could be conducted using personality as a means of sub-grouping with other instruments being used to assess personality types. Brawer (1973) described an instrument, the Omnibus Personality Inventory, which appears to have considerable value in determining sub-groups, particularly in community colleges.

It is worthy to note that one of the predictor variables, the work itself, correlated higher with overall
job satisfaction than any other predictor variable for four of the six personality types. Only in the Social grouping did the work itself variable correlate lower than .40. When the product-moment correlation coefficients were produced for the entire sample (N=515), the work itself again correlated most highly with overall job satisfaction (.50). The promotion predictor variable, correlated at .42 with overall job satisfaction for the entire group. This variable (promotion) was also the second variable to enter the five-variable regression equation in five of the six personality groupings.

The results tend to support the Herzberg findings. Pay, supervision, and co-workers, all classified as maintenance factors in the Dual-Factor Theory, were less prominent in predicting overall satisfaction than were the motivator factors, the work itself and promotions. Since respondents in this study indicated a high level of satisfaction with their jobs, it might be assumed that they were generally satisfied with their opportunities for gratification of these motivator needs. Administrators in the participating institutions might strive to maintain the organizational climates that are currently present. Other community college administrators who have recognized morale problems in their institutions might consider careful review of their promotion policies and of the structure of their
jobs. Job enrichment and professional development programs may provide at least partial solutions to morale problems among dissatisfied faculties in some community colleges.

Because of the way in which participants in this study responded to the various satisfaction scales, the opportunity for advancement and clearly defined promotion policies may provide a more acceptable alternative to pay for rewarding outstanding performance in the community college. This researcher has been aware of considerable controversy concerning the relationship of merit pay and faculty evaluation. Consideration might be given to granting across the board pay increases to all professional personnel in community colleges with opportunities for advancement, when possible, being extended to individuals who have performed their work in a superior manner. Such an approach might help to reduce the merit pay-evaluation controversy, and more importantly, might be more meaningful to the community college professional. Too, if one accepts the Herzberg Theory, advancement opportunities may exceed compensation for motivational purposes.

A further comment worthy of note concerns the effectiveness of the Job Descriptive Index in measuring job satisfaction of the personality groupings in this study. Coefficients of $R^2$ in Table 5.3 show a range of from .28 for Conventional types to .59 to Enterprising types.
From these data, conclusions can be drawn that the JDI was an effective instrument in predicting job satisfaction for each of the six personality groupings. However, the JDI was more effective in predicting satisfaction for Enterprising, Artistic, and Social types and less effective in predicting satisfaction for Investigative and Conventional types.

2. What is the relationship of person-environment congruence and the overall job satisfaction of six personality types of individuals classified according to Holland?

The results of this study did not suggest a positive relationship between person-environment congruence and overall job satisfaction. The study showed that an overwhelming majority of the participants were well satisfied with their jobs regardless of their level of person-environment congruence. Four hundred and sixty seven, or 90.6 percent of those responding, rated their overall job satisfaction as good or excellent. Only four individuals (.8 percent) indicated their level of job satisfaction to be poor. Forty-four, or 8.6 percent, rated their overall satisfaction level as being fair. This lack of variation among the scores of the respondents may have had an impact on the exploration of this specific question.

Another factor that was present which may have implications for this study was the relatively even spread of all personality types within the organization. The model
environment of each institution is presented with the institutional profiles which are included in the appendixes. There were no strong, dominant personality types in any of the schools surveyed. The possibility of the effect of person-environment congruence on overall job satisfaction may be greater in organizations where there is stronger dominance by a particular personality type.

There was some evidence to suggest that as long as people are satisfied with the work they are performing, other dimensions of the job do not significantly affect their overall job satisfaction. To the present, many opportunities have been available which may have placed the community college professional in an unique situation with regard to his potential for enjoyment of the job. All the institutions which participated in the study had been in existence for 15 years or less; most were ten years of age or less. In the new and developing institutions, there may be more opportunities for program development, experimentation, and enjoyment of the challenge of being involved in something new. There has been considerable legislative and public support, and in most instances, adequate funding to accomplish a majority of the objectives of the institutions. These and other factors may have contributed to the overall satisfaction of the majority of the participants in this study.
As competition for tax funds among the various governmental agencies increases, there may be less money available for instructional programs in community colleges. Heavier teaching loads, more administrative control, and an increasing emphasis on accountability are factors which could lead to lower levels of overall satisfaction among community college faculties. It cannot be assumed that high levels of overall job satisfaction as described in this study will continue indefinitely. The community college manager might be sensitive to these economic, political, and social changes and continually search for more ways in which he can relate more practically to his faculty.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. There is no statistically significant difference in the extent to which satisfaction with different dimensions of the job are predictive of overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to Holland's six personality types.

2. There is no statistically significant difference in the overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to their level of congruence with their environment.
3. Job content factors of the work itself and promotions are more important predictors of overall job satisfaction for community college faculty and professional staff than are job context factors of pay, supervision, and co-workers.

4. College management in the institutions which participated in this study is providing opportunities for satisfying work for the majority of the professional employees.

5. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) is an effective instrument for predicting job satisfaction for the personality groupings.

Recommendations

Based upon the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made:

1. The Hexagonal Model (Figure 3.1) presented in Chapter 3 suggests a close relationship between Enterprising and Social types (.54) and also between Enterprising and Conventional types (.68). However, data presented in Table 5.3 do not support these relationships. Moderate differences are noted in the order in which the five specific satisfaction scales entered the regression equations for Social and Enterprising types, and differences are also noted for Conventional and Enterprising types. From the Hexagonal Model, conclusions might also be drawn that
dissimilarities would exist in the manner in which Investigative and Enterprising types would respond to the various satisfaction scales; yet, their responses were quite similar in this research. These unexpected findings may suggest an inconsistency between the way in which students and professional persons respond to the Holland measures. Additional research is recommended to examine these differences.

2. This investigation did not demonstrate a statistically significant relationship between person-environment congruence and overall job satisfaction of the respondents. It should be noted, however, that generally there was a relatively even spread of personality types in most of the participating institutions. More meaningful research might be possible if only those institutions with strong, dominant personality groupings were included for study. One possibility for such research is with the technical schools (Realistic types) where more participants in the trade and occupational areas are present.

3. A vast majority of the respondents in this investigation (90.6 percent) rated their overall job satisfaction as good or better. This lack of variation in the job satisfaction index may have had an impact on this investigation. Similar studies in institutions with more variation in job satisfaction scores might offer more support for the Holland propositions and more information for the educational manager.
4. Social and Conventional types in this research were apparently influenced more by the hygiene factors of co-workers, pay, and supervision than were the other personality groupings. Additional research to examine the relationship of personality types to intrinsic and extrinsic values is recommended to provide further insight into the study of personality and human motivation.

5. From this research, it is concluded that college managers in the participating institutions are apparently doing a good job in providing satisfying work for their professional employees. The study also indicated that these same employees are more responsive to job content factors than they are to job context factors for deriving satisfaction from their work. Based upon these findings, it is recommended that community college managers carefully consider giving attention to the Herzberg motivational factors for recognition, advancement, responsibility, professional development, achievement, and the work itself as possibilities for building morale in their organizations. Of these, clearly defined policies of promotion and challenging work appear to be of extreme importance.

6. A review of the literature of past job satisfaction research did not yield conclusive results other than the inverse relationship that apparently exists between job satisfaction and turnover. Additional study is recommended
to examine other possible correlates of job satisfaction including personality. Other variables might also include values, role perception by superordinates and subordinates, organizational climate, and leadership styles of top community college administrators.

7. Should this study be replicated by other researchers, it is recommended that more personal information about the respondents be gathered. Information such as age, background information, sex, job title, and length of service in the organization would be useful in analyzing the results of the research.
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APPENDIXES
Appendix A

Profiles of Participating Institutions
Institution #1

Institutional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate - 75.2%.

Institution #1 is a multi-campus school with a service region of approximately 500,000 persons. The 1975 Fall quarter enrollment was 7480 students of which 72% were enrolled in vocational-technical programs, 18% in college parallel programs and 10% in developmental programs.
Institution #2

Institutional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate - 98.6%.

Institution #2 is a single campus school with a service region of approximately 100,000 persons. The 1975 Fall quarter enrollment was 2133 students of which 53% were enrolled in vocational-technical programs and 47% in college parallel programs.
Institution #3

Institutional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate - 61%.

Institution #3 is a single campus school with a service region of approximately 102,000 persons. The 1975 Fall quarter enrollment was 1069 students of which 35% were enrolled in vocational technical programs and 65% in college parallel programs.
Institution #4

Institutional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate - 83.3

Institution #4 is a single campus school with a service region of approximately 135,000 persons. The 1975 Fall quarter enrollment was 680 students of which 60% were enrolled in vocational-technical programs and 40% in college parallel programs.
Institution #5

Institutional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate - 89.7%.

Institution #5 is a single campus school with a service region of approximately 120,000 persons. The 1975 Fall quarter enrollment was 2153 students of which 70% were enrolled in vocational-technical programs and 30% in college parallel programs.
### Institution #6

#### Institutional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate - 97.7%.

Institution #6 is a single campus school with a service region of approximately 75,000 persons. The 1975 Fall quarter enrollment was 1067 students of which 63% were enrolled in vocational-technical programs, 17% in college parallel programs and 20% in developmental programs.
### Institutional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate - 26%.

Institution #7 is a multi-campus school with a service region of approximately 92,000 persons. The 1975 Fall quarter enrollment was 1905 students of which 61.5% were enrolled in vocational-technical programs, 23.5% in college parallel programs and 15% were unclassified.

This was one of the three schools where survey instruments were distributed in faculty mailboxes.
### Institution #8

#### Institutional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate - 94.6%.

Institution #8 is a single campus school with a region of approximately 149,000 persons. It was the only Technical Institute included in the study. The 1975 Fall quarter enrollment was 1401 students of which 100% were enrolled in vocational-technical programs.
Institution #9

Institutional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate - 70%.

Institution #9 is a single campus school with a service region of approximately 55,000 persons. It is a branch campus of a state university offering only college transfer programs. The 1975 Fall quarter enrollment was 927 students.

This was one of the three schools where survey instruments were distributed in faculty mailboxes.
### Institutional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate - 47%.

Institution #10 is a single campus school with a service region of approximately 20,000 persons. The 1975 Fall quarter enrollment was 1505 students of which 55% were enrolled in vocational-technical programs and 45% in college transfer programs. The study in this institution was conducted during the same week that an announcement of a small faculty salary decrease was announced.

This was one of the three schools where survey instruments were distributed in faculty mailboxes.
Institution #11

Institutional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate - 100%.

Institution #11 is a single campus school with a service region of approximately 160,000 persons. The 1975 Fall quarter enrollment was 547 students of which 50% were enrolled in vocational-technical programs and 50% in college transfer programs.
Appendix B

Instructions to Respondents
INSTRUCTION SHEET

TO: Professional Staff and Faculty
J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College

FROM: Ed Barnes, Division Chairman of Business and Public Service Technology, New River Community College, Dublin, VA

I am requesting your assistance in a research project I am conducting at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The objectives of the research are as follows:

1- To assess your personality type by having you respond to a number of vocational preferences,
2- To determine your satisfaction with 6 major dimensions of your job, and
3- To assess your overall job satisfaction with your position at J. Sargeant Reynolds.

Your responses will be summarized with those of approximately 500 others in eight Institutions to examine the relationship of personality types and the dimensions of the job which are most important to each type. All information relative to the Job Satisfaction Index at J. Sargeant Reynolds will be summarized and shared with your administration. However, your response will be completely anonymous.

Instructions

1- Please keep your set of forms together with the paper clip which has been provided.

2- Please pay particular attention to the numbering sequence of the Vocational Preference Inventory and the accompanying answer sheet. Four scales on the Vocational Preference Inventory, which are unnecessary for this research, have been eliminated in order to save time for the respondents. This may tend to be confusing at first, but should present no problem for you.

3- Please do not sign your name on either form. Do not fill in any information at the top of your Vocational Preference Inventory answer sheet.
4- If you are in a non-teaching position, please place a check mark in the upper right corner of the Job Descriptive Index Form.

Let me take this opportunity to thank you for participating. A full report of the results of the study will be provided at a later date.
Appendix C
Vocational Preference Inventory
And Scoring Sheet
THE VOCATIONAL PREFERENCE INVENTORY

This is an inventory of your feelings and attitudes about many kinds of work. Fill out your answer sheet by following the directions given below:

1. Show on your answer sheet the occupations which interest or appeal to you by blackening Y for "Yes."

2. Show the occupations which you dislike or find uninteresting by blackening N for "No."

3. Make no marks when you are undecided about an occupation.

1. Aviator 81. Radio Operator
2. Private Investigator 82. Independent Research Scientist
3. YMCA Secretary 83. Clinical Psychologist
4. Detective 84. Tax Expert
5. Post Office Clerk 85. Restaurant Manager
6. Route Salesperson 86. Art Dealer
11. Airplane Mechanic 91. Filling Station Attendant
12. Meteorologist 92. Writer of Scientific or Technical Articles
13. Foreign Missionary 93. Social Science Teacher
14. Bookkeeper 94. Inventory Controller
15. Speculator 95. Master of Ceremonies
16. Poet 96. Dramatic Coach
21. Fish and Wildlife Specialist 101. Tree Surgeon
22. Biologist 102. Editor of a Scientific Journal
23. High School Teacher 103. Director of Welfare Agency
24. Quality Control Expert 104. IBM Equipment Operator
25. Buyer 105. Traveling Salesperson
26. Symphony Conductor 106. Concert Singer
31. Power Station Operator 111. Tool Designer
32. Astronomer 112. Geologist
34. Budget Reviewer 114. Financial Analyst
35. Stock & Bond Salesperson 115. Real Estate Salesperson
36. Musician 116. Composer
41. Master Plumber 121. Locomotive Engineer
42. Aeronautical Design Engineer 122. Botanist
43. Speech Therapist 123. Personal Counselor
44. Traffic Manager 124. Cost Estimator
45. Manufacturer's Representative 125. Industrial Relations Consultant
46. Author 126. Stage Director
51. Power Shovel Operator 131. Photoengraver
52. Anthropologist 132. Scientific Research Worker
53. Marriage Counselor 133. Psychiatric Case Worker
54. Statistician 134. Pay Roll Clerk
55. Television Producer 135. Sports Promoter
56. Commercial Artist 136. Playwright
61. Surveyor 141. Electrician
62. Zoologist 142. Physicist
63. Physical Education Teacher 143. Vocational Counselor
64. Court Stenographer 144. Bank Examiner
65. Hotel Manager 145. Political Campaign Manager
66. Free-Lance Writer 146. Cartoonist
71. Construction Inspector 151. Funeral Director
72. Chemist 152. Counter-Intelligence Agent
73. Playground Director 153. Architect
74. Bank Teller 154. Shipping & Receiving Clerk
75. Business Executive 155. Criminal Psychologist
76. Musical Arranger 156. Insurance Clerk
VOCATIONAL PREFERENCE INVENTORY by John L. Holland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10 Inf.</th>
<th>11 Ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blacken "Y" for Yes, "N" for No. For example: Y or N

CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGISTS PRESS, 577 College Avenue, Palo Alto, California 94306
Appendix D

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI)
The Job Descriptive Index (JDI)

Instructions: Put "Y" beside an item if the item describes the particular factor, and a "N" beside an item if the item does not describe the factor. If you are undecided put a "?" beside the item.

WORK

Fascinating
Routine
Satisfying
Boring
Good
Creative
Respected
Hot
Pleasure
Tiresome
Healthful
Challenging
On your feet
Frustrating
Simple
Endless
Gives sense of accomplishment

SUPERVISION

Asks my advice
Hard to please
Impolite
Praises good work
Tactful
Influential
Up-to-date
Doesn't supervise enough
Quick-tempered
Tells me where I stand
Annoying
Stubborn
Knows job well
Bad
Intelligent
Leaves me on my own
Around when needed
Lazy

CO-WORKERS

Stimulating
Boring
Slow
Ambitious
Stupid
Responsible
Fast
Intelligent
Easy to make enemies
Talk too much
Smart
Lazy
Unpleasant
No privacy
Active
Narrow interests
Loyal
Hard to meet

MISCELLANEOUS

Class load too heavy
Hours too long
Too much work outside teaching
Too much red tape and routine duties
Inadequate appraisal of work
Excessive committee work
No influence in formulating academic policies

PAY

Income adequate for normal expenses
Satisfactory profit sharing
Barley live on income
Bad
Income provides luxuries
Insecure
Less than I deserve
Highly paid
Underpaid

PROMOTIONS

Good opportunity for advancement
Opportunity somewhat limited
Promotion on ability
Dead-end job
Good chance of promotion
Unfair promotion policy
Infrequent promotions
Regular promotions
Fairly good chance for promotion

Please indicate your overall job satisfaction by circling the appropriate figure on the following scale:

Excellent: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Poor
Appendix E

Representative Correspondence

To College Presidents
April 14, 1975

Dr. William E. Taylor, President
Technical Institute of Alamance
411 Camp Road
Burlington, North Carolina 27215

Dear Dr. Taylor:

I am writing to request your assistance.

The preliminary examination for my dissertation has been scheduled for May 16, 1975. At this point, everything looks good and it appears that I may be able to proceed with my research somewhat earlier than I planned. Since this opportunity has presented itself, I would like to collect my data before the end of the current quarter. If I can do this, I will have the summer quarter to analyze and complete the work. This, of course, is desirable since the summer period is less demanding from a work standpoint.

I would like to present two questions to you as follows:

1- Would it be possible to use your Institution as one of four to be included in the study, and

2- Would it be possible for me to meet with your full-time faculty for about 20 minutes between May 16 and the end of your spring quarter? A regular faculty meeting would be fine.

I am enclosing a rough copy of the first chapter of the research to acquaint you with the nature of the study.

Please let me know as soon as possible if you can arrange this for me.

Will appreciate anything you can do.

Warmest personal regards,

Ed Barnes, Chairman
Business and Public Service Technologies
EB/jhc
Enclosure
May 5, 1975

Dr. William E. Taylor, President
Technical Institute of Alamance
411 Camp Road
Burlington, N. C. 27215

Dear Dr. Taylor:

Thank you very much for your letter of April 28, 1975 and for arranging for me to meet with the faculty on May 26.

If a majority of the faculty will participate, the data would be meaningful because their responses will be grouped with a large number of responses from other colleges. I am currently trying to line up another school or two to participate in the study.

If you could arrange for me to have about 20 minutes on May 26, I believe I could possibly sell the project and collect the data at that time. The forms I have are objective checklists and are simple and fast to complete.

After I have collected the data, I will be ready to write the last chapter of my dissertation and it is now possible for me to complete the project by July if all goes well.

Again, thanks so much for your willingness to assist. I knew I could count on you.

Warmest personal regards,

Ed Barnes, Chairman
Business and Public Service Technologies

EB:jhc
May 30, 1976

Dr. Merrill Hamilton, President  
Rowan Technical Institute  
P. O. Box 1555  
Salisbury, N. C. 28144

Dear Dr. Hamilton:

I am writing to request your assistance.

I recently passed the preliminary examination for the doctorate at V.P.I., but my graduate committee has recommended a sample increase from 500 to 500 persons in my research. Because of this, I am in a rather desperate search for 3-4 additional institutions that would be willing to participate in the study. I am wondering if you might allow me to include Rowan as an additional participating school?

The major objective of my study is to examine the relationship of personality types of professional staff and faculty and their satisfaction with six major dimensions of their job. As a by-product of the study, I can provide you with some information about your faculty and staff including:

1. A categorization of your faculty into six major personality groupings,

2. A prediction of which job satisfaction dimensions are most likely to influence the overall job satisfaction of each personality grouping,

3. An assessment of your organizational environment by determining the personality groups which are dominant.

4. An assessment of the degree of overall job satisfaction present in each personality grouping, and

5. A job satisfaction index for your entire organization which will allow you to assess your organization's strengths and weaknesses with regards to job satisfaction.

I am enclosing an instructional sheet and set of forms which I have provided for Caldwell Community College so that you can see what is involved.

I have recently conducted the study at The Technical Institute of Alamance in Burlington, N. C. and at Southeastern Community College
in Whiteville. In both instances, I met with the faculty and staff at a regular faculty meeting. The time required of faculty was approximately 15-20 minutes.

If you would consider permitting me to use your institution, I would be delighted to come and discuss the matter with you further. I will also be pleased to provide you with a complete copy of the proposal.

I will be appreciative for any consideration you might give my request.

Warmest personal regards,

Ed Barnes, Chairman
Business and Public Service Technology

EB:jhc

Enclosure
June 3, 1975

Mr. Joseph Nanny  
Richmond Technical Institute  
P. O. Box 1189  
Hamlet, N. C. 28345

Dear Mr. Nanny:

I am writing to request your assistance on a research project I am conducting at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

I recently passed the preliminary examination for the doctorate, but my graduate committee has recommended a sample increase from 300 to 500 people in my research. Because of this, I am in a rather desperate search for 3-4 additional institutions that will be willing to participate in the study. Sam Morgan has suggested that I contact you about the possibility of Richmond Tech participating.

The major objective of my study is to examine the relationship of personality types of professional staff and faculty and their satisfaction with six major dimensions of their job. As a by-product of the study, I can provide you with some information about your faculty and staff including:

1. A categorization of your faculty into six major personality groupings,

2. A prediction of which job satisfaction dimensions are most likely to influence the overall job satisfaction of each personality grouping,

3. An assessment of your organizational environment by determining the personality groups which are dominant.

4. An assessment of the degree of overall job satisfaction present in each personality grouping, and

5. A job satisfaction index for your entire organization which will allow you to assess your organization's strengths and weaknesses with regards to job satisfaction.

I am enclosing an instruction sheet and set of forms which I have provided for Caldwell Community College so that you can see what is involved.
Mr. Joseph Nanny
June 3, 1975
Page 2

I have recently conducted the study at The Technical Institute of Alamance in Burlington, N. C. and at Southeastern Community College in Whiteville. In both instances, I met with the faculty and staff at a regular faculty meeting. The time required of faculty was approximately 15-20 minutes.

If you would consider permitting me to use your institution, I would be delighted to come and discuss the matter with you further. I will also be pleased to provide you with a complete copy of the proposal.

I will be appreciative for any consideration you might give my request.

Sincerely,

Ed Barnes, Chairman
Business and Public Service Technologies

EB:jhc

cc: Dr. Sam Morgan

Enclosure
THE FOLLOWING LETTER WAS SENT TO:

Dr. Bill McCoy
Dr. G. O. Cannon
Dr. Jack Backels

Dear Dr. :

Back in April, Bob Sullins may have spoken to you concerning a dissertation I am doing at V.P.I and S.U. He suggested that I write you to provide a brief description of the project and to let you know what participation would be required of your faculty.

The major objective of the study is to examine the relationship of personality types of professional staff and faculty and their satisfaction with six major dimensions of their job. As a by-product of the study, I can provide you with some information about your faculty and staff including:

1. A categorization of your faculty into six major personality groupings,
2. A prediction of which job satisfaction dimensions are most likely to influence the overall job satisfaction of each personality grouping,
3. An assessment of your organizational environment by determining the personality groups which are dominant,
4. An assessment of the degree of overall job satisfaction present in each personality grouping, and
5. A job satisfaction index for your entire organization which will allow you to assess your organization's strengths and weaknesses with regards to job satisfaction.

I am enclosing an instruction sheet and set of forms which I have provided for New River Community College so that you can see what is involved.
Dr.
August 11, 1975
Page 2

Other schools which have participated include Rockingham Community College in Wentworth, N. C.; Caldwell Community College in Lenoir, N. C.; The Technical Institute of Alamance in Burlington, N. C.; Southeastern Community College in Whiteville, N. C.; and of course, New River Community College.

In previous studies I have conducted, it has taken approximately 15-20 minutes for completion of the forms. This can be accomplished in one of two ways as follows:

1. I can meet with your faculty and staff for 15-20 minutes to administer the instruments, fall workshop would represent an ideal time for this approach if you can arrange for me to meet with your group.

2. I can provide forms and instruction sheets to be placed in faculty mailboxes if a collection point can be established.

Method one is preferable because I am able to get much better participation. A high percentage of returns is necessary if this particular study is to be of value. However, I will take what I can get.

Please let me know if you need further information to help you to determine whether or not you can participate. If necessary, I will be delighted to come to your Institution to discuss the matter further with you.

I will be appreciative if you can see fit to participate. You can rest assured that any data I might gather at your school would be kept in the closest of confidence.

Sincerely,

Ed Barnes, Chairman
Business and Public Service Technologies

EB:jhc

Enclosure
Dr. John Backels, President  
Dabney Lancaster Community College  
P. O. Box 530  
Clifton Forge, Virginia 24422  

Dear Dr. Backels:  

The purpose of my letter is to thank you for allowing me to include your Institution in my doctoral research. My sincere appreciation is extended to your faculty and staff who were so cordial and helpful.  

When the data are summarized, I will be delighted to share the results with you if you wish. This information should be available shortly after the first of the year.  

Again, thanks much for everything.  

Sincerely,  

Ed Barnes, Chairman  
Business and Public Service Technologies  

EB:jhc  
cc: Dr. Sullins
The vita has been removed from the scanned document
EFFECTS OF PERSONALITY AND PERSON-ENVIRONMENT CONGRUENCE ON JOB SATISFACTION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY AND STAFF

by

Edwin Lewis Barnes

(ABSTRACT)

The effects of personality and person-environment congruence on job satisfaction of community college faculty and professional staff was investigated using data obtained from two instruments for measuring job satisfaction and assessing personality types and one technique for determining environmental models. The instruments and technique were:

1. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) for measuring dimensions of job satisfaction;

2. Holland's Vocational Preference Inventory (VPI) for assessing personality types; and

3. Holland's Environmental Assessment Technique (EAT) for determining environmental models.

The study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent is satisfaction with specific dimensions of the job predictive of overall job satisfaction of individuals classified according to Holland's six personality types?
2. What is the relationship between person-environment congruence and the overall job satisfaction of six personality types of community college faculty classified according to Holland?

The study utilized faculty and professional staff (N=515) from ten community colleges and one technical institute in Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky and New Mexico.

Six separate stepwise, multiple regression equations were developed to determine the degree to which each Job Descriptive Index (JDI) scale contributes to the prediction of overall job satisfaction of all individuals classified according to Holland's six personality types. From the six separate regression equations, rank order correlation coefficients were computed to assess the degree to which the order of the five JDI scales contribute to the prediction of overall satisfaction of the six Holland groups.

The effect of person-environment congruence on job satisfaction was investigated by assigning respondents to one of four groups based upon the congruency of their personality type with their environment. One-way multivariate analyses of variance procedures were used to assess differences in the overall job satisfaction of individuals classified into the four groups previously described.

Findings from the study indicated little variation in the relative contribution of the five predictor variables
to the prediction of overall job satisfaction of the individuals classified according to Holland. There was much similarity in the manner in which individuals in all personality groupings responded to the specific satisfaction scales although two groupings, Social and Conventional, did appear to show some differences from the other four types. Further, the results of the study did not suggest a positive relationship between person-environment congruence and overall job satisfaction.

It was concluded that individuals grouped according to Holland would respond similarly to the five satisfaction scales included on the Job Descriptive Index. It was further concluded that the level of congruence between an individual and their environment would not have an effect on the individual's level of overall job satisfaction.

Two JDI scales, the work itself and promotions, were identified as being more prominent predictors of overall job satisfaction for community college faculty and professional staff than are factors of pay, supervision, and co-workers.