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1 Introduction

The present study addresses how structural conditions that determine how a worker must present him/herself to customers/clients affect conditions of self-esteem, mastery, locus of control, and job satisfaction for workers while on the job. Existing research in the social psychology of work does not address these relationships alone. The present study explores these relationships by drawing on concepts from the three major perspectives within the social psychology of work: social structure and personality, symbolic interactionism, and psychological social psychology. The primary objectives of this study are to explain the effects of structural occupational conditions on workers’ self-esteem, locus of control, mastery, and job satisfaction while at work. Additionally, results of this study are expected to enrich social structure and personality-oriented predictions of on-the-job outcomes of structural occupational conditions. Currently only psychological predictions can be drawn. By identifying additional structural occupational conditions that have an affect on workers, the study strengthens the potential of social structure and personality-oriented predictions of psychological outcomes, while broadening the scope to include predictions of attitudinal outcomes.
The effects of work on the individual, from a social psychological perspective, are the result of a far more complex set of phenomena than simply that of the day-to-day labor taking place. Indeed, such variables as self-esteem, locus of control, mastery, and job satisfaction may be better predicted by the conditions present at a particular occupation than by the actual work that is carried out.

This study broadens the social structure and personality perspective of the social psychology of work by identifying new ways to predict the psychological outcomes of work, while also introducing attitudinal outcomes to the model. This is achieved in the present study by drawing on the three major perspectives of the social psychology of work. Furthermore, the introduction of attitudinal outcomes to social structure and personality will cultivate new thoughts within the area and foster a broader and more comprehensive understanding of the social psychology of work.
2 Literature Review

2.1 The Social Psychology of Work: Three Paradigms

The present study draws on the three paradigms of the social psychology of work to identify new structural occupational conditions of work that affect psychological and attitudinal outcomes. I discuss each in turn.

2.1.1 Social Structure and Personality

Social structure and personality is a major perspective in the social psychology of work. Kohn, Schooler, and colleagues (in Mortimer and Lorence 1995) emphasize the consequences of work on psychological change. Self-direction, closeness of supervision, and degree of routinization at work are of particular interest for explaining psychological outcomes among workers (Mortimer and Lorence 1995). Kohn, Schooler, and colleagues describe a process of learning generalization as mediating the effects of work on the individual, asserting that what takes place at the job is then transferred to realities outside of the job (Mortimer and Lorence 1995). This process is used to describe psychological outcomes, such as well-being and distress, rather than more "attitudinal" outcomes, such as job satisfaction (1995: 498).
2.1.2 Symbolic Interactionism

A second major perspective in the social psychology of work is the symbolic interactionism. The symbolic interactionism orientation focuses on particular problems and solutions encountered by members within occupational groups (Mortimer and Lorence 1995). According to symbolic interactionists, "orientations to the job are continuously emergent and negotiated social realities, dependent on ongoing interactional processes (Miller in Mortimer and Lorence 1995: 499). Interactive mechanisms serve as a solution to the threats to well-being met by individuals while at work (Haas in Mortimer and Lorence 1995). Emergent occupational subcultures are described as a means to avert "the boredom of monotonous tasks, the enforcement of productivity norms, and workers' 'reality maintaining' activities through 'orderly talk,' 'restricted discourse,' and other interactional strategies," (1995: 498).

Symbolic interactionism addresses not only threats to well-being, but also the maintenance of well-being within the occupational context. A particular example is Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson’s (1959) analysis of the maintenance of self-respect among workers of low occupational prestige (Mortimer and Lorence 1995). They found that workers in such situations manage self-respect by favorably redefining their situation. Such workers will emphasize the important functions they carry out, or develop "self-enhancing meanings and symbols," (Mortimer and Lorence: 499)
2.1.3 Psychological Social Psychology

The third major perspective in the social psychology of work is psychological social psychology. The underlying idea of this perspective is that the job ought to "fit" the traits of the particular worker occupying the job. The traits considered for fit include basic work orientations such as vocational interests and identity (Mortimer and Lorence 1995). The perspective assumes that the formation of these traits occurs early in life, and remains steady throughout adulthood. Job dissatisfaction and job change will occur, then, until the individual finds the job that appropriately matches his or her unique traits. Mortimer and Lorence contend that, in this perspective, job satisfaction is ultimately genetically or physiologically determined.

Psychological social psychology also considers how the expectations of workers might determine action in the work setting. Expectancy theory presumes workers' performance results from their expectations, values, and self-conceptions. These expectations are determined by the particular worker’s self-efficacy: the estimation of his capacity to perform (Mortimer and Lorence 1995). Edwin A. Locke and Gary P. Latham (1990) use expectancy theory, along with social-cognitive theory, attribution theory, job characteristics theory, equity theory, and turnover-commitment theory, to consider how expectations might interact with the worker’s immediate situation on the job. Their work focuses on the role of goals in the work setting. According to "goal setting theory," a commitment to goals, fostered by self-efficacy and compatible values, will influence performance at work (Mortimer and Lorence 1995). In particular, Locke and Latham contend that specific difficult goals, rather than specific easy goals, vague goals, or no
goals, lead to better performance (Locke and Latham 1990). Interestingly, Locke and Latham also found that individuals who were assigned goals demonstrated the same level of commitment and performance as those individuals who were permitted to set their own goals (Locke and Latham 1990).

Locke and Latham note their surprise in the high effectiveness of assigned goals, and provide explanation for such a finding. They contend that these goals are often assigned by people with legitimate authority- a powerful tool of influence. Furthermore, the assignment of a goal signals to the worker that the person making the assignment is confident in the worker’s ability to carry out the goal. Additionally, workers will be motivated by the present challenge. Finally, Locke and Latham argue that assigned goals "help to define the standards people use to attain self-satisfaction with their performance," (1990: 241).

There are instances, however, when workers perform more poorly on assigned goals than on goals the workers themselves set. This occurs when instructions for assigned goals lack any rationale (Locke and Latham 1990). Furthermore, the effectiveness of goal setting, according to Locke and Latham, is often contingent on feedback. Without feedback, goals have little long term affect on performance (Locke and Latham 1990).

To review, Table 2.1 summarizes the main concepts of each perspective within the social psychology of work.
In sum, the present study draws on the three paradigms of the social psychology of work to identify new structural occupational conditions of work that affect psychological and attitudinal outcomes. From a social structure and personality perspective, these new conditions contribute to psychological outcome predictions, while also initiating the potential to predict attitudinal outcomes. Justification for the use of these conditions to predict psychological and attitudinal outcomes is found within the symbolic interactionist and psychological social psychologist perspectives.

**Drawing on Social Structure and Personality, Symbolic Interactionism, and Psychological Social Psychology within the Present Study:**

According to the symbolic interactionist perspective, workers’ orientations to work emerge from interactional processes (Mortimer and Lorence 1995). By identifying the worker’s rules for interaction, the interactional process that will take place is known, and thus predictions can be made as to the orientations that will emerge. Furthermore, the psychological social psychology conjecture that the job must “fit” the worker lends additional support to the use of rules for interaction as a predictor of psychological and attitudinal outcomes of work. Simply speaking, rules for interaction, among other implications, function to control the worker’s behavior such that it is similar to that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Structure and Personality</th>
<th>Describes psychological rather than attitudinal outcomes of work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Interactionism</td>
<td>Orientations to the job emerge from ongoing interactional processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Social Psychology</td>
<td>The job ought to “fit” the traits of the particular worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Perspectives within the Social Psychology of Work: Main Concepts
of every other worker within the particular occupational group to which the rules have been assigned. As these rules are followed by all workers within that group, they come to signify conformity and sameness, rather than uniqueness. It is likely, then, that a worker with these rules for interaction would not consider the job to "fit" him/her. If the job was indeed a perfect fit, the worker would be interacting with customers/clients as he or she so chooses; an interaction that "fits" him/her. Thus knowledge of a requirement to follow certain rules for interaction indicates that the job will not "fit" the worker, and therefore predictions of job-dissatisfaction can be assumed. This line of reasoning can then be expanded by including the additional outcome variables previously mentioned.

Each of these three general perspectives, then, highlights rules, generally speaking, as a central component of work. A more specific theoretical question that remains is how rules may affect the outcomes that I focus on in this research, including self esteem, mastery, locus of control, and job satisfaction. While there are many theoretically conceivable dimensions of "rules," I argue that one fruitful approach is to examine the relationship between rules and the aforementioned outcomes vis-à-vis emotional labor in particular.

2.2 Structural Occupational Conditions
2.2.1 Emotional Labor

When studying occupational conditions from a social psychological perspective, rules by which workers must abide can be distinguished as falling within one of two major categories. First, there are those rules that are somewhat typical within any organization (i.e.: "show up on time," "don’t steal," "don’t operate the machinery without safety goggles on"). They typically regulate workers’ physical behavior, or function to keep workers productive and safe and to keep the organization running smoothly. It is the second category of rules, however, that is of particular interest in the present study. These rules are arguably more complex. They function to regulate workers emotional behavior, as a means to project a certain company "image" or to attract and retain clients/customers. These rules are unique in that they often are not communicated through formal means, but rather are simply expected or implied. Within the sociology of occupations literature, this category of rules falls into a broader category of "emotional labor." Kristina Abiala (1999) describes this form of labor by saying, "When emotional labour (sic) is a part of service work, specific rules are transferred. There are rules about how to act and what feelings to communicate, i.e. display rules. There are also rules about what to feel or try to feel, i.e. feeling rules" (208). She goes on to explain that these rules derive from societal, occupational, and organizational norms. Indeed, James M. Diefendorff, Erin M. Richard and Meredith H. Croyle (2006) note that "implicit in much of the emotional labor research is the notion that display rules reflect norms for interacting with others" (274).

Several factors determine the extent to which emotional labor is present within a
particular job. Diefendorff et al distinguish jobs with a high degree of emotional labor as those with high amounts of customer contact, strict control over workers' emotional displays, and the creation of particular emotions in customers. Such characteristics lend themselves to Ian Hampson and Anne Junor's (2005) ideas of emotional labor. They postulate that this form of work is performed to maintain social order "by managing reactions to the conflicts between customer expectations and the rationalised (sic) service deliverable within the capitalist system of accumulation and shareholder value." (2005: 167).

It is interesting to note that emotional labor is rarely noticed or compensated (Juravich: 2005). Diefendorff et al recognize this phenomenon, stating "...it is essential that employees be aware of and understand the display expectations of the job. However... display rules are often not explicitly stated by organizations but exist as unwritten norms" (2006: 273). In other words, rather than incorporate these rules into a structured policy, employers instead communicate these expectations via mission statements and through the implied understanding of professional and societal norms (Diefendorff et al: 2006).

Abiala speaks of the display and feeling rules associated with emotional labor in positive terms, noting their functions within encounters between workers and customers. She states that, by routinizing encounters, display and feeling rules maintain a level of control on behalf of the employer over the worker (Abiala 1999). Furthermore, she argues that these rules provide the worker a degree of emotional distance within the
interaction, by allowing the worker "to maintain objectivity and emotional equilibrium" (1999: 209).

Hasida Ben-Zur and Dana Yagil (2005) speak less favorably of emotional labor. They consider it to be distressing to the worker, citing that the worker must maintain a polite and courteous demeanor, regardless of the customer’s behavior. Hampson and Junor express similar dismay, stating that "even the emotional aspects of customer interaction are scripted, undermining the personal autonomy of the customer service worker who suffers alienation and loss of self." (2005: 172). Additionally, Diefendorff et al denounce emotional labor. They contradict Abiala’s assertion that display rules are desirable to the worker as a means to maintain emotional distance by arguing instead that these rules "are intended to constrain employee emotional expressions to be a certain way so as to facilitate the attainment of desired performance objectives" (2006: 274). In this instance, then, emotional labor functions to benefit the employer, not the worker.

Ben-Zur and Yagil examine the behavior of the customer, particularly the level of customer aggression, as a means to further exemplify the implications of emotional labor on the service worker. They first address the one-sided "relationship" that exists between the service worker and the customer. They describe a situation within which there not only exists a distinct imbalance of power between the service worker and the customer, but the imbalance is expected to be as such before either party enters into the relationship. Ben-Zur and Yagil explain that there is an "informal interpersonal contract between service providers and customers" where the service worker is
obligated to demonstrate "polite and pleasant manners regardless of the customer’s behaviour (sic)" (2005: 81). This situation renders the service worker, or "victim" as termed by Ben-Zur and Yagil, stressed and vulnerable. Such conditions, then, lead to a condition that Ben-Zur and Yagil describe as most common among service professions: burnout. They define burnout as "a syndrome consisting of emotional exhaustion, de-personalization, and a reduction in one's sense of personal accomplishment," (2005: 82).

By far, however, the dominant theoretical position in sociology comes from Hochschild’s (1983) study on the management of human emotions in occupational settings. Her qualitative study focuses on the emotional labor requirements of flight attendants while on the job. By attending training sessions, as well as interviewing individual flight attendants, Hochschild is able to describe the emotional labor as including elaborate sets of rules that the attendants must follow. These rules serve as a means to advertise the airline’s image, as well as to ensure appropriate social interaction with customers. Hochschild’s qualitative study lays the groundwork for the present research. Using a survey method, I am able to quantify the study of emotional labor by identifying specific independent and dependant variables.

2.2.2 Self-Esteem

Self-esteem can be assessed in terms of two major constructs: global self-esteem and specific self-esteem. In the simplest of terms, Morris Rosenberg, Carmi Schooler, Carrie
Schoenbach, and Florence Rosenberg (1995) distinguish global self-esteem as representing how much value people place on themselves as a whole, and specific self-esteem representing how much value people place on particular "facets" of themselves. As a result of this distinction, they claim that it is possible for an individual to experience both high and low self-esteem simultaneously (Rosenberg et al 1995). Furthermore, Rosenberg et al assert that global and specific self-esteem differ in their consequences. Assuming that either construct of self-esteem may be studied as either an independent variable or a dependent variable, they indeed may differentially affect, or be differentially affected by, behavioral outcomes (Rosenberg et al 1995).

Extant research within the social psychology of work on both global and specific self-esteem is limited. Rosenberg et al explain the lack of significant self-esteem literature, in part, as a result of the dual nature of self-esteem. Several studies, they claim, have been conducted with a misunderstanding of the two constructs and have thus yielded "mispredictions and weak associations," (1995: 142). They stress the importance of relating the proper construct of self-esteem, be it global or specific, with the particular outcome variable of interest. In particular, Rosenberg et al postulate that "specific behavior is best predicted by a specific self-esteem that is in some way connected to that behavior, whereas psychological well-being is best predicted by global self-esteem," (1995: 144).

In their 2003 study, Roy F. Baumeister, Jennifer D. Campbell, Joachim I. Krueger, and Kathleen D. Vohs seek to determine if high self-esteem causes, among other outcomes, better performance. They too emphasize the importance of distinguishing
between global and specific self-esteem, and add to Rosenberg et al’s assertions by stating that "predictions improve when self-esteem is measured for the domain of interest and among people who consider this domain to be personally important," (2003: 6, emphasis added).

Baumeister et al establish the general assumption that high self-esteem results in positive outcomes and benefits as a critical point of reference in their study. Applying this assumption to the workplace, Baumeister et al claim the "self-esteem hypothesis" to suggest that "people who feel better about themselves perform better," (2003: 14). They are skeptical of past studies, which showed weak positive relationships, and cite the discrepancies in use of both global and specific measures of self-esteem (Baumeister et al 2003). They also express the lack of causal inference that can be derived from such studies; while self-esteem may improve job performance, the inverse scenario is also plausible. In other words, whether self-esteem functions as the independent variable or dependent variable is unclear.

Baumeister et al reference the findings of studies conducted by Wallace and Baumeister, Baumeister, Heatherton, and Tice, and J.D. Campbell and Fairey as further support for their claims that much self-esteem research with regard to work has yielded nonsignificant or marginally significant results due to erroneous measurements of the construct. Indeed, the most tangible findings they report come from J.D Campbell and Fairey’s (1985) study, showing that, when the prospect of failure is salient, high self-esteem may improve task performance, but in general "self-esteem seems to have little

To study the self-esteem construct in any paradigm, under any circumstance, proves to be a challenge. The researcher must first make the important distinction between global self-esteem and specific self-esteem, and then employ proper measurement of the construct accordingly. The researcher must then take on the question of causality. With the exception, perhaps, of a longitudinal study, it can be quite difficult to establish more than just a correlation between self-esteem and another variable. These obstacles, as noted above, have caused a lack of solid self-esteem research within the social psychology of work, and an even greater deficit in significant findings.

Even more lacking than the overall construct of self-esteem within the social psychological of work research, however, is the study of self-esteem as a dependent variable. To examine self-esteem as such presents yet another challenge. Referring to an individual’s beliefs of his/her own value, self-esteem is more of a perception than a reality (Baumeister et al 2003). The construct is subjective and thus the determinants of a particular individual's self-esteem are more abstract than those of a strictly objective construct. Nevertheless, establishing these determinants, and subsequently being able to study self-esteem as a dependent variable, is critical to the understanding and advancement of the social psychology of work. Such a challenge is undertaken in the present study.
2.2.3 Mastery

Leonard I. Pearlin (year unknown) defines mastery as a concept concerning control over forces affecting one's life, regardless of their source. He categorizes mastery, along with self-efficacy and locus of control, as "concepts that interface around the notion of control," (year unknown: 14). In his study on the effects of social stressors on mental health and disorder, Pearlin suggests that one's sense of mastery can function as a powerful moderator to, among other outcomes, the effects of status demarcation brought on by social structures where there is an unequal distribution of power, prestige, and economic resources (Pearlin year unknown). Indeed, Pearlin refers to mastery as a "personal resource" in coping with such stressors. He speculates that a sense of mastery serves as a barrier to these effects by reducing feelings of vulnerability. Pearlin further speculates the merits of the construct, explaining a sense of mastery as self-fulfilling; when one feels a sense of control over particular forces in life, he/she will act accordingly (Pearlin year unknown). Pearlin ultimately describes mastery as "a liberating disposition, freeing people to be more experimental and more forceful in facing up to life exigencies," (year unknown: 15).

Unsal Yetim (2002) offers a more contemporary definition of mastery as a feeling "derived from personal sense of control on life and from individuals' perceptions about considering themselves as initiator or cause of the life events," (2002: 300). He adds to this definition that it is the "extent to which people feel to be in control of the important circumstances in their life" (2002: 300). Yetim makes an important distinction between two types of mastery: primary control and secondary control. Primary
control, found by Weisz et al to be most important in the United States, involves the
individual making a direct effect on existing realities (Yetim 2002). Secondary control,
then, refers to the individual establishing control in life via the accommodation of ex-
isting realities (Yetim 2002).

Extant research examines the effects of mastery on numerous outcomes. Paul G.
Liberty, Jr. and Robert W. Moulton (1966) examine the effects of mastery on oc-
cupational attraction. Mastery is assumed to be present in their study, rather than
achieved or determined, due to the characteristics of the particular occupations under
consideration. Liberty, Jr. and Moulton describe these jobs to "require a high degree
of skill, promote the utilization of one’s abilities, and represent a challenge, or a test of
personal excellence,” (1966: 105). Liberty, Jr. and Moulton examine how occupations
requiring a high degree mastery will determine job attraction for individuals who differ
in the value placed on activities requiring mastery, as well as direct, conscious value
placed on achievement (Liberty, Jr. and Moulton 1966). In a study of 160 undergrad-
uate college men, Liberty Jr. and Moulton determined that individuals who placed a
high value on activities requiring mastery found jobs requiring mastery or competence
more attractive than jobs with a high level of prestige. Additionally, individuals without
a high value for activities requiring mastery, as well as individuals experiencing a high
fear of failure, found prestigious jobs more attractive than those requiring mastery or
competence (Liberty Jr. and Moulton 1966).

In yet another study of the effects of mastery, Yetim examines its relationship to
life satisfaction among Turkish university students and academicians. Yetim notes that perceptions of mastery may vary according to an individual’s particular culture; to be specific, whether the culture is individualistic or collectivistic. In collectivistic cultures, Yetim explains, there is a strong emphasis on family and group life, and a less essential concept of “self” than in individualist cultures. An individual’s desire for control or mastery within a collectivistic culture is a norm violation, and thus there is less pursuit of mastery (Yetim 2003). The Turkish culture is of particular interest to this study because it cannot be defined as wholly individualistic or wholly collectivistic.

A sample of 696 university students and academicians from the same university were administered the Individualism/Collectivism Scale, the Rosenberg Global Self-Esteem scale, a 4-item mastery scale, and The Satisfaction with Life Scale. When dividing the sample into males and females, Yetim found for both groups the higher the collectivism, the lower the mastery and thus the lower the self-esteem. When dividing the sample into students and academicians, he found individualism moderately correlated with mastery and self-esteem for students. For academicians, he found a moderately strong positive correlation between life satisfaction and mastery as well as self-esteem (Yetim 2003). In summary, Yetim found individualism, self-esteem and mastery to be positively correlated to life satisfaction, whereas collectivism had negative correlations with life satisfaction.

In the previously discussed research, mastery is examined as the independent variable. Like self-esteem, there is little extant research in the social psychology of work
that considers mastery a dependent variable. Mastery is subjective by definition; it is a belief or feeling (Roessler and Rumrill 1995, Lombardi and Ulbrich 1997, Yetim 2003, Timmer and Aartsen 2003), and ultimately this feeling leads to the above-mentioned outcomes. Establishing the determinants of this feeling is thus paramount to a further understanding of occupation social psychology. Furthermore, as demonstrated in the reviewed literature, mastery as an independent variable predicts numerous occupational outcomes, and therefore determining the conditions that result in feelings of mastery is essential.

Emilio L. Lombardi and Patricia M. Ulbrich’s (1997) study considers mastery a dependent variable by examining its relationship, along with the outcome variables depressed mood and anxiety, to the conditions of paid work versus unpaid housework among women. Lombardi and Ulbrich first identify the distinguishing conditions of paid work and unpaid housework. Paid work for the average woman, they argue, lacks autonomy or decision latitude. The individual does not have the freedom to decide what work to do and how to do it; she does not have the opportunity to use discretion in her work activities. Unpaid housework, on the contrary, is unsupervised and allows for autonomy and freedom of decision making (Lombardi and Ulbrich 1997). Lombardi and Ulbrich then make the claim that "jobs that provide discretion in deciding what to do and how to do it foster a sense of control," (1997: 20). In other words, these jobs foster a sense of mastery. Based on this assumption, Lombardi and Ulbrich hypothesize that this sense of mastery (or lack there of) will then mediate the effects of work conditions on the psychological outcomes depressed mood and anxiety.
Taking data from the first wave of the American Changing Lives survey, Lombardi and Ulbrich found decision latitude to be positively associated to mastery and negatively associated to depressed mood and anxiety (Lombardi and Ulbrich 1997). Interestingly, Lombardi and Ulbrich reached the unexpected finding that neither the psychological demands of paid work or unpaid housework had an association with women’s sense of mastery. Mastery showed a strong negative effect on both depressed mood and anxiety, regardless of women’s employment status.

In a study of male inmates at an incentive-based reformatory, Thomas L. Wright and Tom Holman (1980) question the extent to which locus of control predicts mastery over the environment. They first used the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control scale to distinguish subjects as having a generalized expectancy for either internal or external locuses of control. They further distinguished those subjects with external expectancies for locus of control into subgroups. "Defensive externals" responded externally to the scale as a means to avoid internal attribution of responsibility for failure. "Congruent externals" responded externally to the scale because "the items straightforwardly reflect[ed] their own generalized expectancies" (1980: 1006).

Mastery was measured in terms of success versus failure as subjects moved through the incentive system within the reformatory. Wright and Holman predicted, and then confirmed, internals to demonstrate higher levels of motivational and behavioral mastery than externals. Among externals, they predicted the defensive to achieve more
mastery than the congruent (1980: 1007). This hypothesis was not confirmed (Wright and Holman 1980).

Among the extant research, nothing to date has directly examined the effects of occupational conditions on feelings of mastery among workers. The present study does just that.

2.2.4 Locus of Control

Rotter (1989) explains locus of control in terms of internal versus external control beliefs, a nuanced distinction that goes beyond the conventional conceptualization of mastery. Internal locus of control indicates that the individual believes outcomes of their behavior are "contingent on their own behavior or personal characteristics," whereas external locus of control signifies an individual’s belief that outcomes are "a function of chance, luck, or fate," and under the control of powerful others (1989: 489). Locus of control can also be examined as either a unidimensional or multidimensional construct (Tuja Muhonen and Eva Torkelson 2004). As a unidimensional construct, locus of control refers to a particular individual’s global or "overall" control belief. As a multidimensional construct, however, it is possible for an individual to differ in his/her locus of control beliefs in various areas of life (Muhonen and Torkelson 2004).

There is little extant research in the social psychology of work that considers locus of control a dependent variable. Rather, in an overwhelming amount of studies regarding
locus of control, as demonstrated below, a particular individual’s locus of control belief is assessed, determined to be either internal or external, and the subsequent effects of locus of control on a particular outcome variable are considered accordingly. Using data from a previous study, collected via questionnaire administered to employees of a governmental agency, Coleman et al distinguish the effects of internal versus external locus of control beliefs on organizational commitment. They predict that determining an individual’s particular locus of control belief will predict not only the degree, but also the type of organizational commitment the individual holds. For the purposes of their study, Coleman et al identify two types of organizational commitment: affective, referring to a “psychological attachment to the organization,” and continuance, referring to “costs associated with leaving the organization and the perceived lack of alternatives,” (1999: 996).

Coleman et al assert that those with internal locus of control beliefs are more likely to report a higher degree of organizational commitment because they believe they have more control over their work environment and are more likely to be committed to an organization that fosters such control. Furthermore, ”internals” are more likely than ”externals” to take action (i.e. quit) when dissatisfied with a situation, and thus only those only committed internals are likely to remain at a particular organization (Coleman et al 1999). These assertions, coupled with the additional knowledge that internals are more likely to join/remain in organizations that suit their dispositions, lead Coleman et al to also predict affective, rather than continuance, to be the type of commitment associated with internal locus of control beliefs (Coleman et al 1999).
Coleman et al found that rather than externals being less organizationally committed, they instead experienced a different type of organizational commitment than did internals. That is, as predicted, individuals with internal locus of control beliefs reported higher levels of affective organizational commitment than individuals with external locus of control beliefs, and individuals with external locus of control beliefs reported higher levels of continuance organizational commitment than individuals with internal locus of control beliefs (Coleman et al 1999).

Theodore A. Avtgis and Shannon M. Brogan (1999) assess the level of quality and satisfaction in organizational relationships as a function of locus of control at work. Similar to Coleman et al, Avtgis and Brogan’s predictions are based on internal versus external locus of control beliefs. Indeed, they expect internals to report greater relationship satisfaction with coworkers, supervisors, and management than externals. They also speculate that internals will report greater perceived influence than will externals (Avtgis and Brogan 1999).

Employees from several organizations throughout the United States composed the sample of 200 participants who completed both the Work Locus of Control Scale and the Organizational Communication Relationship Scale. As predicted, internals reported significantly higher levels of relational satisfaction with coworkers, supervisors, and management, as well as a higher degree of perceived influence than did externals.
Almerinda Forte (2005) also distinguishes individuals as either internal or external before assessing the subsequent affects of their particular locus of control beliefs. Specifically, Forte examines the relationship of internal versus external control to the moral reasoning of managers. A mail survey was administered to 400 managerial and executive level employees of various organizations throughout the United States. The survey included Rotter’s I-E locus of control scale, and also questions from James Rest’s Defining Issues Test- a scale used to determine the moral reasoning and development of an individual (Forte 2005). The former scale revealed a relatively high degree of internal locus of control beliefs for respondents, while the latter scale revealed a more even distribution across the levels of moral reasoning. By comparing respondents’ scores on the two scales, Forte identified a negative relationship between internal locus of control beliefs and level of moral reasoning, although the relationship was not significant. Interestingly, Forte also found that both extreme internals and extreme externals showed similar levels of moral reasoning (Forte 2005). Further analysis of the data also revealed a positive relationship between age and internal locus of control beliefs. In addition, male respondents reported somewhat higher internal locus of control beliefs than did females, however the results were not significant.

The previously discussed research demonstrates locus of control as the independent variable. Similar to limitations present within the self-esteem and mastery literature, there is little extant research in the social psychology of work that considers locus of control a dependent variable. Like mastery, extant literature identifies locus of control as an independent variable, predicting numerous occupational outcomes. Un-
derstanding what elicits particular locus of control beliefs would thus provide a more comprehensive understanding of the social psychology of work.

Terje Manger, Ole-Johan Eikeland, and Arve Asbjørnsen (2002) provide some insight as to what the locus of control construct may look like as a dependent variable, although their work does not fall directly into the social psychology of work literature. Instead, their school-based study examined the effects of a social-cognitive training program on beliefs of locus of control among 14- and 15-year old students. Manger et al make the argument that, because students with internal locus of control beliefs for success/failure tend to show higher achievement, giving students greater control over their educational experience should result in higher levels of achievement. Manger et al thus endeavored to determine a way in which to generate a greater sense of control among students. They assert that the development of both meta-cognitive and social-cognitive skills is paramount to a student’s beliefs of internal locus of control (Manger et al 2002). The former skill set refers to the use of “cognitive strategies for finding and organizing information.” However it is the latter, and perhaps less-obviously necessary skill set, that is most pertinent to this study.

Manger et al implemented a one-year program which included training in such areas as interpersonal problem-solving, social skills, self-critical thinking, and emotional control. The program functioned as a means to evaluate the effects of social-cognitive skills training on students’ internal or external locus of control beliefs (Manger et al 2002). Manger et al found a significant difference between pre- and post-test scores
for subjects who received training, but not comparison subjects, in the direction of higher locus of control beliefs, thus confirming that social-cognitive training affects students' locus of control beliefs. (Manger et al 2002). Manger et al demonstrate in their study the potential in using locus of control as dependent variable to develop a richer understanding of the construct. The present study introduces locus of a control as a dependent variable, and exhibits its subsequent possibilities for advancement of the literature, to the social psychology of work.

2.2.5 Job Satisfaction

Edwin A. Locke defines job satisfaction as a "positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences," (Locke in Mortimer and Lorence 1995: 500). Within the field, studies of job satisfaction have tended to follow a broad, all-encompassing pattern. In other words, rather than look at specific facets of the job, investigators have focused on individuals' satisfaction (or lack there of) for the job as a whole (Mortimer and Lorence 1995). Using this approach, Jeylan T. Mortimer and Jon Lorence report that several repeated national surveys found only 10 to 15 percent of workers to express job dissatisfaction (1995: 500). The predictors of job satisfaction for subjects in a particular study, however, may prove to yield different results.

Describing job satisfaction as "the extent to which individuals find that their jobs fulfil (sic) some internal desire or need," Diefendorff et al examine its relationship to emotional labor. They find that job satisfaction is positively correlated to emotional labor in situations where the worker is required to express positive emotions; and is
negatively correlated to emotional labor when the worker must suppress negative emo-
tions 2006). Diefendorff et al do not discuss, however, the job satisfaction’s correlation
to emotional labor when the worker must simultaneously express positive emotions and
suppress negative emotions.

In another study of job satisfaction, Thomas Sy, Susanna Tram and Linda A. O’Hara
(2006) examine the relationship between the emotional intelligence of food service
workers and their managers, and job satisfaction. Emotional intelligence is loosely de-

Sy et al go on to predict the effects of a manger’s particular level of emotional intelli-
gence on workers. Citing the potential of a particular manager’s emotional intelligence
level to foster positive work attitudes and altruistic behaviors among workers, as well as
to promote resilience and confidence, and to nurture positive interactions, Sy et al hy-
pothesize and later confirm that managers’ emotional intelligence will positively affect
job satisfaction for workers (Sy et al 2006). More specifically, they predict and confirm
that the relationship will be stronger for workers with a low emotional intelligence than
for those experiencing high emotional intelligence. Sy et al explain this discrepancy
by noting that workers with a low emotional intelligence are less adept at managing
their emotions, and thus the management and regulation of emotions fostered by the emotional intelligence of a manager can have a greater impact (Sy et al 2006). Ultimately, Sy et al’s research demonstrates, among other findings, how the way in which emotions are identified and managed in the workplace, both by the worker and other significant individuals, can affect outcome variables such as job satisfaction.

Brian T. Loher, Raymond A. Noe, Nancy L. Moeller and Michael P. Fitzgerald (1985) use meta-analysis to determine the ”true” relationship between job characteristics and job satisfaction, and to establish whether or not that relationship is moderated by an individual’s high need for personal growth and development (i.e. growth need strength: ”GNS”). Loher et al analyzed 28 studies classified as either directly assessing the relation between job characteristics and job satisfaction, or as assessing the relation between job characteristics and job satisfaction as moderated by GNS (Loher et al 1985). All of the studies relied on Hackman and Oldham’s 1976 Job Diagnostic Survey- a measure of perceived job task characteristics, such as skill variety and task significance. The measurement scale used for job satisfaction throughout the 28 studies varied (Loher et al 1985).

Although they do not indicate the specific job characteristics significant to their findings, Loher et al suggest that such characteristics would contribute to a job’s complexity and enrichment (Loher et al 1985). That being said, Loher et al found a moderate relation between job characteristics and job satisfaction. Furthermore, they found this relationship to be stronger for workers with a high GNS (Loher et al 1985).
Finally, Richard D. Arvey, Thomas J. Bouchard, Jr., Nancy L. Segal, and Lauren M. Abraham (1989) consider environmental and genetic components that may affect job satisfaction. To do so, monozygotic twins reared apart from an early age underwent a comprehensive work-history assessment. Though the researchers did not find support for a single-item overall job satisfaction scale, a significant genetic component to intrinsic and general job satisfaction was confirmed (Arvey et al. 1989). The latter findings have important implications for the social psychology of work, as they suggest that the organization of work itself may have less influence over job satisfaction than is commonly assumed.

Of the four constructs identified as dependent variables in the present study, the extent research on job satisfaction is arguably the most extensive with regard to the social psychology of work. Nonetheless, there is a lack of literature directly examining the effects of emotional labor on job satisfaction. The present study contributes to the literature by addressing this shortage.

2.3 Hypotheses

To test the above arguments, I hypothesize the following:

**Hypothesis 1:** The presence of rules for interaction will have a negative effect on occupational conditions.

**Hypothesis 1a:** The presence of rules for interaction will have a negative effect on self-esteem at work.
**Hypothesis 1b:** The presence of rules for interaction will have a negative effect on feelings of mastery at work.

**Hypothesis 1c:** The presence of rules for interaction will have a negative effect on locus of control beliefs at work.

**Hypothesis 1d:** The presence of rules for interaction will have a negative effect on job satisfaction.
3 Methods

3.0.1 Procedure

A web-based survey was administered to test the hypotheses. The computerized version of the survey was created and administered by the Survey Research Lab (SRL), which is located within the Sociology Department at Kent State University.

Solicitation. Respondents were solicited to participate in the survey via email. The email explained the terms and conditions of the survey. Potential respondents were notified at that point that participation in the study is both voluntary and confidential. Contact information regarding the researcher (myself), faculty advisor, and the Vice President of the Division of Research and Graduate Studies was provided. The email solicitation can be viewed as Appendix I.
The email solicitation also functioned as a preliminary consent form. Potential respondents were notified of the age requirement (18 years of age or older) necessary to participate in the survey. The solicitation also included a disclaimer indicating to potential participants that, by clicking on the provided link to the survey, they were acknowledging the terms and conditions of the survey, and consenting to participate.

The email solicitation was sent out in five groups. Groups 1-4 had 4,400 potential respondents, and group no. 5 had 4,388 potential respondents. By dividing the population into five groups, outgoing and incoming information was more manageable, thus leaving less room for administrative error. The email solicitation was sent to the five groups over a period of two weeks.

Reminder emails were sent to the previously solicited groups each time a new group was initially contacted. After all five groups had been solicited, additional reminder emails were sent to all five groups over a period of approximately eight weeks.

Survey. The survey was accessible online, via a link provided in the email solicitation. The first screen of the survey was a consent form including the same information from the email solicitation: an explanation of the study, the terms and conditions of the survey, and contact information. There was once again a disclaimer indicating to potential participants that, by clicking on the "consent" option, they were acknowledging the terms and conditions of the survey, and consenting to participate. Respondents were unable to proceed with the survey unless they chose the "consent" option. The
The survey itself was computer-adaptive. The specific answers provided by a particular respondent determined which questions followed. This setup was most desirable, as it allowed me to ask each respondent appropriate questions, and avoid asking unnecessary questions. In doing so, the chance of a respondent quitting the survey because a question does not apply to him/her was less likely. Respondents could be subjected to a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 106 questions. Depending on the amount of questions a respondent received, the survey took approximately 1-25 minutes to complete.

Questions on the survey covered the following topics: demographics, education, finances, employment status, occupational conditions, compliance, coworkers, status, self-esteem, mastery, locus of control, and job satisfaction. The majority of the questions had corresponding multiple-choice response sets. The remaining questions had a drop-down menu, response scale, or fill-in box. The survey can be viewed as Appendix III.

A progress bar present on the screen for the duration of the survey progressively grew as respondents reached the end of the survey. A "percent complete" display was also visible for respondents to gauge how close they were to completion. Respondents were notified before they began the survey that it could take up to 25 minutes to complete. Thus I assume that the decision of a respondent to participate in the survey
indicated he/she has accepted the 25 minute time frame and had thereby committed to it. The progress bar, then, functioned to encourage respondents to continue the survey through to the end by demonstrating that they were still within the time frame they committed to. Upon completing the survey, a screen appeared to thank respondents for their participation. Respondents were not be contacted again for any reason after completing the survey.

3.0.2 Participants

Of the 22,317 undergraduate and graduate Kent State University students, 21,988 were able to be solicited via email to participate in the study. Of that population, 1,280 individuals responded. The sample was 29.8\%/ male and 70.2\%/ female. The age bracket 20-22 years had the highest percentage of participants, 30.5\%/o. The age bracket with the next highest percentage, 28.1\%/o, was age 18-19. After that, the age bracket 33 and older had the next highest percentage of participants at 17.6\%/o. The remaining participants fell into the age brackets 23-26 and 27-32 years old. 35.5\%/o of participants reported senior status as a student, 23.8\%/o reported freshman status, 15.2\%/o reported sophomore status, and the remaining 15.1\%/o reported junior student status.

The majority of participants, 89.7\%/o, reported their race to be white. The next highest percentage, 6\%/o, responded as black or African American. The remaining 4.3\%/o of respondents reported their race to be American Indian/Native American, Asian or Pacific Islander, or other.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Research Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Students</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students(^a)</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>33,630</td>
<td>1,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Percentages may not add up to 100, as other categories were not considered.\(^b\) The research sample questionnaire asked if you considered yourself to be an undergraduate. Those that said "no" are in this category. Source: November 2006 Survey of KSU Student Body and KSU Flash Facts

Table 3.1: Rectification of Research Sample and Population Demographics

Dillman (2000) asserts that the acceptable response rate for Web-based surveys should be approximately 80\%. He acknowledges, however, that this rate is extremely high and difficult to obtain. As a result, he suggests that researchers using this design employ a procedure to encourage higher response rates. I indeed employed such a procedure -each of the students was reminded via e-mail to participate in the study. In lieu of very high response rates, Dillman (2000) suggests that samples be rectified with demographic data (e.g. age, sex, class year), so that they closely match the demographic data of the particular population of interest. Table 2 presents the demographics of the sample as compared to the known population parameters provided by administrators at Kent State University. Note that the sample is closely representative of the student population on important demographics.

The present study required information only from those participants presently employed.
After ruling out those participants not presently employed, a sample of 844 participants remained. Of the 844 employed participants remaining, 28.4% were male, and 71.6% female. Again, the age bracket 20-22 years had the highest percentage of participants, 32.1%. In this sample, the age bracket 33 and older had the next highest percentage of participants with 22.2%, followed by 19.8% of participants falling in the 23-26 years age bracket. The remaining participants fell in the 18-19 years and 27-32 years brackets. Like the larger sample, the majority of participants in the workers-only sample reported their race to be white, although in this sample the percent was even higher, at 91.5%. Again, the next highest percentage, in this sample 5.7%, responded as black or African American. Of the remaining 2.9% of respondents, 2.8% reported their race to be Asian or Pacific Islander or other, while only 0.1% reported their race to be American Indian/Native American.

3.1 Measures

3.1.1 Independent Variable

Rules for Interaction:

Rules for interaction were assessed via the following question: "(Prompt: For the next question, think about your responsibilities for talking to customers.) Do you have rules that you must obey when you talk to/interact with clients/customers, such as how to answer the phone, how to settle a dispute with a customer/client, how to treat an upset or angry customer/client, rules that the customer/client is always right, or rules to lie or be misleading to customers/clients in order to sell products and services?"
Respondents could answer 'yes' or 'no' to this question.

### 3.1.2 Dependent Variables

**Self Esteem:**

Self-esteem was assessed using the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale, the most widely used of all self-esteem measures (Rosenberg et al 1995). The scale consists of ten statements, such as "At times I feel that I am not good at all," to which respondents could select "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," or "strongly disagree." To ensure measurement of specific rather than global self-esteem, this section of the survey was preceded by the prompt: "For these questions, think about how you feel WHEN YOU ARE AT WORK." A scale for self esteem was constructed by adding the ten items and then dividing by ten to create the "self esteem" variable. The Cronbach alpha for this scale is .888.

**Mastery:**

The Pearlin Mastery Scale was used to assess respondents' feelings of mastery when at work. The scale consists of seven statements, such as "There is really no way that I can solve some of the problems I have," to which respondents could select "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," or "strongly disagree." For the present study, this section of the survey was preceded by the prompt: "For these questions, think about how you feel WHEN YOU ARE AT WORK." A scale for mastery was constructed by adding the seven items and then dividing by seven to create the "mastery" variable. The Cronbach alpha for this scale is .814.

**Locus of Control:**
Locus of Control was assessed using the "powerful others" subscale, comprised of items from Rotter’s Internal-External Scale found in Levenson's research, which in measurement terms distinguishes, as its name implies, between internal and external dimensions of control. The scale consists of seven statements, such as "I feel like what happens in my life is mostly determined by powerful people," to which respondents could select "strongly disagree," "disagree," "slightly disagree," "slightly agree," "agree," or "strongly agree." For the present study, this section of the survey was preceded by the prompt: "For these questions, think about how you feel WHEN YOU ARE AT WORK." A scale for locus of control was constructed by adding the eight items and then dividing by eight to create the "locus of control" variable. The Cronbach alpha for this scale is .751.

**Job Satisfaction:**

Job satisfaction was assessed in two ways. Respondents completed the Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (1967.) The questionnaire consists of 20 questions, such as "How do you feel about the chance to do things different from time to time," to which respondents could answer "very satisfied," "satisfied," "I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not," "dissatisfied," or "very dissatisfied." For the present study, this section of the survey was preceded by the prompt: "For the following questions, think about how you feel at work." A scale for job satisfaction was constructed by adding the 20 items and then dividing by 20 to create the "job satisfaction large" variable. The Cronbach alpha for this scale is .889.

The second job satisfaction variable, labeled "Job Satisfaction small," was created by
combining respondents’ answers to the following questions: "How would you rate your level of satisfaction with your job," and "How would you rate your level of frustration with your job." Each question included a 7-point Likert response scale. Responses to the two items were then summed to create the "job satisfaction small" variable.
4 Results

Before the substantive analyses were conducted to determine confirmation or disconfirmation of the hypotheses, all dependent variables were standardized to address potential problems with non-normality, and bivariate correlations were run to provide an overview of the simple associations among the included variables, thereby in this case facilitating replication of the analyses by other researchers (e.g., in LISREL). In addition, there is some concern, despite conceptualization and measurement differences, that "mastery" and "locus of control" may be assessing the same underlying construct. The correlation matrix below indicates that these variables are moderately and negatively correlated, suggesting that they are not, in fact, measuring the same thing.
Next, to test my hypotheses, the data were analyzed to determine if there was a significant difference between workers who responded "yes" to the question "Do you have rules that you must obey when you talk to/interact with clients/customers, such as how to answer the phone, how to settle a dispute with a customer/client, how to treat an upset or angry customer/client, rules that the customer/client is always right, or rules to lie or be misleading to customers/clients in order to sell products and services?" and workers who responded "no." OLS regressions were used to determine if the two groups differed significantly with regard to the four outcome variables: self-esteem, locus of control, mastery, and job satisfaction.
Results (not shown) reveal that Hypothesis 1, and subsequently hypotheses 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d were not confirmed; there was no significant difference in the outcome variables between workers who reported having rules for interaction that they must obey and those who reported not having such rules.

While Hypothesis 1 was rejected, it may be that rules still influence the outcomes of interest in this study, but only when workers are averse to them. To explore this possibility, the data yielded from the group that responded "yes" to the question regarding rules for interaction was further analyzed. OLS regressions were used to determine if the group’s answers to the questions "how much do you approve of these rules?" and "would you act differently at work if you did not have these rules?" had a significant effect on the four outcome variables.

Interestingly, follow-up analyses (see Table 4) reveal that the independent variable "how much do you approve of these rules" (1 = "strongly approve" to 7 = "strongly disapprove") yielded a significant negative relationship to all of the dependent variables, and the independent variable "would you act differently at work if you did not have these rules" (1 = "yes"; 0 = "no") showed a significant negative relationship with the dependent variables "locus of control," "mastery," "job satisfaction small," and "job satisfaction large," net of gender, year-in-school, and age group. The relationship between "would you act differently at work if you did not have these rules" and self-

\[1\] In these follow-up analyses, gender is dummy-coded 1=male, 0=female; age consists of five categories (18-19, 20-22, 23-26, 27-32, and 33 and older; 20-22 is the reference category); and year-in-school consists of four categories (freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior).
esteem was also negative, although it was not significant. To summarize, workers who disapproved of the rules and reported that they would act differently showed lower levels of self-esteem, mastery, locus of control, and job satisfaction while at work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Self Esteem</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Locus of Control</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction (Small)</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction (Large)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 19-years-old</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.162)</td>
<td>(.164)</td>
<td>(.164)</td>
<td>(.165)</td>
<td>(.150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 to 26-years-old</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.105 *</td>
<td>-.103 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.116)</td>
<td>(.118)</td>
<td>(.118)</td>
<td>(.113)</td>
<td>(.109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 to 32-years-old</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.130 **</td>
<td>-.100 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.150)</td>
<td>(.152)</td>
<td>(.152)</td>
<td>(.145)</td>
<td>(.139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-years-old or older</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.121)</td>
<td>(.122)</td>
<td>(.122)</td>
<td>(.117)</td>
<td>(.112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Student</td>
<td>-2.30 ***</td>
<td>-2.024</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.042)</td>
<td>(.042)</td>
<td>(.042)</td>
<td>(.041)</td>
<td>(.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>-.139 ***</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.133)</td>
<td>(.135)</td>
<td>(.134)</td>
<td>(.132)</td>
<td>(.124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.117)</td>
<td>(.119)</td>
<td>(.118)</td>
<td>(.117)</td>
<td>(.102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Other</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.087 *</td>
<td>.083 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.134)</td>
<td>(.137)</td>
<td>(.136)</td>
<td>(.130)</td>
<td>(.126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=Strongly Approve, 7=Strongly Disapprove)</td>
<td>-.202 ***</td>
<td>-.221 ***</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.291 ***</td>
<td>-.386 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.042)</td>
<td>(.042)</td>
<td>(.042)</td>
<td>(.041)</td>
<td>(.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act differently with No Rules</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.101 *</td>
<td>.143 ***</td>
<td>-.099 *</td>
<td>-.108 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.106)</td>
<td>(.107)</td>
<td>(.107)</td>
<td>(.106)</td>
<td>(.098)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1=yes)</td>
<td>.217 *</td>
<td>.185 *</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: November 2006 Survey of KSU Student Body * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 4.2: Standardized Coefficients for the Cross-Sectional Regression of Self-Esteem, Mastery, Locus of Control and Job Satisfaction on Independent and Control Variables (N=630)
5 Discussion and Conclusions

Although the hypotheses were not confirmed, results yielded from the present study still demonstrate how drawing on the three major perspectives of the social psychology of work augments social structure and personality-oriented predictions of on-the-job outcomes of structural occupational conditions. Within the social structure and personality paradigm, Kohn et al (1983) identified the major structural occupational conditions that have significant effects on psychological outcomes to be self-direction/complexity of task activity, closeness of supervision, and degree of routinization (Mortimer and Lorence 1995). The present study has demonstrated that rules for interaction, or more specifically, an individual’s level of approval of those rules, also have an effect on psychological outcomes. Furthermore, rules for interaction affect attitudinal outcomes (i.e. job satisfaction,) thus broadening the scope of the theoretical orientation.
The symbolic interactionist and psychological social psychology orientations provide support for use of rules for interaction as a predictor of occupational outcomes within the social structure and personality perspective. With regard to symbolic interactionism, it was noted that identifying the worker’s rules for interaction would elicit predictions to a particular worker’s orientations toward work. Indeed, the present study demonstrates that knowledge of workers’ rules for interaction, or more precisely their level of approval of those rules, yield accurate predictions of workers’ orientation to work with regard to the four occupational outcomes.

The psychological social psychology conception that the job must “fit” the worker’s individual traits was also found, in the present study, to justify the use of rules for interaction as a predictor of psychological and attitudinal outcomes of work. The present study showed that a worker’s level of approval of rules for interaction had a significant effect on his/her self-esteem, mastery, locus of control, and job satisfaction while at work. Arguably, adversity to such rules would indicate that the rules do not “fit” the worker. As previously stated, when rules for interaction, and thus the subsequent job that requires those rules, does not “fit” the worker, predictions of job-dissatisfaction can be assumed. The present study confirmed such predictions.

5.1 Limitations and Guidelines for Future Research

The present study’s findings suggest that the mere presence of rules is not enough to evoke results in occupation-related outcomes, but rather the presence of rules that in-
individuals are adverse to, is sufficient. Future research would benefit from examining the reason why individuals may be adverse to particular rules. The following are tentative explanations as to why individuals were adverse to rules and its affect on the outcome variables in the present study.

5.1.1 Self Esteem

With regard to the self-esteem, Baumeister et al state that predictions improve when measured among people who consider the domain of interest to be personally important. It is indeed arguable that respondents in the present study must have found the rules personally important, for if they did not, they would not care enough to have an adverse response to them. Support for this rationale comes from Rosenberg et al’s analysis of the effects of academic (specific) self-esteem on students’ global self-esteem. The results they found were three times greater for students who "valued academic performance relatively highly (emphasis added)” (1995: 150). In other words, the outcome was greatly mediated by the extent to which respondents found the specific facet personally important.

5.1.2 Mastery

Liberty Jr. and Moulton’s research may provide insight to the correlation between respondents’ adversity to the rules and mastery. Liberty Jr. and Moulton’s findings indicate, to be put briefly, that occupations requiring a high degree mastery will determine job attraction for individuals who differ in the value placed on activities requiring
mastery. Individuals who placed a high value on activities requiring mastery found jobs requiring mastery or competence more attractive than jobs with a high level of prestige (Liberty Jr. and Moulton 1966). It is plausible, then, to speculate that individuals in the present study who reported adversity to the rules may value mastery and desire a job that requires such. If that were true, then their adversity to the rules may stem from feelings that such rules inhibit their achieving feelings of mastery, and thus result in respondents feeling lower levels of mastery while at work.

5.1.3 Locus of Control

There are two possible explanations as to how the reason why some workers were adverse to the rules affected the relationship between rules and the dependent variables. The first explanation involves the workers’ overall locus of control beliefs outside of the job. More specifically, it is possible that an individual’s general inclination to either internal or external locus of control beliefs would influence their level of approval of the rules. In the present study, the very nature of the rules described is likely to elicit external locus of control beliefs for workers on the job. For those individuals who experience external locus of control beliefs in other facets of life, the rules at work may not foster as strong feelings of external locus of control as in those workers who typically hold internal locus of control beliefs. Those who hold general internal locus of control beliefs are not as accustomed to feeling external locus of control, and thus may report higher external locus of control beliefs while at work.

The second explanation addresses the severity of the particular rules an individual
worker must follow. It is possible that those who disapprove of the rules they must follow do so because of the lack of autonomy the rules allow the workers. Those who do not disapprove of the rules may have less restrictive rules to follow. If such were the case, it would be reasonable to assume that those disapproving of the rules report lower levels of locus of control than those who do not disapprove of the rules because of the level of autonomy a particular set of rules fosters.

5.1.4 Job Satisfaction

Explaining how the reason workers were adverse to the rules might affect the relationship between rules and job satisfaction is simple. Any individual reporting disapproval of the rules he/she must follow, and/or reporting that he/she would act differently if not for the rules, automatically shows greater dissatisfaction for at least one aspect of their job than those individuals who did not show adversity to the rules. It is probable that this dissatisfaction (or lack thereof,) with the rules impacted workers' overall reports of job satisfaction. Thus it would follow that those who demonstrated greater dissatisfaction with the rules they must follow would also demonstrate greater dissatisfaction with their jobs as a whole.

Along with a more extensive examination of individuals' adversity to rules, additional guidelines for future research are outlined by the limitations of the present study. As rules for interaction were identified as the primary form of emotional labor assessed in the present study, a clearer, more elaborate measure of the construct may have yielded
more conclusive results. More specific questions to measure the extent and/or salience of a worker’s particular rules, or perhaps tangible examples of such rules via the use of vignettes, would clarify the construct to survey respondents, and potentially elicit more accurate responses. Future research would benefit from making these provisions.

5.1.5 Additional Limitations

Two additional limitations of the present study are a result of the nature of the sample. The population of 21,988 Kent State University students solicited to participate in this study yielded a sample of only 1,280 individuals. The sample was composed of those individuals who opted to respond to the email solicitation and participate in the web-based survey. Thus there is the potential of sample selection bias; there may be something unique about those individuals who decided to participate in the study. This possibility undermines the ability to generalize findings from the present study to all Kent State University students, and also jeopardizes internal validity. Another issue with the sample is the lack of variation in the variables. The majority of the respondents work entry-level, low-paying, low autonomy jobs. A sample more diverse than just college students would potentially show more variation in respondents’ employment status, and would thus elicit richer data.

Finally, the present study makes testing the causal argument that the presence of rules for interaction/adversity to those rules has an affect on self-esteem, mastery, locus of control, and job satisfaction difficult. The data analyzed in the present study is cross-sectional; yielded from a single wave of a web-based survey. As a result, corre-
lation between the independent and dependent variables can be determined; however, establishing a causal relationship is problematic. Future research could address this issue by administering the survey to respondents at several points during their occupational experience. In particular, assessing individuals' levels of self-esteem, locus of control, and mastery prior to and/or outside of work as a means for comparison to their reported levels of these constructs while at work would aid in establishing causality. Furthermore, conducting an experiment using the same independent and dependent variables would supplement data gleaned from survey research.

The present study is a significant step in the advancement of the social psychology of work. Although the hypotheses were not confirmed, further analysis reveals that there is a relationship between rules for interaction and self-esteem, mastery, locus of control, and job satisfaction. These results suggest the need for a more in-depth investigation of the processes and interactions occurring in the workplace.
6 Appendix I- Email Solicitation

Dear Student,

You have been invited to participate in the Occupational Conditions Survey. The purpose of this survey is to gain information and knowledge about occupational conditions and the experiences of workers. Your answers to these questions will remain completely confidential. The information you provide will not be connected to your email address, nor will it be connected to you by any other identifying means. All results will be in aggregate from. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. At any time, for any reason, if you no longer wish to participate, you may cease participation without penalty. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this survey. For additional information about this study, you may contact the following:
Researcher:
Audrey B. Feigenbaum
212 Merrill Hall
(330)672-2699

Faculty Advisor:
Dr. Richard T. Serpe
215b Merrill Hall
(330)672-4896

Information for KSU’s rules for research can be obtained from:
Acting Vice President, Division of Research and Graduate Studies:
Dr. Peter Tandy
(330) 672-2851

By clicking on the link below, you are acknowledging that you have read and understand the terms and conditions, and are giving your consent to participate in this study.

Link to Occupational Conditions Survey:
(Link)
7 Appendix II- Survey Consent Form

The survey you will be participating in is the Occupational Conditions Survey. The purpose of this survey is to gain information and knowledge about occupational conditions and the experiences of workers. Your answers to these questions will remain completely confidential. The information you provide will not be connected to your email address, nor will it be connected to you by any other identifying means. All results will be in aggregate from. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. At any time, for any reason, if you no longer wish to participate, you may cease participation without penalty. For additional information about this study, you may contact the following:
Researcher:
Audrey B. Feigenbaum
212 Merrill Hall
(330)672-2699

Faculty Advisor:
Dr. Richard T. Serpe
215b Merrill Hall
(330)672-4896

Information for KSU’s rules for research can be obtained from:
Acting Vice President, Division of Research and Graduate Studies:
Dr. Peter Tandy
(330) 672-2851

Are you at least 18 years old?
Please select the appropriate box:
☐ Yes
☐ No

To move forward, please select the appropriate box:
☐ Yes, I have read the terms and conditions of this project. I understand that my results will be confidential and my participation is voluntary. I wish to continue.
☐ No, I do not wish to continue with this project.
8 Appendix III- Survey***

*** The following is the survey in its entirety. Depending on responses to particular questions, some respondents were not subjected to all questions.

Gender
Male
Female

Age
☐ Under 18 years old
☐ 18-19
☐ 20-22
☐ 23-26
☐ 27-32
☐ 33 or older

Are you of Hispanic/Latino/Latina origin?
☐ Yes
☐ No

What is your race?
☐ Black or African American

☐ American Indian or Native American

☐ Asian or Pacific Islander

☐ Other
Who do you live with? (check all that apply)

☐ I live alone

☐ Spouse/life partner

☐ Boyfriend/girlfriend

☐ Parent(s)

☐ Family members other than parents

☐ Friends/peers

☐ My children

Do you consider yourself to be a

☐ Freshman

☐ Sophomore

☐ Junior

☐ Senior

What is your major?

(drop down menu)

(Prompt): If you have more than one job, think about your PRIMARY job- the one you spend the most time at- for THE REST OF THE SURVEY

Where do you work?

(Fill in)
. What is your job title?
(Fill in)

. Do you supervise anyone?
☐ Yes
☐ No

Does your supervisor have a supervisor?
☐ Yes
☐ No

. For how long have you been employed at your PRIMARY job?
☐ Less than one month
☐ 1-6 months
☐ 7-11 months
☐ 1-2 years
☐ more than two years

. How many hours do you work at your PRIMARY job in a typical week?
☐ less than 10 hours
☐ 11-15 hours
☐ 16-20 hours
☐ 21-30 hours
☐ 31-40 hours
☐ more than 40 hours

. Is this your first job?
☐ Yes
☐ No

. How much time do you spend talking to clients/customers during a typical shift?
☐ None
☐ A small amount of the shift
☐ Half of the shift
☐ Most of the shift
☐ All of the shift

. How many different clients/customers do you talk to during a typical shift?
☐ 0
☐ 1-5
☐ 6-10
☐ 11-25
☐ 25-40
☐ More than 40
(Prompt): For the next question, think about your responsibilities for talking to customers.

Do you have rules that you must obey when you talk to/interact with clients/customers, such as how to answer the phone, how to settle a dispute with a customer/client, how to treat an upset or angry customer/client, rules that the customer/client is always right, or rules to lie or be misleading to customers/clients in order to sell products and services?
- Yes
- No

. How much do you approve of these rules?
Strongly Approve...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Strongly Disapprove

. Would you act differently at work if you did not have these rules?
- Yes
- No

(Prompt): For the following, consider the customers/clients you talk to during a typical shift.

In general, the customers/clients I talk to are:
Polite...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Rude
In general, the customers/clients I talk to are:

Friendly...1 2 3 ...4 5 6 7 ...Unfriendly

In general, the customers/clients I talk to are:

Pleasant...1 2 3 ...4 5 6 7 ...Unpleasant

In general, the customers/clients I talk to are:

Easy to handle...1 2 3 ...4 5 6 7 ...Difficult to handle

Do you have to wear a uniform or follow a dress code at your PRIMARY job?

☐ Yes

☐ No

(Follow-up) What is your level of approval of having to wear a uniform or follow a dress code?

Strongly Approve...1 2 3 ...4 5 6 7 ...Strongly Disapprove

(Follow-up) Would you dress differently at work if you did not have to wear a uniform or follow a dress code?

☐ Yes

☐ No
. What are the consequences when you do not obey the rules? (check all that apply)

□ verbal/written warning
□ lose hours/shifts
□ get fired
□ there are no consequences
□ other

. How does your manager/supervisor know if you are obeying the rules? (check all that apply)

□ Surveillance cameras
□ He/she is there to observe
□ Other employees tell
□ Customer complaints
□ There is no way for the manager/supervisor to know
□ Other

. How does your manager/supervisor know if you are obeying the rules? (check all that apply)

□ Surveillance cameras
□ He/she is there to observe
□ Other employees tell
□ Customer complaints
□ There is no way for the manager/supervisor to know
What can you do if you do not agree with the rules? (check all that apply)

- Discuss them with a superior
- Choose not to obey them, without any consequences
- Choose not to obey them, but suffer the consequences
- There is nothing I can do
- Other

How often do you disobey the rules?

- Never
- Seldom
- Frequently
- Always

How beneficial are the rules you must obey to the following people?

You

Not at all beneficial...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Highly beneficial

Employees of lower occupational status than you

Not at all beneficial...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Highly beneficial

Employees of higher occupational status than you
What portion of your finances comes from pay you receive at your PRIMARY job?

- None
- Less than half
- Half
- More than half
- All

How financially dependent are you on your job?

Not at all dependent...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Completely dependent

Compared to other employees, how do you rate yourself?

Lower status...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Higher status

Compared to managers/supervisors, how do you rate yourself?

Lower status...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Higher status

Compared to customers, how do you rate yourself?

Lower status...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Higher status
How many coworkers are similar to you regarding age?

□ None
□ Few
□ Half
□ Most
□ All

How many coworkers are similar to you regarding race?

□ None
□ Few
□ Half
□ Most
□ All

How many coworkers are similar to you regarding gender?

□ None
□ Few
□ Half
□ Most
□ All

How many coworkers are similar to you regarding social class?

□ None
□ Few
□ Half
□ Most
□ All

How many managers/supervisors are similar to you regarding age?
□ None
□ Few
□ Half
□ Most
□ All

How many managers/supervisors are similar to you regarding race?
□ None
□ Few
□ Half
□ Most
□ All

How many managers/supervisors are similar to you regarding gender?
□ None
□ Few
□ Half
How many managers/supervisors are similar to you regarding social class?

☐ None
☐ Few
☐ Half
☐ Most
☐ All

How many customers/clients are similar to you regarding age?

☐ None
☐ Few
☐ Half
☐ Most
☐ All

How many customers/clients are similar to you regarding race?

☐ None
☐ Few
☐ Half
☐ Most
☐ All
How many customers/clients are similar to you regarding gender?

☐ None
☐ Few
☐ Half
☐ Most
☐ All

How many customers/clients are similar to you regarding social class?

☐ None
☐ Few
☐ Half
☐ Most
☐ All

(Prompt): For these questions, think about how you feel WHEN YOU ARE AT WORK.

I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree
I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree

All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree

I am able to do things as well as most other people.

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree

I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree
. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree

. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree

. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree

. I certainly feel useless at times.
☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
□ Strongly disagree

. At times I think that I am not good at all.
□ Strongly agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly disagree

(Prompt): For these questions, think about how you feel WHEN YOU ARE AT WORK

. I have little control over the things that happen to me.
□ Strongly agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly disagree

. There is really no way that I can solve some of the problems I have.
□ Strongly agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly disagree

. There is little I can do to change many of the important things in my life.
□ Strongly agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly disagree

. I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life.
□ Strongly agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly disagree

. What happens to me in the future mostly depends upon me.
□ Strongly agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly disagree

. I can do just about anything I really set my mind to do.
□ Strongly agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly disagree
Sometimes I feel like I am being pushed around in life.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

(Prompt): For these questions, think about how you feel WHEN YOU ARE AT WORK.

Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my ability.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I feel like what happens in my life is mostly determined by powerful people.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Although I might have good ability, I will not be given leadership responsibility without appealing to those in positions of power.

□ Strongly disagree
□ Disagree
□ Slightly disagree
□ Slightly agree
□ Agree
□ Strongly agree

My life is chiefly controlled by powerful others.

□ Strongly disagree
□ Disagree
□ Slightly disagree
□ Slightly agree
□ Agree
□ Strongly agree

People like myself have very little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of strong pressure groups.

□ Strongly disagree
□ Disagree
□ Slightly disagree
Getting what I want requires pleasing those people above me.

I pretty much determine what will happen in my life.

In order to have my plans work, I make sure that they fit in with the desires of people who have power over me.
. How do you feel about being able to keep busy all the time?

☐ Disagree
☐ Slightly disagree
☐ Slightly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree

☐ Very satisfied
☐ Satisfied
☐ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not
☐ Dissatisfied
☐ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about the chance to work alone on the job?

☐ Very satisfied
☐ Satisfied
☐ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not
☐ Dissatisfied
☐ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about the chance to do things different from time to time?

☐ Very satisfied
☐ Satisfied
I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not

Dissatisfied

Very dissatisfied

How do you feel about the chance to be "somebody" in the community?

Very satisfied

Satisfied

I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not

Dissatisfied

Very dissatisfied

How do you feel about the way your manager/supervisor handles his/her workers?

Very satisfied

Satisfied

I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not

Dissatisfied

Very dissatisfied

How do you feel about the competence of your manager/supervisor in making decisions?

Very satisfied

Satisfied

I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not
□ Dissatisfied
□ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about being able to do things that don’t go against your conscience?
□ Very satisfied
□ Satisfied
□ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not
□ Dissatisfied
□ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about the way your job provides for steady employment?
□ Very satisfied
□ Satisfied
□ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not
□ Dissatisfied
□ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about the chance to do things for other people?
□ Very satisfied
□ Satisfied
□ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not
□ Dissatisfied
□ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about the chance to tell people what to do?
□ Very satisfied
□ Satisfied
□ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not
□ Dissatisfied
□ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about the chance to do something that makes use of your abilities?
□ Very satisfied
□ Satisfied
□ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not
□ Dissatisfied
□ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about the way company policies are put into practice?
□ Very satisfied
□ Satisfied
□ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not
□ Dissatisfied
□ Very dissatisfied
. How do you feel about your pay and the amount of work you do?

☐ Very satisfied

☐ Satisfied

☐ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not

☐ Dissatisfied

☐ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about the chances of advancement on this job?

☐ Very satisfied

☐ Satisfied

☐ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not

☐ Dissatisfied

☐ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about the freedom to use your own judgment?

☐ Very satisfied

☐ Satisfied

☐ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not

☐ Dissatisfied

☐ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about the chance to try your own methods of doing the job?

☐ Very satisfied
□ Satisfied
□ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not
□ Dissatisfied
□ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about the working conditions?
□ Very satisfied
□ Satisfied
□ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not
□ Dissatisfied
□ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about the way your coworkers get along with each other?
□ Very satisfied
□ Satisfied
□ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not
□ Dissatisfied
□ Very dissatisfied

. How do you feel about the praise you get for doing a good job?
□ Very satisfied
□ Satisfied
□ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not
How do you feel about the feeling of accomplishment you get from the job?

☐ Very satisfied
☐ Satisfied
☐ I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not
☐ Dissatisfied
☐ Very dissatisfied

How would you rate your level of satisfaction with your job?

Completely dissatisfied...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Completely satisfied.

Compared to previous jobs, how would you rate your level of satisfaction with your job?

Completely dissatisfied...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Completely satisfied.

How would you rate your level of frustration with your job?

Completely frustrated...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Not at all frustrated.

Compared to previous jobs, how would you rate your level of frustration with your job?

Completely frustrated...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Not at all frustrated.
How would you rate your level of comfort in performing the duties of your job?

Completely comfortable...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Completely uncomfortable

Compared to previous jobs, how would you rate your level of comfort in performing the duties of your job?

Completely comfortable...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...Completely uncomfortable

In the last week, how often have you considered quitting your job/looking for a different job?

☐ Almost every day
☐ 4-5 days
☐ 2-3 days
☐ Once
☐ Not at all

Compared to previous jobs, how often do you consider quitting your job/looking for a different job?

☐ More often
☐ Less often
☐ The same amount
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