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CHAPTER I

Introduction

This study is based on the assumption that satisfaction with one's work is in fact an important problem for many student personnel workers, and in particular, residence hall staff members. In a live-in work situation a staff member's position becomes the focus of his identity. It is essential to his social status and prestige, and as such, cannot help but engender personal involvement. Such a situation leads an individual to look for certain kinds of satisfactions within his work. However, the residence hall work situation frequently offers little fulfillment for these needs and thereby builds tension and feelings of dissatisfaction. Identification of those elements within the residence hall work situation which create such discord is one of the principal objectives of this study. More specifically, this study attempts:

To identify the reaction of residence hall staff members to certain working conditions which they characterize as having a high degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

To determine the association between such reactions and certain characteristics of the individual and of his interpersonal relations.

Review of Literature and Theoretical Formulation

The psychological ramifications of work have been of concern to researchers in many fields for over forty years. Early investigations
by psychologists and others were directed at examining the relationships between productivity and a variety of psycho-physical and physical characteristics such as light, noise, and fatigue. Insights gleaned from the Hawthorne experiments which began in 1926 (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939) shifted the direction of research efforts from a concern with the physical to an emphasis on the emotional aspects of worker behavior (Schaffer, 1953).

During the 1930's a large number of social scientists began to investigate the human factors in the work environment. Of special importance to these early researchers were those factors which related to job satisfaction and worker adjustment. Foremost among these early studies was that conducted by Hoppock (1935) in which he administered four attitude scales to 500 teachers from 51 urban and rural communities in the northeastern United States. After combining the four attitude scales to produce a measure of job satisfaction, Hoppock compared the 100 most with the 100 least satisfied persons. He discovered that the satisfied teachers were more religious, felt more successful, enjoyed better human relationships with superiors and associates, experienced less monotony and fatigue, and showed fewer indications of emotional maladjustment. The satisfied group was on the average 7.5 years older, taught in cities of over 10,000 population, and had "more favorable" family influence and social status. Although "selection of vocation" distinguished the satisfied from the unsatisfied, 84 percent of the dissatisfied teachers felt their work was interesting. In the conclusion of his research, Hoppock suggests six major components of job satisfaction: security, loyalty, the manner in which an individ-
ual reacts to unpleasant situations, the facility with which he adjusts himself to others, his relative status in the social and economic group with which he identifies, and the nature of his work in relation to his abilities, interests and preparation.

Smith (1936), using an interview approach, discovered that satisfied people are generally better adjusted and more flexible. They either adjust to the demands of their jobs or terminate their employment. On the other hand, employees who are dissatisfied with their work find it difficult to adjust to arbitrary standards of work or to the rigid requirements of their supervisors. Consequently they exhibit a higher percentage of nervous symptoms.

Another study associating job dissatisfaction with some type of maladjustment is Paterson and Stone's research (1942) with almost 1400 workers in seven different occupations. Results show that subjects dissatisfied with their jobs aspired to occupational levels far beyond reasonable expectations of fulfillment because of limitations of ability and of opportunity. Such unrealistic aspirations are felt by the researchers to have a limiting effect on psychological flexibility.

A factor analysis of scores for 184 workers in a steel-container fabricating plant on the SRA Employee Inventory, the Brayfield-Rathe Job Satisfaction Scale and the Thurstone Temperament Schedule (Ash, 1954) revealed a general factor of Job Satisfaction which included positive loadings on the Thurstone Scales Active and Reflective. Negative loadings on the Thurstone scale for Emotional Stability and the SRA scale for Friendliness and Cooperation of Fellow-Employees were also evident. The findings seem to suggest that people who are dissatisfied
with their jobs are less out-going and friendly than those who are satisfied and, that sympathetic regard for fellow employees is not characteristic of people with lots of "nervous energy" who tend to withdraw from interpersonal contacts. In a correlational approach, the two scales of Vigor and Reflectiveness when related to job attitudes differed significantly from zero. The traits of Dominance, Emotional Stability, Sociability, and Impulsiveness also seemed to be more or less significantly (p = .05) related to attitudes of job satisfaction.

Heron's investigations (1952, 1955) of the relationships between personality variables and occupational adjustment in a sample of 80 male unskilled factory workers revealed an even greater association between job satisfaction and emotional stability. A factor analysis of 22 individually administered objective tests designed to cover such aspects of personality as general mental ability, emotional stability, temperament, and dexterity yielded four significant factors accounting for 30 per cent of the variance. Factor III, "Emotional Instability," (many Worries, much Static Ataxia, many Annoyances, many Interests) correlated .45 (p = .001) with Poor Job Adjustment, a rating of the extent to which a man was a source of concern to his supervisor. The four tests having the highest loading on Factor III are all associated with what is described as the "dysthymic" rather than the "hysteric" end of the temperament continuum in neurotics. This includes anxiety states, obsessional tendencies, and reactive depression. An unweighted combination of Factor III reversed and Factor IV, "Speed of Approach," (Finger Dexterity, Quick Approach to Time Test, Manual Dexterity, Speed on Tract Tracer) gave a correlation of .53 with Good Job Adjustment.

Heron interprets these results as support for the hypothesis that "emo-
tional instability" of an anxious or depressive type as evidenced by
objective tests is related systematically to "poor job adjustment"
as rated by supervisors.

Similar results were obtained in a later study (Heron, 1955) with
two groups of 78 and 66 men respectively all of whom stayed 26 weeks
as omnibus conductors without previous experience. After holding con-
stant the effects of age, significant and stable relationships were
shown to exist between job satisfaction as ascertained in a structured
thirty minute interview combined with a 15 item inventory and certain
personality measures tapping the "neuroticism" factor which emerged in
Heron's 1952 study.

Kornhauser and Sharp (1932) in their study of 300 women factory
workers also found positive correlations between favorableness of job
attitudes and individual scores for emotional adjustment. Like Fisher
and Hanna (1931) they attribute a large portion of vocational malad-
justment and industrial unrest to individual emotional adjustment.

Among the studies which attempt to relate vocational maladjustment
and dissatisfaction to generalized maladjustment are several which adopt
a developmental approach bordering in some cases on the psychoanalytic.
Quayle (1935) in a series of interviews with 124 stenographers noted
that in the area of social adjustment, members of the satisfied group
were "happy as school children," experiencing little if any nervousness
or resentment towards authority. The dissatisfied group, on the other
hand, were from less stable family environments and had been restless
at home and on previous jobs. The latter group, however, had a more
mature sexual and social adjustment as well as more satisfactory social
relationships with the opposite sex. "Feelings of inferiority, neu-
rotic tendencies, and ambition seemed to be more characteristic of the dissatisfied than of the satisfied group. The satisfied workers appeared to hold more conventional and stereotyped attitudes although unlike the dissatisfied workers, they believed their vocational choices were made by themselves deliberately. The satisfied group evidenced little insight into their own psychological problems.

Another elaborate developmental analysis of job adjustment was done by Friend and Haggard (1948) with a group of men and women who came to a counseling center from 1933 to 1941 in search of guidance. Detailed life histories were analyzed to discover differences in family history and personality trends between High and Low Job Adjustment groups as identified by a questionnaire. The subjects with Low Job Adjustment came from relatively disorganized family groups in which they were family favorites. They resented parental authority and engaged in unsuccessful rivalry with siblings. These early childhood patterns were carried over into adult life and manifested in resentment of dependency on or dominance by significant others. The High Adjustment group, to the contrary, showed themselves independent of their childhood patterns.

Less affirmative results were found by Kates (1950) in his study of clerical workers. Expressions of job satisfaction and Rorschach indications of adjustment or maladjustments were completely unrelated.

In general all these studies tend to support a relationship between measures of adjustment or neuroticism and job satisfaction. There is, however, one factor which must be considered when generalizing the relationship between general adjustment and job satisfaction. Kates' study (1950) seems to indicate that a person may experience satisfaction in
one area of work in relation to his personality make-up, whereas
transfer to different working areas might prove dissatisfying. All of
these investigations seem to support Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and
Capwell's (1957) conclusion that:

The satisfied worker is, in general, a more flexible, better
adjusted person who has come from a superior family environ-
ment, or who has the capacity to overcome the effects of an
inferior environment. He is realistic about his own situation
and about his goals. The worker dissatisfied with his job, is
often rigid, inflexible, unrealistic in his choice of goals,
unable to overcome environmental obstacles, generally unhappy
and dissatisfied.* (1957, p. 20)

Like Katos (1950) however, Herzberg et al. (1957) emphasize that not
all workers having the personality characteristics of the dissatisfied
worker described above are necessarily dissatisfied with their jobs.
Most studies do reveal however, that workers who do experience dis-
satisfaction in their work often evidence such characteristics.

In a more theoretical approach to the whole question of job satis-
faction, Friedlander (1964) casts some doubt upon the results of studies,
similar to those cited previously, which view job satisfaction and dis-
satisfaction as negatively related poles of a single continuum. In a
study designed to disprove this assumption of convertible bipolarity,
he administered two separate measures of satisfaction and dissatisfaction
to 80 adults (mean age 25) in a variety of occupations including a
college work-study program. Correlational and variance analyses of
the relationships among the two measures and 18 job characteristics
indicated that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are, not complementary
functions and are, for the most part, unrelated.

*Italics are those of the original authors.
Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman's (1959) depth interview study with over 200 engineers and accountants representing Pittsburgh industry supports in some measure Friedlander's findings. Interview which probed the sequences of events in the work lives of the respondents to determine factors involved in their feeling exceptionally happy or unhappy in their jobs yielded two separate unipolar factors. A verification study done in 1964 identified two groups of factors: motivator factors which "make people happy with the jobs because they serve man's basic and human need for psychological growth," i.e., a need to become more competent, and hygiene factors which "meet man's need to avoid unpleasantness" i.e., to keep one's life hygienically clean. (1964, p. 5) The motivator factors leading to satisfaction are Achievement, Recognition for Achievement, Intrinsic Interest in the Work, Responsibility and Advancement. The hygiene factors leading to dissatisfaction are Company Policy, Administrative Practices, Supervision, Interpersonal Relationships, and Working Conditions. Salary contributes only a little dissatisfaction.

Further evidence in favor of Herzberg's theory was found by Myers (1964) in a study of the employees in a manufacturing company and by Schwartz, Jonusaitis, and Stark (1963) in a study of lower-level supervisors. Dissatisfaction in both studies was related to extrinsic work factors such as salary and promotion and satisfaction to intrinsic factors like achievement and responsibility. Two additional studies with similar results are those of Lodahl (1964) and Friedlander and Walton (1964).

Other findings tend to reject Herzberg's two-factor hypothesis of job satisfaction as an oversimplification of what they feel is a complex
interrelationship of many variables. In a study done by Wernimont (1964) responses to both forced choice and free choice items obtained from 50 accountants and 82 engineers in self-descriptions of past satisfying and dissatisfying job situations revealed that satisfaction variables are not unidirectional in their effects and that expectations have a strong influence on the extent of satisfaction with factors. Although both intrinsic and extrinsic factors were sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, intrinsic items were endorsed more in both satisfying and dissatisfying situations. Achievement, the Work Itself, and Responsibility were mentioned most often as causes for a satisfying work situation. Lack of Advancement and Recognition were most often associated with dissatisfaction.

Dunnette (1965), Ewen (1964), Tiredlander (1963), and Kornhauser (1965) conducted similar studies with various occupational groups and their results appear to support Wornimont's findings. The factors involved in workers' feelings of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction do not appear to divide as neatly as was the case with Herzberg's study. Friedlander's results (1964) showing two general groups of Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers with some exceptions (Promotion, Home Life and Use of Best Abilities are important to dissatisfaction) are perhaps closer to a realistic appraisal of the motivational milieu of the world of work.

A somewhat different theoretical approach to the problem of job satisfaction is taken by Morse (1953), Shaffer (1953), Vroom (1960), and others. Unlike the either-or approach (either the nature of the work or the nature of the individual personality causes the dissatis-
faction) adopted by the studies previously cited, these researchers attempt to study simultaneously personality variables as well as the nature of job and the work environment. Shaffer (1953) began his work on job satisfaction with an analysis of human needs. Twelve needs were selected for investigation and a questionnaire was constructed to determine how well job satisfaction could be estimated from a measurement of need strength and need satisfactions in work. The questionnaire contained five parts: three parts measured need strengths, one measured need satisfaction, and final portion measured overall job satisfaction.

For a sample of 72 professional men in variety of occupations the strongest needs were those of (1) Creativity and Challenge, (2) Mastery and Achievement, and (3) Social Welfare (helping others); the weakest were those of (1) Independence, (2) Socio-economic Status, and (3) Dependency. A correlation coefficient of .58 was obtained between the mean satisfaction score of each subject's two strongest needs and his self-rating of overall satisfaction. Using the mean satisfaction of the three (or more) strongest needs reduced the accuracy of prediction. In an analysis of the intercorrelations among the need-strength scales, Shaffer extracted two clusters of needs: one group which was passive or hostility-restraining in nature and another group which was assertive and aggressive. Although Shaffer felt that there was some evidence which indicated that several of the assertive, aggressive needs were not being accurately measured and that people tended to underestimate the importance to themselves of these needs, he nonetheless interpreted his results as support for the hypothesis that overall satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which these needs of an individual
which can be satisfied in a job are actually satisfied. According to Shaffer's theory, the stronger the need, the more closely will job satisfaction depend on its fulfillment.

Morse (1953), Mann (1953), and Ross and Zander (1957), picked up the same theme in their research when they attempted to prove that job satisfaction must be related to the discrepancy between aspirations and achievement rather than to achievement alone. Vroom (1955), in discussing the contributions made by these researchers and others to the study of the determinants of job satisfaction, drew a distinction between models which he termed "subtractive" and those he called "multiplicative." Subtractive models are those models which assert that "job satisfaction or some conceptually similar variable is a function of the difference between the amount of some outcome provided by a work role and the strength of a related desire or motive on the part of the person." Multiplicative models, on the other hand, are those which assume that "job satisfaction is a function of the product of a work role variable and a related motivational variable"* (Vroom, 1964, p. 1963)

Using a subtractive model, Ross and Zander (1957) studied 2,680 female skilled workers in a large company located in a number of different cities to ascertain whether the degree of satisfaction of certain personal needs supplied by an individual's place of employment had a significant relationship to his continuing to work for that company. Correlational analysis of a graphic rating scale containing paired questions directed first to the strength of the need and second to the

*Italics are those of the original author.
extent the need was met revealed that certain personal needs discrimi-
nated significantly in terms of dissatisfaction between those who re-
signed and those who remained with the company. Amount of dissatis-
sfaction was determined by subtracting the extent to which an individual
felt a need was met from the strength he assigned it. Those needs evok-
ing significantly greater dissatisfaction among those who resigned than
among those who stayed are: Achievement (p = .05), Autonomy (p = .025),
Recognition (p = .01), and Fair Evaluation (p = .05). Affiliation (the
need to know and be known by important people in the organization) was
a source of dissatisfaction for both groups, with those individuals who
remained with the company knowing the management better but at the same
time expressing a greater desire to known even more top officials. Ross
and Zander further concluded that the extent to which the job inter-
fered with the satisfactions the worker received from his family and
his community was related to turnover as strongly as the failure to re-
cieve need satisfaction on the job (p = .03). Interference with other
off-the-job sources of satisfaction appeared unrelated to job satisfac-
tion. Morse (1953) in a study of 742 clerical workers including 61
supervisors found results quite similar to those of Ross and Zander (1957)
and Shaffer (1953), i.e., level of job satisfaction is a combination of
both level of aspiration or need tension level and amount of return from
the environment.

Kuhlen (1963) also adopted a subtractive model to test needs, per-
ceived need satisfaction opportunities, and satisfaction with occupation.
The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule which is a measure of the
strength of 14 needs, a questionnaire measuring job satisfaction, and
an instrument designed to estimate the potential of an occupation for satisfying each of the 14 needs were administered to 108 men and 95 women teachers. As Kuhlen hypothesized, low job satisfaction was characteristic of those subjects whose need scores were higher than their occupational potential scores; on the other hand, those expressing high satisfaction had need scores which were lower than their occupational potential scores. As predicted, total discrepancy scores (discrepancy between need strength and potential of the occupation to satisfy the needs) correlated .25 (p = .01) with occupational satisfaction for the men, and .02 (ns) for the women. Such results which indicate that occupation is psychologically more central for men appear to substantiate Kuhlen's hypothesis that if major motives are satisfied in the context of work and career, then satisfaction with occupation should be a function of the discrepancy between personal needs and perceived potential of the occupation for satisfying needs.

Like Kuhlen (1963), Ross and Zander (1957), and Morse (1953), Vroom (1960a) was also interested in the relationship between need strength and job satisfaction. Vroom however adopted for his research a multiplicative model which allowed for an interaction between motivational and work role variables. Using 108 first, second, and third line managers and supervisors in the New York and Chicago plants of a large delivery company, Vroom administered a series of research questionnaires which yielded measures of Attitude Toward the Job, Need for Independence, Authoritarianism, and Psychological Participation, i.e., the extent to which an individual feels he influences joint decisions made with his superior. Participation scores as reported by superiors, subordinates,
and peers were collected for each individual but were not statistically significant when correlated with the other measures. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients relating measurements on psychological participation with simultaneous measurements on job satisfaction ranged from \(0.55\) (\(p = 0.01\)) for persons high in need for independence, to \(0.31\) (\(p = 0.05\)) for those moderate in need for independence, to \(0.13\) for those low in need for independence. A similar relationship was evident between need for independence and job satisfaction with correlations ranging from \(-0.04\) under conditions of low psychological participation to \(0.25\) (\(p = 0.10\)) under conditions of high psychological participation. Similar correlations and relationships were also obtained for the measure of authoritarianism with participation more satisfying to low than high authoritarians. Vroom interpreted these results as support for the multiplicative model and, more specifically, for the existence of an interaction between a work role variable such as psychological participation and personality variables like need for independence and authoritarianism.

Tannenbaum and Allport (1953), also using a multiplicative model and an event-structure approach, hypothesized that the attitudes of favor or disfavor developed by 400 workers in a large business organization to two experimental programs with contrasting patterns of allocating authority (autonomous versus hierarchical) were a function of the interaction between the personality structure of the individuals and the structure of the work-program in which they operated. Subjects whose trend-structures, i.e., those things which the individual characteristically tries to do either consciously or unconsciously, were "suited"
to the program in which they were enrolled tended to feel a greater satisfaction with it and a greater liking for it than those who trend-structures were "unsuited" to their program. "Suitableness" of an individual's trend structures was ascertained by a questionnaire and by judges' ratings. Suited individuals not only liked their programs better, they also tended to want the programs to last longer. Although differences between the "suited" and "unsuited" groups were not always large or typically significant especially when considering the programs individually, data for both programs combined yielded significant differences for attitudes toward Desired Length of Program and Degree of Liking for the Program. The difference for Satisfaction with the Way the Program Operates was not significant but it did yield a suggestive relationship in the predicted direction. Tannenbaum and Allport interpret these results as support for the event-structure approach which they feel not only provides a mathematical explanation of how the interaction between personality and group action might take place but also generates "generalizations that are broader than the field of behavior". (Tannenbaum and Allport, 1953, p. 280)

In spite of the different methods and models used to measure job satisfaction, work role, and personality, the results point to the same overall conclusion. Theoretically it can be stated that there is a definite relationship between the job satisfactions and dissatisfactions experienced by a worker and his personal needs and characteristics. However, the manner in which the work role variables and the individual personality variables combine to determine satisfaction or dissatisfaction is still somewhat unclear and an area open to conjecture.
A number of studies (Hoppock, 1935; Paterson & Stone, 1942; Heron, 1948; Katz, 1949; Mann, 1953; Morse, 1953; Gurin, Veroff & Feld, 1960; Kornhauser, 1964; Elai, 1964) have been reported on the relationship between occupational level or status and job satisfaction. Gurin, Veroff, and Feld's (1960) study of a national sample of professionals and technicians, managers and proprietors, clerical workers, sales workers, skilled workers, semi-skilled workers, unskilled workers, and farmers revealed that men on high status jobs tend to be more ego-involved and will report both more satisfaction (42 percent very satisfied professionals as opposed to 13 percent very satisfied unskilled workers) and more "problems" than men holding low status jobs. In general, reported job satisfaction declines with occupational level although persons in clerical and sales work report quite low satisfaction—even lower than farmers, skilled and semi-skilled workers.

Elai (1964) in a study of differences in occupational level and need satisfaction obtained ratings of need satisfaction from 470 subjects in professional, managerial-official, clerical, and trades manual occupations. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient of .58 (p = .01) was obtained between job satisfaction and need satisfaction scores. Maslow's less prepotent needs of Self-actualization, Advancement, Interesting Duties, and Leadership were selected with increasing frequency from a low by the Trades group (5 to 33%) to a high (13 to 70%) frequency by the Professionals. Conversely the more prepotent needs of Respect, Money Security, Congeniality and Job Security were selected more frequently by Ss in the lower socio-economic groups (Trades & Services), and least often by the Managerial-Official & Professional groups.
A number of studies report data which is consistent with the hypothesis that persons who believe that their jobs require abilities which they feel they possess experience greater job satisfaction than those who feel their skills are not being utilized. Brophy (1959) did a correlational analysis of 81 female nurses' self-ratings on the extent to which they believed themselves to possess each of 49 different traits and the extent to which the job allowed them to be the kind of person represented by each trait. The amount of discrepancy between the two sets of ratings correlated -.41 with scores on a measure of job satisfaction, i.e., the less the subject viewed her job as necessitating the qualities she possessed, the lower her job satisfaction. In a similar study with 489 blue collar workers in a Canadian oil refinery, Vroom (1962) reports a correlation of .59 between job satisfaction and opportunity for self-expression in the job. Kornhauser (1964) observed a marked positive relationship between reports of the extent to which the job enabled a subject to use his abilities and his mental health. The index of mental health was a combination of scores on measures of anxiety, self-esteem, hostility, sociability, and friendship, overall satisfaction, and personal morale.

In reviewing the research on length of service on job attitudes, Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) divide the worker's life into three periods: the new employee; the middle period; and the long-service employee. The new employee is characterized by high morale and a favorable attitude toward both his job and his employer. However, as the months pass, this initial enthusiasm wanes; the job falls into a routine, and fellow workers become familiar. Problems of adjustment
to training become especially pressing. There are a number of studies (Bergen & Dean, 1939; Kalstad, 1944; Mann, 1953; McClusky & Strayer, 1948) showing an early period of high morale and feeling of satisfaction which is in turn followed by a low period concomitant with expressions of dissatisfaction. Some studies such as those done by Chase (1951) in the profession of teaching and Harris (1949) in the area of industry fail to report this early dip in morale. However the findings of these studies are based on correlational analyses which would mark an early lowering of morale in an otherwise positive trend. A worker who has recently emerged from the period of initial adjustment is likely to report lower job satisfaction for a number of years until he achieves the status of a long-service employee. McCluskey and Strayer (1940) discovered teachers with 4 to 12 years of service were less satisfied than those with either more or less experience (p = .01).

Hulin and Smith (1965) concerned with the effects of experience hypothesized that the closer the agreement between the variables of expectation and environmental return, the more satisfaction should be experienced by the worker. The results of their study confirmed this hypothesis and revealed that concomitant with the changing level of the discrepancy between expectations and environmental return because of increased experience, there are increased changes in level of environmental return due to tenure-connected raises and promotions.

Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwell's (1957) compilation of the factors contributing to job satisfaction as reported in 16 different studies involving 11,000 employees indicates quite clearly the extreme importance assigned to supervision. Ranking as a source of satisfaction
more frequently than security, job content, company and management, working conditions, and opportunity for advancement and wages, supervision and relationships with co-workers proved to be the two most frequently mentioned determinants in the area of job satisfaction. However, supervision is relegated to fourth place when the same list of job factors is ordered for job dissatisfaction. In terms of rankings of importance, supervision is accorded an even lower place, the highest ranks being assigned in order to security, opportunity for advancement, company and management, wages, intrinsic aspects of job, supervision, social aspects of job, communication and working conditions.

One type of evidence substantiating the importance of supervisors in employee satisfaction and production is a study reported by Katz and Kahn (1952). Results showed that supervisors in an insurance company having most productive sections were the leaders who supervised less closely, and who thus opened up chances for the workers to make decisions for themselves. The section heads who insisted on giving detailed and frequent instructions, standing over their employees and checking their every move, on the other hand, had the sections with the lowest productivity. Katz and Kahn maintain that this relationship cannot be explained away by the assumption that poor productivity and poor workers required the closer supervision. Workers were randomly assigned to sections and aptitude tests indicated an equivalence of ability among sections.

Ross and Zander (1957) using a different approach to the question of supervision, found indications that anxiety develops in employees who state that their needs for autonomy and fair evaluation are not being met.
The fact that there are a number of variables which influence job satisfaction or dissatisfaction is well substantiated. It is evident from the research cited here and elsewhere that occupational relationships with supervisors and significant others, utilization of special talents and skills, and occupational experience are among the more important determinants.
CHAPTER II

Methodology

This study is an exploration of the hypothesis that there is a relationship among personality characteristics, job tension, and job satisfaction as expressed by residence hall student personnel workers. Nine scales of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) constructed by Gough (1957), two indices developed by Kahn et al., (1964) - the Job-Related Tension Index and the Job-Satisfaction Index and a short personal data sheet composed of four questions concerning position held, sex, amount of student personnel training, and previous residence hall staff experience were distributed to all 144 Ohio State Residence Hall staff members (95 men and 52 women) holding positions of Director, Assistant Director, Student Personnel Assistant, and Resident Adviser.

An item by item tabulation of the Satisfaction and Tension indices yielded 22 variables which when coupled with the 9 CPI scale scores and the four personal data questions resulted in a total of 35 measures. These measures were then factor analyzed by the principal axes method and the resulting factors blindly rotated by the Varimax criterion (Kaiser, 1958).

The following definitions of terms are based on the instruments used:

AC (Achievement via conformance) Scale - those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where conformance is a positive behavior.
HIGH SCORERS tend to be seen as: capable, co-operative, efficient, organized, responsible, stable, and sincere; as being persistent and industrious; and as valuing intellectual activity and intellectual achievement.

LOW SCORERS tend to be seen as: Coarse, stubborn, aloof, awkward, insecure, and opinionated; as easily disorganized under stress or pressures to conform; and as pessimistic about their occupational futures.

AI (Achievement via independence) Scale - those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where autonomy and independence are positive behaviors.

HIGH SCORERS tend to be seen as: mature, forceful, strong, dominant, demanding, and foresighted; as being independent and self-reliant; and as having superior intellectual ability and judgment.

LOW SCORERS tend to be seen as: inhibited, anxious, cautious, dissatisfied, dull, and wary; as being submissive and compliant before authority; and as lacking in self-insight and self-understanding.

CM (Communality) Scale - the degree to which an individual's reactions and responses correspond to the modal ("common") pattern established for the inventory.

HIGH SCORERS tend to be seen as: dependable, moderate, tactful, reliable, sincere, patient, steady, and realistic; as being honest and conscientious; and as having common sense and good judgment.

LOW SCORERS tend to be seen as: impatient, changeable, complicated, imaginative, disorderly, nervous, restless, and confused; as being guileful and deceitful; inattentive and forgetful; and as having internal conflicts and problems.

FE (Femininity) Scale - the masculinity or femininity of interest. (High scores indicate more feminine interest, low scores more masculine.)

HIGH SCORERS tend to be seen as: appreciative, patient, helpful, gentle, moderate, persevering, and sincere; as being respectful and accepting of others; and as behaving in a conscientious and sympathetic way.

LOW SCORERS tend to be seen as: outgoing, hard-headed, ambitious, masculine, active, robust, and restless; as being manipulative and opportunistic in dealing with others; blunt and direct in thinking and action; and impatient with delay, indecision, and reflection.
FX (Flexibility) Scale - degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior.

HIGH SCORERS tend to be seen as: insightful, informal, adventurous, confident, humorous, rebellious, idealistic, assertive, and egotistic; as being sarcastic and cynical; and as highly concerned with personal pleasure and diversion.

LOW SCORERS tend to be seen as: deliberate, cautious, worrying, industrious, guarded, mannerly, methodical, and rigid; as being formal and pedantic in thought; and as being overly deferential to authority, custom, and tradition.

GI (Good Impression) Scale - behavior characteristic of persons capable of creating a favorable impression, and who are concerned about how others react to them.

HIGH SCORERS tend to be seen as: co-operative, enterprising, outgoing, sociable, warm, and helpful; as being concerned with making a good impression; and as being diligent and persistent.

LOW SCORERS tend to be seen as: inhibited, cautious, shrewd, wary, aloof, and resentful as being cool and distant in their relationships with others; and as being self-centered and too little concerned with the needs and wants of others.

PY (Psychological-mindedness) Scale - the degree to which the individual is interested in, and responsive to the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others.

HIGH SCORERS tend to be seen as: observant, spontaneous, quick, perceptive, talkative, resourceful, and changeable; as being verbally fluent and socially ascendant; and as being rebellious toward rules, restrictions, and constraints.

LOW SCORERS tend to be seen as: apathetic, peaceable, serious, cautious, and unassuming; as being slow and deliberate in tempo; and as being overly conforming and conventional.

SA (Self-acceptance) Scale - factors such as sense of personal worth, self-acceptance, and capacity for independent thinking and action.

HIGH SCORERS tend to be seen as: intelligent, outspoken, sharp-witted, demanding, aggressive, and self-centered; as being persuasive and verbally fluent; and as possessing self-confidence and self-assurance.

LOW SCORERS tend to be seen as: methodical, conservative, dependable, conventional, easygoing, and quiet; as self-abasing and given to feelings of guilt and self-blame; and as being passive in action and narrow in interests.
SY (Sociability) Scale - behavior characteristic of persons of outgoing, sociable, participative temperament.

HIGH SCORERS tend to be seen as: outgoing, enterprising, and ingenious; as being competitive and forward; and as original and fluent in thought.

LOW SCORERS tend to be seen as: awkward, conventional, quiet, submissive and unassuming; as being detached and passive in attitude; and as being suggestible and overly influenced by others' reactions and opinions.

JOB SATISFACTION (Job Satisfaction Index) - the balance of satisfaction-dissatisfaction a person feels about his job.

JOB TENSION (Job Related Tension Index) - the amount of pressure a person feels to change either the quality or quantity of his work.

All subjects lived within the residence halls and were employed as Ohio State University Residence Hall staff members on at least a half-time basis, i.e., 20 hours a week. Consequently, Associate Resident Advisors who have only quarter-time appointments were eliminated. Nurses and non-professional staff were not included because the nature of their work was felt to be different from that of persons in student personnel positions. The size of the group was based on an attempt to include all qualified persons and to approach statistically meaningful numbers.

Of the 106 usable returns (58 men and 48 women) 14 were Directors, 8 were Assistant Directors, 24 were Student Personnel Assistants, and 60 were Resident Advisors. The personnel staff for each of the larger residence halls is headed by a full-time Director with at least a Master's degree in the field of student personnel. The Director assumes responsibility for the total program within his residence hall as well as the management of the building. In some cases, the Director is aided by an Assistant Director who carries a 25 hour a week work load and who usually assumes responsibility for one or more areas within the hall,
e.g., freshman orientation, office staff. Some of the smaller buildings are headed by Assistant Directors who, like the Directors of the larger residences, assume complete responsibility for the buildings in which they reside.

Within each building are a certain number of first and second year Student Personnel Assistants (SPAs), graduate students in the Student Personnel Work-Study Program. Assistant Directors are usually chosen from the group of second year Student Personnel Assistants. A great majority of the SPAs are enrolled in academic programs such as Higher Education and Counseling Psychology leading to positions in the field of student personnel, e.g., Residence Hall Director, Dean, College Counselor, Union Director. All SPAs take a core program of courses designed to provide a theoretical framework for the more concrete experiences encountered while living and working in the residence halls. With a work load of approximately 20 hours a week, the SPA's function as residence hall assistants, group advisors, and counselors.

Like the SPAs, the Resident Advisors also work in the areas of advising, counseling and management. The female Resident Advisor assumes most of the responsibilities of the female SPA (with exception of chap-corning) only on a smaller scale, e.g., fewer committees, a smaller number of advisees. Like the SPAs, she works 20 hours a week although her training is limited to a one quarter, one credit psychology course designed exclusively for Resident Adviser candidates. This course is usually taken the spring quarter prior to assuming a staff position. The female Resident Advisor holds no major residence or campus leadership position. Although a full-time student, she is limited to an
academic load of 16 quarter hours. She must have senior or junior status during her appointment, an overall grade point of 2.6 on a 4.0 scale, experience in group living, and demonstrated leadership ability.

The male Resident Advisors differ in some respects from their female counterparts. A male RA is responsible for a living unit of approximately 50 students. His job consists of advising and counseling students, maintaining discipline within the unit, and general administrative duties for the unit. In return for his 20 hours of work a week, he receives room and board. Selection is through personal interview with an individual Director. Any upperclassman (sophomore or above), professional, or graduate student having a 2.5 cumulative point-hour ratio on a 4.0 scale is eligible. Training is viewed as an on-going process and is the responsibility of the individual Directors.

<p>| TABLE 1 |
|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <strong>Student Personnel Training and Residence Hall Staff Experience of The Ohio State University Residence Hall Staff Members (N = 106)</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Training in Years</th>
<th>Total Residence Hall Staff Experience (OSU &amp; elsewhere) in Quarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Directors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Personnel Assistants</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Advisors</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 9 personality scales used in this study were drawn from the 18 standard scales comprising Gough's California Psychological Inventory (1957). Two faculty judges both of whom were familiar with the field of student personnel and more particularly with the Ohio State Residence Hall System, independently rated each of the 18 CPI scales as to their effectiveness in measuring those characteristics of personality important in the work situation of an OSU residence hall staff member. Because of the nature of the study and of the population involved, the investigator felt it necessary to assure the subjects that the scales included within the questionnaire were designed for use with "normal" socially functioning individuals. Consequently, upon the recommendation of the judges, those scales containing a majority of questions of a seemingly projective nature were eliminated. Nine scales covering 279 items (12 of which are repeated for ease of scoring) were judged as being addressed principally to those characteristics important to the social living and social interaction of workers within a residence hall setting. (Copies of the individual scales are included in Appendix C)

The California Psychological Inventory was chosen originally because it is concerned with characteristics of personality which have a wide and pervasive applicability to human behavior and "which are related to the favorable and positive aspects of personality rather than to the morbid and pathological" (Gough, 1957, p. 7). The 18 scales which make up the inventory are each intended to cover one important facet of interpersonal psychology and therefore can be used independently. The appropriateness of the scales is further supported in terms of the population on which they were validated and for which they were constructed. As in this study, Gough's samples included undergraduate
students, graduate psychology and social work students, and professional workers, e.g., school superintendents, business executives. Another important attribute of the CPI is the fact that its scales are largely self-administering and relatively simple to take. Complicated instructions are not needed and rigorous test conditions need not be established to achieve valid and useful results. The inventory has been tried under nearly every conceivable condition. Judging from the validity of the profiles obtained and from the indicators in the test of reliability and dependability, satisfactory results were the rule under every condition. Consequently, the mailing procedure and the take-home plan used in this study did not affect the accuracy of the obtained results.

Reliability

Gough (1957) reports two studies on reliability. Test-retest reliability for the individual scales was determined by administering one complete inventory to two high school junior classes in the fall of 1962 and again a year later when they were seniors. Table 2 contains reliability coefficients for the scales used in the present study.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scalos</th>
<th>High School Females (N=125)</th>
<th>High School Males (N=101)</th>
<th>Prison Males (N=200)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ac (Achievoment via conformance)</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai (Achievoment via independence)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm (Communality)</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo (Femininity)</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fx (Flexibility)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gi (Good impression)</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Py (Psychological-mindedness)</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa (Self-acceptance)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sy (Sociability)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gough explains the rather low correlations on the Communality and Psychological-mindedness scales in terms of their skewness and length. The Cm scale is a 28 item scale with an extremely skewed distribution (Modal score in a test sample is 25 or 26, with values below 20 almost never occurring). This clustering of high scores means that a fluctuation in response to one or two items will markedly influence an individual's relative standing on the Cm scale. The Py scale contains only 22 items and because of its shortness it also is susceptible to changes in 1 or 2 items.

In the other reliability study cited in the Manual (1957), 200 male prisoners took the CPI twice with a lapse of 7 to 21 days between testing. Test-test correlations for the prisoner group which are as high as those generally found in personality measurement are also cited in Table 2. Gough explains the lower correlations of the high school students as reflecting in part the differing rates of adolescent maturation during the year between testings. Although Thorndike (Buros, 1959) feels the evidence provided on the reliability of the scales is hardly adequate to permit an appraisal of the uniqueness of the separate scales, the Manual claims "in general the consistency of measurement is high enough to permit use of the scales to both group and individual testing." (1957, p. 22)

Validity

Before discussing the validity of the individual scales, it is important to note that correlations between scales are high and that the types of validity studies most often cited below are concurrent and predictive in nature. In general, the strongest criticism leveled
against the CPI scales by some of the experts in the field of testing (Cronbach, 1959; Thorndike in Buros, 1959; Horrocks, 1964) has been in the area of validity. Cronbach and Thorndike claim that the presentation of validities based largely on differences between extreme groups is misleading in as much as those groups have considerable overlap. Thorndike also expresses concern about those validity studies which leave out the "middle group" between the high's and low's (e.g., the rankings by high school principals on persons high and low on self-acceptance and sociability). He feels the resulting coefficients are grossly inflated and provide an unrealistic picture of the accuracy with which the instrument would make discrimination in a group.

Another major criticism in this area is the lack of unidimensionality of the individual scales (Horrocks, 1964). The fact that use of all 18 scales causes overlapping and redundancy has been established by a number of researchers. Critos (1964) using test scores from 372 subjects found that a reduced set of 6 scales accounted for about two-thirds of the total variance. Piorco-Jones (1962) in a factor analysis of the scores of 156 city school superintendents and 258 undergraduates, mostly women, found 4 major factors, 2 of which were virtually identical. Nichols (1963) discovered 2 principal factors in his analysis of the 18 scales--neuroticism or Person Orientation and extraversion or Value Orientation. The use of only 9 of the 18 scales coupled with a factor analytic approach to the study was an attempt to alleviate this problem of inefficiency and redundancy.

Individual scale validity studies as reported by Gough (1957) follow.
Ac Scale: In a combined sample of 1,235 females and 946 males drawn from high school senior classes, the correlation between the Ac scale and high school grade average was .41. The correlations between tested IQ and the Ac scale were .13 for females and .19 for males. This same scale when used with 100 military officers studied at the University of California correlated .33 with the staff's composite Q-sorting of the phrase: "Efficient, capable, able to mobilize resources easily and effectively; not bothered with work inhibitions."

Ai Scale: In an assessment of 100 military officers studied at the University of California, the Ai scale correlated .30 with the staff's composite Q-sorting of the phrase, "Is self-reliant; independent in judgment, able to think for himself." Using a similar approach with a sample of 40 University of California Medical School seniors, this same scale correlated .31 with faculty ratings of "Potential success as a physician and surgeon." The Ai scale also correlated .44 with first semester grades for 220 Kansas State College agriculture freshmen tested at admission and .38 with the course grades of 917 psychology students enrolled in seven different classes.

Cm Scale: Like the Gi scale, the Cm scale can be used as an indicator of "test validity." Using a table of random numbers to determine "true" or "false" responses, 30 CPI answer sheets were completed. The exceedingly low scores on the Cm scale (the highest score on the 30 Cm randomized profiles was 20 which is in the lowest one-half of one percent of scores on the Cm scale for all CPI cases in Gough's files) suggest that any record produced by scrambling or randomizing of responses is detectable.
The validity of the scale as an indicator of the ability to create a favorable impression is substantiated by correlations with staff ratings of an assessment sample of 100 military officers. The Cm scale correlated .28 with the staff's composite Q-sorting of the phrase, "Is dependable and practical; has common sense and good judgment," and -.32 with the phrase, "Is at odds with himself, has major internal conflicts."

Fe Scale: In a sample of 152 adult males, the Fe scale correlated -.41 with the masculinity scale of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank and .43 with the Mf (feminino interests) scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. In comparison samples of males and females, Gough obtained point biserial correlation coefficients of .65 for 803 females and 787 male college students; .64 for 46 female and 113 male psychology graduate students; and .78 for 4,056 female and 3,572 male high school students.

Fx Scale: Gough substantiated the validity of the Fx scale with a series of staff ratings of "rigidity." Correlations between the scale and the rigidity ratings were -.48 for a sample of 40 University of California graduate students and -.36 for 40 University of California medical students. In a college class of 180 students, the Fx scale yielded a coefficient of -.58 when correlated with the California F (authoritarian personality) scale.

Gi Scale: In a sample of 152 adult males, the Gi scale correlated .60 with the K (Correction) scale from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and .32 with the Im (interest maturity) scale from the Strong Vocational Interest Blank.

Another approach to the question of validity was utilized when Gough requested a class of 179 high school students to respond to the
scale items so as to present "the best possible impression" of themselves. The Gi scale statistics for this group as compared with an unselected sample of 7,628 high school students revealed a much higher score for the dissimulators (P < .01). Gough maintains that the higher score of the dissimulators tends to confirm the validity of the scale as well as indicating its use in identifying falsified scores.

**Py Scale:** Using a somewhat different approach to the question of validity, Gough (1953) arranged samples according to their average score on the Py scale to determine if the hierarchy corresponded to the presumed "psychological-mindedness" of each group. The ordering of the groups for both sexes corresponded fairly well to a continuum of "psychological-mindedness" ranging from psychology graduate students (Mean = 16.8 for males and 16.5 for females) to high school students (Mean = 9.27 for males and 8.76 for females) and prison inmates for delinquents (Mean = 8.93 for males and 8.52 for females). The mean for both the male and female psychology students is significantly higher (P < .01) than that of the social work graduate students, the next highest group.

The concurrent validity of the Py scale is established by positive correlations with the Psychologist key on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. With a sample of 70 University of California medical school applicants, the two measures correlated .44 while for a sample of 152 adult males, the coefficient was .40.

**Sa Scale:** The Sa scale correlated .32 with staff ratings of "self-acceptance" in a sample of 70 medical school applicants at the University of California. In another assessment sample of 40 graduating seniors in engineering, the Sa scale correlated -.57 with the staff's Q-sorting of the phrase, "Has a readiness to feel guilty."
A similar type validity was established when principals in five high schools where the Sa scale was given were asked to nominate students ranking "highest" and "lowest" on self-acceptance. The correlations between the Sa scale results and the nominations of the most and least "self-accepting" boys ($N = 104$) and girls ($N = 102$) were significant at the .01 level.

**Sy Scale:** The cross-validational studies for the Sy scale are concerned solely with high school students. In five high schools where the Sy scale was administered, the principals were asked to nominate the "most" and "least" participative students. The Sy scale results for the sample of socially active and inactive males ($N = 104$) and females ($N = 102$) were highly significant ($P < .01$).

In another study of the same type 15 additional high school principals were asked to nominate those students who were the "most popular." The Sy scale results for those students in comparison to the unselected students were also significant at the .01 level.

The use of Kahn, Wolfo, Quinn, Snook, and Rosenthal's (1964) Job-Satisfaction and Job-Related Tension Indices was based on an attempt to utilize both a global and a specific approach to the measurement of job satisfaction. The Job-Satisfaction Index actually used was a modification of Kahn et al.'s (1964) suggested final form. The modification consisted of minor word changes ("Ohio State Residentco Hall System" was substituted for "your company"; "in this company" was changed to "in your job" on one item in order to make the test item more meaningful). The index which contains 7 statements regarding the job as a whole taps the degree to which a person is satisfied with his position. The questions comprising the instrument require the subject to weigh a number of
factors according to their relative importance to him, and then after reaching a summary conclusion, respond accordingly. This approach has the advantage of allowing the individual to determine personally the relative importance of all the various aspects of the job as he sees them. The disadvantage inherent in this index is the possibility of distortion caused by momentary elation as misery occasioned possibly by a single factor. Such feelings could overshadow all other considerations and lead the subject to respond quite differently from his normal feelings.

The Job-Related Tension Index which is comprised of items regarding specific aspects of the job was used to balance such fluctuation. This index has the added feature of not requiring the individual to reach composite opinions. Individual item analysis of this index has also avoided the pitfall inherent in a composite score of having to assign weights to each of the various aspects of the job. Intercorrelations among the items composing this index range from as low as .00 to as high as .70. Most of the correlations fall between .20 and .35 (Two intercorrelation matrices done by Kahn (1964) for the tension items are contained in Appendix F).

A modified form of the Likert method of scaling is used on both indices and the subject was asked to respond to each item by agreeing or disagreeing. The items comprising the Job Satisfaction and Job-Related Tension measures, together with the response alternatives provided and the scoring weights assigned those alternatives, can be found in Appendices D and E.

It was felt by the researcher that composite scores on either of the two indices might mask individual problem areas. The possibility
of a single item outweighing all the others for one group of individuals while a different item was doing the same for another group was eliminated to some extent by the item-by-item analysis. As Hoppock (1953) and others have pointed out, more summation of satisfaction with various aspects of the job is not equivalent to satisfaction with the job as a whole. Hoppock conjected that this might have been the reason that the reliability for his 100 item satisfaction measure was only four points higher than his 4 response index. He also speculated that it might account for the low correlation of .67 between the two. Such reasoning by Hoppock and others coupled with the intercorrelational matrices provided for the tension items solved in part the question of individual item validity and reliability. Both indices and their component items are based on standardized attitude scales developed in industrial research by the Survey Research Center at The University of Michigan.

The 9 CPI scales, the Job-Satisfaction and Job-Related Tension Indices, and the 4 personal data questions were combined in one questionnaire (Appendix A) which was administered first to all male and female Directors and Assistant Directors during their respective weekly staff meetings. Part of a letter written by the advisor to this project explaining the overall aims of the study as well as the purpose of the questionnaire was read at this time (A copy of this letter is included in Appendix B). All the Directors and Assistant Directors in charge of individual buildings were requested to provide summer addresses for the staff members within their halls. It was the feeling of all those involved in the project that the remainder of the staff, all of whom were
either part-time or full-time student members, should receive the inventory through the mail after the close of the quarter because of the advent of finals week. The Directors and Assistant Directors were also instructed that all the staff members in their buildings would be receiving copies of the same letter which had been read to them prior to their taking the inventory. This letter requested the participation of all the Student Personnel Assistants and Resident Advisors and alerted them to the fact that they would be receiving the inventory by mail shortly after the beginning of summer quarter. The letter also contained instructions for all those who wished to respond to the inventory before leaving campus. In an attempt to insure anonymity, staff members were requested not to put their names on their questionnaires. For those mailing in the questionnaire anonymity was further guaranteed by the method of return in which the subject's name was cut from the envelope, crossed off a master list, and then mixed in with the other returned inventories. Shortly after the beginning of summer quarter, a second copy of the original letter requesting the subject's participation and explaining the study, the inventory, and a return envelope on which the subject's name was written were sent to all those staff members who had not already filled out questionnaires. Of the 144 staff members within the Ohio State Residence Hall System, 110 filled out questionnaires prior to July 15. The returns numbered 8 out of a possible 8 male Directors, 8 out of 8 female Directors, 3 out of 3 male Assistant Directors, 5 out of 5 female Assistant Directors, 10 out of 16 male Student Personnel Assistants, 14 out of 17 female Student Personnel Assistants, 40 out of 69 male Resident Advisers, and 22 out of 22 female Resident
Advisors. Four subjects (a male Director, a female Director, and 2 male Student Residents) were eliminated because their inventories were improperly filled out.

Because the number of measures in the study was quite large (9 CPI scales, 4 personal data questions, 7 items composing the Job-Satisfaction Index and 15 items comprising the Job-Related Tension Index) and the useful variables needed for economical and dependable descriptive purposes were overlaid with multiplex manifestations, a factor analytic procedure was used. Extraction of factors by the principal axes method and rotation by the Varimax criterion was an attempt to reduce redundancy and to discover the basic dimensions being tapped by the 35 variables.
CHAPTER III

Analysis of Findings

Fifteen factors, accounting for 81 per cent of the common factor variance, were extracted from the intercorrelational matrix by the principal axes method. These factors were then blindly rotated by the Vari-max criterion (Kaiser, 1958). The 15 factors thus obtained are presented in full in Appendix H. Of the original 15 factors, only 7 factors accounting for 47 per cent of the common factor variance were judged to be significant. The discarded 8 factors had appreciable loadings on only one or two items with the remainder of the loadings being quite small and contributing little to the communalities. Those few measures loading on each of these factors reflected neither great similarity nor difference making psychologically sound, reasonable interpretations virtually impossible. Tables 3 through 9 give the loadings of the major identifying variables for the 7 rotated factors which were retained. In factorial studies similar to the present one the criterion for significant loadings generally runs at the .30 level or above. This standard has been used in this study although at various points qualified interpretations of lower loadings designated as "slight" have been made.

Factor I: Interpersonal Ineffectiveness

Factor I which accounts for .105 of the variance, is clearly a
communication factor. Its constituent measures are composed of items drawn primarily from the Tension and Satisfaction indicies which express negative feelings about supervisors, co-workers, the requirements of the job, and most particularly, the Ohio State Residence Hall system. A person at the high end of this dimension can probably be expected to experience frustration and feelings of inadequacy, particularly in the area of interpersonal relationships (Instability to satisfy conflicting demands of superiors .73; Lack of communication with supervisor .631; Inability to influence supervisor's decision .693; Lack of communication with co-workers .728).

There are some slight indications that such experiences are accompanied by feelings of resentment and a cautious, distant approach to others (Good impression -.176) which may be a reflection of the fact that such persons do not feel liked and accepted by the people with whom they work (Non-acceptance by co-workers .387). The inability to relate to and communicate effectively with others is probably caused in part by this aloofness and wariness. Such feelings might also explain to some slight degree their reluctance to decide things affecting the lives of others, particularly people they know (Having to decide things affecting the lives of acquaintances .201) and their feelings of having to do things as a consequence of their jobs which are against their better judgment (.462). An inability to get enough information to carry out the job (.486) could also be a reflection of conflicts in the area of interpersonal relations for much of a staff members information comes from personal contacts with others. There is some slight indication that such persons tend to fall in the more experienced (Training .096), upper level
groups (Position -.085) rather than among the generally experienced RAs.

TABLE 3

Factor I: Interpersonal Ineffectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.735</td>
<td>Inability to satisfy conflicting demands of superiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.728</td>
<td>Lack of communication with co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.703</td>
<td>Insufficient information to carry out job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.695</td>
<td>Inability to influence supervisor's decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.631</td>
<td>Lack of communication with supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.520</td>
<td>Too little authority for demands of job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.486</td>
<td>Lack of clarity on scope and responsibilities of job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.462</td>
<td>Having to do things against better judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.378</td>
<td>Lack of acceptance by co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>Liking for OSU Residence Hall system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.201</td>
<td>Having to decide things affecting lives of acquaintances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>Good impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>Liking for kind of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>Advise friends to work for OSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor II: Profile of Experienced Trained Supervisor

The second factor which accounts for .079 of the common factor variance appears to present a composite picture of the experienced (Experience .813), trained (Training .832) residence hall staff member who holds a supervisory position at the Director or Assistant Director level (Position -.853). In the light of the known correlates of the two CPI scales
with slight loadings on Factor II (Psychological-mindedness .273; Flexibility .173) and the manifest content of their component items, such individuals seem to be characterized by an interest in and a responsiveness to the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others. Insightful and observant, they exhibit some measure of flexibility and adaptability in their relations with others. Slightly dissatisfied with the more objective aspects of their job (Lack of information needed to carry out job .208; Having to do things against better judgment .206; Quantity of work interferes with quality .149), individuals in this group appear to experience very little tension in their interpersonal relations (Inability to satisfy conflicting demands of superiors -.280; Non-acceptance by co-workers -.095; Lack of communication with supervisor -.028). Slight tension is felt however concerning the amount of influence with immediate supervisor (Inability to influence supervisor's decisions .131) especially concerning matters affecting the individual. This may be attributed to the break in communication between the members of the Dean's office who do not live in the residence halls and the Directors who do. Inter-staff communication of this type is bound to be less effective than intra-staff exchanges which go on among staff members who reside in one area.

Many of the members of this group have families and consequently feel more acutely the pressures of a live-in situation (Job interference with family life .380). Professional commitment to the field of student personnel as a life's work (Liking for other kinds of work -.183) generates some slight concern about opportunities for advancement and promotion (Lack of information on promotional opportunities .231). Slight
negative loadings on advising a friend to come to OSU (-.152) and liking for the OSU Rosidence Hall System (-.143) may indicate that the early enchantment of the now employee has worn off, leaving such persons somewhat disillusioned but perhaps more realistic.

### TABLE 4

**Factor II: Profile of Experienced Trained Supervisor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.853</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.832</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.813</td>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.380</td>
<td>Job information with family life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>Inability to satisfy conflicting demands of superiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.273</td>
<td>Psychological-mindedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2319</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge on promotional opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.208</td>
<td>Insufficient information to carry out job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.206</td>
<td>Having to do things against better judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>Liking for other work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.173</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>Advise friend to work for OSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.149</td>
<td>Quantity of work information with quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>Liking for OSU Rosidence Hall system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor III: Authoritarian Adaptability**

The next factor, Factor III, which accounts for .075 per cent of the common factor variance is somewhat more difficult to interpret. Taken at face value, it appears to be a second dimension of the inter-
personal ineffectiveness factor, but with the poles reversed. However, a closer look reveals that the loadings on these two factors are not quite the same. One who is high on Factor III seems to be characterized to some extent by effective interpersonal relationships with his fellow workers (Inability to influence supervisor's decisions -.298; Lack of Communication with supervisor -.294; Non-acceptance by co-workers -.260). Concerned with the authoritarian aspects of his job (Too little authority for demands of job -.554) he apparently feels little tension in connection with his position (Job interference with family life .436; Utilization of abilities and skills .484). The fact that he knows his responsibilities and duties (Lack of clarity on scope and responsibilities of job -.207) and then discharges them capably, responsibly, and efficiently (Achievement via conformance .220) is slightly evident. He is also slightly concerned with creating a good impression (Good impression .163) and as a consequence probably makes an effort to be both cooperative and industrious. His orientation to life and those around him appears to be positive (Liking for other kinds of work .199; Liking for OSU .364; Non-acceptance by co-workers -.260).
TABLE 5

Factor III: Authoritarian Adaptability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.768</td>
<td>Advise friends to work for OSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.705</td>
<td>Liking for present kind of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.554</td>
<td>Too little authority for demands of job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.484</td>
<td>Utilization of abilities and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.436</td>
<td>Job interference with family life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.401</td>
<td>Having to do things against better judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.364</td>
<td>Liking for OSU Residence Hall System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.298</td>
<td>Inability to influence supervisor's decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.294</td>
<td>Lack of communication with supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>Non-acceptance by co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.220</td>
<td>Achievoment via conformance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>Lack of clarity on scope and responsibilities of job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.199</td>
<td>Liking for other work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.190</td>
<td>Femininity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.163</td>
<td>Good impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.146</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor IV: The Flexible Independence**

The two predominant scales for Factor IV (Flexibility .731 and Achievoment via Independence .855) indicate a general dimension of flexible independence. The term "independence" in Factor IV (percentage of variance .044) reflects not the shy, withdrawn solitariness of the introvert but the forceful, mature self-reliance of the intellectual. Rebel-
lion and insight (Psychological-mindedness .176; Achievement via Independence .855; Flexibility .731) are prominent in the measure.

An individual scoring high on this factor would possess those interests and characteristics which would facilitate achievement in a setting where autonomy and independence rather than conformance and submission (Achievement via conformance .074) were positive behaviors. Such an individual tends slightly to look to other residence hall systems as having greater opportunities for autonomy (Preference for OSU over other residence hall systems -.159) even though he appears rather indifferent to the system at OSU (Liking for OSU System .029).

Adventurous, confident, and idealistic, he can be expected to be responsibly realistic about himself and others. Such an attitude might engender some slight feelings of not being fully qualified to handle the job (.131) as well as the almost contradictory attitude that the job provides an excellent opportunity to utilize his particular skills and abilities (Utilization of skills and abilities .153). His assertive independence causes him some slight tensions within his current position (Having to do things on the job against your better judgment .183).

Possessing a genuine capacity for positive affective relations with others (Psychological-mindedness .176; Flexibility .731), such an individual would experience little difficulty in coping with the conflicting demands of the various people over him (Inability to satisfy conflicting demands of superiors -.157).
TABLE 6

Factor IV: Flexiblo Independence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.855</td>
<td>Achievemont via Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.731</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.183</td>
<td>Having to do things against better judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.176</td>
<td>Psychological-mindodness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>Preference for OSU residenco hall system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>Inability to satisfy conflicting demands of supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.153</td>
<td>Utilization of abilities and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.131</td>
<td>Lack of qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.114</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor V: The Judgmental Rigidity

Factor V accounting for .050 percentage of the variance, seems to be almost the second dimension of Factor IV but without the strong loading on the indepandence-conformance aspect. An individual scoring high on Factor V is more apt to be inner-directed (Psychological-mindedness -.350), to be resistant to influence and to prefer a neat and orderly routine in his daily life (Flexibility -.341). He is likely to be inconsiderate of another's needs; his approach to those around him and to life being deliberato and cautious in manner, formal and conventional in action. Slightly deferential to authority, (Achievement via conformance .178), he is somewhat clear on the scope and responsibilities of his position (Lack of clarity on scope and responsibilities of job -.296).
Ho expresses some slight confidence in his ability to handle the demands of his job (Lack of qualifications - .196). With his rigid conceptual framework and standards, he is slightly judgmental about his environment (Achievement via Indepedence .170) but not about himself. He feels he is making great progress (Progress .785) and doing the things for which he is best suited (Utilization of abilities and skills .558), irrespective of the fact he tends to lack adaptability in his relationships with those around him (Flexibility -.341)—a major demand of his position.

He feels slight pressure concerning the more objective aspects of his position (Too heavy a work load .178; Insufficient information to carry out job .172) as well as the fact he is forced by his position to make decisions affecting the lives of his acquaintances (Having to decide things affecting people you know .177). On the whole however, he evidences slight tendencies to screen out tensions created by the objective environment and his fellow workers (Non-acceptance by co-workers -.256), thereby experiencing little pressure to change either the quality or quantity of his work.
TABLE 7
Factor V: The Judgmental Rigidity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.785</td>
<td>Progress in present job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.558</td>
<td>Utilization of abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.350</td>
<td>Psychological-mindedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.341</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.296</td>
<td>Lack of clarity on scope and responsibilities of job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>Non-acceptance by co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>Lack of qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.179</td>
<td>Liking for present kind of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.178</td>
<td>Quantity of work interferes with quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.178</td>
<td>Achievement via conformance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.177</td>
<td>Having to make decisions affecting the lives of acquaintances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.171</td>
<td>Insufficient information to carry out job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.170</td>
<td>Achievement via independonco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor VI: Unfavorable Self-Regard

In the light of the known correlates of the scales making up Factor VI, (percentage of variance .062) a person at the high end of this dimension can probably be expected to exhibit the following characteristics: suspicion of others, self-centeredness, and a lack of concern with the needs and wants of others (Good impression -.816; Psychological-mindedness -.510). Such a person tends to be aloof, quiet, and withdrawn, avoiding prominence in social affairs (Sociability -.303).

Lacking interest and motivation (Liking for OSU Residence Hall System -.233; Achievement via conformance -.762; Achievement via independonco
- .297), he experiences some slight tension in his work (Having to do things against better judgment .185; Too little authority to carry out responsibility .179) and a lack of self-confidence (Progress -.173; Chance to utilize abilities -.166; Lack of acceptance by co-workers .173). A rather strong strain of pessimism appears to run throughout this factor particularly in reference to occupation.

TABLE 8
Factor VI: Unfavorable Self-Regard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good impression</td>
<td>-.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement via conformance</td>
<td>-.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological-mindedness</td>
<td>-.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement via independence</td>
<td>-.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking for OSU Residence Hall system</td>
<td>-.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having to do things against better judgment</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little authority for demands of job</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress in present job</td>
<td>-.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-acceptance by co-workers</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise friend to come to work for OSU</td>
<td>-.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of abilities</td>
<td>-.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of clarity on scope and responsibilities of job</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor VII: Self-Assured Sociability

The person who scores high on Factor VII (Variance .057) presents a picture of an outgoing, sociable participative individual (Sociability .824) who has a well-developed sense of personal worth and a good measure of self-confidence (Self-acceptance .902). Convinced slightly that his job gives him a chance to utilize his talents (.257), most particularly his social skills, he evidences some slight feelings of being able to handle the demands and responsibilities of his position (Lack of qualifications -.212). Highly verbal and fluent in thought, he is capable, cooperative, and responsible.

Interested in and responsive to the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others (Psychological-mindedness .301), he enjoys working with people and being of service to them--something his position allows him to do. Consequently he feels some slight regard for the OSU Residence Hall System (.125) and expresses mildly negative feelings towards other kinds of work (-.127). He experiences slight difficulty in the area of interpersonal relationships whether it can be with his superiors or his peers. (Lack of communication with supervisors -.185; Lack of communication with co-workers -.195).
TABLE 9
Factor VII: Self-Assured Sociability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.902</td>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.824</td>
<td>Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.301</td>
<td>Psychological-mindedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.247</td>
<td>Utilization of abilities and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.226</td>
<td>Achievement via conformance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>Lack of qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>Lack of communication with co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>Lack of communication with supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.145</td>
<td>Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>Non-acceptance by co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>Liking for other work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.125</td>
<td>Liking for work at OSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the study appear to suggest that the staff member lacking interpersonal effectiveness unlike his adaptable counterpart, experiences particular problem areas within the work situation as well as a lack of personal resources to cope with the demands which the job makes upon him. The situational aspects of the satisfaction and dissatisfaction felt by such individuals seem to center around the supervisor. In fact, the extreme importance of the supervisor in bringing about feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction is clearly evident in most of the factors—a fact in line with research findings indicating that the behavior of managers and superiors impinging on the satisfactions experi-
icnccd by tho members of an organization. Likort's (1961) discovery that workers' perceptions of the behavior of supervisors is determined both by the character of the supervisor's actual behavior and the personality of the worker also has relevance for many of the factors. Those factors revealing personalities characterized by a sense of personal worth, flexibility, and sensitivity to others (Factors II, III, IV, VII) are not heavily loaded with measures reflecting unfavorable attitudes toward superiors. Conversely, those factors portraying personalities characterized by unfavorable self-regard, rigidity and self-centeredness are (Factors I, V, VI) heavily loaded with items revealing negative feelings toward supervisors. A similar type of relationship is evident for many of the factors for attitudes toward co-workers.

Analysis of Factor II, trained professionals at the supervisory level reveals striking differences in perceptions and feelings. (Differences might also have emerged at the other levels if correlational analysis by group had been done.) Disparity of perception between groups is in keeping with Katz and Kahn's findings (in Swanson, Nowcomb, & Hartley, 1952) that social institutions such as universities or even individual residence halls are a complex of various interrelated systems whose members possess differential perceptions and attitudes according to their different roles and functions. Although other persons expressing a liking for the work they are doing feel they have adequate information to carry out their jobs, experienced, trained supervisors express a concern about the inadequacies of this aspect of their work. Elai's study (1964) revealing discrepancies in needs according to occupational level also appears to have some relevance. The supervisors unlike the
others appear concerned about opportunities for advancement and job interforonco with family life—a finding substantiated by Elai's discovery that needs for Advancement and for Self-Actualization were more characteristic of professionals than persons at other levels. Conversely, other staff members are typically bothered by things such as not knowing what the people with whom they work expect of them—a finding corroborated by the fact that persons falling below the professional level place a greater emphasis on the need for Respect (Elai, 1964).

The appreciable differences in experience and training between groups may be a function of exceptional adjustment. Those loading high on Factor II had greater opportunities than other staff members to adjust their expectations to what the environment is likely to provide appear to experience more satisfaction—a finding substantiated by Hulin and Smith's (1965) results. Those who have been on the job longer know what to expect. Rettig, Jacobson, & Pasamanick's (1958) findings that groups of lower objective status tended to overestimate their status more than those of higher status might explain the other groups', e.g. Factor III, concern with authority and the supervisors' apparent indifference to this facet of the work. Gurin, Voroff, & Fold's (1960) findings that men in high status jobs will tend to be more ego-involved and will report more satisfaction and more "problems" than men holding low status jobs certainly seems to be substantiated by the factor profiles of these groups.
CHAPTER IV

Summary

From the theoretical framework provided by the research in the area of job satisfaction, it was postulated that there is a relationship between personality characteristics, job-related tension, and job satisfaction as expressed by residence hall student personnel workers. Nine scales of Gough's California Psychological Inventory, two indices developed by Kahn et al., The Job-Related Tension Index and the Job-Satisfaction Index, and a short personal data sheet composed of 4 questions concerning sex, position held, amount of student personnel training, and previous residence hall staff experience were distributed to all 144 Ohio State Residence Hall staff members holding positions of Director, Assistant Director, Student Personnel Assistant, and Resident Advisors.

In an analysis of the 106 usable returns, item by item tabulation of the satisfaction and tension indices yielded 22 variables which when coupled with the 9 CPI scores, and the 4 personal data questions resulted in a total of 35 measures. Fifteen factors, 7 of which were judged significant, were extracted from the intercorrelational matrix by the principal axes method. Those factors were then blindly rotated by the Varimax criterion. The profiles of the 7 significant factors which account for 47 per cent of the common factor variance are:
1. Factor I -- Intrapersonal Ineffectiveness
2. Factor II -- Profile of the Trained, Experienced Supervisor
3. Factor III -- Authoritarian Adaptability
4. Factor IV -- The Flexible Independence
5. Factor V -- Judgmental Rigidity
6. Factor VI -- Unfavorable Self-Regard
7. Factor VII -- The Self-Assured Sociability

Conclusions

If, as has been suggested by the results of this study and the research done by others, satisfaction or dissatisfaction with a job is in some manner a function of work role and individual personality characteristics, then identification of those variables within the person and the environment is certainly an important task. Given the shortcomings of the component measures and the limited representativeness of the sample however, one can hardly assume that the factors obtained represent the basic dimensions of the feelings and characteristics of the average student personnel worker within a residence hall system. The factor analytic technique was viewed solely as a means of data reduction and simplification not as the answer to all possible questions generated by such a study. At best, this study points the direction for future research in other residence hall systems and areas of student personnel, which, if confirming these results, could have significant social consequences. The immediate need is for a corroboration of the present findings. The logic underlying the present design could then be used to study the effects of a wide variety of situational variables on persons of differing personality characteristics.

This line of research might also have the effect of broadening the field of student personnel from a concern primarily with worker abilities, e.g., "demonstrated leadership ability," to a thoughtful consideration
of personality characteristics. This procedure would require the use of some method (e.g., inventory, ratings by judges) to assess those personality characteristics as well as to measure the relevant properties of the work situation (type of job, level of position, supervision, etc.). Such measures would of necessity need to be combined with ability ratings; however, the combined approach might lead to more effective job placement as well as more efficient selection of student personnel workers in general.

Another even more practical aspect of such research would be its possible utility in the training of student personnel workers who are potential supervisors and consequently significant others in the area of general job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Instruction on correct methods of supervision and on practices and methods for dealing with persons of differing personality characteristics is sorely needed within the field. Similarly, the teachers in such programs need to recognize that methods of training must be varied in order to achieve maximum training effectiveness for all persons concerned.

It is apparent from the results of this study that for some individuals, the Ohio State Residence Hall System and, by inference, a great majority of others, does not offer enough creative and self-actualizing opportunities. Student personnel workers and college administrators in general have long cajoled themselves into believing that they have created jobs and situations within residence halls which call for independence of mind and action, flexibility of approach, and sensitivity to one's fellow man. Yet most of the factors in this study seem to indicate that the Ohio State system, at least, fosters conformity and deference to
authority and tradition. Those characteristics of the system only serve to create feelings of dissatisfaction within those individuals of an independent, flexible nature. The real answer to this dilemma is a change in the irritating aspects of the work situation. Such decisions need to be based on intensive, thoughtful analysis of work roles and their situational components.

Another partial solution to the problem might be posed by programs oriented toward teaching supervisors how to help workers realize and take advantage of the creative aspects of the work in which they are engaged and more particularly, of the particular work situation in which they find themselves.

It is imperative that the proper recognition be given to the whole area of interpersonal relations particularly in jobs as all-encompassing and close-knit as a live-in position in a dormitory. Relationships with superiors, co-workers, and significant others can be either potential sources of stress or buffers in a tension-evoking work situation. The importance of the supervisor in the area of worker satisfaction or dissatisfaction has already been discussed. However, it is well to remember that the supervisor not only has formally recognized power over his subordinates but he is the source of their recognition for successful work. Failure to recognize the primacy of this facet of the working relationship can only result in a highly dissatisfying and stressful experience for all involved.

Assuming a relationship does exist between personality variables and job satisfaction and job-related tensions, further research efforts in this area might prove beneficial. Development of some type of profile
or norms for student personnel workers and for the specific work environments in which they find themselves, e.g., deans' offices, residence halls, unions, counseling centers might eliminate some of the characteristic and crucial weaknesses of the total field. Although information concerning such variables is at best fragmentary, increased research efforts in this area might provide real understanding of the human organizations comprising the total field of student personnel.
APPENDIX A

Sample Copy of Inventory as Distributed
A. General Information

1. Sex M ___ F ___

2. Circle the position currently held within The Ohio State University Residence Hall system: Director or Head Resident, Assistant Head Resident or Director, Graduate Resident, Student Resident or Counselor.

3. Circle amount of time spent in a student personnel training program: none, one year or less, two years, three years or more

4. Total amount of experience in all residence hall staff positions expressed in quarters. Include Ohio State as well as any other residence hall experience in other institutions ___________quarters.

B. Job Satisfaction

5. Is there some other work, either here or outside The Ohio State Residence Hall System, which you would like better than what you are doing now?

[ ] a. I would rather have some other job.
[ ] b. I would rather have my present job.

6. Not counting all the other things that make your particular job good or bad, how do you like the kind of work that you do?

[ ] a. I dislike it very much; would prefer almost any other kind of work.
[ ] b. I don't like it very much; would much prefer some other kind of work.
[ ] c. It's all right, but there are other kinds of work I like better.
[ ] d. I like it very much, but there are other kinds of work I like just as much.
[ ] e. It's exactly the kind of work I like best.

7. How do you feel about the progress you have made in your job?

[ ] a. I have made little or no progress
[ ] b. I have made some progress, but it should have been much better.
[ ] c. I have made quite a lot of progress, but it should have been better.
[ ] d. I have made a great deal of progress.

8. How much does your job give you a chance to do the things you are best at?

[ ] a. No chance at all
[ ] b. Very little chance
[ ] c. Some chance
[ ] d. Fairly good chance
[ ] e. Very good chance

9. How do you like working for The Ohio State Residence Hall System?

[ ] a. It's not a very good place to work.
[ ] b. It's all right, but there are many things that should be changed.
[ ] c. It's a fairly good place, but quite a few things should be changed.
[ ] d. It's a good place, but there are a few things that should be changed.
[ ] e. It's a very good place--wouldn't change anything.
10. Would you advise a friend to come and work for The Ohio State Residence Hall System?

[] a. I would not advise a friend to come and work for The Ohio State Residence Hall System.

[] b. I would advise a friend to come and work for The Ohio State Residence Hall System.

11. If you had a chance to do the same kind of work for the same pay, but in another residence hall system, would you stay here?

[] a. I would prefer to go to the other residence hall system.

[] b. I would prefer to stay in this residence hall system.

C. Reaction to Job

All people are occasionally bothered by certain kinds of things in their work. Below is a list of things that sometimes bother people. Please indicate how frequently you feel bothered by each of the following by choosing the appropriate response.

12. Feeling that you have too little authority to carry out the responsibility assigned to you.

[] a. Never

[] b. Rarely

[] c. Sometimes

[] d. Rather often

[] e. Nearly all the time

13. Being unclear on just what the scope and responsibilities of your job are.

[] a. Never

[] b. Rarely

[] c. Sometimes

[] d. Rather often

[] e. Nearly all the time

14. Not knowing what opportunities for advancement or promotion exist for you.

[] a. Never

[] b. Rarely

[] c. Sometimes

[] d. Rather often

[] e. Nearly all the time

15. Feeling that you have too heavy a work load, one that you can't possibly finish during an ordinary workday.

[] a. Never

[] b. Rarely

[] c. Sometimes

[] d. Rather often

[] e. Nearly all the time
16. Thinking that you'll not be able to satisfy the conflicting demands of various people over you.

[ ] a. Never  
[ ] b. Rarely  
[ ] c. Sometimes  
[ ] d. Rather often  
[ ] e. Nearly all the time

17. Feeling that you're not fully qualified to handle your job.

[ ] a. Never  
[ ] b. Rarely  
[ ] c. Sometimes  
[ ] d. Rather often  
[ ] e. Nearly all the time

18. Not knowing what your supervisor thinks of you, how he evaluates your performance.

[ ] a. Never  
[ ] b. Rarely  
[ ] c. Sometimes  
[ ] d. Rather often  
[ ] e. Nearly all the time

19. The fact that you can't get information needed to carry out your job.

[ ] a. Never  
[ ] b. Rarely  
[ ] c. Sometimes  
[ ] d. Rather often  
[ ] e. Nearly all the time

20. Having to decide things that affect the lives of individuals, people that you know.

[ ] a. Never  
[ ] b. Rarely  
[ ] c. Sometimes  
[ ] d. Rather often  
[ ] e. Nearly all the time

21. Feeling that you may not be liked and accepted by the people you work with.

[ ] a. Never  
[ ] b. Rarely  
[ ] c. Sometimes  
[ ] d. Rather often  
[ ] e. Nearly all the time

22. Feeling unable to influence your immediate supervisor's decisions and actions that affect you.

[ ] a. Never  
[ ] b. Rarely  
[ ] c. Sometimes  
[ ] d. Rather often  
[ ] e. Nearly all the time
23. Not knowing just what the people you work with expect of you.
   [a. Never  b. Rarely  c. Sometimes  d. Rather often  e. Nearly all the time]

24. Thinking that the amount of work you have to do may interfere with how well it gets done.
   [a. Never  b. Rarely  c. Sometimes  d. Rather often  e. Nearly all the time]

25. Feeling that you have to do things on the job that are against your better judgment.
   [a. Never  b. Rarely  c. Sometimes  d. Rather often  e. Nearly all the time]

26. Feeling that your job tends to interfere with your family life.
   [a. Never  b. Rarely  c. Sometimes  d. Rather often  e. Nearly all the time]

D. Attitudes and Feelings

This inventory is concerned principally with those personality characteristics and attitudes important for social living and social interaction. It has been used by Kahn and others in studies related to job satisfaction in industry. It is not a projective device even though some questions may appear so.

TRUE FALSE

[ ] [ ] 1. I enjoy social gatherings just to be with people.

[ ] [ ] 2. I looked up to my father as an ideal man.

[ ] [ ] 3. A person needs to "show off" a little now and then.

[ ] [ ] 4. Our thinking would be a lot better off if we would just forget about words like "probably," "approximately," and "perhaps."

[ ] [ ] 5. I have a very strong desire to be a success in the world.
TRUE   FALSE

6. When in a group of people I usually do what the others want rather than make suggestions.

7. I liked "Alice in Wonderland" by Lewis Carroll.

8. I usually go to the movies more than once a week.

9. Some people exaggerate their troubles in order to get sympathy.

10. People can pretty easily change me even though I thought that my mind was already made up on a subject.

11. I often feel that I made a wrong choice in my occupation.

12. I am very slow in making up my mind.

13. I always follow the rule: business before pleasure.

14. I think I would like the work of a building contractor.

15. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.

16. My daily life is full of things that keep me interested.

17. In most ways the poor man is better off than the rich man.

18. I always like to keep my things neat and tidy and in good order.

19. Clever, sarcastic people make me feel very uncomfortable.

20. I think I would like the work of a dress designer.

21. I am often said to be hotheaded.

22. I gossip a little at times.

23. I doubt whether I would make a good leader.

24. There are few people who just cannot be trusted.

25. I become quite irritated when I see someone spit on the sidewalk.

26. When I was going to school I played hooky quite often.

27. I have very few fears compared to my friends.

28. It is hard for me to start a conversation with strangers.

29. I must admit that I enjoy playing practical jokes on people.

30. For most questions there is just one right answer, once a person is able to get all the facts.

31. I sometimes pretend to know more than I really do.
[ ] [ ] 32. Sometimes I feel like smashing things
[ ] [ ] 33. As a child I used to be able to go to my parents with my problems.
[ ] [ ] 34. I think I would like the work of a school teacher.
[ ] [ ] 35. Women should not be allowed to drink in cocktail bars.
[ ] [ ] 36. Most people would tell a lie if they could gain by it.
[ ] [ ] 37. When someone does me a wrong I feel I should pay him back if I can, just for the principle of the thing.
[ ] [ ] 38. I seem to be about as capable and smart as most others around me.
[ ] [ ] 39. I usually take an active part in the entertainment at parties.
[ ] [ ] 40. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job.
[ ] [ ] 41. I hate to be interrupted when I am working on something.
[ ] [ ] 42. I get very tense and anxious when I think other people are disapproving of me.
[ ] [ ] 43. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.
[ ] [ ] 44. I liked school.
[ ] [ ] 45. It is always a good thing to be frank.
[ ] [ ] 46. A windstorm terrifies me.
[ ] [ ] 47. I think I would like the work of a clerk in a large department store.
[ ] [ ] 48. Sometimes I feel like swearing.
[ ] [ ] 49. I am embarrassed by dirty stories.
[ ] [ ] 50. I would disapprove of anyone's drinking to the point of intoxication at a party.
[ ] [ ] 51. Sometimes I cross the street just to avoid meeting someone.
[ ] [ ] 52. I get excited very easily.
[ ] [ ] 53. It is very hard for me to tell anyone about myself.
[ ] [ ] 54. I often feel as if the world was just passing me by.
[ ] [ ] 55. When I get bored I like to stir up some excitement.
[ ] [ ] 56. I like to boast about my achievements every now and then.
[ ] [ ] 57. There have been times when I have been very angry.
58. I must admit I often try to get my own way regardless of what others may want.

59. I think I would like the work of a garage mechanic.

60. I usually feel nervous and ill at ease at a formal dance or party.

61. I have at one time or another in my life tried my hand at writing poetry.

62. I don't like to undertake any project unless I have a pretty good idea as to how it will turn out.

63. Most of the arguments or quarrels I get into are over matters of principle.

64. I like adventure stories better than romantic stories.

65. I do not like to see people carelessly dressed.

66. Sometimes I think of things too bad to talk about.

67. People often expect too much of me.

68. I would do almost anything on a dare.

69. The idea of doing research appeals to me.

70. I take a rather serious attitude toward ethical and moral issues.

71. I would like the job of a foreign correspondent for a newspaper.

72. People today have forgotten how to feel properly ashamed of themselves.

73. I cannot keep my mind on one thing.

74. I prefer a shower to a bathtub.

75. I must admit that I often do as little work as I can get by with.

76. I like to be the center of attention.

77. I like to listen to symphony orchestra concerts on the radio.

78. I would like to see a bullfight in Spain.

79. The average person is not able to appreciate art and music very well.

80. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.
[] [] 81. I have no dread of going into a room by myself where other people have already gathered and are talking.

[] [] 82. I get pretty discouraged sometimes.

[] [] 83. The thought of being in an automobile accident is very frightening to me.

[] [] 84. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.

[] [] 85. I set a high standard for myself and I feel others should do the same.

[] [] 86. At times I feel like picking a fist fight with someone.

[] [] 87. Sometimes I have the same dream over and over.

[] [] 88. It is annoying to listen to a lecturer who cannot seem to make up his mind as to what he really believes.

[] [] 89. I don't blame anyone for trying to grab all he can get in this world.

[] [] 90. I believe we are made better by the trials and hardships of life.

[] [] 91. Planning one's activities in advance is very likely to take most of the fun out of life.

[] [] 92. I do not always tell the truth.

[] [] 93. I was a slow learner in school.

[] [] 94. I like poetry.

[] [] 95. I think I am stricter about right and wrong than most people.

[] [] 96. I am likely not to speak to people until they speak to me.

[] [] 97. There is something wrong with a person who can't take orders without getting angry or resentful.

[] [] 98. I do not dread seeing a doctor about a sickness or injury.

[] [] 99. I always try to consider the other fellow's feelings before I do something.

[] [] 100. I think I would like to drive a racing car.

[] [] 101. Sometimes without any reason or even when things are going wrong I feel excitedly happy, "on top of the world."

[] [] 102. One of my aims in life is to accomplish something that would make my mother proud of me.

[] [] 103. I feel as good now as I ever have.
104. It makes me uncomfortable to put on a stunt at a party even when others are doing the same sort of thing.

105. I wake up fresh and rested most mornings.

106. I wish I were not bothered by thoughts about sex.

107. I seldom or never have dizzy spells.

108. It is all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it.

109. I enjoy hearing lectures on world affairs.

110. Parents are much too easy on their children nowadays.

111. I like to be with a crowd who play jokes on one another.

112. I am somewhat afraid of the dark.

113. I have a tendency to give up easily when I meet difficult problems.

114. I would like to wear expensive clothes.

115. I certainly feel useless at times.

116. I believe women should have as much sexual freedom as men.

117. Criticism or scolding makes me very uncomfortable.

118. I read at least ten books a year.

119. If I am not feeling well I am somewhat cross and grouchy.

120. A person should adapt his ideas and his behavior to the group that happens to be with him at the time.

121. I hardly ever get excited or thrilled.

122. I have the wanderlust and am never happy unless I am roaming or traveling about.

123. I feel nervous if I have to meet a lot of people.

124. I am sometimes cross and grouchy without any good reason.

125. I like parties and socials.

126. My parents have often disapproved of my friends.

127. I do not mind taking orders and being told what to do.

128. In school I always looked far ahead in planning what courses to take.

129. I should like to belong to several clubs or lodges.
130. Teachers often expect too much work from the students.

131. I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think.

132. I think I could do better than most of the present politicians if I were in office.

133. I do not have a great fear of snakes.

134. My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others.

135. I never make judgments about people until I am sure of the facts.

136. I have had blank spells in which my activities were interrupted and I did not know what was going on around me.

137. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence.

138. Most people are secretly pleased when someone else gets into trouble.

139. When I work on a committee I like to take charge of things.

140. My parents have generally let me make my own decisions.

141. I always tried to make the best school grades that I could.

142. I would rather go without something than ask for a favor.

143. I often do whatever makes me feel cheerful here and now, even at the cost of some distant goal.

144. I am inclined to take things hard.

145. I am quite often not in on the gossip and talk of the group I belong to.

146. When I meet a stranger I often think that he is better than I am.

147. I like to keep people guessing what I'm going to do next.

148. The most important things to me are my duties to my job and to my fellow man.

149. I think I would like to fight in a boxing match sometime.

150. Once in a while I laugh at a dirty joke.

151. Before I do something I try to consider how my friends will react to it.

152. I would like to be a soldier.

153. In a group of people I would not be embarrassed to be called upon to start a discussion or give an opinion about something I know well.
154. If given the chance I would make a good leader of people.

155. When things go wrong I sometimes blame the other fellow.

156. I like to plan a home study schedule and then follow it.

157. I have often found people jealous of my good ideas, just because they had not thought of them first.

158. Sometimes at elections I vote for men about whom I know very little.

159. I like to go to parties and other affairs where there is lots of loud fun.

160. I very much like hunting.

161. I have frequently found myself, when alone, pondering such abstract problems as freewill, evil, etc.

162. In school I was sometimes sent to the principal for cutting up.

163. I would like to write a technical book.

164. At times I have worn myself out by undertaking too much.

165. I think I would like the work of a librarian.

166. I love to go to dances.

167. I would like to belong to a discussion and study club.

168. I usually expect to succeed in things I do.

169. People pretend to care more about one another than they really do.

170. Most people worry too much about sex.

171. It is hard for me to find anything to talk about when I meet a new person.

172. I like to read about history.

173. I much prefer symmetry to asymmetry.

174. I am apt to show off in some way if I get the chance.

175. Sometimes I feel that I am about to go to pieces.

176. A person does not need to worry about other people if only he looks after himself.

177. We ought to pay our elected officials better than we do.

178. I am so touchy on some subjects that I can't talk about them.

179. The future is too uncertain for a person to make serious plans.
180. Sometimes I just can't seem to get going.
181. I like to talk before groups of people.
182. I would like to be a nurse.
183. The man who provides temptation by leaving valuable property unprotected is about as much to blame for its theft as the one who steals it.
184. I am a good mixer.
185. I am often bothered by useless thoughts which keep running through my mind.
186. If I were a reporter I would like very much to report news of the theater.
187. Most of the time I feel happy.
188. I like to plan out my activities in advance.
189. When a man is with a woman he is usually thinking about things related to her sex.
190. I must admit that I have a bad temper, once I get angry.
191. I like mechanics magazines.
192. I must admit I find it very hard to work under strict rules and regulations.
193. I like large, noisy parties.
194. I sometimes feel that I am a burden to others.
195. I have never deliberately told a lie.
196. Only a fool would try to change our American way of life.
197. I want to be an important person in the community.
198. In school I found it very hard to talk before the class.
199. I usually feel that life is worthwhile.
200. I always try to do at least a little better than what is expected of me.
201. There have been a few times when I have been very mean to another person.
202. Lawbreakers are almost always caught and punished.
203. I would be very unhappy if I was not successful at something I had seriously started to do.
204. I dread the thought of an earthquake.
205. At times I have been very anxious to get away from my family.
206. I like science.
207. I often lose my temper.
208. My parents were always very strict and stern with me.
209. I must admit I feel sort of scared when I move to a strange place.
210. I am bothered by people outside, on streetcars, in stores, etc., watching me.
211. I'm pretty sure I know how we can settle the international problems we face today.
212. Sometimes I rather enjoy going against the rules and doing things I'm not supposed to.
213. I have no fear of water.
214. If I get too much change in a store, I always give it back.
215. I often get disgusted with myself.
216. I enjoy many different kinds of play and recreation.
217. Society owes a lot more to the businessman and the manufacturer than it does to the artist and the professor.
218. A large number of people are guilty of bad sexual conduct.
219. I like to read about science.
220. It is hard for me to act natural when I am with new people.
221. I refuse to play some games because I am not good at them.
222. There have been times when I have worried a lot about something that was not really important.
223. I think I would like to belong to a motorcycle club.
224. I used to like it very much when one of my papers was read to the class in school.
225. Every now and then I get into a bad mood, and no one can do anything to please me.
226. I feel that I have often been punished without cause.
227. I would like to be an actor on the stage or in the movies.
228. I don't seem to care what happens to me.
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>252.</td>
<td>It is impossible for an honest man to get ahead in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253.</td>
<td>I like to have a place for everything and everything in its place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254.</td>
<td>I don't like to work on a problem unless there is the possibility of coming out with a clear-cut and unambiguous answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255.</td>
<td>It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256.</td>
<td>I never seem to get hungry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257.</td>
<td>I would rather be a steady and dependable worker than a brilliant but unstable one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258.</td>
<td>I would never go out of my way to help another person if it meant giving up some personal pleasure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259.</td>
<td>Most of the arguments or quarrels I get into are over matters of principle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.</td>
<td>I doubt if anyone is really happy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261.</td>
<td>I am known as a hard and steady worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262.</td>
<td>Most people would be better off if they never went to school at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263.</td>
<td>I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264.</td>
<td>Once I have my mind made up I seldom change it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265.</td>
<td>I think I am stricter about right and wrong than most people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266.</td>
<td>Most young people get too much education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267.</td>
<td>I am in favor of a very strict enforcement of all laws, no matter what the consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268.</td>
<td>I always see to it that my work is carefully planned and organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269.</td>
<td>I regard the right to speak my mind as very important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270.</td>
<td>I don't really care whether people like me or dislike me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271.</td>
<td>There have been times when I have been very angry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272.</td>
<td>There are a few people who just cannot be trusted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273.</td>
<td>There are times when I have been discouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274.</td>
<td>The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275.</td>
<td>I would fight if someone tried to take my rights away.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
276. I must admit that people sometimes disappoint me.

277. If I saw some children hurting another child, I am sure I would try to make them stop.

278. I set a high standard for myself and I feel others should do the same.

279. People who seem unsure and uncertain about things make me feel uncomfortable.
APPENDIX B

Cover Letter Enclosed with Inventory
Dear G.R's, Counselors and Student Residents:

This letter is to make an important request of you. As some of you know, we have been working for sometime on a research design which will help us define both the satisfying and the unsatisfying interpersonal relations which grow out of the student's day-to-day encounters with his peers, the faculty, the administration, and significant others on the college campus.

Surely those who live and work with students in the residence halls are "significant others" to college students. The climate created by the staff members individually and collectively does have an impact upon human relations. The way they feel about what they are doing is reflected daily in contacts with students and helps or hinders the communication process.

We are then, in our first effort taking a look at the job satisfaction, the sources of irritation and the attitudes and feelings held by residence hall workers. We have chosen to begin here because we believe that these matters are not only extremely important ones but they are also within our area of freedom to improve.

The inventory to which you are asked to respond will take about one hour and fifteen minutes time. Since this is a "high pressure" period for you we are asking you to provide us with your summer address from June 14 to June 21st. We will mail the inventory with return postage supplied.

If you can respond to the inventory before you leave campus, Mrs. Joann Lloyd in Arps 333; X4113, will supply you with the needed materials. We assure you that no person will be identified with the responses he or she makes.

In appealing to you we would like to say that although this is a busy time of year, it is the best time, the end of the academic year, to review our work with students and to seek ways of improvement in the residence hall system. We will be grateful for your participation and we do need your help!

Incidentally, the design upon which we are embarking is a part of a request for a research grant. Such a grant will provide the financial means for several graduate students to carry out M.A. and Ph.D. studies. This pilot study is the M.A. thesis of Mary Elyn Gregory. She, too, will appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Maude A. Stewart
Director, Graduate Resident Program
Professor of Psychology
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APPENDIX C

Total California Psychological Inventory

Adaptations Classified According to Scalos
Ac (Achievement via conformance) Scale

1. I have a very strong desire to be a success in the world.
2. I liked "Alice in Wonderland" by Lewis Carroll.
3. I usually go to the movies more than once a week.
4. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.
5. I am often said to be hotheaded.
6. When I was going to school I played hooky quite often.
7. I think I would like the work of a school teacher.
8. When someone does me a wrong I feel I should pay him back if I can, just for the principle of the thing.
9. Planning one's activities in advance is very likely to take most of the fun out of life.
10. I was a slow learner in school.
11. There is something wrong with a person who can't take orders without getting angry or resentful.
12. I wake up fresh and rested most mornings.
13. I have a tendency to give up easily when I meet difficult problems.
14. I certainly feel useless at times.
15. I have the wanderlust and am never happy unless I am roaming or traveling about.
16. I am sometimes cross and grouchy without any good reason.
17. My parents have often disapproved of my friends.
18. My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others.
19. I have had blank spells in which my activities were interrupted and I did not know what was going on around me.
20. I like to keep people guessing what I'm going to do next.
21. If given the chance I would make a good leader of people.
22. In school I was sometimes sent to the principal for cutting up.
23. I like to read about history.
24. I am so touchy on some subjects that I can't talk about them.

25. I like to talk before groups of people.

26. I am often bothered by useless thoughts which keep running through my mind.

27. I like to plan out my activities in advance.

28. I must admit I find it very hard to work under strict rules and regulations.

29. I like large, noisy parties.

30. I always try to do at least a little better than what is expected of me.

31. I would be very unhappy if I was not successful at something I had seriously started to do.

32. I often lose my temper.

33. My parents were always very strict and stern with me.

34. I often get disgusted with myself.

35. Society owes a lot more to the businessman and the manufacturer than it does to the artist and the professor.

36. I think I would like to belong to a motorcycle club.

37. I used to like it very much when one of my papers was read to the class in school.

38. I don't seem to care what happens to me.
1. I looked up to my father as an ideal man.

2. Our thinking would be a lot better off if we would just forget about words like "probably," "approximately," and "perhaps."

3. I liked "Alice in Wonderland" by Lewis J. Carroll.

4. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.

5. I have very few fears compared to my friends.

6. For most questions there is just one right answer, once a person is able to get all the facts.

7. I seem to be about as capable and smart as most others around me.

8. I usually take an active part in the entertainment at parties.

9. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.

10. It is always a good thing to be frank.

11. It is annoying to listen to a lecturer who can't seem to make up his mind what he really believes.

12. I don't blame anyone for trying to grab all he can get in this world.

13. I was a slow learner in school.


15. Sometimes without any reason or even when things are going wrong I feel excitedly happy, "on top of the world."

16. It is all right to get round the law if you don't actually break it.

17. Parents are much too easy on their children nowadays.

18. I have a tendency to give up easily when I meet difficult problems.

19. Teachers often expect too much work from the students.

20. I think I would like to fight in a boxing match sometimes.

21. I like to plan a home study schedule and then follow it.

22. I have often found people jealous of my good ideas, just because they had not thought of them first.
Ai Sealo (Continuod)

23. People pretend to care more about one another than they really do.

24. The future is too uncertain for a person to make serious plans.

25. The man who provides temptation by leaving valuable property unprotected is about as much to blame for its theft as the one who steals it.

26. I sometimes feel that I am a burden to others.

27. Lawbreakers are almost always caught and punished.

28. Only a fool would try to change our American way of life.

29. I dread the thought of an earthquake.

30. I often lose my temper.

31. I am bothered by people outside, on streetcars, in stores, etc., watching me.

32. I feel I have often been punished without cause.
Cm (Communality)

1. If I am driving a car, I try to keep others from passing me.
2. I cannot do anything well.
3. My parents wanted me to "make good" in the world.
4. I almost never go to sleep.
5. I do not like to loan my things to people who are careless in the way they take care of them.
6. Voting is nothing but a nuisance.
7. I could be perfectly happy without a single friend.
8. Education is more important than most people think.
9. Some people exaggerate their troubles in order to get sympathy.
10. In school most teachers treated me fairly and honestly.
11. I usually try to do what is expected of me, and to avoid criticism.
12. If a person is clever enough to cheat someone out of a large sum of money, he ought to be allowed to keep it.
13. A person should not be expected to do anything for his community unless he is paid for it.
14. It is impossible for an honest man to get ahead in the world.
15. I never seem to get hungry.
16. I would rather be a steady and dependable worker than a brilliant but unstable one.
17. I would never go out of my way to help another person if it meant giving up some personal pleasure.
18. I doubt if anyone is really happy.
19. Most people would be better off if they never went to school at all.
20. Most young people got too much education.
21. I regard the right to speak my mind as very important.
22. I don't really care whether people like me or dislike me.
23. There have been times when I have been very angry.
24. There are a few people who just cannot be trusted.
25. There are times when I have been discouraged.
26. I would fight if someone tried to take my rights away.
27. I must admit people sometimes disappoint me.
28. If I saw some children hurting another child, I am sure I would try to make them stop.
1. I am very slow in making up my mind.
2. I think I would like the work of a building contractor.
3. I think I would like the work of a dress designer.
4. I become quite irritated when I see someone spit on the sidewalk.
5. It is hard for me to start a conversation with strangers.
6. I must admit that I enjoy playing practical jokes on people.
7. I get very tense and anxious when I think other people are disapproving of me.
8. A windstorm terrifies me.
9. I think I would like the work of a clerk in a large department store.
10. I get excited very easily.
11. I like to boast about my achievements every now and then.
12. I think I would like the work of a garage mechanic.
13. I like adventure stories better than romantic stories.
14. I prefer a shower to a bathtub.
15. The average person is not able to appreciate art and music very well.
16. The thought of being in an automobile accident is very frightening to me.
17. At times I feel like picking a fist fight with someone.
18. Sometimes I have the same dream over and over.
19. I think I am stricter about right and wrong than most people.
20. I think I would like to drive a racing car.
21. I like to be with a crowd who play jokes on one another.
22. I am somewhat afraid of the dark.
23. I think I could do better than most of the present politicians if I were in office.
24. I always tried to make the best school grades that I could.
Fo Scala (Continued)

25. I am inclined to take things hard.

26. I would like to be a soldier.

27. I like to go to parties and other affairs where there is lots of
toward fun.

28. I very much like hunting.

29. In school I was sometimes sent to the principal for cutting up.

30. I think I would like the work of a librarian.

31. Sometimes I feel that I am about to go to pieces.

32. I would like to be a nurse.

33. If I were a reporter I would like very much to report news of the
theater.

34. I like mechanics magazines.

35. I want to be an important person in the community.

36. I must admit I feel sort of scared when I move to a strange place.

37. I'm pretty sure I know how we can settle the international problems
we face today.

38. If I get too much change in a store, I always give it back.
Fx (Flexibility)

1. I often wish people would be more definite about things.

2. It is annoying to listen to a lecturer who cannot seem to make up his mind as to what he really believes.

3. I find that a well-ordered mode of life with regular hours is congenial to my temperament.

4. It is hard for me to sympathize with someone who is always doubting and unsure about things.

5. I often start things I never finish.

6. Our thinking would be a lot better off if we would just forget about words like "probably," "approximately," and "perhaps."

7. I never make judgments about people until I am sure of the facts.

8. A strong person will be able to make up his mind even on the most difficult questions.

9. For most questions there is just one right answer, once a person is able to get all the facts.

10. I like to have a place for everything and everything in its place.

11. I don't like to work on a problem unless there is the possibility of coming out with a clear-cut and unambiguous answer.

12. It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine.

13. Most of the arguments or quarrels I get into are over matters of principles.

14. I am known as a hard and steady worker.

15. I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable.

16. Once I have my mind made up I seldom change it.

17. I think I am stricter about right and wrong than most people.

18. I am in favor of a very strict enforcement of all laws, no matter what the consequences.

19. I always see to it that my work is carefully planned and organized.

20. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.
21. I set a high standard for myself and I feel others should do the same.

22. People who seem unsure and uncertain about things make me feel uncomfortable.
Gi (Good Impression)

1. Some people exaggerate their troubles in order to get sympathy.
2. I always follow the rule: business before pleasure.
3. I gossip a little at times.
4. There are a few people who just cannot be trusted.
5. It is hard for me to start a conversation with strangers.
6. I sometimes pretend to know more than I really do.
7. Sometimes I feel like smashing things.
8. Most people would tell a lie if they could gain by it.
9. I hate to be interrupted when I am working on something.
10. Sometimes I feel like swearing.
11. Sometimes I cross the street just to avoid meeting someone.
12. I like to boast about my achievements every now and then.
13. I must admit I often try to get my own way regardless of what others may want.
14. Sometimes I think of things too bad to talk about.
15. I must admit that I often do as little work as I can get by with.
16. I like to listen to symphony orchestra concerts on the radio.
17. I got pretty discouraged sometimes.
18. I do not always tell the truth.
19. I always try to consider the other fellow's feelings before I do something.
20. I feel as good now as I ever have.
21. I enjoy hearing lectures on world affairs.
22. Criticism or scolding makes me very uncomfortable.
23. If I am not feeling well I am somewhat cross and grouchy.
24. I feel nervous if I have to meet a lot of people.
25. I do not mind taking orders and being told what to do.
26. I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think.

27. Most people are secretly pleased when someone else gets into trouble.

28. The most important things to me are my duties to my job and to my fellowman.

29. When things go wrong I sometimes blame the other fellow.

30. I would like to belong to a discussion and study club.

32. I am apt to show off in some way if I got the chance.

33. Sometimes I just can't seem to get going.

34. I must admit that I have a bad temper, once I got angry.

35. I have never deliberately told a lie.

36. Thoro have boon a few times when I have boon vory moan to another person.

37. At times I have been very anxious to get away from my family.

38. Somotimos I rather enjoy going against tho rules and doing things I'm not supposed to.

39. Thoro have boon times when I have worried a lot about something that was not really important.

40. Evory now and then I got into a bad mood, and no one can do anything to please mo.
Py (Psychological-mindedness)

1. People can pretty easily change me even though I thought that my mind was already made up on a subject.

2. I often feel that I made a wrong choice in my occupation.

3. I always like to keep my things neat and tidy and in good order.

4. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job.

5. I don't like to undertake any project unless I have a pretty good idea as to how it will turn out.

6. I do not like to see people carelessly dressed.

7. The idea of doing research appeals to me.

8. I cannot keep my mind on one thing.

9. I believe we are made better by the trials and hardships of life.

10. One of my aims in life is to accomplish something that would make my mother proud of me.

11. I have a tendency to give up easily when I meet difficult problems.

12. A person should adapt his ideas and his behavior to the group that happens to be with him at the time.

13. In school I always looked far ahead in planning what courses to take.

14. I do not have a great fear of snakes.

15. I often do whatever makes me feel cheerful here and now, even at the cost of some distant goal.

16. Sometimes at elections I vote for men about whom I know very little.

17. I have frequently found myself, when alone, pondering such abstract problems as free will, evil, etc.

18. I would like to write a technical book.

19. Most people worry too much about sex.

20. I much prefer symmetry to asymmetry.

21. We ought to pay our elected officials better than we do.

22. A large number of people are guilty of bad sexual conduct.
Sa (Self-acceptance)

1. I looked up to my father as an ideal man.

2. When in a group of people I usually do what the others want rather than make suggestions.

3. My daily life is full of things that keep me interested.

4. I doubt whether I would make a good leader.

5. It is hard for me to start a conversation with strangers.

6. I sometimes pretend to know more than I really do.

7. Women should not be allowed to drink in cocktail bars.

8. I would disapprove of anyone's drinking to the point of intoxication at a party.

9. Most of the arguments or quarrels I got into are over matters of principle.

10. I must admit that I often do as little work as I can get by with.

11. I would like to see a bullfight in Spain.

12. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.

13. I set a high standard for myself and I feel others should do the same.

14. I was a slow learner in school.

15. I seldom or never have dizzy spells.

16. I would like to wear expensive clothes.

17. I never make judgments about people until I am sure of the facts.

18. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence.

19. When I work on a committee I like to take charge of things.

20. I would rather go without something than ask for a favor.

21. I often do whatever makes me feel cheerful hero and now, even at the cost of some distant goal.

22. Once in a while I laugh at a dirty joke.
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23. Before I do something I try to consider how my friends will react to it.

24. I have frequently found myself, when alone, pondering such abstract problems as freewill, evil, etc.

25. At times I have worn myself out by undertaking too much.

26. It is hard for me to find anything to talk about when I meet a new person.

27. A person does not have to worry about other people if only he looks after himself.

28. When a man is with a woman he is usually thinking about things related to her sex.

29. In school I found it very hard to talk before the class.

30. Sometimes I rather enjoy going against the rules and doing things I'm not supposed to do.

31. It is hard for me to act natural when I am with new people.

32. I think I would like to belong to a motorcycle club.

33. I would like to be an actor on the stage or in the movies.

34. Police cars should be especially marked so that you can always see them coming.
Sy (Sociability)

1. I enjoy social gatherings just to be with people.
2. A person needs to "show off" a little now and then.
3. When in a group of people I usually do what the others want rather than make suggestions.
4. As a child I used to be able to go to my parents with my problems.
5. I seem to be about as capable and smart as most others around me.
6. I liked school.
7. A windstorm terrifies me.
8. It is very hard for me to tell anyone about myself.
9. I usually feel nervous and ill at ease at a formal dance or party.
10. I have at one time or another in my life tried my hand at writing poetry.
11. I like to be the center of attention.
12. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.
13. I have no dread of going into a room by myself where other people have already gathered and are talking.
14. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.
15. I was a slow learner in school.
16. I am likely not to speak to people until they speak to me.
17. I do not dread seeing a doctor about a sickness or injury.
18. It makes me uncomfortable to put on a stunt at a party even when others are doing the same sort of thing.
19. I have a tendency to give up easily when I meet difficult problems.
20. I would like to wear expensive clothes.
21. I like parties and socials.
22. I should like to belong to several clubs or lodges.
23. I am quite often not in on the gossip and talk of the group I belong to.
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24. Once in awhile I laugh at a dirty joke.

25. If given the chance I would make a good leader of people.

26. At times I have worn myself out by undertaking too much.

27. I love to go to dances.

28. People pretend to care more about one another than they really do.

29. I like to read about history.

30. I am a good mixer.

31. In school I found it very hard to talk before a class.

32. I like science.

33. I am bothered by people outside, on streetcars, in stores, etc. watching me.

34. I have no fear of water.

35. I like to read about science.

36. It is hard for me to act natural when I am with new people.
APPENDIX D

Kahn, et al's Job-Satisfaction Index: Response Alternatives and Item Scoring Weights
ITEMS IN JOB-SATISFACTION INDEX

Respondents were administered the items composing the job-satisfaction measure as part of the personality inventory. These items, together with the response alternatives provided and the scoring weights assigned those alternatives, are:

1. Is there some other work, either here or outside The Ohio State Residence Hall System, which you would like better than what you are doing now?
   (1) I would rather have some other job.
   (5) I would rather have my present job.

2. Not counting all the other things that make your particular job good or bad, how do you like the kind of work that you do?
   (1) I dislike it very much; would prefer almost any other kind of work.
   (2) I don't like it very much; would much prefer some other kind of work.
   (3) It's all right, but there are other kinds of work I like better.
   (4) I like it very much, but there are other kinds of work I like just as much.
   (5) It's exactly the kind of work I like best.

3. How do you feel about the progress you have made in your job?
   (1) I have made little or no progress.
   (2) I have made some progress, but it should have been much better.
   (4) I have made quite a lot of progress, but it should have been better.
   (5) I have made a great deal of progress.

4. How much does your job give you a chance to do the things you are best at?
   (1) No chance at all
   (2) Very little chance
   (3) Some chance
   (4) Fairly good chance
   (5) Very good chance

5. How do you like working for The Ohio State Residence Hall System?
   (1) It's not a very good place to work.
   (2) It's all right, but there are many things that should be changed.
   (3) It's a fairly good place, but quite a few things should be changed.
   (4) It's a good place, but there are a few things that should be changed.
   (5) It's a very good place—wouldn't change anything.

6. Would you advise a friend to come and work for The Ohio State Residence Hall System?
   (1) I would not advise a friend to come and work for The Ohio State Residence Hall System.
   (5) I would advise a friend to come and work for The Ohio State Residence Hall System.
7. If you had a chance to do the same kind of work for the same pay, but in another residential hall system, would you stay here?  
(1) I would prefer to go to the other residential hall system.  
(5) I would prefer to stay in this residential hall system.
APPENDIX E

Kahn, et al's Job-Related Tension Index: Response Alternatives and Item Scoring Weight
ITEMS IN JOB-RELATED TENSION INDEX

All people are occasionally bothered by certain kinds of things in their work. Below is a list of things that sometimes bother people. Please indicate how frequently you feel bothered by each of the following by choosing the appropriate response.

A. Feeling that you have too little authority to carry out the responsibility assigned to you.

B. Being unclear on just what the scope and responsibilities of your job are.

C. Not knowing what opportunities for advancement or promotion exist for you.

D. Feeling that you have too heavy a work load, one that you can’t possibly finish during an ordinary workday.

E. Thinking that you’ll not be able to satisfy the conflicting demands of various people over you.

F. Feeling that you’re not fully qualified to handle your job.

G. Not knowing what your supervisor thinks of you, how he evaluates your performance.

H. The fact that you can’t get information needed to carry out your job.

I. Having to decide things that affect the lives of individuals, people that you know.

J. Feeling that you may not be liked and accepted by the people you work with.

K. Feeling unable to influence your immediate supervisor’s decisions and actions that affect you.

L. Not knowing just what the people you work with expect of you.

M. Thinking that the amount of work you have to do may interfere with how well it gets done.

N. Feeling that you have to do things on the job that are against your better judgment.

O. Feeling that your job tends to interfere with your family life.

Respondant answered each item by choosing one of five fixed alternative responses: Never; Rarely; Sometime; Rather Often; Nearly all the time. Those alternatives were assigned coding values of from 1 to 5 respectively.
APPENDIX F

Intercorrelation Matrices of Job-Related Tension Items
### Intercorrelation Matrices of Tension Items for a National Survey (NS) and an Intensive Study (IS)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Item(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)These intercorrelations are based on the test results (Kahn, et al, 1964) for a national survey of 725 persons, representing that portion of the labor force of the United States employed during the Spring of 1961 and for an intensive series of studies of 53 selected individuals in six industrial locations.

\(^2\)The letters correspond to those assigned items in Appendix E.
APPENDIX G

Factor Analytic Data:
Intercorrelations, Communalities, and Residuals
Intercorrelations (Above Diagonal), Communalities (Diagonal), and Residuals (Below Diagonal) Associated with a Factor Analysis of Nine CPI Scales, a Job Satisfaction Index and a Job-Related Tension Index Administered to Ohio State University Residence Hall Staff Members (n = 106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Position</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-.713</td>
<td>-.620</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>-.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Personnel Training</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Residence Hall Experience</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Liking for Other Work</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Liking for Present Kind of Work</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.356</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>-.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Progress in Present Job</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Utilization of Abilities &amp; Skills</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.321</td>
<td>-.315</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>-.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Liking for Work at OSU</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>-.286</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>-.319</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>-.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advise Friend to Work for OSU</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Liking for Other Residence Hall System</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Too Little Authority for Demands of Job</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lack of clarity on scope and responsibilities of job</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lack of knowledge on promotional possibilities</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Too heavy a work load</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Inability to satisfy conflicting demands of superiors</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lack of qualifications</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intercorrelational, Communality, and Residual Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Position</td>
<td>-.243</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td>-.446</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Personnel Training</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.410</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Residence Hall Experience</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Liking for Other Work</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>-.444</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Liking for Present Kind of Work</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.302</td>
<td>-.339</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>-.360</td>
<td>-.484</td>
<td>-.271</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Progress in Present Job</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>-.253</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>-.247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Utilization of Abilities &amp; Skills</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>-.293</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>-.338</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>-.391</td>
<td>-.298</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>-.293</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>-.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Liking for Work at OSU</td>
<td>-.273</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>-.469</td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td>-.424</td>
<td>-.363</td>
<td>-.315</td>
<td>-.382</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>-.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advise Friend to Work for OSU</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>-.271</td>
<td>-.334</td>
<td>-.309</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>-.429</td>
<td>-.443</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Liking for Other Residence</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.279</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>-.247</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>-.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall System</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Too Little Authority for Demands of Job</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-.299</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lack of Clarity on Scope and Responsibilities of Job</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>-.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lack of Knowledge on Promotional Possibilities</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Too Heavy a Work Load</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Inability to Satisfy Conflicting Demands of Superiors</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>-.301</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lack of Qualifications</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.279</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All figures in this portion of the table fall above the diagonal and thus are intercorrelations.*
### Intercorrelational, Communality, and Residual Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Insufficient Information to Carry Out Job</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Having to Make Decisions Affecting Lives of Acquaintances</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Non-acceptance By Co-workers Decision</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Inability to Influence Supervisor's Decision</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Lack of Communication with Co-workers</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Quantity of Work Interferes With Quality</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Having to Do Things Against Better Judgment</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Job Interference with Family Life</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Achievement via Conformance</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Good Impression</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Achievement via Independence</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Self-acceptance</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Sociability</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Femininity</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Psychological-mindedness</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Communality</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Flexibility</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All the figures in this portion of the table fall below the diagonal and thus are residual.*
### Intercorrelational, Communality, and Residual Matrix (Continued)

| Variables                                             | 19    | 20    | 21    | 22    | 23    | 24    | 25    | 26    | 27    | 28    | 29    | 30    | 31    | 32    | 33    | 34    | 35    |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 19. Insufficient Information to Carry Out Job         | 0.197 | 0.169 | 0.220 | 0.454 | 0.452 | 0.136 | 0.389 | 0.217 | -0.140 | -0.274 | -0.073 | 0.017 | -0.074 | -0.166 | -0.142 | -0.067 | 0.012 |
| 20. Having to Make Decisions Affecting Lives of Acquaintances | 0.022 | 0.167 | 0.351 | 0.118 | 0.343 | 0.346 | 0.247 | 0.249 | -0.084 | -0.212 | -0.016 | -0.064 | -0.164 | 0.181 | -0.194 | -0.008 | -0.098 |
| 21. Non-acceptance by Co-workers                      | -0.030 | -0.059 | 0.163 | 0.351 | 0.385 | 0.173 | 0.131 | 0.166 | -0.137 | -0.307 | -0.164 | -0.352 | 0.057 | -0.217 | -0.033 | 0.003 |
| 22. Inability to Influence Supervisor's Decision      | -0.032 | -0.038 | -0.012 | 0.224 | 0.490 | 0.094 | 0.458 | 0.233 | -0.323 | -0.232 | -0.041 | -0.172 | -0.197 | -0.071 | 0.014 | -0.282 | 0.197 |
| 23. Lack of Communication with Co-workers             | -0.028 | -0.019 | 0.003 | -0.014 | 0.165 | 0.170 | 0.473 | 0.257 | -0.261 | -0.291 | -0.064 | -0.217 | -0.278 | 0.038 | -0.149 | -0.136 | 0.101 |
| 24. Quantity of Work Interferes With Quality          | 0.029 | -0.034 | 0.043 | 0.039 | 0.003 | 0.245 | 0.347 | 0.343 | -0.085 | -0.153 | 0.016 | 0.012 | -0.152 | 0.267 | 0.000 | 0.045 | 0.124 |
| 25. Having to Do Things Against Better Judgment       | -0.023 | 0.012 | -0.071 | 0.008 | -0.033 | -0.054 | 0.177 | 0.390 | -0.255 | -0.328 | 0.090 | -0.087 | -0.102 | 0.010 | -0.085 | -0.117 | 0.227 |
| 26. Job Interference With Family Life                 | 0.024 | -0.046 | -0.034 | 0.032 | 0.000 | -0.025 | -0.027 | 0.274 | -0.152 | -0.235 | 0.103 | -0.084 | -0.082 | 0.150 | -0.000 | -0.113 | 0.138 |
| 27. Achievement via Conformance                       | 0.037 | 0.007 | -0.013 | 0.016 | -0.034 | 0.041 | 0.023 | -0.031 | 0.199 | 0.610 | 0.348 | 0.238 | 0.421 | 0.020 | 0.360 | 0.169 | -0.198 |
| 28. Good Impression                                   | 0.048 | 0.020 | 0.014 | -0.010 | 0.002 | 0.041 | 0.016 | 0.013 | -0.071 | 0.202 | 0.232 | -0.038 | 0.257 | -0.020 | 0.290 | 0.058 | -0.128 |
| 29. Achievement via Independence                      | -0.020 | 0.010 | -0.014 | -0.010 | -0.018 | 0.005 | 0.018 | -0.009 | 0.002 | -0.460 | 0.097 | 0.143 | 0.143 | 0.135 | 0.276 | 0.049 | 0.445 |
| 30. Self-acceptance                                   | 0.005 | -0.032 | 0.014 | 0.037 | 0.020 | 0.051 | 0.001 | -0.017 | 0.019 | 0.038 | 0.016 | 0.117 | 0.657 | 0.078 | 0.135 | 0.025 | 0.098 |
| 31. Sociability                                       | 0.001 | -0.002 | -0.018 | 0.001 | 0.016 | -0.047 | -0.009 | 0.039 | -0.003 | -0.007 | -0.006 | 0.073 | 0.142 | 0.224 | 0.307 | 0.155 | 0.018 |
| 32. Femininity                                        | 0.049 | 0.000 | -0.021 | -0.004 | -0.009 | 0.027 | 0.013 | -0.002 | 0.002 | 0.011 | 0.018 | 0.013 | 0.005 | 0.142 | -0.035 | 0.128 | -0.049 |
| 33. Psychological-mindedness                         | 0.018 | 0.009 | -0.012 | -0.047 | 0.019 | 0.076 | -0.013 | -0.024 | -0.052 | -0.068 | 0.013 | -0.031 | 0.043 | 0.028 | -0.167 | 0.073 | 0.322 |
| 34. Communality                                       | -0.032 | 0.057 | -0.006 | 0.052 | 0.028 | -0.047 | -0.001 | 0.061 | -0.022 | -0.029 | -0.005 | -0.005 | -0.009 | -0.024 | 0.039 | 0.012 | 0.289 |
| 35. Flexibility                                       | -0.020 | 0.015 | -0.000 | -0.034 | 0.010 | 0.004 | -0.071 | 0.032 | 0.025 | 0.048 | -0.089 | -0.034 | 0.009 | 0.025 | 0.024 | 0.026 | 0.172 |
APPENDIX H

Loadings of the Measures for the Fifteen Rotated Factors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Position</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.858</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Personnel Training</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Residencio Hall Experience</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Liking for Other Work</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Liking for Present Kind of Work</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Progress in Present Job</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Utilization of Abilities and Skills</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Liking for Work at OSU</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Adviso Friend to Work for OSU</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Liking for Other Residencio Hall System</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.554</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Too Little Authority for Demands of Job</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.296</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lack of Clarity on Scope and Responsiblities of Job</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>-.945</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lack of Knowledge on Promotional Possibilities</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Too Heavy a Work Load</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Inability to Satisfy Conflicting Demands of Superiors</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>-.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lack of Qualifications</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.294</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lack of Communication with Supervisor</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Insufficient Information to Carry Out Job</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Having to Make Decisions Affecting Lives of Acquaintances</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Non-acceptance by Co-workers</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>-.298</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Inability to Influence Supervisor's Decision</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Lack of Communication with Co-workers</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Quantity of Work Interforos with Quality</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Having to do Things Against Better Judgment</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>-.436</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Job Interforoence with Family Life</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>-.762</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Achievement via Conformance</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>-.861</td>
<td>-.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Good impression</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>-.297</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Achievement via Indopondonce</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Self-acceptance</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Sociability</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Femininity</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>-.350</td>
<td>-.510</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Psychological-mindodness</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Communality</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>-.341</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Loadings of the Measures for the 15 Rotated Factors (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XI</th>
<th>XII</th>
<th>XIII</th>
<th>XIV</th>
<th>XV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-.239</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.362</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.860</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.287</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.253</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.474</td>
<td>-.317</td>
<td>-.245</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>-.285</td>
<td>-.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.386</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.572</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>-.267</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.330</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>-.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>-.709</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.253</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.378</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

Raw Scores Means and Standard Deviations on 9 Scales of California Psychological Inventory for Rosidoco Hall Staff Members as Compared with Other Educational and Occupational Groups
Raw Score Means and Standard Deviations on Nine Scales of California Psychological Inventory for Residence Hall Staff Members as Compared with Other Educational and Occupational Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>No. of Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male College Students (N=680)</td>
<td>Female College Students (N=2,120)</td>
<td>Male City School Superintendents (N=144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Achievement via Conformance</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Good Impression</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Achievement via Independence</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Self-acceptance</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Sociability</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Femininity</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Psychological-mindedness</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Communality</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Flexibility</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data is taken from CPI Manual
APPENDIX J

Raw Score Means and Standard Deviations on the Items of Job Satisfaction and Job-Related Tension Indices
Raw Score Means and Standard Deviations on the Items Comprising Kahn, et al.'s Items of Job Satisfaction and Job-Related Tension Indices (N = 106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sox</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Position</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Personnel Training</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rosidonco Hall Experience</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Liking for Other Work</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Liking for Present Kind of Work</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Progress in Present Job</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Utilization of Abilities and Skills</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Liking for Work at OSU</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advise Friend to Work for OSU</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Liking for Other Rosidonco Hall System</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Too Little Authority for Demands of Job</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lack of Clarity on Scope and Responsibilities of Job</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lack of Knowledge on Promotional Possibilities</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Too Heavy a Work Load</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Inability to Satisfy Conflicting Demands of Superiors</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lack of Qualifications</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lack of Communication with Supervisor</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Insufficient Information to Carry Out Job</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Having to Make Decisions Affecting Lives of Acquaintances</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Inability to Influence Supervisors Decisions</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Lack of Communication with Co-workers</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Quantity of Work Interferes with Quality</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Having to do Things Against Better Judgment</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Job Interference with Family Life</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Achievement via Conformance</td>
<td>29.28</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Good Impression</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Achievement via Independence</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Self-acceptance</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Sociability</td>
<td>27.70</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Femininity</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Psychological-mindodness</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Communalinity</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Flexibility</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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