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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview

In recent years industrial/organizational researchers have devoted considerable effort in attempts to enhance employee motivation and satisfaction in the workplace. A prevalent tactic for achieving greater motivation and satisfaction with the work itself has been to redesign existing jobs by manipulating objective features of the work environment (Turner & Lawrence, 1965; Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Brief & Aldag, 1975; Hackman & Oldham, 1976). The results of these and other related investigations have generally supported the assertion that the enhancement of objective task characteristics encountered on the job, such as autonomy, feedback, significance, etc., can lead to improvements in intrinsic motivation and satisfaction with one's work (Hackman & Oldham, 1976).
More recently, however, investigators have begun to question the accuracy with which the gains in motivation and satisfaction with work are solely attributable to changes in the objective characteristics of a job. Elements such as social influences and informational cues present in the work environment, as well as the individual differences of the workers themselves, have been shown to contribute significantly to changes in motivation and satisfaction with work (O'Connor & Barrett, 1980; O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1979; Pfeffer, 1980; Weiss & Shaw, 1979; White & Mitchell, 1979). These findings have significant implications for future job redesign efforts, for they suggest that outcomes once attributed to "objective" changes in a job may have been due primarily to some associated, yet unintended, changes in more basic psychological elements present within the context of these experiments.

The concern over the objective components of the job neglected to place sufficient emphasis on the more basic social/psychological components that may influence the formation of perceptions of task characteristics. Perhaps a more discerning perspective that probes the attributional and inferential processes operating within a task setting may provide some needed insights. The merits of this shift in focus from objective features of
tasks to the processes underlying their identification is illustrated by the following concern.

A particularly perplexing issue facing those who see objective task characteristics as the primary element of job redesign efforts is the inability to find adequate convergence in ratings of task characteristics between observers of a task and participants actually engaged in the same task (Shaw, 1980). If indeed objective task characteristics are ultimately distinct and identifiable elements of reality, one would certainly expect to find high agreement between observers and participants who are attending to the same task. The failure to find this expected convergence between observers and participants points to the possible influence of role making, task redefinition, and other situational components as potential social/psychological factors that merit greater attention in the realm of job design. Perhaps the particular role assumed and/or created by an individual produces perceptions of task characteristics different from those believed to have been objectively manipulated by the researcher.

These concerns raise two basic questions which have not been sufficiently addressed in the job design literature. First, are the task characteristics described by Hackman and Oldham truly objective elements of a task?
And second, what are the processes by which individuals arrive at perceptions of task characteristics? This paper addresses these questions by initially reviewing some of the background research preceding the current job design models. Next, the Job Characteristics Model of Hackman and Oldham (1976) and the Social Information Processing Model of Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) are presented; accompanied by a sample of the research that has been conducted on portions of these theories. This review is followed by a detailed examination of the components of a task for which an inference/attribution process is proposed as a possible mechanism by which task components are identified. The consideration task characteristics from an inference/attribution perspective reveals the need to reevaluate the level at which inferences of task characteristics are formed. This paper develops an argument that task characteristics such as autonomy, significance, etc., are best depicted as originating from a work role rather than an individual task or an overall job. Finally, a framework that integrates the work role into an inference/attribution process for identifying work components is introduced. Based upon this framework, various predictions and implications are raised which focus on the work role as the most meaningful level from which ratings of the core
dimensions can be derived.

Background Research

Initial investigations in the area of job design were primarily concerned with the impact of task characteristics and situational factors on employee motivation and satisfaction with work. Task characteristics were assumed to be objective features of the task, and consequently little effort was devoted to studying the underlying processes that might influence perceptions of task characteristics. The following landmark studies illustrate the emphasis on work satisfaction and motivation as the principal dependent variables in the majority of job design studies.

The early work of Turner and Lawrence (1965) postulated six requisite task attributes (RTAs) which were expected to be positively related to employee satisfaction and attendance at work. These attributes included variety, autonomy, required social interaction, opportunities for social interaction, knowledge and skill required, and responsibility. A measurement instrument designed to produce a summary score known as the Requisite Task Attribute Index (RTA Index) was developed in order to assess the presence of these attributes in a given job. It was expected that jobs showing
higher RTA Index scores would enhance attendance and satisfaction on the job. However, such a relationship was only found for jobs within organizations located in small rural towns. This result sparked speculation that factors other than RTAs may exert powerful influences over job design outcomes.

Blood and Hulin (1967) postulated that the discrepant results relating satisfaction and absenteeism within rural and urban settings may have been due to differences in work norms that were prevalent in each area. Where the Protestant work ethic was thought to predominate, as in rural settings, the expected relationship between job characteristics and work responses was generally supported. However, where the Protestant work ethic was considered less powerful, as sometimes suspected in urban locations, the relationship between job characteristics and worker responses was reversed. These findings as well as the frequently ambiguous results of the job enlargement studies reviewed by Hulin and Blood (1968) suggested that the design of jobs, so as to enhance job characteristics, was not sufficient to ensure improvements in satisfaction, attendance, and productivity.

This suggestion initiated further investigations into possible conditions that would moderate the impact
of objective task characteristics. However, Turner and Lawrence, as well as subsequent researchers and theorists, have failed to explore the implications of Requisite Task Attributes as attributes, choosing instead to consider RTAs as objective features of a job. A review of the contemporary models of job design still reflects this basic belief in the objective nature of task characteristics.

**The Hackman and Oldham Task Characteristics Model**

Expanding upon the pioneering efforts of Turner and Lawrence (1965) and Blood and Hulin (1967), Hackman and Oldham (1976) presented what has become a popular framework for job redesign aimed at improving employee satisfaction and motivation with their work (Figure 1). The model presents five task characteristics which, when incorporated in a job, are thought to contribute significantly to improved motivation and satisfaction with the work itself. These task characteristics or core dimensions include skill variety, task significance, task identity, autonomy, and feedback. Skill variety describes a task which requires the use of diverse skills and activities. Task significance refers to the impact and importance that a worker's activity has upon others. Task identity represents the extent to which the job
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Figure 1.
The Hackman and Oldham Job Characteristics Model
permits an individual to complete a significant whole work product as opposed to only fragmented elements of a larger project. The degree of autonomy in a job is reflected by the amount of discretion that a given employee is permitted to exercise in areas such as decision making, scheduling work assignments, establishing sequences and methods in performing the job, etc. In the Hackman and Oldham (1976) model, feedback refers to information regarding the quality of performance which is attainable directly through the completion of a task itself.

As shown in Figure 1 the incorporation of these five task characteristics into the overall Hackman and Oldham model is theorized to produce high intrinsic motivation on the job, enhanced satisfaction with the work itself, and even increased productivity. However, the impact of the five core dimensions upon these dependent variables (i.e. motivation, satisfaction, and productivity) is depicted as operating through various psychological states. Specifically, skill variety, task significance, and task identity are all depicted as operating through the psychological state of experienced meaningfulness of the work. Autonomy, however, impacts upon these outcome variables through a state of personal responsibility for the work, while feedback exerts its influence
through knowledge of results regarding the work activities themselves. In addition, Hackman and Oldham (1976) emphasized that the relationships suggested in their model are moderated by the growth need strength of the individual worker. That is, task characteristics should be expected to create a greater impact on motivation, satisfaction, and productivity for employees with higher growth need strength, while a less dramatic impact should appear for individuals lower in growth need strength.

**Representative Research on the Task Characteristics Model**

Numerous investigations have been conducted in an effort to test the predictions established by the task characteristics model. An earlier study by Hackman and Lawler (1971) which eventually led to the development of the task characteristics model illustrates some of the typical research conducted in the area. Using a sample of approximately 200 telephone company employees, these investigators found that when employees' jobs were characterized as high on the core dimensions, reports of intrinsic motivation were high as well. Moreover, when the employees were categorized according to their expressed growth need strength, it was revealed that the relationship between the core job dimensions and outcome
variables such as internal motivation, satisfaction, and quality of performance were more substantially enhanced for employees with high growth need strength than for employees with low growth need strength. These and similar findings by Brief and Aldag (1975), as well as Bhagat and Cassie (1980) have generally supported the conclusion that perceptions of the core dimensions significantly influence affective responses such as intrinsic motivation and satisfaction with the work itself.

A study conducted by Umstot, Bell, and Mitchell (1976) also confirmed the positive impact of task characteristics on job satisfaction. However, no significant relationship was found between task characteristics and productivity. Other applications of the task characteristics model, particularly in actual work settings, have also failed to show the predicted positive influence of enhanced core dimensions on productivity. Hall, Goodale and Rabinowitz (1978) reported that changes in task characteristics were not significantly related to perceived changes in performance on the job. Moreover, the work attitudes among employees in departments where job characteristics had not been altered reported more favorable work attitudes than employees from areas in which job characteristics had been changed either positively or negatively. Similar findings with a group of telephone
operators were reported by Lawler, Hackman and Kaufman (1973). The telephone operators actually indicated a significant decrease in satisfaction with interpersonal relations following interventions aimed at enhancing the core dimensions. A study of a job redesign effort among bank employees conducted by Frank and Hackman (1975) also revealed that changes in perceptions of task characteristics following job redesign were in the opposite direction of those predicted by the task characteristics model.

More recent studies have explored the predicted direction of causality from task characteristics to job attitudes such as satisfaction with one's work as predicted by Hackman and Oldham (1976). A study by O'Reilly, Parlette, and Bloom (1980) found that nurses who were most satisfied with their work perceived their jobs as offering greater variety, identity, feedback, task significance, and overall motivating potential than nurses less satisfied with the job. Since the jobs were identical for all nurses, O'Reilly et al (1980) concluded that levels of job satisfaction were responsible for differences in perceived task characteristics, rather than objective task characteristics producing satisfaction. A less extreme position was taken by James and Jones (1980) and Ivancevich (1978) who suggested the possibility of a reciprocal causal relationship between
task characteristics and job satisfaction.

Based upon these examples of research on the task characteristics model, it can be concluded that only mixed support exists for the expected relationship between the core dimensions and satisfaction with the job itself. The possibility has also been raised that satisfaction with the work itself exerts a significant impact on perceptions of task characteristics in addition to the influence of task characteristics on job satisfaction. Even less encouraging is the evidence regarding the task characteristics/productivity relationship. Following these and other tests of the Hackman and Oldham job design model, researchers began to suggest that the enhancement of intrinsic motivation, satisfaction with the work itself, and performance on the job may involve more than an attempt to manipulate the core dimensions of task identity, task significance, skill variety, autonomy, and feedback (Frank and Hackman, 1975; Hall et al, 1978; Lawler et al, 1973). The trend of these suggestions called for greater attention to contextual, social and group factors. It is interesting to note that similar conclusions were reached by Blood and Hulin (1967) when they suggested that work norms may be important components influencing the outcomes of the Turner and Lawrence (1965) RTA research. A more recent model which
attempts to incorporate some contextual and social factors missing from earlier theories was presented by Salancik and Pfeffer (1978). Even more important for purposes of the present study is the possibility, entertained by Salancik and Pfeffer, that task characteristics may not be the purely objective entities described by Hackman and Oldham, and endorsed by other researchers.

The Social Information Processing Model

The basic philosophy of Salancik and Pfeffer's theory, known as the social information processing model, departed from the basic need theory assumptions, such as growth need strength, which formed the foundation of the Hackman and Oldham approach. Need theories according to Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) assumed that attitudes and behaviors resulted from the basic traits, needs and personal characteristics of an individual. Needs, often characterized as inherent and enduring features of the personality, were viewed as either frustrated or fulfilled depending upon the particular set of circumstances encountered by an individual. Because needs were considered inherent to one's personality, need theories cast individuals as passive entities with only a minimal element of control over their own needs.
Salancik and Pfeffer (1978), however, envisioned needs not as something inherently present in an individual, but as an outcome produced or constructed by the individual. Consequently, the social information processing approach (Figure 2), depicts the worker as playing a more active part in the determination of his/her own needs, happiness, and satisfaction with work. The theory operates from the premise that needs, attitudes (i.e. satisfaction) and job characteristics are all influenced to a large degree by the informational and social cues present in the environment (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). In addition to the cues from an individual's social context, a person's interpretation of his/her past and present behavior, as well as situational factors contribute to the formation of attitudes, behaviors and beliefs.

This social basis for attitude formation places great emphasis on the impact of the work group in the development of job satisfaction. Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) describe several direct and indirect avenues where this impact may be noted. Overt statements from co-workers about both pleasant and unpleasant aspects of the job, particularly those that are consistent over time, are most likely to be incorporated into an individual worker's attitude structure. One reason offered to
Salancik and Pfeffer's Social Information Processing Model
explain the susceptibility of a worker to evaluations and opinions voiced by his/her peers concerns the set of highly complex stimuli that are frequently encountered when performing a job. Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) suggest that the encounter of complex stimuli creates a certain element of confusion for the worker which prompts a greater reliance on other coworkers for information regarding the proper way to react to a situation. Another significant factor responsible for coworker influence on attitudes is the desire for social acceptance. By incorporating the prevalent attitudes of one's peers, the individual worker facilitates his/her chances of "fitting in" with the group.

On a more indirect level, coworker comments serve to highlight or make salient specific aspects of the environment. Persistent social comments constitute cues informing a worker of those job components most worthy of attention. According to Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) attitudes are based upon whatever information is most available or salient to an individual at any given time. Thus, by increasing the saliency of certain job aspects, coworker comments indirectly influence attitude formation. However, social factors not only contribute to information saliency, they may also provide easily adapted interpretations of environmental cues. A
supervisor who reprimands an employee for violating a safety regulation might be perceived as being unduly harsh and critical or as being genuinely concerned with the safety and well being of his/her work force. The interpretation of this situation by an individual worker is likely to be influenced by the prevalent interpretations and cues offered by the coworkers (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). These authors further suggest that the more equivocal the event, the greater will be the reliance on social cues to provide an interpretation.

Yet another indirect avenue by which social factors can impact upon attitudes arises from the tendency of individuals to learn their needs and values through their encounters with others. In the job context Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) suggest that coworker comments about the repetitive nature of the work may not only increase the saliency of this job component, but also suggests that a desire for stimulating, non-routine work should be a concern of the individual. In this way exposure to social and informational cues may actually contribute to the formation of needs.

Although Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) emphasize the contribution of the social context to the development of attitudes, their framework also recognizes the influence of other factors as depicted in Figure 2. Specifically,
the model includes elements from Hackman and Oldham's (1976) job design theory. Environmental perceptions, particularly cognitive evaluations of job dimensions such as autonomy, variety, etc., are seen as impacting on attitudes. However, the Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) model differs from that of Hackman and Oldham (1976) in that the former views job characteristics as socially constructed realities rather than as purely objective components of the task. That is, social information influences the perception of job and task characteristics as they impact upon job satisfaction.

The final major component recognized by the social information processing approach as a potential influence on the formation of attitudes is the self-perception of the individual worker. Self-perceptions are at least in part determined by one's past behaviors, but more specifically by one's commitment to those behaviors (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Commitment to behavior is reportedly facilitated when behavior is freely chosen by the individual and is viewed as irrevocable, public, and explicit. These factors are important in that people tend to develop attitudes that are consistent with those behaviors to which they are most committed. Furthermore, Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) contend that workers seek to rationalize their present actions by making them consis-
tent with their past behaviors and by formulating legitimate justifications for the behavior. In formulating these justifications it is common to examine aspects of the environment that might supply a legitimate explanation for the actions. In so doing, the individual is confronted with social pressures to maintain a consistency between the facts surrounding the behavior and the justifications expressed for that behavior. As with overt coworker comments, the person seeking to legitimize his/her behaviors experiences some additional social pressure to generate socially acceptable justifications. In all, Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) propose that the formation of justifications for behavioral actions is affected by salient aspects of the past and present environments and by the perceived credibility of the justification.

In summary, the social information processing approach suggests that attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs about a job are influenced by the worker's social context, by the worker's interpretation of his/her own past and present behavior, and by the situational components of the job itself. The social context plays a predominant role in the development of socially acceptable beliefs and in providing justifications for individual actions. The social context also functions to focus
attention on specific environmental cues thereby enhancing the salience of some job components over other factors present in the work environment. The model strongly suggests that task characteristics might be more accurately described as socially constructed realities rather than purely objective phenomena.

Tests of the Social Information Processing Model

A review of the current research on the social information processing model revealed five studies which addressed the potential influence of information cues and individual differences on perceptions of task characteristics. All of these investigations drew upon the suggestion initiated by Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) that characteristics of a task may be influenced by the social context of the work environment.

An initial investigation in this area was conducted by O'Reilly and Caldwell (1979). These authors hypothesized that social information cues would exert a significant influence on perceptions of task characteristics beyond that attributable to direct manipulations of the task characteristics themselves. Two task conditions were defined, each involving the screening of admission folders to an MBA program, but differing on the job enrichment characteristics incorporated in the task. The
enriched task incorporated elements of skill variety, task significance, task identify, autonomy, and feedback in that the participants were required to record demographic information from the folders, as well as read and evaluate the application materials. Conversely, the non-enriched task required only the recording of various demographic data onto computer coding sheets and hence was lacking in many of the job enrichment components. Following completion of either the enriched or non-enriched task, each participant was exposed to either enriched or unenriched cues about the task. These cues were introduced by requiring the subjects to read bogus evaluations of the same task completed by previous participants. The enriched cue evaluations described the task in a positive light, while the unenriched cue evaluations were described in a less favorable fashion.

The results of the investigation suggested that social cues play an important role in forming perceptions of task characteristics. Subjects who participated in the enriched task but were exposed to unenriched social cues viewed the task as lower in task characteristics than subjects in the enriched task condition who had received enriched cues. Similarly, participants in the unenriched task who were recipients of enriched cues reported the task as possessing significantly greater
levels of the task dimensions than subjects also in the unenriched task condition who had received unenriched cues.

From these findings O'Reilly and Caldwell (1979) claimed that social information cues exerted a greater impact on perceptions of job dimensions than the objective features of the task itself. However, this conclusion may be overstated because the strength of the social cue manipulations could not be equated with the strength of manipulations of objective task characteristics. Nevertheless, it seems safe to assert that both objective differences in task design, as well as social cue information, exerted some significant impact on perceptions of those task characteristics incorporated in the job. Thus, it is very probable that individuals exposed to the same job and even the same task dimensions may develop different perceptions of the job depending on the expressions and sentiments of the coworkers.

A closely related study conducted by White and Mitchell (1979) succeeded in confirming and extending some of the results demonstrated by O'Reilly and Caldwell (1979). These researchers created a simulated work environment involving routine clerical duties that permitted manipulations of task characteristics and social cues. Enriched and unenriched tasks were again created through manipulations of task identity, task significance, etc.
However, for purposes of enhancing the external validity of the study, social cues were manipulated through verbal comments expressed by confederates participating in the tasks along with the actual subjects. The results of this investigation mirrored those of O'Reilly and Caldwell (1979) in that perceptions of job enrichment were significantly influenced by social information cues.

A somewhat different approach to examining the impact of social information cues was taken by Pfeffer (1980) who chose to investigate the influence of work-group membership on perceptions of job dimensions in a field setting. Pfeffer acknowledged that his field experiment was unable to control for potential similarities in task characteristics between work groups that may have existed because of workers performing objectively similar tasks. Moreover, the possibility was also recognized that similarities in perceived job dimensions might already exist between work groups due to similar social information cues that may have been exchanged across work groups. Despite the chance for these factors to attenuate variance between the work groups, a difference in perceived task characteristics was hypothesized to exist across four groups of engineers. A significant effect for work-group membership on job dimension perceptions was reported. However, a large amount of variance was
left unexplained. Pfeffer (1980) suggested that the lower than expected correlations may have resulted from reduced variability in job dimensions brought about by the use of professional engineers in all four work groups.

Other researchers began to investigate various personality factors which might contribute to an individual's reliance on social information cues as opposed to more objective information available from the task itself. Weiss and Shaw (1979), in addition to investigating the impact of positive social statements on job dimension perceptions, looked for differences in perceptions of task characteristics that could be attributed to field dependence or independence and high or low self-esteem among individual workers. As expected, both task characteristics and exposure to coworker attitudes about the task were influential in the development of task perceptions. Weiss and Shaw (1979) also found that subjects who were field dependent (i.e., who could be described as other directed, socially dependent, and perceptually undifferentiated) relied more heavily on social information cues in developing perceptions of the job than subjects who could be described as field independent (i.e., who could be described as analytic, perceptually discriminating, and socially independent).
Similar results were reported for subjects who were dichotomized according to self-esteem. Low self-esteem participants showed a slight tendency toward greater dependence on social cues when articulating task perceptions than did high self-esteem subjects.

These results prompted Weiss and Shaw (1979) to assert that personality factors in addition to the social context and the objective task dimensions make significant contributions to the development of task perceptions. This assertion was corroborated by the research of O'Connor and Barrett (1980) who also compared the perceptions of task characteristics reported by field dependent and field independent subjects. Their results indicated that field dependent subjects were more likely to rely on social cues when forming task perceptions than were the field independent individuals. Moreover, subjects lower in general mental ability were found to be more dependent on social information cues for purposes of constructing perceptions of task characteristics than were individuals possessing greater general mental abilities.

From this handful of studies on the social information processing model, it can be concluded that social cues, particularly evaluative comments from coworkers, have an impact upon an individual's perception of task
characteristics. In addition, individual differences among workers themselves, such as differences in field dependence/independence and self-esteem, have been shown to influence perceptions of task characteristics. Yet, despite this initial support for elements of the social information processing model, several potential factors that may also affect perceptions of task characteristics have been largely ignored. These factors include the past work history and experience of the employee, information regarding performance expectations and goals, characteristics of the supervisor's leadership style, rate of pay for the work performed, style of dress required on the job, etc. Although the impact of these additional informational cues remains to be explored, more basic questions regarding the influence of multiple interdependent tasks, the effect of differences in work roles, and even the objectivity of the core dimensions themselves remain to be investigated.

The Questionable Objectivity of Task Characteristics

Consistent with these new directions for job design research, contemporary studies have shown concern over the concept of objective task characteristics as popularized by Hackman and Oldham (1976) and incorporated into the social information processing model. Recent
reviews of the job design literature (Aldag, Barr, & Brief, 1981; O'Connor, Rudolf, & Peters, 1980; Roberts & Glick, 1981) have been critical of the practice of utilizing only perceptual measures of task characteristics as indices of objective task dimensions. O'Connor et al (1980) pointed out that measures of subjective task perceptions may actually confound objective task characteristics with individual differences. These reviewers illustrated that over fifty percent of the variance in incumbents' perceptions of task characteristics was not accounted for by observer perceptions of task characteristics. Their explanation for this finding suggested that perceptual task assessments contain a large, built-in source of individual difference variance that served to confound objective task characteristics with individual difference elements.

Research by O'Reilly, Parlette, and Bloom (1980) supported these assertions by suggesting that individual differences in tenure, education, union affiliation, individual wealth, etc. produce different perceptions of the same objective task characteristics. These individual differences, or frames of reference as described by O'Reilly et al (1980), were measured for a sample of nurses all of whom performed identical jobs. It was theorized that despite their performance of identical
jobs, variations in perceptions of task characteristics would exist because of the nurses' differing frames of reference. As hypothesized, the results indicated a systematic biasing of perceptions of task characteristics by individual frames of reference. Consequently, the assumption that differences in perceived task characteristics can be attributed solely to concomitant differences in objective task characteristics is questionable (Aldag, et al, 1981). As an outgrowth of this research it was suggested that renewed efforts should be encouraged in the development of objective measures of task characteristics as opposed to the perceptual measures now being employed (Aldag, et al, 1981; O'Connor et al, 1980).

However, a study reported by Ferratt, Dunham, and Pierce (1981) suggested that truly objective assessments of task characteristics may not be feasible. This position was based on the contention that task characteristics have typically not been defined in an entirely descriptive manner. Their results indicated that individual assessments of task characteristics appeared to incorporate evaluative and affective interpretations carried over from the situational context in which the task(s) had been performed. Thus, by the usual definitions, task characteristics seemed to suggest more than
purely descriptive features of the task. Ferratt et al arrived at these conclusions when they were unable to find adequate discrimination between popular perceptual measures of task characteristics (i.e., the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) and the Job Characteristics Inventory (JCI)) and measures of job satisfaction (i.e., the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)). Job satisfaction measures have been considered evaluative by definition. Therefore, a potential explanation for the inadequate discrimination between the job characteristics and job satisfaction instruments may reside in the likelihood that individuals incorporated much of the same affective and evaluative information used in assessing job satisfaction into their "descriptions" of task characteristics.

These problems with current measures of perceived task characteristics prompted Aldag et al (1980) to question whether a set of "real" characteristics of jobs can really be delineated. Yet, despite this suspected inadequacy with the concept of objective task characteristics, few theorists or researchers have directly confronted the possibility that the task characteristics proposed by Hackman and Oldham may not be objective entities. Shaw (1980) touched upon this concern. According to his
report, Hackman and Oldham (1976) gathered ratings from employees, supervisors, and observers all of whom were attending the same job. The median correlation between ratings made by employees and their supervisors was .51 with a range from .07 to .64. The correlations between employees and observers ranged from -.13 to .76 with a median of .63. The correlations between supervisors' and observers' ratings were also disappointing; with a median of .46 and a range from -.14 to .89. Based upon these data, Shaw (1980) concluded that "these correlations are lower than one would expect if indeed raters were accurately reporting the objective characteristics of the same job" (p.42).

Rather than confronting this possibility directly, job design researchers and theorists have largely overlooked this possibility in interpreting their results and in building their theoretical models. For example, the finding by O'Connor et al (1980) that over fifty percent of the variance in incumbent's perceptions of task characteristics was not accounted for by observer perceptions of task characteristics would be expected if indeed task characteristics were not considered objective. Similarly, the point made by Ferratt et al (1981) that objective assessments of task characteristics may not be possible because of the inability to define task
characteristics in a purely descriptive manner, seems to have skirted a more central explanation. Perhaps it is the very process by which individuals arrive at perceptions of task characteristics that actually interferes with the objective measurement of the core dimensions. Even the social information processing model, although articulating various factors that may influence the perception of task characteristics, continues to imply the existence of some true job or task characteristics which are simply misperceived due to the influence of social factors. Yet, the basis for assuming the existence of some true or objective task characteristics on the order of those described by Hackman and Oldham (1976) has gone largely uninvestigated. Perhaps Shaw's (1980) call for an examination of the processes by which task characteristics are perceived as well as evaluated may provide a means for substantiating or refuting this assumption.

Defining the Components of a Task

However, a preliminary step to understanding the processes involved in forming perceptions of task characteristics would be a clear perspective on the basic elements needed to comprise a task. Unfortunately, few attempts have been made to provide a precise specification of the features or properties required to
appropriately label a given situation or event as a task. Hackman (1969) initially offered some insights by describing properties which he believed to be common to all tasks. According to his conceptualization, a task may be either assigned to an individual, or self-generated by an individual. Moreover, he contended that in either case tasks are composed of various objective parameters which can be held constant such that the same task might be assigned to numerous individuals, or systematically manipulated in order to create many different tasks. Hackman (1969) also noted that tasks must involve some identifiable stimulus material as well as some form of instructions regarding what goals are to be attained and/or what operations are to be performed. From his perspective then, a task consisted of the real world dimensions and characteristics of the stimulus material in association with general behavioral requirements dictated through various instructions. In addition to these two aspects, Fine and Wiley (1971) added that a task also includes specified outcomes or desired results. This element of a task was also addressed by Hackman (1969), who included desired results or outcomes as a form of instruction regarding the specific goals to be attained.
The term objective task characteristics introduced by Hackman and Oldham (1976) was defined by the core dimensions of variety, significance, identity, autonomy, and feedback. Although never precisely stated, the research by Hackman and Oldham (1976) treated these objective task characteristics as having their origin in both the stimulus materials and instructions on which these task characteristics are based. For example, it seems likely that multiple sources of information may exist which describe the elements of a task. Instructions, stimulus materials, and desired outcomes for a particular task may be available through a variety of sources including a written job description, an individual's supervisor, and an incumbent's coworkers. The process by which an individual selects or combines these sources of information in order to specify the components of a task has not been adequately described.

Similarly, the origin of the core dimensions, particularly their foundation in these basic features of the task have been accepted with little challenge by recent investigators. Yet, an examination of these task elements at a more primary level suggests that objective task characteristics may involve more than just the task itself. That is, an objective task characteristic such as autonomy may be generated from more than elements of
the stimulus materials in combination with certain instructions for behavior.

**Task Characteristics as Process**

In their social information processing model, Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) propelled the thinking of job design researchers beyond the stage that considered perceptions of task characteristics as influenced only by the stimulus materials, the instructional set and possible desired outcomes. Their reference to task characteristics as socially constructed realities proposed that characteristics of a task are constructed from a variety of information sources present in the work environment. A major portion of this information was felt to be socially derived. Interpretations of events particularly from similar others such as coworkers were viewed as exerting considerable influence over perceptions of such things as the importance and skill variety associated with a job. In addition, the social construction perspective acknowledged the influence of an individual's own behavior in forming perceptions of task characteristics. Perception in general was portrayed as a retrospective process, necessitating the coding and short term storage of events. When events are recalled, however, portions of the original image are likely to be
lost, requiring the individual to fill-in or literally reconstruct reality through inferences from his/her own behavior.

James and Jones (1980) extended this line of thinking when they referred to autonomy, significance, identity, etc. not as objective task characteristics, but as a higher order schemas. According to James and Jones (1980) these higher order schemas result from cognitive associations between lower order elements of the job situation. While these elements may include aspects of the task itself, such as the repetitiveness of the stimulus material, they also incorporate aspects more removed from the stimulus materials or task instructions, such as opinions from others, mental challenge, self-determination, etc. This description of objective task characteristics as higher order schemas is in some ways similar to the concept of socially constructed realities. Both terminologies convey the idea that perceptions of task characteristics involve more than stimulus materials, task instructions, and expected results.

However, an important distinction exists between Salancik and Pfeffer's view of objective task characteristics as socially constructed realities, and the description of task characteristics as higher order schemas conveyed by James and Jones (1980). Despite the
innovative features of the Salancik and Pfeffer model, their theory continues to imply that for a given task there exists some true degree of the core dimensions, such as autonomy, significance, etc. which somehow come to be misperceived because of social information influences and the retrospective processes involved in perceptions. The portrayal of task characteristics as higher order schemas (James & Jones, 1980) removes the need for the underlying assumption that some true level of the task characteristics exists for a given job. When thought of as higher order schemas, the possibility that autonomy, significance, identity, etc. are formed through a unique combination of stimuli, task materials, opinions of others, instructions, and other personal characteristics can be entertained. From this perspective no true level of the core dimensions would be assumed for a given job or task.

These subtle yet important distinctions created by viewing task characteristics as higher order schemas rather than socially constructed realities may have significant implications for job design theory and measurement. For example, if objective task characteristics are best described as schemas, then the term "objective" task characteristics is truly misleading, particularly when task characteristics cannot be
accurately represented simply by objects, individuals, or events. When considered only as objects, the process involved in the identification of task characteristics would be entirely perceptual. To illustrate, perceptions of a dog or a chair are very closely linked to the objects they represent (Selltiz et al, 1976). Due to the close match between perceptions and objects, the stimulus, or source of one's perceptions, are often directly observable and easily measured by others in the situation. Perception, therefore, implies some generally accepted standards which permit a common ordering or classification of objects based upon their characteristics.

The process involved in the formation of task characteristics as defined by Hackman and Oldham (1976) does not appear to conform as precisely to a perceptual process as one would expect of characteristics that are truly objective. Indeed, if task characteristics are truly objective, and identified through a perceptual process, it would be expected that some common classification of these characteristics should be achieved across individuals. This expectation was put forth by Jenkins, Nadler, and Lawler (1975) who suggested that job factors such as variety should show high agreement among observers both when observing a job at the same time and
at different times. However, as indicated by Shaw (1980), high convergence in ratings of task characteristics for the same task by different types of raters (i.e., employees, supervisors, and observers) has not been confirmed.

If task characteristics, as typically conceptualized by job design researchers, can more accurately be described as task schemas rather than objective characteristics, some higher order mechanism beyond that of object perception would seem to be involved. Clear-cut standards by which to categorize phenomena in a perceptual sense would not exist when dealing with task schemas. Rather, schemas, as higher order abstractions (i.e., higher than a perceptual process), would necessitate the formation of inferences (Selltiz et al, 1976).

It is acknowledged that schemas tend to vary in the degree to which they are associated with objective elements in the environment. For example, length as a schema is typically associated with a specific object encountered in the environment. A piece of lumber is easily compared to another object, such as a yardstick, in order to determine its length. However, despite the close association between length and distinct elements from the environment, length has yet to be seen, touched or heard in a perceptual sense. Rather, the determination of
length requires more than the perception of its associated environmental objects.

Similar, if not more complex, processes would be expected for the identification of schemas with a less distinct association with environmental objects. These schemas such as autonomy and the remaining core dimensions are not clearly linked to a specific element within the environment. A distinct, objective standard for identifying the presence of such schemas within the environment has not been delineated. To assert that autonomy or length are identified in a perceptual sense appears misguided. A more complex process must be entertained.

An Inference/Attribution Process

The inference process as described by Schneider and Hastorf (1979) in their book Person Perception appears appropriate to these concerns. These researchers suggested that inferences go beyond the immediate physical stimuli to incorporate behaviors of individuals in addition to contextual components in which behavior occurs. A related mechanism known as the attribution process or attribution theory also captures these ideas. In fact, the definition of attribution given by Kelley (1967) as the process of inferring the dispositional properties of entities in the environment (p. 193)
suggests that inferences and attributions may be one in the same. Traditionally, attribution theory was reserved for the process by which an individual interpreted the causes of another person's behavior (Heider, 1958). However, Wrightsman (1973) credits Kelley with extending attribution theory to encompass inferences made regarding the properties of both people and objects in the environment. Therefore, the attribution process addresses the interpretation or judgments regarding the properties of people and elements in the environment (Kelley, 1967).

A variety of factors have been identified as exerting considerable influence on the inference/attribution process. Contextual features of the environment play a predominant role. According to Schneider and Hastorf (1979) contextual features included the physical setting, such as the characteristics of the room, as well as the behavior of others encountered in the environment. For example, Heider (1958) proposed that behavior contained such salient cue properties that it may tend to overshadow other valuable pieces of information present in the context of that behavior. That is, behavior as a source of cue information is sometimes overemphasized in the formation of inferences thereby promoting an underutilization of additional data from the surrounding field. Consequently, contextual factors,
including the behavior of others, would appear to provide an important source of cues utilized in making inferences.

Individual differences have also been highlighted as exerting potential influences on the formation of inferences. Schneider and Hastorf (1979) argued that individuals differ in what cues they attend to; how they attach labels to and form categorizations of their observations; and in the relative importance given to cues both from an individual's behavior, as well as from various situational contexts. An individual's purposes, goals, values, and expectations are offered as possible factors responsible for determining which cues would receive the greatest attention. It was also noted that an individual's emotional state, such as one's mood or cognitive set, can affect the interpretation of cues particularly when the cues themselves are relatively clear and unambiguous.

The numerous factors which are thought to influence the inference/attribution process serve to illustrate that task schemas, as attributions or inferences, depend upon a variety of available sources of information which are combined to form a schema. No preexisting or true level of the core dimensions is implied. Rather, the inference attribution perspective suggests that
information from environmental objects and events, current and past experiences, social cues, etc. may all contribute to the formation of schemas associated with a given task. Despite this assortment of possible information sources from which a schema can emerge, past researchers have focused their attention on only a limited set of potential information sources. The examination of task schemas from an inference/attribute process should encompass a more expanded list of possible information sources than that which appeared in past research.

Information Sources Used to Manipulate Task Characteristics

By far the most prevalent method of manipulating task characteristics has involved changing the instructional set and/or the stimulus materials given to subjects performing a task. This trend probably developed because of the common belief that the core dimensions of Hackman and Oldham (1976) are objective characteristics of the task itself, rather than schemas derived from inferences which integrate information from a variety of sources. Recent studies have continued this restricted approach of manipulating task characteristics. In a simulated task which involved the processing of student applications to an MBA program, O'Reilly and
Caldwell (1979) created enriched and unenriched task conditions. The unenriched conditions instructed participants to search each application and appropriately code twenty-four information items for computer processing. The enriched condition directed participants to computer code only ten information items, as well as to read and evaluate each application for potential managerial talent. This manipulation conformed to Hackman's (1969) conceptualization of an objective task manipulation by relying on different instructional sets or task stimuli as an independent variable.

Another illustration is provided in the electrical assembly task employed in research by Weiss & Shaw (1979). This task required subjects to wire an electrical circuit board in a manner that would allow several small incandescent bulbs to light. In the enriched task condition, subjects were given a schematic diagram and the necessary materials for the task. A battery was also provided and subjects were instructed to wire the circuit in such a way that the bulbs would light. In the unenriched condition, subjects were given specific step-by-step instructions regarding the proper wiring assembly. No battery was provided in order to test the circuit, and subjects did not have access to a schematic diagram; consequently they could not develop their own procedures.
for wiring the circuit. As in the O'Reilly and Caldwell (1979) study, manipulations of task characteristics were restricted to variations in the instructional set and the stimulus materials employed in the enriched and unenriched conditions. Other recent studies have relied on similar manipulations (Ganster, 1980; O'Connor & Barrett, 1980; White & Mitchell, 1979).

However, an issue that has been ignored in these manipulations of stimulus materials and task instructions is the existence of multiple information sources describing these basic task components. Within an actual work setting for example, it would not be uncommon for an incumbent to encounter several sets of instructions for a particular task. The written job description, the immediate supervisor, as well as the incumbent's co-workers may all provide instructions about a task. Moreover, the instructions provided through these various channels may not always be consistent. The job description may suggest that the task be performed in one way, while the supervisor and the coworkers insist that it be performed in yet another manner. The impact of multiple, and sometimes discordant, sources of task information on the formation of work related schemas is unknown.

Although varying the instructions or stimulus materials presented to experimental subjects may be a
legitimate means of manipulating a task, and conform to Hackman's (1969) description of the elements of a task, the conceptualization of task characteristics as schemas suggests that instructions and specific task stimuli, even when obtained through multiple sources, are but a portion of the information that can be utilized in forming inferences about work related schemas. Moreover, manipulations of task characteristics exclusively through changes in the instructional set or the stimulus materials themselves tend to perpetuate the narrow impression that the core dimensions are objective features of the environment.

To date, studies are lacking which attempt to manipulate task schemas primarily through information sources other than the task itself. The impact of performance expectations, educational requirements, rate of pay, leadership style of the supervisor, or style of dress on perceptions of task schemas has not been adequately researched. For example, high performance expectations for a particular task may predispose an individual to form more positive schemas from that task than if lower performance expectations existed. Similar predispositions toward the formation of positive task schemas could be expected where tasks are associated with high educational requirements, high rates of pay, or formal styles.
of dress. In addition, a considerate management style may prompt incumbents to form more positive task schemas than if they operated within a more structured managerial environment.

Still another contributing factor to the formation of task schemas might be found in the impact of coworker reactions to an individual's work behaviors. If an individual attempts to exercise greater autonomy (or some other core dimension) in his/her job, the reactions of coworkers to this attempt may influence the task schemas formed by that individual. Positive reactions from coworkers to these behaviors may result in the formation of more positive task schemas than if these behaviors produced negative or indifferent reactions. It should be noted that this type of social reaction moves beyond that proposed by Salancik and Pfeffer (1978). The social information processing theory focuses upon the coworkers' evaluation of the objective task itself, while the present proposal considers the impact of coworker reactions to another incumbent's behavior.

These ideas highlight the potential importance of additional information sources other than the stimulus materials and the instructional set in the formation of task schemas. Moreover, this consideration of additional information sources suggests that job design theories
might be improved by depicting work related schemas as originating at a level other than the individual task. The possibility that task schemas like autonomy, significance, identity, etc may be formed at a level above that of an individual task should be examined.

**The Level of Origin of Task Schemas**

The particular level at which inferences of autonomy, significance, identity, and the like are formed has been very obscure throughout the job design literature. That is, job design research has been particularly inconsistent regarding whether task schemas actually derive their origin from an individual task or from the overall job itself. Indeed the terms "task characteristics" and "job characteristics" have often been used interchangeably. However, the practice of using the words "task" and "job" interchangeably may mask some important clues about the origin of core dimension inferences. Greater precision in defining the terms job and task should highlight some of these critical distinctions.

A task, according to Cascio (1978), is defined as "a distinct work activity carried out for a distinct purpose such as sweeping a floor, typing a letter, or unloading a truck" (p. 133). A job according to Cascio (1978) is
described as a group of positions which are similar in large segments of the work to be performed. Positions consist of numerous duties or groups of tasks which when taken together comprise a job. Consequently, a job may include any number of tasks such as those required in conducting interviews, counseling personnel, etc.

Several consequences for job design theory can be derived from this distinction between a job and a task. If inferences of the core dimensions are depicted as originating at the task level, it should be theoretically possible for an individual to formulate an independent set of task schemas for each individual task encountered on the job. Yet, different implications follow if the job is taken as the level at which inferences of the core dimensions are derived. When viewed as job characteristics, an individual would be expected to incorporate information from all the tasks encountered on the job in making inferences of the core dimensions.

Under close scrutiny, neither the task nor the job seem to adequately reflect the level at which inferences of the core dimensions are formed. The individual task may be too micro a level from which to make accurate inferences of task schemas given the nature of the constructs involved. For example, autonomy as defined by Hackman and Oldham (1976) reflects "the degree to which
the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out (p. 258)." It seems doubtful that any single task, in and of itself, could create a quality like autonomy. Rather, autonomy might result more readily from an individual choosing, selecting, and/or prioritizing among tasks, or even from a synthesis of several tasks.

While the suggestion that inferences of autonomy are derived from a synthesis of several tasks would seem to support the job as the proper level of origin, a thorough consideration of most jobs would suggest that the job may be too encompassing to permit precise assessments of the core dimensions. A job may contain some components that stimulate the formation of positive work related schemas, while other components of the same job may suggest less positive schemas. The various components of a single job could therefore lead to multiple levels of the same core dimensions. For example, the job of a university professor requires an individual to serve as an instructor, an advisor, a researcher, a committee member, etc., all of which may require the performance of different tasks. To inquire about the extent of autonomy or significance present in the job of a university professor would likely produce confusing results, for it is
quite probable that a professor may experience considerable autonomy when acting as a researcher, while little if any autonomy is experienced when serving as a committee member. Clearly a job design theory that holds the job as the proper level of origin for inferences of work related schemas would hide important differences in the core dimensions that may exist between the various facets of a job. From these analyses, it appears that a more precise description of the level at which work related schemas emerge falls somewhere between the level of the task and that of the job.

A term that seems to fulfill these requirements, yet has received only minimal attention in the job design literature, is the concept of the work role. As defined by Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1966), a role is a set of expectations or evaluative standards applied to an incumbent of a particular position (p. 60). Here, a position is taken to mean "the location of an actor or class of actors in a system of social relationships" (Gross et al, 1966, p. 67), such as a business firm, university, etc. As a set of expectations for an incumbent in a particular position, a work role often incorporates more than a single task. McGrath (1976) contends that roles are not tied to a specific milieu or setting, but rather transcend particular settings and specific tasks.
Moreover, the role is also less encompassing than an entire job, as many jobs require an incumbent to assume multiple roles.

The role as a midpoint between the level of the job and the level of the task can be illustrated by again considering the example of a university professor. The instructor, advisor, researcher, and committee member components of the job can be considered individual roles that constitute the job of a university professor. In addition, while carrying out each of these roles, the professor often performs multiple tasks. For example, while functioning in the role of an instructor, a professor is likely to perform tasks such as lecturing, reading, preparing course notes, grading examinations, etc. Therefore, from a theoretical or definitional point of view, the concept of the work role is often positioned between the extremes of the individual task and the overall job and consequently seems to more appropriately describe the level of origin of work related schemas than is accomplished by either the job or the task.

From a more operational perspective it should be noted that experimental investigations of job design have failed to recognize the importance of the work role in their manipulations of enriched and unenriched conditions. Many studies have employed single task roles such
as assembling electrical components, reviewing admission folders and coding information onto a computer sheet as the focal point of work (O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1979; Weiss & Shaw, 1980; White & Mitchell, 1979). While these occurrences might be attributed to the authors' practical concerns for ease in the manipulation and control of independent variables, the coincidence more likely reflects a lack of insight regarding the level at which work-related schemas originate. The majority of work situations designed to be unenriched in recent job design studies have consisted of single tasks. Consequently, the enriched work situations have frequently been created through the inclusion of additional tasks rather than altering aspects of the single unenriched task. The addition of tasks as a means of creating an enriched job environment signals a shift in focus from the task to the role.

These arguments suggest a revision in terminology in order to accurately reflect the significance of the work role in job design. Rather than employing the term "task schemas" in job design models, the title "role schemas" better captures the underlying processes. These changes in the terminology used to describe the core dimensions reflect the development of arguments presented thus far: objective task characteristics→task schemas→role
schemas.

**Work Roles and the Inference/Attribution Process**

The recognition of the work role as the most appropriate level of analysis from which to make inferences regarding role schemas implies additional processes which may impact upon role schemas. The concept of role implies more than just the existence of multiple tasks. It should be reemphasized that McGrath (1976) conceptualized a role as transcending specific tasks. In this regard theorists such as Weick (1977) and Katz and Kahn (1978) have popularized terms such as enactment and role making in reference to an individual's own contribution in defining his/her work role(s). Accordingly, rather than reacting passively to a prescribed role, these theorists contend that individuals also assume a more proactive part in actually creating the roles in which they participate. Katz and Kahn (1978) contended that roles consist not only of a set of prescribed behaviors dictated by powerful others, but also of choice points which permit an individual to exercise some discretion in the methods and styles employed in carrying out a role. These choice points allow the unique features of the individual to impact upon the role in subtle yet important ways. Consequently, even prescribed roles are
subject to modification by each incumbent who assumes the role.

Hackman (1969) acknowledged a similar process at the task level. He employed the term "task redefinition" to describe the extent to which a task, imposed upon an individual, is subjectively redefined by that individual. Consequently, Hackman (1969) acknowledged the distinction between an "official" task and a "private" task. An official task was taken to represent the rules, procedures, and criteria established by the task setter. A private task, however, addressed the individual's tendency to respond, not just to the official task, but also to redefine or modify the stimulus situation in such a way as to gain a more personal outcome from the task. Although Hackman (1969) referred to this process of redefinition at the task level, the redefinition process probably occurs more often at the role level.

The ideas of enactment and redefinition add further support to the position that workrelated schemas are inferences that form through the synthesis of many possible cues and information sources. Although the rules, procedures, and criteria that comprise the "official" role are relevant information sources, they represent only a portion of the information available to the individual performing in that role. Consequently,
job design theories that portray the core dimensions as objective elements fail to recognize the "private" role and the inference process that occurs when the individual worker reports on the autonomy, significance, etc., experienced in a work role.

**An Inference/Attribution Model of Role Schemas**

An accurate representation of the underlying processes in the development of role schemas would portray role inferences as originating from an information processing or attribution framework. Moving beyond the accomplishments of Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) who depicted perceived task characteristics as influenced by multiple information sources, the preceding arguments strongly suggest the conceptualization of work related schemas as inferences rather than task characteristics. This approach seeks to eliminate the implication by Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) that work related schemas are actual characteristics of a task which exist at some "true" level for a given task, yet whose perception becomes distorted due to social information influences. Instead, role schemas when conceptualized as inferences or attributions are expected to result from a combination of possible information sources. Stimulus materials, instructional sets, and social cues are believed to
comprise only a portion of the information sources used by an individual in forming role schemas. Unlike the social information processing model, role schemas are not believed to be objective entities that can be misinterpreted because of social cues. Rather, social cues become a potential ingredient from which role schemas can emerge. The model shown in Figure 3 attempts to characterize work related schemas from this inference/attribute perspective.

In addition, it has been argued that work related schemas result more directly from the level of the role as opposed to the level of the individual task or the overall job. Work related schemas such as autonomy are often created when an individual has the opportunity to select the order in which several tasks are to be performed. These circumstances elevate work related schemas beyond the level of the individual task. The work role, as a set of expectations for an incumbent in a particular position, adequately accommodates the existence of multiple tasks. Moreover, the work role avoids the additional problem of "overinclusiveness" encountered when work related schemas are derived from the level of the job. The work role maintains meaningful distinctions between major components of a job that may otherwise be lost when the overall job is taken as the point of origin
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Inference/Attribution Model of Role Schemas
of work related schemas.

This distinction in level, particularly between the task and the role, is incorporated in Figure 3. Differences between influential elements operating at the task level and those exerting an influence at the level of the work role are highlighted. The elements at the task level adhere closely to Hackman's (1969) conceptualization of the components of a task. The stimulus materials or objects actually manipulated or in some way involved in carrying out a task are included here. Of further importance are the specific instructions which describe the necessary manipulations of these stimulus materials, as well as the end products or desired outcomes anticipated from the performance of the task. At this initial level, each task is portrayed as an independent entity with its own set of stimulus materials, instructions, and product outcomes. Also at the task level, the model reflects the possible existence of multiple information sources, particularly multiple sources of instruction for a given task.

The interrelationship among tasks is shown as occurring at the level of the work role. It is at the level of the work role that a variety of processes may operate to combine and synthesize independent tasks into a coordinated work role. The combination of tasks may
be achieved through various instructions articulated at the role level. For example, instructions at the role level may include directives for prioritizing independent tasks, or may include preexisting interdependencies among tasks that determine the sequence by which tasks are to be performed.

Beyond the integration of independent tasks, additional factors exist at the level of the work role that contribute to the formation of role schemas. The social milieu captures many of the components emphasized by Salancik and Pfeffer (1978). Comments and attitudes expressed by coworkers are included here, as are the various stereotypes that may be held by incumbents, such as race bias, impressions of union versus nonunion workers, or civil service as opposed to private sector employees. It should also be noted that the management style employed by an individual's immediate supervisor may contribute extensively to the schemas formed for a specific role.

The physical milieu refers to elements of the environment that are associated with but not directly utilized by an individual in carrying out a specified role. These include the clothing style of workers, the cleanliness of the worksite, the size and color of the room, etc. To illustrate, the type of attire worn while
performing a role may contribute to the formation of inferences regarding the significance of that role. A suit or similar business attire may contribute to different inferences of significance about a role than if boots and overalls were worn while carrying out the same role. Therefore, the physical context apart from those stimulus materials directly employed in carrying out individual tasks may contribute to the formation of schemas at the role level.

Also included as part of the physical milieu is the amount of social exchange permitted in a particular role. While not the most obvious component of the physical setting, this feature may be an important ingredient to the development of role schemas. A role which permits only minimal social exchange might be experienced as less significant than the same role in which more open social exchange occurs. In addition, the degree of social exchange encountered in a role may influence the extent to which a formal position description is relied upon in forming role inferences. Without some degree of social exchange, the effect of coworker comments on role schemas would be minimized, and may promote a greater reliance on position descriptions as an information source when forming role inferences.
Another potential source of information that may impact upon inferences of role schemas resides in the work related, experiential background of the individual. This category includes past experiences which may form the standard of comparison used in generating inferences about the present work role. Similarly, pre-established goals or expectations about performance that may also influence attributions regarding the work role are included here. Other elements incorporated in this context include the tenure and past work behavior of an individual, as well as the rate of pay established for the job.

The integration of individual tasks in association with the social and physical milieus, as well as an individual's experiential background, are depicted as potential sources of information leading to role inferences. However, these role level components should not be considered as mutually exclusive or independent. For example, the clothing style of workers may impact upon role attributions due to certain stereotypes about people who dress in a particular manner. The possible overlap among these factors again illustrates that role inferences can result from the combination of a variety of information sources.
An important element that may dictate how these various sources of information are chosen and eventually combined to form role inferences may lie in the personality or global affect of the individual forming the inferences. Thus, the personality traits such as levels of self-esteem or field dependence or independence, that have been demonstrated to influence a worker's use of social cues in arriving at task perceptions (O'Connor & Barrett, 1980; Weiss & Shaw, 1979), may actually impact upon more than just the elements of the social context. Figure 3 therefore shows global affect as a general individual difference factor that can affect which cues are attended to, as well as the process by which the various information sources are weighed or combined in arriving at role inferences.

By applying one's unique personality characteristics in both the selection and interpretation of these various information sources, the role making processes described by Weick (1969) and Katz and Kahn (1978) are also incorporated into the model. As a result, work related schemas are shown as products of the work role rather than any individual task. Implications of some "true," preestablished level of the core dimensions for a particular task are absent from the model. Individuals are recognized as bringing to bear there own integrations and
interpretations of information sources when forming role inferences.

The right side of the model portrays role inferences as leading to work outcome variables. These variables, as outlined by Hackman and Oldham (1976), included satisfaction with the work itself, intrinsic motivation, and productivity. However, with respect to the research conducted by James and Jones (1980) it is necessary to recognize that variables such as satisfaction may also operate to influence role construct inferences. Expressed satisfaction with the work itself tends to call attention to those cues most consistent with that level of felt satisfaction. Consequently, the individual worker may rely most heavily on those information sources consistent with his/her experienced satisfaction when making future role inferences.

The model portrayed in Figure 3 presents the basic features of an inference/attribution approach to job design through the information elements and processes available at the task and role levels. It should also be recognized that the model can be expanded to illustrate the conditions that might be encountered when inferences of the core dimensions are requested at the job level. Figure 4 presents a simplified extension of the inference/attribution model to include inferences formed
Figure 4.

Extension of the Inference/Attribution Model to the Job Level
at the job level. Many of the information elements and processes depicted at the role level in Figure 3 are again potential ingredients for job level inferences. Past work experiences, the management style of the supervisor, compensation level, stereotypes, etc., may influence inferences at both the role and job levels. Moreover, when inferences are made at the job level, additional information might also appear. For multiple role jobs, a role integration process may emerge. This process would incorporate instructions given at the job level in addition to established interdependencies among roles. Individual inferences of the core dimensions developed for each component role could comprise still another source of information available when inferences are formed for an overall job. These additional sources of information would further complicate the processes involved in arriving at inferences of the core dimensions.

However, the purpose in expanding the inference/attribution model of role schemas to the job level is not to present a fully developed framework for the formation of job level inferences. The potential processes involved in processing all the potential information components available at this level remain highly speculative. Yet, Figure 4 is valuable in illustrating that the
most basic and meaningful level at which to access the core dimensions resides at the level of the work role. In all, the inference/attribution model portrays the core dimensions as schemas that are formed at the level of the work role; not at the level of the task or the job. This conceptualization also rejects the popular belief that the core dimensions are true, objective entities which are sometimes misinterpreted due to social cues. Rather, the inference/attribution perspective portrays role schemas as the synthesis of many possible information items present within a role and the tasks that comprise that role. Social cues, as well as objective elements of tasks themselves, comprise only a portion of the sources of information that may be used in forming role schemas.

**Implications of an Inference/Attribution Model of Role Schemas**

In depicting role schemas as the synthesis of many possible information elements, the inference/attribution model acknowledges that information items used in forming role schemas may not always be consistent with one another; consistent, that is, in the level of the core dimensions that is implied by an element of information. For example, at the task level, the written job
description, the trainer, the supervisor, the union steward, and the coworkers may all provide slightly different instructions to a new employee about how to perform a given task. Individually, these instructions may each contribute to the formation of a slightly different rating of a core dimension for a particular role. When called upon to make ratings of the core dimensions encountered in that role, the new employee is likely to experience some uncertainty due to these inconsistencies in the information elements on which his/her inferences are based. Additional inconsistencies might be encountered within information items obtained at the role level (i.e., the task integration process, the social milieu, etc.) as well as between these role information elements and those acquired at the task level. These circumstances suggest that a large segment of role schema inferences are formed from information elements that are inconsistent with one another. The presence of inconsistent information items further complicates the processes involved in forming role schema inferences.

Several theorists and researchers including Asch (1952), Deutsch and Gerard (1955), Festinger (1954), and Salancik and Pfeffer (1976) have proposed that when an individual is required to make judgments based upon uncertain or ambiguous information, the individual is
likely to become more dependent on social information cues in forming that judgment. Although this effect has been demonstrated in several social psychology research endeavors (Asch, 1958), the extent to which social information cues are utilized when rating the core dimensions, specifically when inconsistencies exist in the information elements used to form role inferences, has not been empirically demonstrated. The social information processing theory as well as the inference/attribution model would suggest that individuals should rely more heavily upon social information cues in making ratings of the core dimensions when the more immediate information components are inconsistent than when they are consistent. The inference/attribution framework further suggests that when inconsistencies are encountered in the instructions, the stimulus materials, or anticipated outcomes, an individual will rely more extensively upon information available through the physical milieu and his/her experiential background, in addition to social cues, than if the more immediate information elements had conveyed a consistent message.

An additional implication follows from the presence of inconsistencies in information elements particularly when the inference/attribution perspective is applied to these conditions. The inference/attribution model
depicts the role as the most meaningful level at which inferences of the core dimensions can be assessed. Assessments of the core dimensions at the job level are criticized as being overly inclusive, thereby overlooking important differences in the core dimensions that may exist at the role level. This distinction in the meaningfulness of assessments of the core dimensions obtained at the role versus the job level might best be highlighted under conditions of inconsistent information elements. Specifically, when inconsistencies in information elements exist such that information items are consistent within a role (i.e., when all tasks of a given role are enriched) yet inconsistent across roles (i.e., one role is composed of enriched tasks while a second role consists of unenriched tasks), the inference attribution model would expect greater agreement in ratings of the core dimensions to occur at the role level than at the job level. Inferences formed at the role level would be based upon consistent information items thereby promoting agreement among individuals in their inferences of the core dimensions. However, inferences formed at the job level would be based upon inconsistent information items thereby creating some confusion as to how these inconsistencies might be reconciled in forming ratings of the core dimensions for the entire job. For example,
some individuals may focus on the more enriched role when making inferences about the job. Others may be more influenced by the information elements comprising the unenriched role; while still others may attempt a synthesis of the information from both roles. When applying the inference/ attribution model of role schemas, these circumstances should lead to greater agreement in ratings of the core dimensions at the role level than at the job level.

In addition, the possible confusion created by inconsistencies in information items between roles would seem to create a high degree of ambiguity on the part of an individual required to make ratings of the core dimensions at the job level. However, if consistent information items exist within roles, considerably less ambiguity and confusion would be encountered when making inferences at the role level. Under these conditions, an application of Festinger's theory that ambiguous situations result in a greater reliance on social cues when making judgments should result in general information cues exerting a greater influence on ratings of the core dimensions formed at the job level than at the role level.

Other implications can also be derived from the inference/ attribution model of role schemas, such as an
explanation for the disappointing convergence in ratings of the core dimensions given by incumbents and observers attending to the same job. However, the concentration on the level (i.e., role versus job) at which work related inferences are most meaningfully formed, as well as the influence of inconsistent information items and general information cues, represent more basic tenets of the model. The processes implied by the inference/attribution approach to work dimensions are intended principally as mechanisms through which characteristics contributing to the motivational elements of job design are derived. Other approaches to job design such as the mechanistic, biological, and perceptual/motor models (Campion & Thayer, 1985) involve additional characteristics which may be evoked through processes other than those proposed in the inference/attribution model. For example, mechanistic characteristics of a job such as motion economy, pacing, and skill simplification may not be influenced to the same degree by the factors comprising the inference/attribution approach. In fact, Campion and Thayer (1985) reported significantly negative correlations between a motivational job design scale and outcome measures for mechanistic and perceptual/motor approaches to work design. The inference/attribution approach to work dimensions therefore addresses processes through which characteristics fostering
a motivational emphasis to job design may be derived. Consistent with this emphasis, the following predictions were offered as an initial test of the inference/attribution model of role schemas.

**Prediction 1:** The extent of agreement among incumbents in their ratings of the core dimensions was expected to be greater when the ratings were made at the role level than at the job level. This result was anticipated because of the greater number of information elements that were available at the job level compared to the role level.

**Prediction 2:** The extent of agreement among incumbents in their ratings of the core dimensions at the job level was expected to be greater when the roles were consistently enriched or unenriched, than when the roles were inconsistently enriched. Consistency among roles existed when each role within the job was enriched. Inconsistency between roles existed when the roles within the job deviated markedly in enrichment (i.e., one role was very enriched while the other role was very unenriched).

**Prediction 3:** When the roles comprising a job were inconsistent in their enrichment, the extent of agreement among incumbents in their ratings of the core dimensions was expected to be greater at the role level than at the
job level.

**Prediction 4:** Ratings of the core dimensions at the job level were expected to be higher for incumbents exposed to enhanced general cues about a job, such as high education requirements and a high level of compensation, than for incumbents exposed to detracting general cues about the job such as lower educational requirements and a lower level of compensation.

**Prediction 5:** General information cues were expected to exert a greater influence on ratings of the core dimensions at the job level when the roles comprising the job were inconsistent in enrichment than when all roles were consistently enriched or unenriched.

**Prediction 6:** General information cues were expected to exert a greater influence on ratings of the core dimensions made at the job level than at the role level. This result was expected because the greater number of information items available at the job level were expected to create more ambiguity than would be encountered when inferences were formed at the role level. Therefore, the greater ambiguity present at the job level was anticipated to promote more extensive use of general information cues at the job level than at the role level.
Chapter II

METHOD

Overview

The preceding predictions were tested through a 2 X 2 X 2 (role enrichment X general cues X role consistency) experimental design. Participants in the study were asked to perform the job of a company employment counselor which involved two distinct roles: processing employment applications, and interviewing a job applicant. Both roles were carried out by each participant during the course of the experiment. Each role was either enriched or unenriched in terms of the degree of autonomy that could be exercised, thereby creating the two levels of the enrichment factor. The role consistency factor was also comprised of two levels: consistent and inconsistent. The consistent condition existed when both the application processing and the interviewing portions of the job were enriched (permitted considerable autonomy) or when both roles were unenriched (permitted
very little autonomy). The inconsistent condition existed when one role was enriched while the other role was unenriched in terms of the autonomy that could be exercised. For the general cue factor, half the participants conducted the study in a large, spacious, well appointed office with the expectation that their job as an employment counselor was well paying and required an advanced college degree. The remaining participants completed the experiment in a small, plain office and were presented with information indicating that an employment counselor was not well paid, and was not required to possess an advanced college degree. In all, the study employed eight between subject conditions. In order to account for possible order effects, the order in which the application processing and interviewing roles were performed was also varied. Half the participants within each condition interviewed a job applicant first, and half the participants processed employment applications first.

Subjects

Sixty-seven male and female undergraduate students enrolled in introductory psychology classes at The Ohio State University took part in this investigation. Participation was voluntary and served to partially
fulfill a research requirement established for the course. Participants were recruited for a study entitled "Employment Decision Bias". Power analysis (Cohen & Cohen, 1975) indicated that a sample size of forty-six was necessary to achieve a power level of .80 with an effect size of .40. Twenty-eight males and thirty-nine females participated in the study although only the data from sixty-four subjects were included in the analyses. Eight participants were assigned to each experimental condition. The results from two participants were not included in the study because of failure to follow critical experimental instructions. A third participant was unable to complete the entire experiment due to a scheduling conflict.

Procedure

Prior to the beginning of the experimental sessions, each subject was randomly assigned to one of the eight primary conditions included in the design. The order in which the individual roles of the job were to be performed (i.e. application processing, and interviewing) was also accomplished by random draw without replacement.

Participants were seated alone at a table in a small office. On the table immediately in front of the subject was a one page job description for a Personnel and Labor
Relations Specialist excerpted from the *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (see Appendix A), and four small stacks of colored 3 X 5 inch index cards arranged by color (white, yellow, blue, green). Information in the job description pertaining to training, qualifications, and earnings were highlighted in yellow to attract the subjects' attention. Subjects were instructed to read the description before the experiment began. The description served to familiarize the participant with the job of a personnel specialist and to create a common point of reference with respect to typical job qualifications and earnings. Prior to beginning the experiment, the experimenter inquired if the participants had read the description. If not, the subject was instructed to read the description in the presence of the experimenter.

The experimenter then introduced the study by reading the following experimental scenario to the participant.

A faculty member in the Industrial Psychology Department at The Ohio State University has been awarded a contract from a major insurance company to investigate possible discrimination in its employment practices for entry level claims positions. The company has received several complaints from
female and minority applicants who have not been selected for these positions. Specifically, the company asked that a study be conducted to determine if the hiring decisions made by its employment counselors were biased, and if so whether the bias was due to the counselors themselves, or possibly to the procedures that an employment counselor is expected to follow in performing his or her job. Quick action to correct any hiring discrimination could permit the company to avert some potentially damaging lawsuits.

The study that you'll participate in today is designed to compare employment judgments made by individuals who are not affiliated with our sponsor company, to the hiring decisions made by the company's own employment counselors. This comparison will allow us to identify any systematic bias in the counselors' hiring decisions.

Are you currently working for an insurance company?

If YES: Which one?

Since you are not an employee of the client company,
I'll be asking you to perform the job of an employment counselor for a short time today and to make some of the necessary employment decisions required of a person in that position. After performing the job, I'll ask that you also complete several questionnaire items directed at your reactions to the job.

**General Cue Manipulations**

If the subject had been assigned to the high general cue condition, he/she was informed that his/her past experiences and activities suggested the ability to interact effectively with other people and as a result would enable him/her to perform the experiment in a more elaborate office (see Appendix B). If the subject had been assigned to the low general cue condition, the participant was told that his/her past experiences and activities did not evidence a familiarity with the kind of interactions and with the caliber of people typically encountered by an employment counselor, which otherwise would have permitted him/her to perform the experiment in a more elaborate office (see Appendix C).

At this point, subjects in both high and low cue conditions were escorted to a well-appointed office approximately four times as large as the initial office.
In sharp contrast to the initial office, this facility was furnished with a roll top desk, side chair, conference table and chairs, credenza, windows overlooking the campus, and photographs mounted on the wall.

While in the well-appointed office, subjects in the low cue condition were told that this facility is used by persons whose background is more suitable to the work performed by an employment counselor. The subjects in the low cue condition were then escorted back to the initial office where the remainder of the experiment was conducted. Subjects in the high cue condition were asked to sit at the roll top desk and performed the rest of the experiment in the well-appointed office. From this point on, the experimenter addressed high cue subjects as "Mr." or "Miss" and were given instructions on the proper use of the intercom to be used in alerting the experimenter upon completion of the various segments of the experiment. Low cue subjects continued to be addressed by their first names. No intercom was available for their use. Instead, low cue subjects were required simply to open their office door as a signal to the experimenter that they had completed a portion of the experiment and were ready to proceed.

All subjects were then presented with a general description of the employment counselor's job which was
read aloud by the experimenter. Job descriptions for both high and low general cue subjects differed only by starting salary (high - $15.38/hr. or $32,000/yr. versus low - $4.42/hr. or $9,200/yr.), education and experience requirements (high - Master's Degree plus eight years experience versus low - high school diploma, no experience), and position on the "Organizational Chart" (high - third from the top versus low - third from the bottom) (see Appendices D & E). These areas of the job description were highlighted in yellow in order to increase their salience for the subjects.

Description of the Tasks and Roles Performed as an Employment Counselor

As outlined in the scenario, each subject was asked to perform the job of an employment counselor. This job was composed of two roles: an application processor, and an interviewer. Subjects were required to carry out two tasks for each role in the job.

The role of an application processor involved reviewing the contents of six employment applications for an entry level claims examiner position. The application blanks (see Appendix F) were constructed by the experimenter and included applications from three males and three females, each with varying degrees of work related
and educational experience. To compliment the scenario, two applications, one male and one female, were designated as originating from black applicants. The remaining applications were specified as coming from white applicants. In addition, the names on the applications were constructed to reflect distinct ethnic backgrounds (i.e., Italian, Irish, Jewish, and English).

One task comprising the role of application processor required subjects to record demographic information (i.e., applicant's name, sex, race, date of birth, etc.) from each application on one of the colored (white, yellow, blue, or green) 3 X 5 inch index cards. The other task encountered in the role of an application processor required subjects to decide if the background information and experiences contained on each application qualified the applicant for a personal interview. Subjects were instructed to indicated their decision by checking the appropriate box in the "Office Use Only" portion of each application blank (see Appendix F).

Subjects also performed the role of employment interviewer which required each subject to conduct a personal interview with a trained applicant (experimental assistant). Subjects were informed that the interviewee was a company representative who had been coached to play the role of an applicant for an entry level claims
position. Prior to conducting the interview, subjects were provided with the application blank submitted by the interviewee (see Appendix G). The role of employment interviewer was also divided into two tasks. One task required subjects to talk with the applicant about the major advantages and benefits that are provided to employees of the company. Essentially, this amounted to informing and selling the applicant on the positive features of the company. The other task in the role of employment interviewer required subjects to ask the applicant questions about his/her qualifications and experiences pertaining to an entry level claims position. The subject's intent was to obtain information on which to base a hire/no hire recommendation. Following the interview, subjects were asked to indicate their recommendation in the "Office Use Only" portion of the application form.

To summarize, subjects in this experiment assumed the job of an employment counselor. This job required subjects to perform two roles, that of an application processor and that of an employment interviewer. As an application processor, subjects recorded demographic information on index cards and made a determination as to whether or not each of six applicants qualified for a personal interview. As an employment interviewer,
subjects interviewed an (role playing) applicant for an entry level claims position. During the interview subjects highlighted the major benefits of working for the company, as well as asked questions that helped to substantiate a hire/no hire recommendation.

Enriched and Unenriched Role Conditions

The conditions under which the roles of an employment counselor were performed were manipulated to create an enriched and an unenriched version of each task encountered in a role. An enriched role was created by permitting subjects to perform the associated tasks under more autonomous conditions than those permitted in the unenriched role. Conditions of autonomy were the only features of the core dimensions intentionally manipulated in creating enriched and unenriched roles. The use of autonomy manipulations as opposed to manipulations of other core dimensions was intended to highlight the distinction between the overall job and the individual work roles. For example, autonomy may not only be produced by the freedom or discretion within an individual role, but may also be enhanced through the sequencing of tasks and roles within the same job. Moreover, it was felt that autonomy was less closely associated with distinct objects in the work environment than other core dimensions and therefore more
likely to lead to differences in inter-rater agreement when roles were inconsistently enriched. Conditions of high and low autonomy were created through instructions specifying how each individual task was to be performed.

**Application Processing Role.** For the unenriched version of the task in which subjects recorded demographic data on index cards, subjects were instructed to use an index card of a specified color to record the information. The color of the card to be used was determined by the race and sex of the applicant. In addition, all subjects were required to copy particular information elements on specified lines of the index cards. Detailed instructions to subjects in this condition are included in Appendix H.

The enriched version of the same task also required subjects to record applicant information on color coded index cards. However, greater discretion was permitted in selecting the appropriate information to record on the card. Moreover, participants were asked to develop their own card color scheme for identifying the race and sex of the job applicant. Appendix I contains the detailed instructions given to subjects in this condition.

The second task encountered in the role of application processor required subjects to decide if the information available from the application blank qualified the
applicant for a personal interview. The unenriched instructions for this task required subjects to apply a rigid set of minimal qualifications (see Appendix J) to each application in order to make this decision. The enriched version of this same task provided subjects with some general guidelines for selecting claims personnel, thereby permitting the subjects to use their own discretion in determining if an applicant should or should not be scheduled for an interview. Instructions to subjects in this condition appear in Appendix K.

These manipulations enabled an enriched and an unenriched version of the application processor role to be created. The enriched version consisted of two enriched (higher autonomy) tasks. The unenriched version consisted of two enriched (lower autonomy) tasks. Similar manipulations were conducted to create enriched and unenriched conditions for the interviewer role.

**Interviewing Role.** For the "sales pitch" task of the interviewer role subjects in the unenriched condition were required to read a statement of benefits verbatim to the interviewee (see Appendix L). Deviations from this "statement of benefits" were strongly discouraged in the instructions given to the subjects. In the enriched condition of the same task, subjects received a list of "positive features and selling points" of the company.
Instructions to the subjects (Appendix M) encouraged them to formulate a persuasive statement of their own, using whatever positive features they felt would be effective to convince the interviewee that the company would be a profitable and respected place to work.

The second task of the interviewer's role required the subject to ask questions and probe the interviewee regarding his/her qualifications for an entry level claims position. The unenriched version of this task required subjects to ask a prescribed series of questions in the order presented in a structured interview guide. Again, any deviations from the prescribed question format were discouraged in the instructions to the subjects (Appendix N). Instructions to subjects in the enriched version of this task encouraged them to develop their own questioning strategy for assessing the qualifications of the interviewee (see Appendix O). Prior to beginning the interview, subjects received a "list of topics and questions helpful in determining the qualifications of claims personnel" for their use in conducting the interview (see Appendix P).

When performing the interviewing role, subjects interviewed one of four individuals (three male, one female) trained to play the part of an applicant for a claims examiner's position. These individuals were
trained to give similar favorable responses to subjects' questions during the interviews. Responses were in keeping with the information contained on the interviewee's application blank (see Appendix G). Because subjects in the enriched interview condition were encouraged to formulate their own interview questions, a singular script could not be followed by the interviewees. However, interviewees were coached to make their responses to the interview questions consistent with the information on the application blank. In keeping with the experimental scenerio, the interviewees' wearing apparel was appropriate for an employment interview (i.e., ties for the males, a skirt for the female).

**Consistent and Inconsistent Conditions Between Roles**

A major independent variable included in this study involved the consistency in which enriched or unenriched conditions were encountered across the roles that comprised the employment counselor's job. In this study a consistent job was created when both the application processor role and the interviewer role were either enriched or unenriched. An inconsistent job existed when one role is performed under enriched conditions while the other role was performed under unenriched conditions. Roles within the inconsistent job were counter balanced.
such that both the application processor and the interviewer roles were performed by an equal number of subjects under enriched and unenriched conditions. Tasks within each role remained consistent through the experiment. That is, in an enriched role, both component tasks were performed under enriched conditions. For an unenriched role, unenriched versions of both component tasks were employed.

Assessments of the Core Dimensions

Measures of the core dimensions were constructed using items from the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) (Hackman & Oldham, 1974) and the Job Characteristics Inventory (JCI) (Sims, Szalagyi, & Keller, 1976) (see Appendices Q, R, & S). Items adopted from the JDS included those designed to assess variety, identity, significance, autonomy, feedback, dealing with others, and affective reactions to the job. Unique items from the JCI which also measured these elements were modified and included with the items from the JDS. In addition, several items designed by the experimenter to assess elements such as satisfaction with pay, physical setting, and prestige and status were also included. These items, as well as those from the JDS and the JCI, were rated on seven point scales and comprised the Work Description Scales used
throughout the experiment.

Three versions of the Work Description Scale were constructed: one to assess task characteristic ratings for the application processing role (Appendix Q), a second for task characteristic ratings for the interviewing role (Appendix R), and a third to assess the task characteristic ratings for the overall job of an employment counselor (Appendix S). Therefore, ratings of task characteristics were obtained three times from each subject; once immediately after the application processing role, again immediately following the completion of the interviewing role, and a third time following the completion of both roles. Participants were instructed to base their ratings strictly upon the specific unit of the employment counselor's work to which the particular Work Description Scale applied. Items in each Work Description Scale made repeated references to the appropriate unit of work that was to be described.

Supplemental Assessments

Following the completion of the Work Description Scale for the overall job, participants completed three additional questionnaires designed to assess the effectiveness of the independent variable manipulations, as well as the clarity of the participants' understanding
of the roles encountered in the experiment. The first instrument, the Work Environment Questionnaire (Appendix T) was constructed by the experimenter and consisted of five multiple choice items. The items assessed how accurately the subject had perceived objective components of the work environment that contributed to the manipulation of several general environmental cues.

The second questionnaire, the Work Impression Questionnaire (Appendix U) consisted of three narrative response, open-ended questions directed at gauging the participant's understanding of the duties performed by an employment counselor. Specifically, subjects were asked to provide a brief description of the employment counselor's job as they had experienced it, as well as an outline of specific duties and any noticeable differences in the ways the various parts of the job were performed.

The final instrument completed by the participant was entitled the Follow-up Questionnaire (Appendix V). This instrument consisted of multiple choice, Likert scale and semantic differential items designed to assess the effectiveness of the independent variable manipulations. In order to monitor role consistency, subjects were asked to indicate which role had provided the most discretion and freedom in performing the assigned tasks. Ratings were also obtained for the amount of freedom and
autonomy exercised in performing the overall job with possible ratings ranging from 0 when one part of the job permitted considerable freedom and the other part very little freedom to 7 when the overall job permitted a high degree of freedom (see item 6, Appendix V). Subjects also indicated their degree of endorsement for an item stating that the overall job of an employment counselor was both high and low on autonomy (item 10, Appendix V). The potential uncertainty or diminished confidence in rating the autonomy experienced in the overall job (as a result of inconsistent roles) was assessed through items 11 and 14 on the Follow-up Questionnaire. Subjects indicated their extent of agreement with statements about the level of confidence they had in rating the overall autonomy as well as the degree of uncertainty when rating the overall freedom experienced in the job.

To assess the potential influence of differences in importance attributed to the roles performed in the experiment on ratings of the core dimensions, the Follow-up Questionnaire included items on which the subjects indicated their preference for the roles in the experiment, as well as which role they considered to be most important. Items were also included which assessed the clarity of information and expectations regarding the roles in the experiment (items 5, 13, & 14). These items served
to monitor the possible introduction of role ambiguity as a result of experimental attempts to enhance role autonomy.

The Work Description Scale, the Work Environment Questionnaire, the Work Impression Questionnaire, and the Follow-up Questionnaire were administered individually to guard against the direct comparison of answers from one instrument to another.

**Debriefing**

Following the completion of each experimental session, subjects were thoroughly debriefed. During this period the basic purpose underlying the experiment was revealed in an attempt to eliminate any misleading assumptions which may have been created through the experimental scenario.

Time was also allotted for answering questions the subjects had regarding any aspects of the experiment. Subjects were asked not to reveal the objectives of the experiment to any of their friends or acquaintances in an attempt to preserve the integrity of the study. At the close of the debriefing session the experimenter thanked the subjects for their cooperation.
Agreement Index

Several hypothesized relationships in this study suggested the impact of consistency, general cues and/or enrichment on the degree of agreement between subjects in various conditions as well as the overall job. An index of inter-rater agreement which was not sensitive of mean differences in the cells of the design was required to test these relationships. An average absolute difference score within each cell was computed by adjusting the cell means to zero through the standardization procedure of the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) (1979), subtracting the cell mean from each subject's score within the individual cell, and calculating the absolute value of these differences. These scores were then used throughout the MANOVAs in which agreement was used as a dependent variable. It should be noted that high agreement was indicated by lower average absolute difference scores.
Chapter III

RESULTS

Manipulation Checks

General Cues. Subjects participating under high general cue conditions rated the starting salary, office setting, educational requirements, and the status and prestige associated with the job of an employment counselor significantly higher than subjects who participated in the low general cue conditions. Ratings of these general cue dimensions were comprised of individual responses to questionnaire items administered to the subjects following their participation in the interviewing and application processing roles. Inter-item correlations among the individual questionnaire items are shown separately for each general cue dimension in Appendices W - Z. The inter-item correlations for each dimension were sufficiently high to justify the use of total scores as indices of starting salary, office setting, education, and status/prestige. Table 1 shows the results of the ANOVA conducted to test the magnitude
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cue Dimension</th>
<th>Low Cue Mean (SD)</th>
<th>High Cue Mean (SD)</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>2.953 (1.163)</td>
<td>5.573 (.941)</td>
<td>105.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3.575 (1.108)</td>
<td>5.732 (.854)</td>
<td>76.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.968 (.974)</td>
<td>5.469 (.941)</td>
<td>102.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status/Prestige</td>
<td>3.309 (1.016)</td>
<td>4.922 (1.097)</td>
<td>34.84*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 32

See Appendices W - Z for items contributing to Cue Dimension scores.

*Significant at .00001 level.
of these general cue manipulations. The results indicate statistically significant manipulations of these general cue dimensions.

**Enrichment.** Ratings of the degree of autonomy experienced in enriched role conditions were significantly greater than those for unenriched role conditions. Tables 2 and 3 show the means of the core dimensions for the enriched and unenriched conditions of the application processing and interviewing roles respectively. In addition to subjects under enriched conditions rating autonomy significantly higher than the autonomy experienced in the unenriched conditions, subjects also rated variety, feedback, and motivating potential as significantly greater for enriched than for unenriched conditions. Although these additional core dimensions were not intentionally manipulated, high inter-correlations (ranging from .85 to .56) were found between autonomy and these core dimensions (see Appendices AA – CC).

**Role Consistency.** Follow-up ratings gathered from participants also revealed that under inconsistent role conditions subjects admitted a stronger desire to rate the autonomy on the overall job as both high and low on autonomy than did subjects in the consistent role conditions. A one-way analysis of variance revealed a
Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Core Dimension Ratings for the Application Processing Role Under Enriched and Unenriched Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimensions</th>
<th>Enriched</th>
<th>Unenriched</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>5.492 (1.033)</td>
<td>2.367 (1.45)</td>
<td>39.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>3.055 (1.001)</td>
<td>1.602 (.718)</td>
<td>7.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>4.219 (1.307)</td>
<td>3.906 (1.467)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>5.445 (1.041)</td>
<td>5.562 (1.053)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>3.367 (.965)</td>
<td>2.586 (1.307)</td>
<td>1.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Potential</td>
<td>81.99 (37.43)</td>
<td>29.19 (34.65)</td>
<td>4.72*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=32

* p ≤ .05
Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Core Dimension Ratings for the Interview Role Under Enriched and Unenriched Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimensions</th>
<th>Enriched Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Unenriched Mean (SD)</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>5.969 (0.594)</td>
<td>3.258 (1.557)</td>
<td>29.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>4.023 (1.050)</td>
<td>2.813 (1.355)</td>
<td>3.63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>5.008 (1.013)</td>
<td>4.844 (1.398)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>5.992 (0.966)</td>
<td>5.672 (1.268)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>4.680 (1.091)</td>
<td>3.437 (1.368)</td>
<td>8.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Potential</td>
<td>142.5 (48.67)</td>
<td>60.62 (51.72)</td>
<td>15.32*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 32

* p ≤ .05
mean of 5.5 (on a seven point scale - high scores endorsing the desire to rate autonomy as both high and low) for the inconsistent condition (SD = 1.45) and a mean of 3.4 for the consistent condition (SD = 1.84), (F = 23.93, p ≤ .01). The results of these manipulation checks not only indicate statistically significant differences between the levels of the three independent variables (general cues, enrichment and role consistency), the magnitude of the differences suggest that practical and meaningful distinctions were achieved through the experimental manipulations.

Order Effects. The order in which the roles of the employment counselor was conducted was initially included as a factor in the overall MANOVA conducted for this study. None of the analyses indicated either main or interactive effects for order of role performance, which suggests that the order in which the application processing or interviewing roles were performed had no significant bearing on the predicted relationships in this study. Therefore, in further analyses, order of role performance was not included as a factor.
Prediction 1. Influence of Response Level on Agreement in Core Dimension Ratings

Due to the greater number of information elements available to subjects when assigning ratings of the core dimensions at the job level as opposed to the role level, it was predicted that subjects would display greater agreement when rating core dimensions at the role level than at the job level. Using absolute difference scores to index agreement, this prediction suggested lower absolute difference scores for core dimension ratings taken for both the application processing and interviewing role levels than for the ratings assigned to the overall job.

A repeated measures MANOVA (BMDP, 1983) was conducted with enrichment, consistency, and cues as between subject factors, and assessments of the core dimensions at the application processing, interviewing, and overall job levels as within subject factors. Results of the MANOVA for the overall influence of levels on agreement were significant ($F=2.46, P<.01$) but

1. An overall repeated measures MANOVA was also conducted excluding the MPS variable from the analyses, however, no significant differences were noted between this analysis and those reported here which include the MPS variable.
generally did not indicate consistently greater agreement at the role levels than at the overall job level (see Table 4). Only ratings of variety made for the application processing role showed significantly more agreement than ratings of variety for the overall job. The impact of this result is lessened by the finding using Dunn's Multiple Comparison Procedure that ratings of variety for the interview role showed no statistically significant differences in agreement from the ratings obtained for the overall job. Moreover, agreement in ratings of task significance obtained for the interview role were significantly less than ratings obtained for the overall job ($d=.162, p<.05$). The prediction of greater agreement in core dimension ratings made at the role level than at the job level was not supported.

**Prediction 2. Influence of Consistency on Agreement in Core Dimension Ratings**

A second prediction employing agreement in ratings of the core dimensions as the dependent variable suggested that ratings taken at the job level would reveal significantly more agreement among subjects for whom the application processing and interviewing roles were consistent in the level of enrichment than among subjects who experienced inconsistent enrichment levels.
Table 4

Mean Absolute Difference Scores as Indices of Agreement in Ratings of Core Dimensions at Role Versus Job Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimension</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>4.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>8.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS (Avg.)</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=64
*P≤.02

Note 1. Tabled entries with the same lettered subscripts are significantly different from one another.

Note 2. Greater agreement in ratings of the core dimensions is reflected by the lower valued table entries.
in these roles. Therefore, subjects who performed both the application processing activity and the interviewing under completely enriched or completely unenriched conditions were expected to show a high degree of agreement among themselves (lower absolute difference scores) in ratings for the overall job. However, subjects who performed one role under enriched conditions and the other under unenriched conditions were expected to show significantly less agreement (higher absolute difference scores) when rating the core dimensions for the overall job than their counterparts in the consistent condition.

Mean differences in the absolute difference scores between subjects who experienced consistent versus inconsistent roles are shown in Table 5. Moreover, the interaction effect of enriched and unenriched application processing with enriched and unenriched interviewing conditions in the MANOVA procedure was not significant ($F=.30, p>.05$) (see Table 5). The overall interaction for enrichment at the application processing and interviewing roles was not significant ($F=.30, p>.05$). Table 6 shows the breakdown of the absolute difference scores by the four possible enrichment combinations which produced the consistent and inconsistent conditions. Because autonomy was the core dimension directly
Table 5

Mean Absolute Difference Scores as Indices of Agreement in Ratings of the Core Dimensions at the Job Level for Consistent and Inconsistent Role Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimensions</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
<th>Inconsistent</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Potential</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=32
Table 6
Mean Absolute Difference Scores as Indices of Agreement -
Consistent Versus Inconsistent Conditions - Job Level Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimensions</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
<th>Inconsistent</th>
<th>En-applications</th>
<th>UN-applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enriched</td>
<td>Unenriched</td>
<td>UN-interview</td>
<td>EN-interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Potential</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=16
EN-signifies enriched condition
UN-signifies unenriched condition
manipulated to produce consistency or inconsistency between the roles of the employment counselor's job, the greatest impact of differences in consistency were expected in the agreement for ratings of autonomy. However, no significant differences in agreement between subjects in consistent or inconsistent conditions were found for ratings of autonomy or for any of the other core dimensions. No support was found for an overall interaction between enrichment at the application processing and interviewing role levels.

Prediction 3. Influence of Consistency and Response Level on Agreement in Core Dimension Ratings

A third prediction using agreement as the principle dependent variable suggested that subjects who participated in roles that were inconsistent in the degree of enrichment would show greater agreement when rating the core dimensions at the role levels than at the overall job level. This prediction was formed on the assumption that under inconsistent conditions fewer conflicting information elements on which to base ratings of the core dimensions would exist at the role levels than at the overall job level. Absolute difference scores were then expected to be greater at the job level than for either of the individual roles.
The results of the repeated measures MANOVA conducted to examine the interaction between the level of measurement and consistency did not support this prediction. The overall MANOVA was not significant (F=.47, p>.05). Moreover, the means of the absolute difference scores shown in Table 7 did not reveal statistically significant differences in agreement between the job and the roles for ratings of autonomy or any other core dimension, although agreement scores in the predicted direction were found for all the core dimensions except significance.

Prediction 4. Influence of General Cues on Core Dimension Ratings

The influence of high versus low general cues surrounding the job of an employment counselor was predicted to have a major impact on the mean ratings of the core dimensions themselves and not necessarily upon the extent of agreement in those ratings. Subjects exposed to high general cues about the job, such as high status, elaborate office, advanced educational requirements, and high pay were expected to rate the core dimensions for the overall job of an employment counselor at generally higher levels than subjects exposed to low cues regarding these same aspects of the job. Because the general
Table 7

Mean Absolute Difference Scores as Indices of Agreement in Ratings of the Core Dimensions Among Subjects in Inconsistent Enrichment Conditions at the Role Versus the Job Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimension</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Potential</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=32
cues about the employment counselor's job were not specifically intended to enhance any specific core dimension, the primary influence was expected to occur across all core dimensions. A motivating potential score (MPS) was computed as the major dependent variable for this prediction. Higher MPS scores were anticipated for subjects exposed to high general cues than for subjects exposed to low general cues.

Table 8 presents the means for all five core dimensions and the motivating potential ratings of subjects under low and high cue conditions for the overall job of the employment counselor. The results of the overall MANOVA testing for the impact of general cues were not statistically significant \((F=1.22, p>.05)\), nor were there effects on the individual core dimensions or the MPS score. With the exception of task significance, however, all ratings of the core dimensions were slightly higher under high cue conditions than under low cue conditions. This result also occurred when ratings of the core dimensions were compared at the individual role levels (see Appendix DD). Overall, general information cues were not shown to have a statistically significant impact on ratings of the core dimensions.
Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations of
Ratings of the Core Dimensions for the Overall
Job of an Employment Counselor Under High and
Low General Cue Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimension</th>
<th>High Cue</th>
<th></th>
<th>Low Cue</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Potential</td>
<td>111.79</td>
<td>58.18</td>
<td>80.09</td>
<td>64.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=32
Prediction 5. Influence of General Cues and Consistency on Core Dimension Ratings

Another prediction which focused on mean differences in ratings of the core dimensions as a dependent variable called for an interaction between general cues and role consistency. It was expected that when the interviewing and application processing roles were consistent in their levels of enrichment, the difference in the core dimension ratings given by subjects who experienced high general cues versus those who received low general cues would be significantly less than when these same comparisons were made for subjects whose application processing and interviewing roles were inconsistent in their levels of enrichment. The expected relationship might be clarified by considering the rationale behind the hypothesis. When subjects were exposed to either consistently enriched or consistently unenriched application processing and interviewing roles, it was hypothesized that enrichment levels of the roles themselves would be the driving force behind the subjects' ratings of the core dimensions, and that the impact of the general cues on these ratings would be minimized due to the consistency in enrichment (namely autonomy) experienced in the two roles. A slightly different strategy was expected from subjects
whose application processing and interviewing roles were inconsistent in enrichment (namely one role permitted considerable autonomy while the other role permitted very little). Under the circumstances of inconsistent role conditions, it was suggested that subjects would experience some uncertainty in arriving at a rating of the autonomy permitted in the overall job of an employment counselor. This uncertainty created by the high autonomy permitted in one role and the lower autonomy permitted in the other suggested that subjects would be inclined to rely more heavily on elements of information other than the actual enrichment levels of the roles (i.e., general cues) to guide them in rating the autonomy and other core dimensions experienced in the overall job.

To test this prediction, a MANOVA was conducted using enrichment at the two role levels and general cues as independent variables and ratings of the core dimensions as dependent variables. Within the MANOVA this prediction was tested by examining the interaction between enrichment at the role levels and levels of the general cues. The overall interaction term in the MANOVA was not significant ($F=1.46, p>.05$). Table 9 displays the means and difference scores for high and low general cues under consistent and inconsistent role
Table 9

Means and Mean Differences (D) for Core Dimension Ratings Under High Versus Low Cue Conditions for Consistent and Inconsistent Role Enrichment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimensions</th>
<th>Consistent High Cue</th>
<th>Consistent Low Cue</th>
<th>Inconsistent High Cue</th>
<th>Inconsistent Low Cue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4.41 (.49)</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>5.26 (.77)</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>3.31 (.10)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.02 (.69)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>5.25 (.72)</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5.37 (.04)</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>6.04 (.54)</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.72 (.46)</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>3.97 (.46)</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.16 (.44)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Potential</td>
<td>107.89 (37.03)</td>
<td>70.86</td>
<td>115.65 (26.32)</td>
<td>89.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=16

(D) represents values obtained by subtracting the low cue mean from the high cue mean.
enrichment conditions. The hypothesis being tested predicted significantly greater differences between means of the core dimensions (particularly autonomy) for high versus low general cues in the inconsistent enrichment conditions than in the consistent enrichment conditions. Although the difference scores for autonomy were in the predicted direction, the difference was not statistically significant (Dunn's Multiple Comparison Procedure, d of 1.671 needed for p<.05). No statistically significant differences were identified for the remaining core dimensions or for the Motivating Potential Score. Appendices EE - HH provide a further breakdown of consistency into consistently enriched and consistently unenriched conditions, as well as a similar division of the inconsistent condition into its two components: enriched application - unenriched interview, and unenriched application - enriched interview.

Additional analyses were conducted in order to identify potential reasons for the failure to find support for this prediction. A MANOVA conducted on responses to selected items of the Follow-up Questionnaire revealed that subjects under inconsistent role conditions were much more affirmative in their desire to rate the overall job both high and low on autonomy (X=5.52)
than were subjects under consistent role conditions
\((X=3.38)(F=28.42, p<.001)\). Results of a Chi Square
conducted on responses to an item asking subjects to
classify the overall freedom and autonomy of the job as
both high and low, low, moderate, or high were also
significant (Chi Square=35.6, \(p<.001\)). Twenty-two
subjects in the inconsistent role condition classified
autonomy as both high and low, while no subjects in the
consistent role condition endorsed this response choice.
These results suggest that subjects were experiencing
the intended inconsistency and consistency in role
enrichment (autonomy) as manipulated in the experiment.
However, responses to other follow-up items suggested
that subjects were not shaken in their confidence, nor
did they express uncertainty in their ratings that could
be attributed to inconsistent role conditions. One way
ANOVAs were conducted on ratings of confidence and uncer-
tainty experienced in assessing the degree of autonomy in
the overall job by subjects in consistent versus incon-
sistent role conditions. No statistically significant
differences were reported between subjects in these con-
ditions for either confidence in ratings (\(F=0.00, p>.05\))
or for uncertainty in the ratings (\(F=0.16, p>.05\)).
Therefore, although subjects perceived the inconsis-
tency in roles, the inconsistency did not influence their
degree of certainty in rating the core dimensions.

Prediction 6. Influence of General Cues on Core Dimension Ratings - Job versus Role Levels

Another relationship expected to create mean differences in core dimension ratings was that of the impact of general information cues on ratings made for the overall job versus those made for the individual roles. Specifically, it was predicted that because ratings of the overall job would require a synthesis of the information acquired through both the application processing and interviewing roles, ratings made for the overall job would be more complex, and, therefore, more subject to the influence of general information cues than ratings made for individual roles. To test this hypothesis, an inspection was made of the level by cue interaction term in a repeated measures MANOVA. This overall interaction term was not statistically significant ($F=.57, p>.05$), however, an inspection of the ratings for the individual core dimensions revealed some statistically significant relationships.

Table 10 shows the mean ratings of the core dimensions under high and low general cue conditions by the individual role levels as well as for the overall job. Included with the means are the mean difference scores
Table 10

Means and Mean Differences for Core Dimension Ratings Under Low and High General Cues for the Individual Roles and the Overall Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Core Low Cue</th>
<th>High Cue</th>
<th>Low Cue</th>
<th>High Cue</th>
<th>Low Cue</th>
<th>High Cue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dim.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>3.86 (.14)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.39 (.45)</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.20 (.63)</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>2.33 (.00)</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.24 (.35)</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.26 (.40)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDN</td>
<td>3.87 (.39)</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.89 (.07)</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.93 (.39)</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIG</td>
<td>5.63 (-.25)</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.87 (-.07)</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.88 (.00)</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FED</td>
<td>2.90 (.15)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.91 (.30)</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.61 (.45)</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>51.5 (8.2)</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>92.4 (18.3)</td>
<td>110.7</td>
<td>80.1 (31.7)</td>
<td>111.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=32

(D) represents values obtained by subtracting the low cue mean from the high cue mean.

Note: Table entries with the same lettered subscripts are significantly different from one another.
representing the difference in mean ratings between the high and low cue conditions at each role level as well as for the job level. According to the prediction of a cue by response level interaction, greater difference scores would be expected at the job level than at the individual role levels. If general information cues were indeed more influential on ratings for the overall job, the difference in core dimension ratings between high and low cue conditions should be greater than the differences seen at the individual role levels. Therefore, the size of the discrepancy between difference scores at the overall job and the application role, and the overall job and the interview role, were analyzed separately for each core dimension.

To examine this relationship, t statistics were conducted between the difference scores shown in Table 10 for each core dimension. Statistically significant differences in the expected direction were found between the overall job and the application processing role for autonomy (t=3.35, p<.01), variety (t=3.13, p<.01), feedback (t=2.22, p<.05), and MPS (t=4.06, p<.01); and between the overall job and the interview role for identity (t=1.69, p<.05) and MPS (t=2.32, p<.05). Although the impact of general cues was not significantly greater at the job level than at the role levels across
all the core dimensions, the expected relationship was found for several of the core dimensions particularly between the overall job and the application processing role. These results provide some support for the prediction that general information cues exert a greater influence on core dimension ratings at a multiple role level (overall job) than when the core dimensions are rated individually for each role comprising a job.

**Influence of General Cues and Consistency on Agreement in Core Dimension Ratings**

Although not proposed as one of the initial hypotheses to be examined in this study, a post hoc examination of the data suggested that an interaction between general cues and role consistency could reasonably be expected to influence the extent of agreement in ratings of the core dimensions. In this study the job of an employment counselor could be consistent with respect to enrichment (autonomy) when both the application processing role and the interviewing role were enriched (consistently enriched) or when both roles were unenriched (consistently unenriched). From a different perspective, yet another form of "consistency" was created by the introduction of general cues to the already consistently enriched or unenriched job of an employment counselor. Consider the following
conditions: for subjects exposed to consistently unenriched roles (both roles low in autonomy) exposure to low general information cues about the job would likely appear "consistent" with the low degree of autonomy experienced in that job, whereas exposure to high general cues would likely appear somewhat "inconsistent" with the low degree of autonomy in the job. A similar situation would be expected for subjects exposed to consistently enriched roles (both roles high in autonomy). Here high general cues would appear "consistent" with the levels of autonomy, while low general cues would seem "inconsistent."

This alternative perspective on "consistency" raised some issues with respect to agreement in ratings of the core dimensions and most particularly autonomy when general cues were "consistent" or "inconsistent" with the levels of enrichment experienced on the job. It seemed reasonable to propose that when general cues were consistent with the enrichment conditions present in the job, greater levels of agreement should exist in ratings of the core dimensions than when the general information cues were inconsistent with the enrichment conditions. This relationship was examined through the Application by Interview by Cue interaction term of a MANOVA with agreement between subjects as the dependent
variable. The overall effect of this interaction was not significant ($F=2.20$, $p>.05$). Table 11 shows the extent of agreement (as indexed by absolute difference scores between the group mean and individual scores) in rating of the core dimensions by subjects exposed to consistently enriched or unenriched roles, under low or high general cue conditions. According to the preceding suggestion, greater agreement (lower absolute difference scores) were expected for subjects exposed to low cue - consistently unenriched tasks and high cue - consistently enriched tasks than for subjects in the remaining conditions. Dunn's Multiple Comparison Procedure (Kirk, 1968) indicated statistically significant differences in ratings of autonomy ($d=.94$, $p<.05$) and variety ($d=.80$, $p<.05$) between high and low cue conditions for subjects exposed to consistently unenriched conditions. For subjects in the consistently enriched condition, significantly greater agreement was found in ratings of task significance under high general cues than under low general cues. With the exception of ratings of significance under consistently unenriched conditions, and feedback under consistently enriched conditions, the remaining differences in agreement for the core dimensions were in the predicted direction though not statistically significant. These
Table 11

Mean Absolute Difference Scores as Indices of Agreement in Ratings of the Core Dimensions for Consistently Enriched and Consistently Unenriched Roles Under High and Low General Cues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimensions</th>
<th>Consistent Unenriched</th>
<th>Consistent Enriched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cue</td>
<td>High Cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>1.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>1.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>1.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>1.161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=8
differences suggest that agreement in ratings of the core dimensions was impacted by the "consistency" of the general cues to the levels of autonomy experienced on the job when both roles were similar in their levels of enrichment.

**Supplemental Analyses**

In order to further explain the outcomes of the predictions examined in this study ratings from the Follow-up Questionnaire, particularly those addressing the importance and preference assigned to the various roles of the employment counselor's job, were examined. A Chi Square was performed on the item asking subjects to indicate the role they would prefer to perform if given a choice. Table 12 shows the frequencies of subjects' responses to this item when grouped individually by the application processing and interview enrichment conditions. The Chi Square for the application processing role was significant (Chi Square = 6.02, p<.05) with a majority of subjects (even among those who experienced enriched application processing conditions) indicating a preference for the interview role. Similar preferences were found when the analyses were conducted for the interviewing role (Chi Square=7.32, p<.03).

A Chi Square analysis was also conducted on the subject's responses to an item assessing which part of
Table 12

Response Choice Frequencies to Inquiries of Role Preference by Enriched and Unenriched Role Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unenriched Applications</th>
<th>Enriched Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Applications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Interview</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preference</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 32
Chi Square = 6.02, p ≤ 0.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unenriched Interview</th>
<th>Enriched Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Applications</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Interview</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preference</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 32
Chi Square = 7.32, p ≤ 0.03
the job was most important. The results shown in Table 13 indicate that the Chi Square was not significant (Chi Square = 0.63 p > .73). However, it should be noted that only five of the 64 subjects felt that the application processing role was most important. Thirty-three subjects felt the interview role was most important, while twenty-six subjects indicated that both roles were equally important. The overall results of the Chi Square analyses show a general preference for the interview role over that of processing applications.
Table 13

Response Choice Frequencies to Inquiries of Role Importance by Enriched and Unenriched Role Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Unenriched</th>
<th>Enriched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications Most Important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Most Important</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Equally Important</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 32
Chi Square = 0.63, p > .73

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Unenriched</th>
<th>Enriched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Most Important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Most Important</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Equally Important</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 32
Chi Square = 0.63, p > .73
Chapter IV
DISCUSSION

The inference/attribution model of work dimensions introduced in this study extended the Social Information Processing model of Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) by emphasizing additional sources of information cues other than those originating from coworkers' reactions to the job. The impact of social information cues communicated through evaluative comments of coworkers has been shown to have a marked impact on the ratings given to the core dimensions of a task (O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1979; Pfeffer, 1980; White & Mitchell, 1979). This study sought to investigate the impact of more general information cues within the work environment that provided no direct evaluation of the core dimensions themselves. Another aim of the study was to examine how the presence of inconsistently enriched and unenriched elements of work would influence the use of general information cues in arriving at ratings of the core dimensions. Theories offered by Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) suggested that situations
involving ambiguity or uncertainty about the core dimensions would prompt greater reliance on information from sources other than the work itself in order to arrive at judgments about the job characteristics. Attempts were also made to test these predictions in a context that would more clearly identify the level at which inferences about the core dimensions are generated. This aspect of job design research had been largely unspecified as evidenced by the reference to core dimensions as both task and job characteristics. The concept of the work role as a more appropriate level from which to assess the core dimensions was introduced in the inference/attrition model.

Inconsistencies in Role and Informational Components

Hypotheses dealing with inconsistencies in enrichment levels between roles of a job had predicted greater disagreement in ratings of the core dimensions when enrichment levels were inconsistent than when they were consistent with one another. Inter-rater agreement was selected as the major focus of these hypotheses in an effort to better understand the factors and information attended to when rating the core dimensions. Differences in inter-rater agreement were expected to provide additional insight into the processes involved in utilizing
varied components of information in arriving at ratings of the core dimensions. Specifically, the interest in what information components are attended to when confronted with inconsistencies suggested the focus on inter-rater agreement. However, inconsistencies in the degree of enrichment comprising the elements of a job did not produce the expected impact on agreement in ratings of the core dimensions. Subjects whose roles were inconsistent with respect to the autonomy exercised in those roles did not evidence any less agreement in assigning ratings of the core dimensions for the overall job than did subjects who had experienced consistent levels of autonomy for the two roles.

One explanation for this finding was highlighted through additional analyses of responses to follow-up questions which revealed that the interviewing and application processing roles were not viewed as equivalent in terms of more affective reactions to the roles, such as the preference and importance assigned to the roles. Most subjects considered the interview role to be more important than the application processing role even when the interview was conducted under low-autonomy conditions. Similarly, subjects preferred the interview role over application processing even when the interview was unenriched.
The novelty of the interview role may have contributed to these reactions. It is likely that many subjects had never been asked to conduct an employment interview with another person. Consequently, the novelty of that experience may have promoted a greater preference for that role than for the application processing role which contained clerical components somewhat more typical of the tasks encountered by young college students. Moreover, the fact that subjects were asked to process six application blanks, yet interview only one applicant may have elevated the interview role in terms of importance to the overall job of the employment counselor. It is also possible that because an employment interview usually comes later in the employment process than that of an application review, subjects may have assigned greater importance to the interview. Although subjects were able to distinguish between enriched and unenriched roles, the differences in importance and preference assigned to those roles may have contributed to the lack of disagreement among subjects in ratings of the core dimensions for the overall job in spite of the inconsistencies in levels of enrichment between the two roles. For example, if the interview role was preferred and considered more important than the application processing role, even when
the interview was performed under unenriched conditions, the inconsistency created by an enriched application processing role may have been reduced in the eyes of the subjects due to the overriding preference and importance assigned to interview process. The influence of subjective preferences and felt importance on core dimension ratings is congruent with the ideas of Ferratt, Dunham, and Pierce (1981) who emphasized the potential impact of evaluative and affective interpretations formed from the situational context in which the work is performed.

The lack of significant differences in agreement between subjects' ratings of the core dimensions at the role levels and the overall job level suggests that the presence of more complex stimuli (i.e., the number of information components available on which to base ratings for the overall job) do not by necessity create confusion or uncertainty about how a given job should be rated. Similarly, the presence of inconsistencies in the enrichment levels experienced in the various parts of the job do not lead to self reports of confusion or uncertainty in ratings assigned to the overall job. Recall that subjects in inconsistent role conditions reported a significantly greater desire to rate the overall job as both high and low on autonomy.
However, these same subjects did not report greater feelings of uncertainty in their overall ratings than did subjects in consistent role conditions. The pattern of these results is not consistent with the views of Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) who suggested that the presence of more complex stimuli will lead to greater confusion in the ratings of core dimensions for a job. A more psychologically complex situation than that produced in this study may be necessary to produce the feeling of uncertainty hypothesized here and in the social information processing model. A more complex job, studied in a field setting so as to include informational components from a greater number of diverse roles, may reveal greater uncertainty. Nevertheless, the results of this study do not rule out the possibility that individuals synthesize multiple elements of information about a job rather routinely and in a manner that produces no greater discrepancies in core dimension ratings at the job level than when assessments are made separately for individual work roles. Perhaps too, the importance and preference for the interview role served to make this a common point of reference for subjects, thereby enhancing agreement at the job level.

The lack of significant differences in agreement for ratings of the overall job, regardless of whether role
elements were consistent or inconsistent in enrichment, indicates that participants do achieve agreement in ratings not only when multiple elements of information are present, but also when these elements are inconsistent with one another. Not only do individuals agree in their overall ratings when confronted with multiple information elements, they also seem to process inconsistencies in these multiple elements in a manner that results in no less agreement than that produced by consistent information elements.

This pattern was further corroborated by the finding that when inconsistencies in enrichment (autonomy) existed between the roles, subjects displayed no significant differences in the extent of agreement for ratings of the core dimensions taken at the individual role levels (although the differences were in the predicted direction). It had been predicted that the multiple information elements combined with inconsistencies in these elements at the job level would promote disagreement in ratings at the job level. Whereas, ratings of the core dimensions at the individual role levels were expected to show higher levels of agreement based upon the fewer number of job information elements available at this level, and the absence of discrepancies in this information. The overall lack of support for
predictions of differences in agreement for core dimension ratings suggests that neither the number of information elements, nor the inconsistencies in these elements alone or in combination is sufficient to produce uncertainty or disagreement in ratings of the core dimensions.

Although the inconsistencies in autonomy manipulated in this study did not produce feelings of uncertainty among subjects when rating the core dimensions, the results of this study cannot rule out the possibility that inconsistencies in the core dimensions experienced in a job do not influence the levels of inter-rater agreement obtained in ratings of those core dimensions. Moreover, the lack of confirmation for hypotheses predicting significant differences in agreement for ratings of the core dimensions is consistent with the evidence of high inter-rater reliability in job analysis ratings. An average inter-rater reliability coefficient of .79 was reported for the Position Analysis Questionnaire (Mecham, McCormick, & Jeanneret, 1977). Taylor (1977) reported an average "rate-rerate" reliability coefficient of .78 for ratings also obtained from the Position Analysis Questionnaire. Historically, researchers have reported even higher reliability coefficients for job analysis ratings particularly for
response scales measuring time spent and task occurrence (Brit, 1968; Christal, 1969; Cragun & McCormick, 1967). This high inter-rater agreement suggests that greater statistical power than that incorporated in the present study would have been beneficial, given that many of the study's hypotheses sought to demonstrate lower inter-rater agreement. Moreover, these high reliabilities and the results of the present study suggest that individuals generally achieve appreciable agreement when rating components of a job, even when rating core dimensions like autonomy which appear at first to require a higher level inference than reports of time spent in performing a task.

Impact of General Information Cues

The introduction of general information cues that are unrelated to the manipulations of the core dimensions (specifically autonomy) add a different dimension to the issues of consistency and agreement in ratings of the core dimensions. When inconsistency was considered from the perspective of overall enrichment levels (consistently enriched, or consistently unenriched) versus high and low general cue conditions, significant differences in the extent of agreement emerged between subjects whose general cues were consistent with the
enrichment in the overall job and subjects whose general cues were inconsistent with the overall enrichment level. Significantly greater agreement in ratings of the core dimensions for the overall job were obtained from subjects when the experienced enrichment level in the job was consistent with the general information cues than when enrichment and cues were discordant. This relationship occurred for ratings of autonomy and variety when the interviewing and application processing roles were both unenriched (low autonomy) and for ratings of significance when the work roles were both enriched.

This finding suggests that inconsistencies in information on two different dimensions, namely autonomy factors intrinsic to the work itself, and general information cues of a contextual nature, do have an adverse impact on the extent of agreement in ratings of some core dimensions. However, inconsistencies within the same dimension (autonomy experienced in the work roles) did not result in similar increases in disagreement for ratings of the core dimensions. These results point to the possible importance of the dimension on which information is provided as a factor in determining how information and inconsistencies in that information are processed.
For the other hypotheses which predicted differences in agreement for the core dimension ratings, inconsistencies existed for only one dimension; that of autonomy intrinsic to the work itself. With the introduction of general information cues, inconsistencies were created between two dimensions; that of autonomy intrinsic to the work itself and contextual features of the work environment. This situation suggests that inconsistencies alone do not lead to greater disagreement in ratings of the core dimensions, but that the nature of the inconsistencies (i.e., between different elements) may be the more critical element.

This explanation can also be applied to the failure to find significant differences in mean ratings of the core dimensions when the work roles were consistent as opposed to inconsistent in autonomy. If inconsistencies along a single dimension do not produce significant disagreement in ratings of the core dimensions, it is not unreasonable that general information cues would also fail to exert more influence under these single dimension inconsistencies than when both roles were consistent with respect of autonomy.

Another possible explanation for these findings implicates the source of information about work as an influential factor in the extent of agreement between
individuals' rating the core dimensions. In this experiment, significant differences in core dimension ratings were obtained when one source of information about the work (i.e. autonomy experienced in the work itself) was inconsistent with information from another source (i.e., general information cues within the context of the work). This situation is similar to the conditions in studies on the influence of social cues (O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1979; Weiss & Shaw, 1979; White & Mitchell, 1979) in which the job itself provided some information about the core dimensions, as did evaluations or comments from coworkers. These studies, which revealed a significant impact of social cues on ratings of the core dimensions, made use of multiple sources of information about the job.

Aside from inconsistencies in multiple sources of information, the present study also examined the impact of general information cues originating from the context in which the work was performed as an alternative to the more evaluative cues offered by coworkers as frequently manipulated in previous job design research. As with the studies utilizing social cues, it was anticipated that subjects exposed to enhanced general information about a job (i.e., high salary, elaborate office) would rate the core dimensions for this job significantly higher than
subjects exposed to detracting general information about the same job. However, no statistically significant differences were revealed between the core dimension ratings supplied by high cue versus low cue subjects.

Although this prediction was not supported, the finding that ratings for all the core dimensions were somewhat higher for subjects in high cue conditions than for those who received low information cues implies that general information cues originating from the contextual features of the work, may simply exert a weaker influence than initially hypothesized. Research on the social information processing model of Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) has generally shown a more extensive impact on core dimension ratings through social cues (O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1979; Weiss & Shaw, 1979; White & Mitchell, 1979) than that obtained through the general information cues employed in this study. Comparisons between the contextual cues encountered by subjects in this study and the social cues used in the previous research must be made cautiously, however, because the strength of the cue manipulations cannot be directly compared. Nevertheless, the source and nature of the cues may be a critical factor in determining the impact on ratings of the core dimensions. Behavior, or the social aspect affiliated with the information may tend to overshadow other sources
of information that is void of a social or behavioral component (Heider, 1958). In addition, the evaluative or affective components of the social cues predominant in previous studies may ultimately operate to enhance the impact of a cue's content on core dimension ratings (Ferratt, Dunham & Pierce, 1981). These perspectives, as well as the results of this study suggest that general information cues bearing few social, evaluative, or affective connotations do not exert the degree of influence on ratings of the core dimensions as initially proposed. Instead, future conceptualizations of information processing models might do well to propose some form of hierarchy of cues based at least in part on the source and channel through which the content of a cue is conveyed.

Additional support for these arguments was revealed by the significantly greater impact of general information cues on ratings of some core dimensions at the job level as opposed to individual role levels. Ratings of autonomy, variety, feedback, and the motivating potential score were influenced to a greater extent by the contextual cues when taken for the overall job than for the application processing role. Similar results for the interview role were obtained for ratings of identity and the motivating potential score. Although
these findings only partially support the hypothesized influence that general cues would exert a greater impact at the job level than at the level of individual work roles, the findings are consistent with the argument that general information cues do exert some degree of influence on ratings of the core dimensions.

Moreover, these results also suggest that the distinction between individual work roles and the overall job is meaningful in terms of providing ratings for the core dimensions. Factors such as general information cues operate to a greater extent at the job level than at the level of the individual role. Although significant differences in agreement between ratings at the job versus the role levels would have enhanced the distinction between roles and the total job, factors apart from the level of analysis (i.e., consistency, and preferences) may have been more responsible for the lack of support for these hypotheses. In addition, the results of manipulation checks for enrichment at the role levels showed significant differences in ratings of autonomy between enriched and unenriched roles. These differences indicate that meaningful distinctions in the core dimensions can be made at the role level, and that ratings of these dimensions at the level of the overall job do not represent the basic unit at which these
constructs can be formed. Further research is needed, however, in order to demonstrate the appropriateness of the work role over that of the individual task as the most appropriate unit from which inferences about the core dimensions are made.

**Conclusions**

Inconsistencies in the level of autonomy between two roles of a job were not found to increase the degree of disagreement in ratings of the core dimensions for the job over those obtained when the two roles were consistent in autonomy. However, when inconsistencies existed across dimensions (i.e., between enrichment levels and general information cues about a job), these inconsistencies did increase the level of disagreement in ratings of the core dimensions over those obtained by subjects who experienced general cues consistent with the levels of enrichment permitted in the job. Additional research is required to identify if this decrease in agreement was attributable primarily to the inconsistencies between two dimensions (autonomy within the job itself, and contextual cues) or possibly to varying sources of information. The source of information about a job may be a critical component in determining the extent to which the information will
influence ratings of dimensions of work.

The impact of general information cues originating from the context in which work is performed was found to play a less substantial part in influencing core dimension ratings than initially proposed by the inference/attribute model of work dimensions. Further research is needed in order to clearly specify the components of cues that are likely to enhance or detract from their impact on ratings of work dimensions. The generally weak influence of the contextual cues utilized in this study suggest that the social, evaluative, and affective components of cues may be more critical than initially proposed in the inference/attribute model. All cues are not equally utilized in arriving at ratings of the core dimensions. General information cues, however, were found to have a greater impact on core dimension ratings at the job level than at the individual role level which not only indicated that contextual information does at least play some part in constructing inferences of core dimensions, but also that the distinction between the overall job and its component work roles is useful in determining when and how information cues are used in forming these inferences.
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Appendix A

Personnel and Labor Relations Specialists
Personnel and Labor Relations Specialists

Nature of the Work

Personnel specialists and labor relations specialists concentrate on different aspects of employer-employee relations. Personnel specialists interview, select, and recommend applicants to fill job openings. They keep informed of rules and regulations pertaining to affirmative action and equal employment opportunity and oversee the implementation of policies governing hiring and advancement. They handle wage and salary administration, training and career development, and employee benefits.

In a small organization, personnel work consists mostly of interviewing and hiring, and one person can handle it all. By contrast, the professional staff of a large personnel department may include recruiters, interviewers, job analysts, benefits specialists, training specialists, and labor relations specialists. Personnel clerks and assistants handle routine tasks such as issuing forms, maintaining files, compiling statistics, and answering inquiries.

Training, Other Qualifications, and Advancement

A college degree is required for most beginning positions in this field. Prospective personnel or labor relations specialists have a wide choice of undergraduate majors, for a number of disciplines provide a suitable background. Some employers look for individuals who have majored in personnel administration or industrial and labor relations, while others prefer college graduates with a general business background. Still other employers feel that a well-rounded liberal arts education is best; many personnel specialists have degrees in psychology, sociology, counseling, or education.

Earnings

The average minimum salary in 1980 was about $13,900; the average maximum salary was about $18,800. Counselors generally receive benefits such as vacations, sick leave, pension plans, and insurance coverage.
Appendix B

Experimental Scenerio - High Cue
Experimental Scenerio

A faculty member in the industrial psychology department at Ohio State University has been awarded a contract from a major insurance company to investigate possible discrimination in its employment practices for entry level claims positions. The company has received several complaints from female and minority applicants who have not been selected for these positions. Specifically, the company asked that a study be conducted to determine if the hiring decisions made by its employment counselors were biased, and if so whether the bias was due to the counselors themselves, or possibly to the procedures that an employment counselor is expected to follow in performing his/her job. Quick action to correct any hiring discrimination could permit the company to avert some potentially damaging lawsuits.

The study that you'll participate in today is designed to compare employment judgements made by individuals who are not affiliated with our sponsor company, to the hiring decisions made by the company's own employment counselors. This comparison will allow us to identify any systematic bias in the counselors' hiring decisions.

To see if you qualify to continue in this experiment, I need to ask a few questions about your background:

Are you currently working for an insurance company?

If YES: Which one?

What previous work experience have you had?

What types of extra-curricular activities do you participate in?

Since you are not an employee of the client company, I'll be asking you to perform the job of an employment counselor for a short time today, and to make some of the necessary decisions required of a person in that position. After performing the job, I'll ask that you also complete several questionnaire items directed at your reactions to the job.

Since your past experiences and activities suggest that you interact effectively with other people, you'll be performing the work of an Employment Counselor in a more elaborate office. (Take S to other office)

(Have S sit at the desk, E sits in the side chair)

Now that we've looked at your qualifications, let's go over some information about the Employment Counselor's job that you'll be performing today.

(Give a copy of the Job Description to the subject)

(Read the Job Description to the subject)

(Show the S the organizational chart)
Appendix C

Experimental Scenerio - Low Cue
Experimental Scenario

A faculty member in the industrial psychology department at Ohio State University has been awarded a contract from a major insurance company to investigate possible discrimination in its employment practices for entry level claims positions. The company has received several complaints from female and minority applicants who have not been selected for these positions. Specifically, the company asked that a study be conducted to determine if the hiring decisions made by its employment counselors were biased, and if so whether the bias was due to the counselors themselves, or possibly to the procedures that an employment counselor is expected to follow in performing his/her job. Quick action to correct any hiring discrimination could permit the company to avert some potentially damaging lawsuits.

The study that you’ll participate in today is designed to compare employment judgements made by individuals who are not affiliated with our sponsor company, to the hiring decisions made by the company’s own employment counselors. This comparison will allow us to identify any systematic bias in the counselors’ hiring decisions.

To see if you qualify to continue in this experiment, I need to ask a few questions about your background:

Are you currently working for an insurance company?
If YES: Which one?

What previous work experience have you had?

What types of extra-curricular activities do you participate in?

Since you are not an employee of the client company, I’ll be asking you to perform the job of an employment counselor for a short time today, and to make some of the necessary decisions required of a person in that position. After performing the job, I’ll ask that you also complete several questionnaire items directed at your reactions to the job.

Since your past experiences and activities do not suggest that you are accustomed to interacting with the caliber of people normally encountered in the work of an Employment Counselor, you’ll have to perform your work in this office. Had your background included more extensive experience in interacting with other people, you’d perform your work in our more elaborate office which I’ll show you now. (Show the S the large office)

(While in the large office) This office is used by persons whose background is more suitable to the kind of work performed by an Employment Counselor.

(Take S back to small office)

Now that we’ve looked at your qualifications, let’s go over some information about the Employment Counselor’s job that you’ll be performing today.

(Give a copy of the Job Description to the subject)

(Read the Job Description to the subject)

(Show the S the organizational chart)
Appendix D

General Description of Employment
Counselor Job - High Cue
General Description of Employment Counselor Job

Introduction

While you are participating in this experiment please try to image yourself as an employment counselor for a large insurance company who is responsible for reviewing employment applications and for interviewing candidates for entry level positions with the company. The following information is a copy of the job description for employment counselors employed by the company sponsoring this study. Please take a few minutes to familiarize yourself with the job by looking over the job description as I read it aloud.

JOB DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Starting Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Counselor</td>
<td>$15.38/hr. - $32,000.00/yr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objectives:

To file employment applications in a manner that easily identifies female and minority applicants for government reporting purposes. To screen applications and schedule interviews with individuals most qualified for vacant positions. To assess the qualifications of job applicants by conducting employment interviews. To promote a positive public image of the company by highlighting the positive aspects of the company while conducting employment interviews.

Immediate Supervisor: Central Office Employment Manager

Outline of Duties and Responsibilities

A. 1. Receives employment applications.
    2. Establishes file system of submitted applications.
    3. Determines which applicants should be interviewed for vacant positions.

B. 1. Interviews applicants for vacant positions.
    2. Promotes the positive features of the company during employment interviews.
    3. Gathers information regarding the qualifications of job applicants through employment interviews.

C. Performs other duties as assigned.

Education & Experience Requirements

Master's Degree—Labor & Human Resources, Plus 8 years Personnel Experience
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Organizational Chart - Human Resources Division
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Appendix E

General Description of Employment

Counselor Job - Low Cue
General Description of Employment Counselor Job

Introduction

While you are participating in this experiment please try to image yourself as an employment counselor for a large insurance company who is responsible for reviewing employment applications and for interviewing candidates for entry level positions with the company. The following information is a copy of the job description for employment counselors employed by the company sponsoring this study. Please take a few minutes to familiarize yourself with the job by looking over the job description as I read it aloud.

JOB DESCRIPTION

Job Title:
Employment Counselor

Starting Salary:
$4.42/hr - $9,200/yr.

Objectives:

To file employment applications in a manner that easily identifies female and minority applicants for government reporting purposes. To screen applications and schedule interviews with individuals most qualified for vacant positions. To assess the qualifications of job applicants by conducting employment interviews. To promote a positive public image of the company by highlighting the positive aspects of the company while conducting employment interviews.

Immediate Supervisor: Central Office Employment Manager

Outline of Duties and Responsibilities

A. Receives employment applications.
   1. Establishes file system of submitted applications.
   2. Determines which applicants should be interviewed for vacant positions.

B. Interviews applicants for vacant positions.
   1. Interviews applicants for vacant positions.
   2. Promotes the positive features of the company during employment interviews.
   3. Gathers information regarding the qualifications of job applicants through employment interviews.

C. Performs other duties as assigned.

Education & Experience Requirements

High School Graduate - no experience required
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Application Blanks - Candidates
**Application Blank**

**Name:** Charles E. Long  
**Address:** 7122 Westborne Circle, Dayton, Ohio 45471  
**City:** Dayton  
**State:** Ohio  
**Zip Code:** 45471  
**Date of birth:** 12/11/56  
**Race:** Black  
**Sex:** Male  
**Date:** 5/29/83  
**Telephone number:** 657-9863  
**How long at this address:** 17 years  
**Position you are applying for:** Claims Adjuster

**HEALTH AND PHYSICAL CONDITION**

- **How would you rate your overall health?** Good
- **Describe any physical disabilities of defects:** Diabetes
- **During the past year how much time have you lost due to personal illness or the illness of others?** 6 days

**EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Name &amp; Location of Schools Attended</th>
<th>Dates From</th>
<th>Dates To</th>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>South Jefferson High School</td>
<td>9/74</td>
<td>6/78</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>781 Colonial Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>University of Dayton</td>
<td>9/78</td>
<td>6/82</td>
<td>B.A. Business</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

- CPCU (1 part) Insurance Training

**List any other educational or training programs:**

**List other significant activities (honors, awards, positions held, etc):**
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EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE

(1) Present or most recent position Insurance Agent

Name and Address
of Employer: Hafner and Associates  Dayton, Ohio

Describe the position: Sell Life, Auto, and Homeowner insurance

Dates of Employment: From 8/62 To present

Reasons for leaving: no advancement opportunity

(2) Previous position Bartender

Name and Address
of Employer: The Lighthouse  Dayton, Ohio

Describe the position: Bartending

Dates of Employment: From 6/80 To present

Reasons for leaving: only part-time work

GENERAL INFORMATION

Specific position for which you are applying: Claims Adjuster

Are you willing to work: days X YES NO

evenings X YES X NO

weekends X YES X NO

Are you willing to relocate? ___YES ___NO

Please check those office machines that you can operate proficiently:

dictaphone X CRT (computer terminal)

adding machine X typewriter

key punch X other (please describe):

Have you ever been convicted of a felony? ___YES ___NO

If YES please explain: ________________________________

When would you be available to start work here? DATE: 9/1/83

List community activities, hobbies, and special areas of interest, etc.

Fishing, football, any spectator sport
Application Blank

Name Salvatore A. Bruno Date 5/18/83

First Middle Last

Address 452 West 21st Ave.

Street

Chicago Illinois 53318 Telephone number 902-6134

City State Zip Code

How long at this address? 2 years

Date of birth 1/19/57 Race White

Sex Male

Position you are applying for: Claims Examiner

HEALTH AND PHYSICAL CONDITION

How would you rate your overall health?

Excellent X Good Fair Poor

Describe any physical disabilities of defects: None

During the past year how much time have you lost due to personal illness or the illness of others? 3 days

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Type of School Name & Location of Schools Attended Dates From To Degree Earned Major GPA

High School Grand Rapids Central Grand Rapids, Michigan 9/75 6/79 Diploma

College

Other

List any other educational or training programs:

U.S. Army Quality Control Training Program

List other significant activities (honors, awards, positions held, etc):
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EMPLEYMENT EXPERIENCE

(1) Present or most recent position U.S. Army Quality Control Technical Specialist

Name and Address
of Employer Fort Knox, Kentucky

Describe the position: Quality Control in Shipping & Receiving

Dates of Employment: From 12/79 To 12/82

Reasons for leaving: Did not want an Army Career

(2) Previous position Stock Boy

Name and Address
of Employer Ambell Distributing Co. Grand Rapids, Michigan

Describe the position Stocked shelves, loaded trucks

Dates of Employment: From 1/76 To 8/77

Reasons for leaving: Conflict with supervisor

GENERAL INFORMATION

Specific position for which you are applying: Claims Examiner

Are you willing to work: days X YES NO
   evenings X YES NO
   weekends X YES NO

Are you willing to relocate? X YES NO

Please check those office machines that you can operate proficiently:
   dictaphone
   CRT (computer terminal)
   X adding machine
   typewriter
   key punch
   other (please describe):

Have you ever been convicted of a felony? X YES NO
If YES please explain: Transporting stolen goods across state lines

When would you be available to start work here? DATE: 7/1/83

List Community activities, hobbies, and special areas of interest, etc.: 
   Auto Mechanics
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Application Blank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Robert J. McCreary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>5/16/83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>9384 Wainright Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Trenton, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Trenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>65681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>221-8665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long at this address?</td>
<td>16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>2/25/55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position you are applying for:</td>
<td>Claims Examiner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HEALTH AND PHYSICAL CONDITION**

How would you rate your overall health?

- Excellent
- Good [X]
- Fair
- Poor

Describe any physical disabilities of defects: Asthma

During the past year how much time have you lost due to personal illness or the illness of others? 2 weeks

**EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Name &amp; Location of Schools Attended</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Anderson High School</td>
<td>9/73  5/77</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Trenton Junior College</td>
<td>9/78  6/80</td>
<td>A.S. Mechanical Operations</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any other educational or training programs:

List other significant activities (honors, awards, positions held, etc):
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EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE

(1) Present or most recent position  Auto Body Repairman

Name and Address  Stillwell Auto Body

Describe the position  Repair and estimate auto body damage

Dates of Employment: From 7/60 To present

Reasons for leaving: Better working conditions

(2) Previous position  Delivery Driver

Name and Address  Aziq Pizza

Describe the position  Delivered food orders

Dates of Employment: From 7/77 To 4/80

Reasons for leaving: Part-time during school

GENERAL INFORMATION

Specific position for which you are applying: Claims Examiner

Are you willing to work:  
- days  X  YES  NO
- evenings  X  YES  NO
- weekends  X  YES  NO

Are you willing to relocate?  X  YES  NO

Please check those office machines that you can operate proficiently:

- dictaphone
- CRT (computer terminal)
- adding machine
- typewriter
- key punch
- other (please describe):

Have you ever been convicted of a felony?  YES  X  NO

If YES please explain:

When would you be available to start work here?  DATE:  Immediately

List Community activities, hobbies, and special areas of interest, etc.:

Little League Baseball Coach
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Application Blank

Name Irene L. Roberts

First     Middle     Last

Date 6/27/83

Address 8416 Clearview Heights Apt. #11
Street

Wheeling     West Virginia     45690
City     State     Zip Code

Date of birth 9/6/51
Race Black

Position you are applying for: Claims Adjuster

HEALTH AND PHYSICAL CONDITION

How would you rate your overall health?

Excellent X Good     Fair     Poor

Describe any physical disabilities or defects: wear glasses (myopia)

During the past year how much time have you lost due to personal illness or the illness of others? 4 days

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Type of
School

Name & Location of Schools Attended

Dates From To

Degree Earned

Major GPA

High School Clarmont School for Girls 9/71 6/75 Diploma
New York, New York

College Concord College 9/75 7/77 RN Nursing 3.20

Other University of Kentucky 9/79 6/82 B.A. Business 2.91
Lexington, Kentucky

List any other educational or training programs:

List other significant activities (honors, awards, positions held, etc):

Outstanding Nursing Student-Concord College, 1977
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EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE

(1) Present or most recent position: Registered Nurse

Name and Address of Employer: Riverside Hospital, Wheeling, West Virginia

Describe the position: General Nursing

Dates of Employment: From 7/82 To present

Reasons for leaving: Want to apply business education

(2) Previous position: Camp Counselor

Name and Address of Employer: Stone Mountain Girls Camp, Syracuse, New York

Describe the position: Supervised outdoor recreational activities

Dates of Employment: From 6/76 To 8/77

Reasons for leaving: Summer job while in college

GENERAL INFORMATION

Specific position for which you are applying: Claims Adjuster

Are you willing to work: days X YES NO
         evenings X YES NO
         weekends X YES NO

Are you willing to relocate? X YES NO

Please check those office machines that you can operate proficiently:

X dictaphone
X CRT (computer terminal)
X adding machine
X typewriter
X key punch
Other (please describe):

Have you ever been convicted of a felony? YES X NO

If YES please explain:

When would you be available to start work here? DATE: 9/1/83

List Community activities, hobbies, and special areas of interest, etc.:

Girl Scout Troop Leader
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Application Blank

Name: Julia Adams  Date: 8/25/83
First Middle Last

Address: 5733 Belmont Ave., Fort Wayne, Indiana 57842
City: Fort Wayne  State: Indiana  Zip Code: 57842

Telephone number: 874-1137

How long at this address? 9 years

Date of birth: 11/3/57  Race: White  Sex: Female

Position you are applying for: Claims Examiner

HEALTH AND PHYSICAL CONDITION

How would you rate your overall health?
Excellent X Good Fair Poor

Describe any physical disabilities of defects: None

During the past year how much time have you lost due to personal illness or the illness of others? 8 days

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Name &amp; Location of Schools Attended</th>
<th>Dates From To</th>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>St. Gregory High School, Fort Wayne, Indiana</td>
<td>9/74 6/78</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>DePauw University, Green Castle, Indiana</td>
<td>9/78 6/82</td>
<td>B.A. Home Economics 3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

List any other educational or training programs:
Certified Water Safety Instructor

List other significant activities (honors, awards, positions held, etc):
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EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE

(1) Present or most recent position: Sales Representative

Name and Address of Employer: Avon Products, Inc., Fort Wayne, Indiana

Describe the position: Sold Cosmetic Products

Dates of Employment: From 10/82 To Present

Reasons for leaving: Want to get out of sales

(2) Previous position: Library Assistant

Name and Address of Employer: DePauw University Library, Greencastle, Indiana

Describe the position: Reshuffled books

Dates of Employment: From 9/79 To 5/82

Reasons for leaving: Temporary position during college

GENERAL INFORMATION

Specific position for which you are applying: Claims Examiner

Are you willing to work: days X YES NO
                  evenings X YES NO
                  weekends X YES X NO

Are you willing to relocate? X YES NO

Please check those office machines that you can operate proficiently:

- dictaphone
- CRT (computer terminal)
- adding machine
- typewriter
- key punch
- other (please describe):

Have you ever been convicted of a felony? X YES NO

If YES please explain:

When would you be available to start work here? DATE: Sept. 1983

List Community activities, hobbies, and special areas of interest, etc.:

Junior Achievement Advisor
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Application Blank

Name Margaret P. Kolstein
Date 4/30/83

F. First M. Middle L. Last

Address 6151 Mounds Ave.

Street

Fort Thomas Kentucky 33421
City State Zip Code

How long at this address? 5 years

Date of birth 3/16/58 Race White

Sex Female

Position you are applying for: Claims Adjuster

HEALTH AND PHYSICAL CONDITION

How would you rate your overall health?

Excellent X Good _____ Fair_____ Poor_____

Describe any physical disabilities of defects: None

During the past year how much time have you lost due to personal illness or the illness of others? 1 Week

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Name &amp; Location of Schools Attended</th>
<th>Dates From To</th>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>New London High School</td>
<td>9/73 6/77</td>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aurora, Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Macomb Community College</td>
<td>9/77 6/79</td>
<td>A.S. Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Clemens, Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any other educational or training programs:

Basic Computer Programming - Continuing Education program

List other significant activities (honors, awards, positions held, etc):
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EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE

(1) Present or most recent position Personnel Clerk

Name and Address
of Employer Ferguson Manufacturing, Inc. Newport, Kentucky
Describe the position: Maintain employee personnel files
Dates of Employment: From 6/79 To Present
Reasons for leaving: Low pay

(2) Previous position Waitress

Name and Address
of Employer Clark's Deli Mt. Clemens, Michigan
Describe the position Waited on tables
Dates of Employment: From 9/77 To 5/79
Reasons for leaving: part-time during school

GENERAL INFORMATION

Specific position for which you are applying: Claims Adjuster

Are you willing to work: days X YES  NO
                        evenings X YES  NO
                        weekends X YES  NO

Are you willing to relocate? X YES  NO

Please check those office machines that you can operate proficiently:

dictaphone
adding machine
key punch
CRT (computer terminal)
X typewriter

other (please describe):

Have you ever been convicted of a felony? X YES  NO
If YES please explain: ________________________________

When would you be available to start work here? DATE:  6/1/83

List Community activities, hobbies, and special areas of interest, etc.:

Jogging, camping, boating
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Appendix G

Application Blanks - Interviewee
Application Blank

Name: Michael J. Price

First Middle Last

Date: 8/2/83

Address: 1784 Broxton Road

Street: 

Cincinnati, Ohio 45207

City State Zip Code

Race: White

Sex: Male

Date of birth: 7/10/57

Position you are applying for: Claims Examiner

HEALTH AND PHYSICAL CONDITION

How would you rate your overall health?

Excellent Good X Fair Poor

Describe any physical disabilities of defects: None

During the past year how much time have you lost due to personal illness or the illness of others? 8 days

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Type of School Name & Location of Schools Attended Dates From To Degree Earned Major GPA

High School Mt. Washington High School 8/73 5/77 High School Grad. Cincinnati, Ohio

College University of Cincinnati 9/77 6/81 B.S. Education 2.81

Cincinnati, Ohio

Other

List any other educational or training programs:

Red Cross First Aid, CPR Training

List other significant activities (honors, awards, positions held, etc):

High School Track Coach
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EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE

(1) Present or most recent position: High School Teacher

Name and Address
of Employer South Eastern School District Cincinnati, Ohio

Describe the position: Business Skills Teacher

Dates of Employment: From 8/81 To present

Reasons for leaving: Poor compensation - no advancement opportunity

(2) Previous position: Damage Inspector

Name and Address
of Employer EZ Car Rental Cincinnati, Ohio

Describe the position: Inspect cars for damage upon return to agency

Dates of Employment: From 1/82 To present

Reasons for leaving: Job is only part-time

GENERAL INFORMATION

Specific position for which you are applying: Claims Examiner

Are you willing to work: 
- days X YES NO
- evenings X YES NO
- weekends X YES NO

Are you willing to relocate? YES X NO

Please check those office machines that you can operate proficiently:

X dictaphone X CRT (computer terminal)
X adding machine X typewriter
X key punch

Other (please describe):

Have you ever been convicted of a felony? YES X NO

If YES please explain:

When would you be available to start work here? DATE: 9/1/83

List Community activities, hobbies, and special areas of interest, etc.:

Member of local teachers union organizing committee
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Application Blank

Name Michelle J. Price
Date 8/2/83

Address 17814 Broxton Road

City Cincinnati Ohio Zip Code 45207

Date of birth 7/10/57 Race White Sex Female

Position you are applying for: Claims Examiner

HEALTH AND PHYSICAL CONDITION

How would you rate your overall health?

Excellent____ Good X Fair____ Poor____

Describe any physical disabilities or defects: None

During the past year how much time have you lost due to personal illness or the illness of others? 8 days

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Type of School

Name & Location of Schools Attended Dates From To Degree Earned Major GPA

High School Mt. Washington High School 8/73 5/77 High School Grad. Cincinnati, Ohio

College University of Cincinnati 9/77 6/81 B.S. Education 2.81 Cincinnati, Ohio

Other

List any other educational or training programs:

Red Cross First Aid, CPR Training

List other significant activities (honors, awards, positions held, etc):

High School Track Coach
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Unenriched Instructions for the Application Processor Role - Recording Demographic
Unenriched Instructions for the Application Processor Role

Recording Demographic Information

General Comments (To be read only when application processing is the first role to be performed by the subject, otherwise begin with the Specific Instructions below.)

As you can tell from reading the description, the employment counselor's activities can be divided into two major parts: application processor and interviewer. You'll be performing both parts today, but to begin with let's just concentrate on application processor.

Specific Instructions

In this part of the job you'll be asked to process six applications for entry level claims positions with our client company. The first task will require that you fill out a file card for each application you process. You are to use the following system when filling out the file cards. If the application is from a:

- white male use a white file card
- white female use a green file card
- black male use a blue file card
- black female use a yellow file card

The race and sex of each applicant is indicated on the application form.

(Give "Cheat Sheet" to subject now.)

Once you've determined the proper card to use for a given application, you are to copy the following information from the application on to the file card. Be sure that you copy the information, line for line as shown in the example.

Example

LINE #1: APPLICANT'S LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, MIDDLE INITIAL
LINE #2: APPLICANT'S DATE-OF BIRTH
LINE #3: POSITION APPLICANT IS APPLYING FOR
LINE #4: DATE OF APPLICATION
LINE #5: CITY IN WHICH THE APPLICANT RESIDES
LINE #6: STATE IN WHICH THE APPLICANT RESIDES

Remember, one file card is to be completed for each application you process.

Do you have any questions about how to perform this portion of the application processing activity?
Processing Employment Applications

I. Complete one index card for each application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If the application is from a:</th>
<th>Use a:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHITE MALE</td>
<td>WHITE FILE CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE FEMALE</td>
<td>GREEN FILE CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK MALE</td>
<td>BLUE FILE CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK FEMALE</td>
<td>YELLOW FILE CARD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Enter the following information on each file card.

LINE #1: APPLICANT'S LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, MIDDLE INITIAL
LINE #2: APPLICANT'S DATE OF BIRTH
LINE #3: POSITION APPLICANT IS APPLYING FOR
LINE #4: DATE OF APPLICATION
LINE #5: CITY IN WHICH APPLICANT RESIDES
LINE #6: STATE IN WHICH APPLICANT RESIDES

III. Apply the following standards to determine if an applicant qualifies for an employment interview. An applicant MUST pass ALL of the standards in order to qualify for an interview.

1. Applicant has at least 2 years of full-time work experience
2. Applicant has at least a 2 year college degree
3. Applicant has not been convicted of a felony
4. Applicant can type
5. Applicant is willing to work during the evenings and on weekends

Check INT on the application - if the applicant QUALIFIES for an interview

Check REJ on the application - if the applicant does NOT QUALIFY for an interview
Appendix I

Enriched Instructions for the Application Processor Role - Recording Demographic Information
Enriched Instructions for the Application Processor Role

Recording Demographic Information

General Comments (To be read only when application processing is the first role to be performed by the subject, otherwise begin with the Specific Instructions below.)

As you can tell from the description, the employment counselor's activities can be divided into two major parts: application processor and interviewer. You'll be performing both parts today, but to begin with let's just concentrate on application processor.

Specific Instructions

In this part of the session you'll be asked to process six applications for entry level claims positions with our client company. You are to fill out a file card for each application you process. File cards are available in four different colors so that you can establish a color code for identifying the race and sex of the candidates whose applications you process just by the color of the file card. For example, some employment counselors use a:

- white file card for all white male applications
- green file card for all white female applications
- blue file card for all black male applications
- yellow file card for all black female applications

However, this is only one of many possible color schemes. You are free to use this or any other color scheme you desire provided it enables you to identify the race and sex of the applicant by the color of the file card. The race and sex of each candidate will be found on their application blank.

(Give "Cheat Sheet" to subject now.)

Once you've decided on your color scheme please copy at least the following information items from the application blank onto the file card for that candidate.

- Applicant's last name, first name, and middle initial
- Applicant's date of birth
- Position applicant is applying for
- Date of application
- City and state in which the applicant resides.

These items of information and any others you choose to record may be copied in any order that you feel is best. Remember, one file card is to be completed for each application you process.

Do you have any questions about how to record information from the application blanks?

K6(2.20-1)ce
Processing Employment Applications

I. Complete one index card for each application. Establish a color coded file system using the color of the file card to indicate the race and sex of the applicant.

For Example:

WHITE MALES - might be indicated by a WHITE FILE CARD

II. Enter quick reference information on each file card. Sometimes this information is useful for quick retrieval of an applicant's age, geographic location, desired position, and date of application. Please copy those facts about an applicant from the application blank which you feel would best allow you to quickly report on these and any other important characteristics of a candidate.

III. Next decide whether or not each applicant qualifies for a personal interview. In the past, some counselors have considered such things as the applicant's employment history, arrest record, formal education, office machine skills and flexibility in working hours in making this decision. However, please use your own best judgement in deciding which applicants should and should not be interviewed.

Check INT on the application - if you feel the applicant SHOULD be interviewed for the claims position

Check REJ on the application - if you feel the applicant SHOULD NOT be interviewed for the claims position
Appendix J

Unenriched Instructions for the Application
Processor Role - Selecting Applicants
to be Interviewed
Unenriched Instructions for the Application Processor Role

Selecting Applicants to be Interviewed

Instructions

Another activity you'll have to perform when processing applications is to decide whether or not an applicant qualifies for a personal interview. This decision is made by applying the following standards to each application.

1. Applicant has at least 2 years of full-time work experience.
2. Applicant has at least a 2 year college degree.
3. Applicant has not been convicted of an felony.
4. The applicant can type.
5. The applicant is willing to work during the evenings and on weekends.

If you can answer NO to any of these questions, the applicant does not qualify for an interview for the claims position. In this case you must indicate that the applicant DOES NOT QUALIFY by checking the REJ. box in the "Office Use Only" portion of the application blank.

If you were able to answer YES to each of the questions above, the applicant qualifies for a personal interview. You must therefore check the INT. box in the "Office Use Only" portion of the application blank.

These standards must be strictly applied to each application. No exceptions are permitted.

(Give 6 applications to the subject here.)

Do you have any questions about this part of processing the application blanks?

General Comments

In processing these applications, you must complete all the activities in exactly the order I have specified. That is, you must record the demographic data from all six applications before deciding if any of the applicants qualify for an interview.
Appendix K

Enriched Instructions for the Application Processor Role - Selecting Applicants to be Interviewed
Enriched Instructions for the Application Processor Role

Selecting Applicants to be Interviewed

Instructions

Another activity you'll have to perform when processing applications is to decide whether or not an applicant qualifies for a personal interview. In the past, employment counselors usually consider such things as the applicant's employment history, arrest record, formal education, office machine skills, and flexibility in working hours in deciding which applicants should be interviewed. Please use your own best judgment in deciding which applicants should or should not be interviewed. (Give 6 applications to subject here.) If you decide that an applicant is NOT qualified for an interview, please indicate your decision by checking the REJ. box in the "Office Use Only" portion of the application blank. If you decide that an applicant IS qualified for an interview, please check the INT. box in the "Office Use Only" portion of the application blank.

Do you have any questions about this part of processing of the employment applications?

General Comments

In performing these application processing activities, you are free to perform the activities in any order or combination that works best for you. For example, some counselors record all the quick reference information from all the applications before deciding if any of the applicants qualify for an interview. Others perform the activities in the opposite order, while still others record the quick reference information and decide on the qualifications almost simultaneously for each application. Please use whatever method works best for you.
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Unenriched Instructions for the Interviewer Role - Highlighting the Company's Benefits
Unenriched Instructions for the Interviewer Role

Highlighting the Company's Benefits

General Comments

A major part of an employment counselor's activities involves interviewing job applicants. In this experiment you'll be responsible for conducting an employment interview with an applicant for an entry level claims position. Part of the interview will require you to highlight for the applicant, some of the benefits of working for this company. The rest of the interview you will spend asking the applicant some questions about his/her qualifications for the job. First, let's focus on that part of the interview where you highlight the benefits offered by the company for the applicant.

Specific Instructions

As part of the interview guide for entry level claims positions (give interview guide to the subject here), you'll be required to read the following script to the applicant. This script assures that each applicant is presented with the same facts about the company.

Let me fill you in on just some of the benefits that you'll enjoy as an employee with our company. Since the person who fills this position will work in the claims department, you'll be able to participate in our flexi-time program which allows you to begin work anytime between 7 and 9 in the morning. Of course your starting time determines your quitting time. The earlier you start the earlier you can leave in the evening.

We also have a liberal vacation program in that after 4 years of employment with the company you qualify for 3 weeks of vacation. The vacation days can easily mount up to 4 weeks if you choose to exchange your unused sick time for vacation days. You will also be able to choose from several medical and health insurance programs, one of which pays for 100% of all medical related costs incurred by the employee or his/her family. The cost of health insurance to the employee depends upon the plan you select. I think you'll agree that we have one of the finest benefits packages available in our industry today.

When presenting these benefits to the applicant please read the script word for word as it appears here. Do you have any questions about how to conduct this portion of the interview?
Appendix M

Enriched Instructions for the Interviewer
Role - Highlighting the Company's Benefits
Enriched Instructions for the Interviewer Role

Highlighting the Company's Benefits

General Comments

A major part of an employment counselor's activities involves interviewing job applicants. In this part of the experiment, you'll be responsible for conducting an employment interview with an applicant for an entry level claims position. Part of the interview will require you to highlight for the applicant, some of the benefits of working for this company. The rest of the interview you will spend asking the applicant some questions about his/her qualifications for the job. First, let's focus on highlighting the benefits offered by the company for the applicant.

Specific Instructions

A list of the benefits available to employees of the company will be provided to help you with this part of the interview.

(Give list of Company benefits to subject here.)

You may choose to mention some or all of these benefits to the applicant. Usually, most counselors prefer to highlight only those that would be most attractive to the individual applicant. Please feel free to use the information contained on this list in whatever way you feel would most impress the applicant. Do you have any questions about how to conduct this portion of the interview?
INSTRUCTIONS:
You may explain any or all of these benefits to the applicant during the employment interview.

Vacation
2 weeks after 1 year of service
3 weeks after 4 years of service
4 weeks after 10 years of service
Option to exchange unused sick days for extra vacation days.

Flexi-Time
Start work between 7:00 and 9:00 A.M. Finish between 3:30 and 5:30 P.M., depending on start time.

Medical and Health Insurance
Three plans available—employee choose the plan(s) to best suit his/her needs.

1. 100% coverage
2. Comprehensive and major medical
3. Dental and vision

*Cost to employee depends upon the plan selected.
Credit Union

VISA

Low interest loans
Automatic check deposit

Employee Activities Program

Use of physical fitness facilities
Travel club
Employee blood bank

Early Retirement Program

Retire at age 55 with 75% pension.
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Interview Guide and Unenriched Instructions for the Interviewer Role - Assessing the Applicant's Qualifications
Unenriched Instructions for the Interviewer Role

Assessing the Applicant’s Qualifications

Instructions

Also during the interview you will be required to assess the applicant’s qualifications for an entry level claims position by asking the applicant some questions about his/her background and experiences. The following script is provided to ensure that each applicant is asked the same questions during the employment interview. You are to follow this script word for word when interviewing the applicant for the claims position. Please take a few minutes now to review the interview guide.

Before the interview, you’ll receive a copy of the candidate’s application blank. It will provide you with some background information about the applicant. (Give the application blank to the subject here.)

Once you have completed the interview and dismissed the applicant, you are to make an employment recommendation based upon the information obtained from the application blank and through the employment interview.

This recommendation is made by applying the following standards:

1. In his or her present job(s), the applicant must occasionally work more than 40 hours a week.
2. The applicant is willing to accept a starting salary of less than $18,000.
3. On his or her present job, the applicant is NOT required to supervise other employees.
4. The applicant has some “good things” to say about his/her present job.
5. The applicant’s current job requires frequent interaction with other people, customers, etc.

If you can answer NO to any of these statements, the applicant CANNOT be hired for the claims position. In this case you must recommend that the applicant NOT be hired by checking the PASS box in the “Office Use Only” portion of the application.

If you can answer YES to each of the statements, the applicant should be recommended for the claims position. You must, therefore, check the HIRE box in the “Office Use Only” portion of the application blank.

These standards must be strictly applied. No exceptions are permitted.
GENERAL COMMENTS

In conducting the employment interview, you must carry out both parts of the interview in exactly the order I have specified. That is, you must highlight the company benefits for the applicant before asking questions about the applicant's qualifications for the job.

In a few minutes, the applicant will knock at the door. Please answer the door and begin the interview at that time. The applicant is an employee from the claims department of the sponsor company who will be playing the role of a job applicant. Nevertheless, please carry out the interview as you have been instructed. The interview should take about 10-20 minutes, so after you've dismissed the applicant wait here for me to return.

Do you have any questions about how to conduct the interview?
INSTRUCTIONS: Follow this script word for word when interviewing the applicant for the claims position. DO NOT add your own words or make up your own questions. Ask only those questions that appear in this interview guide.

* (Shake hands with the applicant)

"Hi, ___(APPLICANT'S NAME)___, I'm ___(YOUR NAME)____. Won't you have a seat?"

"Today, I'd like to discuss our entry level claims position with you, and ask you to elaborate on some of the information on your application."

"But first let me fill you in on just some of the benefits that you'll enjoy as an employee with our company. Since the person who fills this position will work in the claims department, you'll be able to participate in our flexi-time program which allows you to begin work anytime between 7:00 and 9:00 in the morning. Of course your starting time determines your quitting time. The earlier you start the earlier you can leave in the evening. We also have a liberal vacation program in that after 4 years of employment with the company you qualify for 3 weeks of vacation. The vacation days can easily mount up to 4 weeks if you choose to exchange your unused sick time for vacation days. You will also be able to choose from several medical and health insurance programs, one of which pays for 100% of all medical related costs incurred by the employee or his/her family. The cost of health insurance to the employee depends upon the plan you select. I think you'll agree that we have one of the finest benefits packages available in our industry today."

"Now I'd like to find out a little more about you. "Let me start by asking you about your background. While I have some information about you from your application, I'd like you to be more specific."

What were the things you liked to do most in school?

How did you do in your classes?

What was your most difficult class and how did you handle it?

What extracurricular activities did you participate in during your years in school?

How did you get your present job?

What were your actual job duties?

What kind of salary are you accustomed to in your present job?

Tell me about the work load that you have on your present job?

Describe the kind of supervision you have on your present job.
What aspects of the job give you the most satisfaction/dissatisfaction?

Why do you want to leave your present job?

What kind of experience have you had in the insurance industry?

What kind of income do you anticipate here?

That's all the information I need for now. Let me assure you that we will contact you within the next 2 weeks to inform you of our employment decision.

I've enjoyed talking with you.

(Stand and open the door for the applicant)

Now make your employment recommendation by strictly applying the following standards. You must be able to answer YES to all of the following standards in order to recommend that the applicant be hired.

1. Applicant must occasionally work more than 40 hours a week in his/her present job(s).

2. Applicant is willing to accept a starting salary of less than $12,000.

3. In his/her present job the applicant is not required to supervise other employees.

4. The applicant has some "good things" to say about his/her present job.

5. The applicant's current job requires frequent interactions with other people, customers, etc.

Check HIRE — if you can answer YES to ALL of these statements.

Check PASS — if you can answer NO to ONE OR MORE of these statements.
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Enriched Instructions for the Interviewer
Role - Assessing the Applicants
Qualifications
Enriched Instructions for the Interviewer Role

Assessing the Applicant's Qualifications

Instructions

Also during the interview you will be required to assess the applicant's qualifications for an entry level claims position by asking the applicant about his/her background and experiences. You will be provided with a list of sample questions of the type typically used by employment counselors when interviewing applicants. (Give sample questions to the subject now.) These questions are intended to tap the applicant's strengths and weaknesses in several major categories including: initiative, stress management, commitment, and insurance knowledge. The following list shows the kind of questions that can be used to assess the applicant's qualifications in each of these major categories. The Xs following each question indicate the categories that the question typically addresses.

Feel free to use any of the sample questions you think are appropriate in your interview with the job applicant. It is also perfectly acceptable to develop and use your own questions throughout the interview. Please take a few minutes now to review the materials.

Before the interview you'll receive a copy of the candidate's application blank. It will provide you with some background information about the applicant. (Give application to subject now.)

Once you have completed the interview and dismissed the applicant, you are to make an employment recommendation based upon the information obtained from the application blank and through the employment interview. Please indicate your employment recommendation by checking the appropriate item in the "Office Use Only" section of the candidate's application blank.

If you recommend that the applicant be hired — check HIRE.

If you recommend that the applicant NOT be hired — check PASS.

GENERAL COMMENTS

In conducting the employment interview, you are free to carry out both parts of the interview in whatever order you feel is best. That is, you may wish to highlight the benefits of the company early in the interview, at the end of the interview, or possibly even at several different times throughout the interview. Similarly, the times during the interview in which you wish to assess the applicant's qualifications for the job are left up to you.

In several minutes, the applicant will knock at the door. Please answer the door and begin the interview at that time. The applicant is an employee from the claims department of the sponsor company who will be playing the role of a job applicant. Nevertheless, please carry out the interview as you have
been instructed. The interview should take about 10-20 minutes, so after you've dismissed the applicant wait here for me to return. (Give "Suggestions Sheet" to subject now.)

This sheet offers some suggestions that may be useful in conducting the experiment. Do you have any questions about how to conduct the interview?
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Sample Interview Questions
SAMPLE QUESTIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: You may use any or all of these questions in assessing the applicant's qualifications. You may also form questions of your own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR QUALIFICATION CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What were the things you liked to do most in school? X X
- How did you do in your classes? X X
- What was your most difficult class and how did you handle it? X X X
- What extracurricular activities did you participate in during your years in school? X X X
- How did you get your present job? X X
- What were your actual duties? X
- What kind of salary are you accustomed to in your present job? X
- Tell me about the work load that you have on your job X
- Describe the kind of supervision you have on your present job X X X
- What aspects of your job give you the most satisfaction/dissatisfaction? X X
- Why do you want to leave your present job? X X
- What kind of experience have you had in the insurance industry? X
- What in your background qualifies you to work in the claims dept.? X X
- What kind of income do you anticipate here? X X
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Suggestions for Conducting Employment Interviews

You may want to begin the interview by:
- Shaking hands with the applicant
- Introducing yourself
- Inviting the applicant to sit down
- Letting the applicant know that during the interview you will be discussing the information on his/her application blank, as well as providing some information about working for this company

You may want to close the interview by:
- Telling the applicant that the company will inform him/her of the employment decision in the near future
- Informing the applicant that you enjoyed talking with him/her
- Opening the door for the applicant

Once you've dismissed the applicant, please indicate your employment recommendation at the top of the candidate's application form.

Check HIRE - if you recommend hiring the applicant
Check PASS - if you recommend NOT hiring the applicant
Appendix Q

Work Description Scale - Processing

Employment Applications
Work Description Scale
Processing Employment Applications

Instructions

This part of the questionnaire asks you to describe the work of processing employment applications as objectively as you can. Please do not use this part of the questionnaire to show how much you like or dislike this part of the job. Instead try to make your descriptions as accurate and as objective as you possibly can.

SECTION I

Each question in this section is followed by a rating scale you are to use in responding to that particular question. You are to circle the number on the scale which is the most accurate description of the work of processing employment applications as you experienced it in this experiment.

PLEASE BE SURE TO ANSWER EVERY ITEM.

BASE YOUR ANSWERS ON HOW YOU EXPERIENCED PROCESSING EMPLOYMENT APPLICATIONS IN THIS EXPERIMENT!!

1. In this experiment, to what extent does the work of processing employment applications require you to work closely with other people (either the general public or people in related jobs within the company)?

| Very little; dealing with other people is not at all necessary in doing this part of the job. | Moderately; some dealing with others is necessary. | Very much; dealing with other people is an absolutely essential and crucial element of doing this part of the job. |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

2. In this experiment, how much autonomy is there in the work of processing employment applications? That is, to what extent does this part of the job permit you to decide on your own how and when to do the work?

| Very little; this part of the job gives me almost no personal "say" about how and when the work is done. | Moderate autonomy; many things are standardized and not under my control, but I can make some decisions about the work. | Very much; this part of the job gives me almost complete responsibility for deciding how and when the work is done. |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
3. In this experiment, to what extent does processing employment applications involve doing a "whole" and identifiable piece of work? That is, is this part of the job a complete piece of work that has an obvious beginning and end? Or is it only a small part of the overall piece of work, which is finished by other people or by automatic machines?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This part of the job is only a tiny part of the overall piece of work; the results of my activities cannot be seen in the final product or service.</td>
<td>This part of the job is a moderate-sized &quot;chunk&quot; of the overall piece of work; my own contribution can be seen in the final outcome.</td>
<td>This part of the job involves doing a whole piece of work from start to finish; the results of my activities are easily seen in the final product or service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In this experiment, how much variety is there in processing employment applications? That is, to what extent does this part of the job require you to do many different things at work, using a variety of your skills and talents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little; this part of the job requires me to do the same routine things over and over again.</td>
<td>Moderate variety.</td>
<td>Very much; this part of the job requires me to do many different things, using a number of different skills and talents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In general in this experiment, how significant or important is the work of processing employment applications? That is, are the results of this part of the job likely to significantly affect the lives or well-being of other people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not very significant; the outcomes of this part of the job are not likely to have important effects on other people.</td>
<td>Moderately significant.</td>
<td>Highly significant; the outcomes of this part of the job can affect other people in very important ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. In this experiment, to what extent does processing employment applications provide you with information about your work performance? That is, does this part of the job itself provide clues about how well you are doing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little; this part of the job itself is set up so I could work forever without finding out how well I am doing.</td>
<td>Moderately; some times doing this part of the job provides &quot;feedback&quot; to me; sometimes it does not.</td>
<td>Very much; this part of the job is set up so that I get almost constant &quot;feedback&quot; as I work about how well I am doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listed below are a number of statements which could be used to describe work. You are to indicate whether each statement is an ACCURATE or an INACCURATE description of the work involved in processing employment applications.

Once again, please try to be as objective as you can in deciding how accurately each statement describes this part of the job—regardless of whether you like or dislike this part of the job.

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How accurate is the statement in describing the work involved in processing employment applications as experienced in this experiment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate</td>
<td>Inaccurate</td>
<td>Inaccurate</td>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td>Accurate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. This part of the job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.

3. This part of the job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people.

9. This part of the job is arranged so that I do not have the chance to do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.

10. Just doing the work required in this part of the job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.

11. This part of the job is quite simple and repetitive.

12. This part of the job can be done adequately by a person working alone—without talking or checking with other people.

13. This part of the job is one where a lot of other people can be affected by how well the work gets done.

14. This part of the job denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgement in carrying out the work.

15. This part of the job provides me the chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin.

16. This part of the job itself provides very few clues about whether or not I am performing well.

17. This part of the job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.

18. This part of the job itself is NOT very significant or important in the broader scheme of things.
20. This part of the job requires me to personally handle work from beginning to end.

21. The quality of my work in this part of the job can have a major influence on others.

22. This part of the job allows the opportunity for independent thought and action.

23. Doing this part of the job gives me the feeling that I know whether I am performing my work well or poorly.

24. Dealing with other people is necessary in this part of the job.

SECTION III

Now please indicate how you personally feel about the application processing part of the job.

Each of the statements below is something that a person might say about this portion of his or her job. You are to indicate your own, personal feelings about this part of the job by marking how much you agree with each of the statements.

Write the number in the blank before each statement, based on this scale:

How much do you agree with the statement?

1.2.3.4.5.6.7

Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Neutral Slightly Agree Strongly Cannot Judge

25. My opinion of myself went up when I did this part of the job well.

26. Generally speaking, I was very satisfied with this part of the job.

27. I felt a great sense of personal satisfaction when I performed this part of the job well.
28. I frequently thought about not completing this part of the job.
29. I would feel bad and unhappy if I discovered that I had performed poorly on this part of the job.
30. I was generally satisfied with the kind of work I did in this part of the job.
31. My own feelings would generally NOT be affected much one way or the other by how well I did on this part of the job.
32. I was generally satisfied with the office facilities provided for this part of the job.

SECTION IV

Now please indicate how satisfied you are with each aspect of processing employment applications listed below. Once again, write the appropriate number in the blank before each statement.

How satisfied are you with this aspect of processing employment applications?

33. The amount of pay I receive.
34. The amount of personal growth and development I get in doing this part of the job.
35. The physical setting (office, desk, etc.) where I worked.
36. The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment I get from doing this part of the job.
37. The prestige and status associated with this part of the job.
38. The degree to which I am fairly paid for what I contribute to this organization.
39. The amount of independent thought and action I can exercise in this part of the job.
40. The amount of challenge in this part of the job.
Appendix R

Work Description Scale - Interviewing
Job Applicants
Work Description Scale
Interviewing Job Applicants

Instructions

This part of the questionnaire asks you to describe the work of interviewing job applicants as objectively as you can. Please do not use this section of the questionnaire to show how much you like or dislike this part of the job. Instead try to make your descriptions as accurate and as objective as you possibly can.

SECTION I

Each question in this section is followed by a rating scale you are to use in responding to that particular question. You are to circle the number on the scale which is the most accurate description of the work of interviewing job applicants as you experienced it in this experiment.

PLEASE BE SURE TO ANSWER EVERY ITEM.

BASE YOUR ANSWERS ON HOW YOU EXPERIENCED INTERVIEWING JOB APPLICANTS IN THIS EXPERIMENT!!

1. In this experiment, to what extent does the work of interviewing job applicants require you to work closely with other people (either the general public or people in related jobs within the company)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little; dealing with other people is not at all necessary in doing this part of the job.</td>
<td>Moderately; some dealing with others is necessary.</td>
<td>Very much; dealing with other people is an absolutely essential and crucial element of doing this part of the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In this experiment, how much autonomy is there in the work of interviewing job applicants? That is, to what extent does this part of the job permit you to decide on your own how to go about doing the work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little; this part of the job gives me almost no personal &quot;say&quot; about how and when the work is done.</td>
<td>Moderate autonomy; many things are not under my control, but I can make some decisions about the work.</td>
<td>Very much; this part of the job gives me almost complete responsibility for deciding how and when the work is done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. In this experiment, to what extent does interviewing job applicants involve doing a "whole" and identifiable piece of work? That is, is this part of the job a complete piece of work that has an obvious beginning and end? Or is it only a small part of the overall piece of work, which is finished by other people or by automatic machines?

1) This part of the job is only a tiny part of the overall piece of work; the results of my activities cannot be seen in the final product or service.

2) This part of the job is a moderate-sized "chunk" of the overall piece of work; my own contribution can be seen in the final outcome.

3) This part of the job is a large part of the overall piece of work; the results of my activities are easily seen in the final product or service.

4. In this experiment, how much variety is there in interviewing job applicants? That is to what extent does this part of the job require you to do many different things at work, using a variety of your skills and talents?

1) Very little; this part of the job requires me to do the same routine things over and over again.

2) Moderate variety.

3) Very much; this part of the job requires me to do many different things, using a number of different skills and talents.

5. In general in this experiment, how significant or important is the work of interviewing job applicants? That is, are the results of this part of the job likely to significantly affect the lives or well-being of other people?

1) Not very significant; the outcomes of this part of the job are not likely to have important effects on other people.

2) Moderately significant.

3) Highly significant; the outcomes of this part of the job can affect other people in very important ways.

6. In this experiment, to what extent does interviewing job applicants provide you with information about your work performance? That is, does this part of the job itself provide clues about how well you are doing?

1) Very little; this part of the job itself tells me very little about how well I am doing.

2) Moderate; some times doing this part of the job provides "feedback" to me about how well I am doing.

3) Very much; every part of the job tells me how well I do it and gives me feedback about my work.

4) Extreme; this part of the job itself tells me exactly how well I am doing.
Section II

Listed below are a number of statements which could be used to describe work. You are to indicate whether each statement is an accurate or an inaccurate description of the work involved in interviewing job applicants. Once again, please try to be as objective as you can in deciding how accurately each statement describes this part of the job—regardless of whether you like or dislike this part of the job.

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How accurate is the statement in describing the work involved in interviewing job applicants as experienced in this experiment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Inaccurate</th>
<th>Mostly Inaccurate</th>
<th>Slightly Inaccurate</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Slightly Accurate</th>
<th>Mostly Accurate</th>
<th>Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. This part of the job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.
8. This part of the job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people.
9. This part of the job is arranged so that I do not have the chance to do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.
10. Just doing the work required in this part of the job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.
11. This part of the job is quite simple and repetitive.
12. This part of the job can be done adequately by a person working alone—without talking or checking with other people.
13. This part of the job is one where a lot of other people can be affected by how well the work gets done.
14. This part of the job denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgement in carrying out the work.
15. This part of the job provides me the chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin.
16. This part of the job itself provides very few clues about whether or not I am performing well.
17. This part of the job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.
18. This part of the job itself is not very significant or important in the broader scheme of things.
19. The tasks I perform in this part of the job are similar.

20. This part of the job requires me to personally handle work from beginning to end.

21. The quality of my work in this part of the job can have a major influence on others.

22. This part of the job allows the opportunity for independent thought and action.

23. Doing this part of the job gives me the feeling that I know whether I am performing my work well or poorly.

24. Dealing with other people is necessary in this part of the job.

SECTION III

Now please indicate how you personally feel about the interviewing job applicants part of the job.

Each of the statements below is something that a person might say about this portion of his or her job. You are to indicate your own personal feelings about this part of the job by marking how much you agree with each of the statements.

Write a number in the blank before each statement, based on this scale:

How much do you agree with the statement?

1 ——— 2 ——— 3 ——— 4 ——— 5 ——— 6 ——— 7

Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Slightly Neutral Agree Agree Strongly Agree

25. My opinion of myself went up when I did this part of the job well.

26. Generally speaking, I was very satisfied with this part of the job.

27. I felt a great sense of personal satisfaction when I performed this part of the job well.
23. I frequently thought about not completing this part of the job.

29. I would feel bad and unhappy if I discovered that I had performed poorly on this part of the job.

30. I was generally satisfied with the kind of work I did in this part of the job.

31. My own feelings would generally NOT be affected much one way or the other by how well I did on this part of the job.

32. I was generally satisfied with the office facilities provided for this part of the job.

SECTION IV

Now please indicate how satisfied you are with each aspect of interviewing job applicants listed below. Once again, write the appropriate number in the blank before each statement.

How satisfied are you with this aspect of interviewing job applicants?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
Very Dissat- Slightly Neutral Slightly Satis- Very Cannot
satisfied dissatisfied satisfied satisfied satisfied satisfied

33. The amount of pay I receive.

34. The amount of personal growth and development I get in doing this part of the job.

35. The physical setting (office, desk, etc.) where I work.

36. The prestige and status associated with this part of the job.

37. The degree to which I am fairly paid for what I contribute to this organization.

38. The amount of independent thought and action I can exercise in this part of the job.

40. The amount of challenge in this part of the job.
Appendix S

Work Description Scale - Overall Job
of Employment Counselor
Work Description Scale
Overall Job of Employment Counselor

Instructions

This part of the questionnaire asks you to describe the overall job of an employment counselor as objectively as you can. Please do not use this part of the questionnaire to show how much you like or dislike the overall job. Instead try to make your descriptions as accurate and as objective as you possibly can.

SECTION I

Each question in this section is followed by a rating scale you are to use in responding to that particular question. You are to circle the number on the scale which is the most accurate description of the overall job as you experienced it in this experiment.

PLEASE BE SURE TO ANSWER EVERY ITEM.
BASE YOUR ANSWERS ON HOW YOU EXPERIENCED THE OVERALL JOB IN THIS EXPERIMENT!!

1. In this experiment, to what extent does the overall job require you to work closely with other people (either the general public or people in related jobs within the company)?

1——2——3——4——5——6——7

Very little; dealing with other people is not at all necessary in doing the job.

Moderately; some dealing with others is necessary.

Very much; dealing with other people is an absolutely essential and crucial part of doing the job.

2. In this experiment, how much autonomy is there in the job? That is, to what extent does the job permit you to decide on your own how to go about doing the work?

1——2——3——4——5——6——7

Very little; the job gives me almost no personal "say" about how and when the work is done.

Moderate autonomy; many things are standardized and not under my control, but I can make some decisions about the work.

Very much; the job gives me almost complete responsibility for deciding how and when the work is done.
3. In this experiment, to what extent does the job involve doing a "whole" and identifiable piece of work? That is, is the job a complete piece of work that has an obvious beginning and end? Or is it only a small part of the overall piece of work, which is finished by other people or by automatic machines?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My job is only a tiny part of the overall piece of work; the results of my activities cannot be seen in the final product or service.</td>
<td>My job is a moderate-sized &quot;chunk&quot; of the overall piece of work; my own contribution can be seen in the final outcome.</td>
<td>My job involves doing the whole piece of work, from start to finish; the results of my activities are easily seen in the final product or service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In this experiment, how much variety is there in the job? That is, to what extent does the job require you to do many different things at work, using a variety of your skills and talents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little; the job requires me to do the same routine things over and over again.</td>
<td>Moderate variety.</td>
<td>Very much; the job requires me to do many different things, using a number of different skills and talents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In general in this experiment, how significant or important is the job? That is, are the results of your work likely to significantly affect the lives or well-being of other people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not very significant; the outcomes of my work are not likely to have important effects on other people.</td>
<td>Moderately significant.</td>
<td>Highly significant; the outcomes of my work can affect other people in very important ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. In this experiment, to what extent does doing the job itself provide you with information about your work performance? That is, does the actual work itself provide clues about how well you are doing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little; the job itself is set up so I could work forever without finding out how well I am doing.</td>
<td>Moderately; some times doing the job provides &quot;feedback&quot; to me; sometimes it does not.</td>
<td>Very much; the job is set up so that I get almost constant &quot;feedback&quot; as I work about how well I am doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION II

Listed below are a number of statements which could be used to describe a job. You are to indicate whether each statement is an ACCURATE or an INACCURATE description of the overall job of an employment counselor.

Once again, please try to be as objective as you can in deciding how accurately each statement describes the job—regardless of whether you like or dislike the job.

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How accurate is the statement in describing the job as you experienced it in this experiment?

| 1 Very inaccurate | 2 Mostly inaccurate | 3 Slightly inaccurate | 4 Uncertain | 5 Slightly accurate | 6 Mostly accurate | 7 Very accurate |

_7. The job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills._

_8. The job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people._

_9. The job is arranged so that I do not have the chance to do an entire piece of work from beginning to end._

_10. Just doing the work required on the job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing._

_11. The job is quite simple and repetitive._

_12. The job can be done adequately by a person working alone—without talking or checking with other people._

_13. This job is one where a lot of other people can be affected by how well the work gets done._

_14. The job denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgement in carrying out the work._

_15. The job provides me the chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin._

_16. The job itself provides very few clues about whether or not I am performing well._

_17. The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work._

_18. The job itself is NOT very significant or important in the broader scheme of things._
The tasks I perform in this job are similar.
This job requires me to personally handle work from beginning to end.
The quality of my work in this job can have a major influence on others.
This job allows the opportunity for independent thought and action.
Doing this job gives me the feeling that I know whether I am performing my work well or poorly.
Dealing with other people is necessary in this job.

SECTION III

Now please indicate how you personally feel about the overall job.

Each of the statements below is something that a person might say about his or her job. You are to indicate your own, personal feelings about the overall job by marking how much you agree with each of the statements.

Write the number in the blank before each statement, based on this scale:

How much do you agree with the statement?

1 Strongly Disagree 2 Slightly Disagree 3 Neutral 4 Slightly Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6 Cannot Judge 7

25. My opinion of myself went up when I did this job well.
26. Generally speaking, I was very satisfied with the overall job.
27. I felt a great sense of personal satisfaction when I performed this job well.
28. I frequently thought about not completing this job.

29. I would feel bad and unhappy if I discovered that I had performed poorly on this job.

30. I was generally satisfied with the kind of work I did in this job.

31. My own feelings would generally NOT be affected much one way or the other by how well I did on this job.

32. I was generally satisfied with the office facilities provided for this job.

SECTION IV

Now please indicate how satisfied you are with each aspect of the overall job listed below. Once again, write the appropriate number in the blank before each statement.

How satisfied are you with this aspect of the overall job?

33. The amount of pay I receive.

34. The amount of personal growth and development I get in doing this job.

35. The physical setting (office, desk, etc.) where I worked.

36. The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment I get from doing this job.

37. The prestige and status associated with this job.

38. The degree to which I am fairly paid for what I contribute to this organization.

39. The amount of independent thought and action I can exercise in this job.

40. The amount of challenge in this job.
Appendix T

Work Environment Questionnaire
Work Environment Questionnaire

Instructions

Please be as accurate as possible in answering the following questions. These questions are necessary in order to determine how attentive you were to the job you were asked to perform. Circle the letter corresponding to your answer.

1. How many different colors of file cards were available to you when copying the quick reference information contained on the application blanks?

   A. Two
   B. Three
   C. Four
   D. Five

2. What was the color of the application blanks?

   A. White
   B. Blue
   C. Green
   D. Yellow

3. The applicant you interviewed was dressed:

   A. Much too casually for an employment interview
   B. Very appropriately for an employment interview
   C. Much too formally for an employment interview

4. The starting salary paid by the sponsor company for the job of employment counselor which you just performed was given at around:

   A. $9,000 per year
   B. $21,000 per year
   C. $32,000 per year
   D. The starting salary was never given

5. The minimum level of education required by the sponsor company for an employment counselor who performs the same duties that you just performed was:

   A. A high school diploma
   B. A two year college degree
   C. A four year college degree
   D. An advanced (graduate) degree
   E. No minimum level of education was specified
Appendix U

Work Impression Questionnaire
Work Impression Questionnaire

Instructions:

Please complete the following questions about your experience in this experiment. There are no right or wrong answers, so please be as candid and accurate as possible in your responses. Be sure to answer all the questions in the order in which they are presented.

1. Write a brief description of the job of an employment counselor as you experienced it in this experiment.

2. What were the major duties you performed as an employment counselor?

3. What DIFFERENCES (if any) did you notice in the way you were permitted to perform the various parts of this job?
Appendix V

Follow-up Questionnaire
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I.
Instructions:

Please mark your answers to the following questions by circling the letter that best corresponds to your answer. Be as accurate as possible. Be sure to answer every question.

1. In performing the job of employment counselor in this experiment, which role allowed you to exercise the greatest amount of discretion or individual choice in deciding HOW to go about accomplishing your work?
   A. The Application Processor role
   B. The Interviewer role
   C. Both roles permitted about the same degree of discretion

2. In which role were you given the most freedom to perform the tasks in the ways that you felt they should be performed?
   A. The Application Processor role
   B. The Interviewer role
   C. Both roles permitted about the same amount of freedom

3. Which role would you prefer to perform if given a choice?
   A. The Application Processor role
   B. The Interviewer role
   C. I would have no preference

4. What part of the job did you feel was the most important?
   A. The APPLICATION PROCESSING portion of the job
   B. The INTERVIEWING portion of the job
   C. BOTH parts seemed about equally important

5. I was given sufficient information to feel comfortable in performing:
   A. BOTH the application processing and the interviewing portions of this job
   B. The APPLICATION PROCESSING but not the interviewing portion of this job
   C. The INTERVIEWING but not the application processing portion of this job
   D. NEITHER the application processing nor the interviewing portions of this job
PART II

Instructions:

Please circle the number of the scale that best describes your answer to the question.

6. For the overall job of an employment counselor in this experiment, the amount of freedom and autonomy that you felt you were able to exercise in how to perform the work was:

1—2—3—4—5—6—7

very low moderate very high both high and low

one part of the job allowed considerable freedom; the other part allowed very little freedom.

7. Compared to the usual starting salary for a person beginning work as an employment counselor, the starting salary of $4.42 per hour ($9,200 per year) offered by our sponsor company is:

1—2—3—4—5—6—7

Very Low Slightly Average Slightly Very

Low Low Medium Medium Medium

High High High High High

8. Compared to the usual educational and experience requirements for a person beginning work as an employment counselor, the requirements stated by our sponsor company of a High School Diploma, no experience necessary is:

1—2—3—4—5—6—7

Very Low Slightly Average Slightly Very

Low Low Low Low High

High High High High

9. The office space provided for this job was:

1—2—3—4—5—6—7

Very Confined Slightly Average Slightly Spacious Very

Confined Confined Spacious Spacious Spacious
PART III
Instructions:

On the line following each statement please enter the number from the scale below that best describes the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. I wanted to rate the OVERALL job of an employment counselor, as experienced in this experiment, as both high and low on autonomy

11. I felt confident in rating the degree of autonomy experienced
in the OVERALL job

12. I knew what was expected of me in the INTERVIEWER role

13. I knew what was expected of me in the APPLICATION PROCESSOR
role

14. I felt some uncertainty about what rating to assign when asked
about the amount of freedom experienced in the OVERALL job

15. As I experienced it, the job of an employment counselor with the
sponsor company was a high status position.

PART IV
Instructions:

For each of the adjective pairs below please make an X on the line between each adjective pair that best describes how the job of an employment counselor with our sponsor company was portrayed in this experiment.

16. Free

17. Over—paid

18. Active

19. Structured

20. Over—qualified

21. Important

22. Exciting

23. Varied

24. Significant

Constrained

Under—paid

Passive

Unstructured

Under—qualified

Unimportant

Boring

Monotonous

Insignificant
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I.
Instructions:

Please mark your answers to the following questions by circling the letter that best corresponds to your answer. Be as accurate as possible. Be sure to answer every question.

1. In performing the job of employment counselor in this experiment, which role allowed you to exercise the greatest amount of discretion or individual choice in deciding how to go about accomplishing your work?
   A. The Application Processor role
   B. The Interviewer role
   C. Both roles permitted about the same degree of discretion

2. In which role were you given the most freedom to perform the tasks in the ways that you felt they should be performed?
   A. The Application Processor role
   B. The Interviewer role
   C. Both roles permitted about the same amount of freedom

3. Which role would you prefer to perform if given a choice?
   A. The Application Processor role
   B. The Interviewer role
   C. I would have no preference

4. What part of the job did you feel was the most important?
   A. The APPLICATION PROCESSING portion of the job
   B. The INTERVIEWING portion of the job
   C. BOTH parts seemed about equally important

5. I was given sufficient information to feel comfortable in performing:
   A. BOTH the application processing and the interviewing portions of this job
   B. The APPLICATION PROCESSING but not the interviewing portion of this job
   C. The INTERVIEWING but not the application processing portion of this job
   D. NEITHER the application processing nor the interviewing portions of this job
PART II

Instructions:

Please circle the number of the scale that best describes your answer to the question.

6. For the overall job of an employment counselor in this experiment, the amount of freedom and autonomy that you felt you were able to exercise in how to perform the work was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very low</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>very low</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>both high and low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

one part of the job allowed considerable freedom, the other part allowed very little freedom.

7. Compared to the usual starting salary for a person beginning work as an employment counselor, the starting salary of $15.38 per hour ($32,000 per year) offered by our sponsor company is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Slightly Low</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Slightly High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Compared to the usual educational and experience requirements for a person beginning work as an employment counselor, the requirements stated by our sponsor company of a Master's Degree in Labor and Human Resources, plus 8 years of personnel experience is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Slightly Low</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Slightly High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The office space provided for this job was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Confined</td>
<td>Slightly Confined</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Slightly Spacious</td>
<td>Spacious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very Spacious
PART III
Instructions:

On the line following each statement please enter the number from the scale below that best describes the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree nor Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Cannot judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. I wanted to rate the OVERALL job of an employment counselor, as experienced in this experiment, as both high and low on autonomy

11. I felt confident in rating the degree of autonomy experienced in the OVERALL job

12. I knew what was expected of me in the INTERVIEWER role

13. I knew what was expected of me in the APPLICATION PROCESSOR role

14. I felt some uncertainty about what rating to assign when asked about the amount of freedom experienced in the OVERALL job

15. As I experienced it, the job of an employment counselor with the sponsor company was a high status position.

PART IV. Instructions:

For each of the adjective pairs below please make an X on the line between each adjective pair that best describes how the job of an employment counselor with our sponsor company was portrayed in this experiment.

16. Free:________:________:________:________:________:________:________ Constrained

17. Over-paid:________:________:________:________:________:________:________ Under-paid

18. Active:________:________:________:________:________:________:________ Passive

19. Structured:________:________:________:________:________:________:________ Unstructured

20. Over-qualified:________:________:________:________:________:________:________ Under-qualified

21. Important:________:________:________:________:________:________:________ Unimportant

22. Exciting:________:________:________:________:________:________:________ Boring

23. Varied:________:________:________:________:________:________:________ Monotonous

24. Significant:________:________:________:________:________:________:________ Insignificant
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Appendix W

Intercorrelation of Items Contributing to the Salary Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Index Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overpaid-Underpaid t</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JOB level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pay Satisfaction (JOB level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pay Satisfaction (APP level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pay Satisfaction (INT level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fair Pay (JOB level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fair Pay (APP level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fair Pay (INT level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=64

- item was rated on a reversed scale
- (JOB) rating taken at the overall job level
- (APP) rating taken at the application processing level
- (INT) rating taken at the interviewing role level
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Intercorrelations of Items Contributing to the Office Setting Index Score
Appendix X

Intercorrelations of Items Contributing to the
Office Setting Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Index Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Confined-spacious (JOB level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfied with office (JOB level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Satisfied with office (APP level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Satisfied with office (INT level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Satisfied with desk (JOB level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Satisfied with desk (APP level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Satisfied with desk (INT level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=64

(JOB) rating taken at the overall job level
(APP) rating taken at the application processing level
(INT) rating taken at the interviewing role level
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Intercorrelations of Items Contributing to the Education Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Index Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Education Requirements were high - low</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JOB level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overqualified - Underqualified t</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JOB level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=64

The item was rated on a reversed scale (JOB) rating taken at the overall job level.
Appendix Z

Intercorrelations of Items Contributing to the Status/Prestige Index Score
### Appendix Z

**Intercorrelations of Items Contributing to the Status/Prestige Index Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status/Prestige Index Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. High Status Position (JOB level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfied with Status (JOB level)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Satisfied with Status (APP level)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Satisfied with Status (INT level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=64

*(JOB) rating taken at the overall job level

(APP) rating taken at the application processing level

*INT) rating taken at the interviewing role level
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Intercorrelations for Ratings of Task Characteristics for the Application Processing Role
### Intercorrelations for Ratings of Task Characteristics for the Application Processing Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUT</th>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>IDN</th>
<th>SIG</th>
<th>FED</th>
<th>MPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=64

* p ≤ .05
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Intercorrelations for Ratings of Task Characteristics for the Interviewing Role
### Intercorrelations for Ratings of Task Characteristics for the Interviewing Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUT</th>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>IDN</th>
<th>SIG</th>
<th>FED</th>
<th>MPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.84*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=64

* p < .05
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Intercorrelations for Ratings of Task Characteristics for the Overall Job
Intercorrelations for Ratings of Task Characteristics for the Overall Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUT</th>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>IDN</th>
<th>SIG</th>
<th>FED</th>
<th>MPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=64
* p \leq .05
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Means and Standard Deviations of Core Dimension Ratings at the Individual Role Levels: High Versus Low Cue Conditions
Means and Standard Deviations of Core Dimension Ratings
at the Individual Role Levels: High Versus Low Cue Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimensions</th>
<th>Application Role</th>
<th>Interviewing Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Cue</td>
<td>Low Cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Potential</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110.7</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=32
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Mean Ratings of Core Dimensions for Consistently Unenriched Roles
Taken at Role and Job Levels by High and Low Cue Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimensions</th>
<th>Consistently Unenriched</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Interviewing</th>
<th>Overall Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cue</td>
<td>High Cue</td>
<td>Low Cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=8
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### Mean Ratings of Core Dimensions for Consistently Enriched Roles

Taken at Role and Job Levels by High and Low Cue Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimensions</th>
<th>Consistently Enriched</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Interviewing</th>
<th>Overall Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cue</td>
<td>High Cue</td>
<td>Low Cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=8
Appendix GG

Mean Ratings of Core Dimensions for Inconsistent Roles
Taken at Role and Job Levels by
High and Low Cue Conditions
Mean Ratings of Core Dimensions for Inconsistent Roles
Taken at Role and Job Levels by High and Low Cue Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimensions</th>
<th>Unenriched Applications</th>
<th>Enriched Interviewing</th>
<th>Overall Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cue</td>
<td>High Cue</td>
<td>Low Cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=8
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Mean Ratings of Core Dimensions for Inconsistent Roles
Taken at Role and Job Levels by High and Low Cue Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Dimensions</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Interviewing</th>
<th>Overall Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Cue</td>
<td>High Cue</td>
<td>Low Cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The impact of inconsistencies in the degree of autonomy experienced in two roles of an employment counselor's job was examined in terms of the extent of agreement in ratings of the core dimensions as defined in the job design literature. General information cues regarding wages, educational requirements, and the office setting were also manipulated and examined for their influence on mean ratings of the core dimensions. Subjects who experienced inconsistencies in the autonomy permitted in the two roles of the job did not evidence a greater degree of disagreement in their ratings of the core dimensions. However, when the level of autonomy experienced in the overall job was inconsistent with the information cues surrounding the job, ratings of the core
dimensions showed significantly more disagreement than when the general information cues were consistent with the autonomy experienced in the job. The general information cues had a weaker impact on the mean ratings of the core dimensions than initially predicted, although the cues did exert a greater impact on ratings of the core dimensions taken for the overall job than for ratings of the individual roles comprising the job. The results suggest that the level of the work role is a meaningful unit from which to obtain assessments of the core dimensions. The smaller than expected influence of general information cues also suggests that the social and evaluative nature of cues employed in previous job design research may be a critical factor that promotes the potential of a cue to impact ratings of the core dimensions.