1976

A Study Of Relationships Between Job Satisfaction And Personality Needs Of College Student Volunteers At Indiana State University.

Emanuel T. Newsome
Indiana State University

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A STUDY OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND PERSONALITY NEEDS OF COLLEGE STUDENT VOLUNTEERS AT INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

A Dissertation

Presented to

The School of Graduate Studies

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

Emanuel T. Newsome

August 1976

DISSERTATION APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation of Emanuel T. Newsome, Contribution to the School of Graduate Studies, Indiana State University, Series III, Number 128, under the title, A Study of Relationships Between Job Satisfaction and Personality Needs of College Student Volunteers at Indiana State University, is approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree.

Chairperson and Director of Dissertation

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

July 29, 1976
Date

For the School of Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purposes of this study were to: (1) investigate the relationships between personality needs of college student volunteers as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), and measures of their job satisfaction as derived from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-MSQ (Modified Short Form), and (2) to find the best combination of the fifteen personality variables for predicting high intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction. This study is delimited to Indiana State University students who registered to volunteer at the Center for Voluntary Services and were placed on a job during the Fall semester of the 1975-76 school year.

PROCEDURES

One hundred and ninety college student volunteers were initially contacted by letter, requesting their participation in this study. One hundred and thirty-one student volunteers (69%) responded by completing both questionnaires. The first question, which sought to find the relationships between job satisfaction and personality needs, was analyzed by using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Technique, and the second question, which sought to find the best combination of personality variables for predicting high intrinsic, extrinsic and general job satisfaction, was analyzed using multiple linear stepwise regressions. Each of the correlations was tested at the .05 level. Forty-five hypotheses related to the first question while three hypotheses related to the second question.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The result of testing the first forty-five hypotheses relating to the first question, revealed that there was only one significant correlation

between scores on the three scales of the MSQ and scores on the 15 personality variables of the EPPS. Specifically, there was a significant correlation between intrinsic job satisfaction and succorance. The result of testing the three hypotheses relating to the second question revealed that the need succorance was the only personality variable which might contribute to the prediction of intrinsic job satisfaction.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The correlation of succorance with intrinsic job satisfaction was the only significant correlation computed. Since the correlation was negative, this finding indicated that self-sufficient and independent students were more likely to find intrinsic satisfaction with their voluntary jobs.

2. External and general reinforcements did not contribute to or fulfill a defined pattern of personality needs of college student volunteers.

3. Personality needs alone is not enough for the predicition of job satisfaction of college scudent volunteers. Possibly, combining personality needs with situational variables may prove beneficial in predicting job satisfaction of volunteers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation and gratitude to Professor Stanley J. Gross for his guidance and encouragement throughout the preparation and writing of this study. Appreciation is also extended to Professor Frank W. Jerse for his assistance in organizing and preparing the statistical data and to Professor William Van Til for his editorial assistance and constructive criticism. Also, a special thanks is extended to Dr. John W. Truitt for his interest, support, and confidence in my professional development.

I am indebted to Dr. John F. Bush, Mrs. Ruth Shipman, Dr. Walter L. Sullins, and Dr. Russell L. Hamm for their special assistance, sincere concern, and continuous support throughout this research project.

Finally, a very special thanks to my wife, Nellie, and children, Kimberly, Eric, and Ericka, for their patience and encouragement and to my mother who has always provided the support essential to success.

E.T.N.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Volunteering is a solution to the problem of maximizing use of human resources, as Swanson (1970), indicated:

> Never has there been a time in our history, as a nation, where it has been more necessary to make maximum use of our human potential and resources as there is in the seventies. The problems of our society are many and complex. However, one bright spot looms in the effective utilization of volunteers to help in the solution of these problems. (P. 3).

Lippit and Rainman (1970) have also pointed out that:

> Volunteerism is being discussed more widely and at all levels of the society and the community . . . . There is a more widespread request for, support of, and sanction for being a volunteer, and there is a strong trend to involve college students in social service needs for the community. (P. 7).

Since the early sixties, volunteerism began to increase among college students. Colleges and universities have served as an organizing force and vehicle for recruiting and directing volunteers to fulfill needs within the community. Blatchford (1972) reported that, according to a Gallup Poll in 1972, approximately half of all students in colleges had given time to volunteering.

This prevalent practice on college and university campuses is the concern of this study. The college student volunteer is an individual who voluntarily takes a job in the community and who works without financial remuneration. These students are the subject of much informed comment but are rarely systematically studied.

It is important that volunteers are placed in an environment in which they feel needed, are at ease, and where their abilities can be effectively utilized. Johnson (1973) commented that most volunteers

prefer to make useful and meaningful contributions to the organization. Not all volunteers desire the same type of assignment or task. While some volunteers prefer desk and clerical jobs, others receive a great deal of satisfaction from providing social and personal services. Lippitt and Rainman (1970) further stated that data indicated fewer volunteers are wanting desk and clerical jobs; instead, they want to provide direct services to clients.

In Allen's article (1971), "What Motivates Volunteers," Harriet Naylor commented that a knowledge of motivation is more effective than mere use of assumptions in planning a diversified program of activities. Through an understanding of the motivations and needs of volunteers, programs can be designed to make better use of volunteer talents, and ultimately provide better service.

The question of why the individual desires to volunteer initially is important in light of structuring activities designed to better utilize the volunteer's talents. This research project looked chiefly at task satisfaction and personality needs of college student volunteers.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Review of literature reveals no studies on the relationship of volunteer needs to their satisfaction with the volunteering task. There is a need for research to (a) describe the volunteer's needs (motives) as related to entering into such an arrangement, (b) to measure task satisfaction, and (c) to investigate the relationship between needs (motives) and task satisfaction.

This study attempted to answer the following questions:

A. What are the relationships between personality needs of college student volunteers as measured by the Edwards

Personal Preference Schedule and measures of their job satisfaction as derived from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Modified Short Form).

B. What are the best combinations of the 15 personality variables for predicting high intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction?

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

This study is important because volunteering has been quite popular among thousands of college students in America. Blatchford (1972) mentioned that in 1972 over 400,000 students were regularly involved in student volunteer programs at 1,700 universities. It appears that more volunteers will be needed in the future. Purdy (1971) revealed that most social planners now recognize that a significant part of the human power deficit in service occupations will have to be filled with volunteers.

Volunteering provides numerous college students the opportunity to gain valuable on-the-job experience which they need for personal activity outside of school, and an acquaintanceship with community programs and needs.

Learning takes place out of school as well as in school. Numerous students have felt that they actually learned more by participating actively in volunteer programs. Eberly, Graham, and Havighurst (1972) reported that:

> ... a recent poll of the participants in the University Year for Action Program showed that 83% of them felt that they had learned more in their year of service and job related activities than in their conventional college study. (P. 10).

There have been numerous studies in industry pertaining to the relationship between job satisfaction and other variables such as age, sex, and socio-economic status. Hoppock (1935) found that job satisfaction apparently increased with age.

Cantor (1968) studied 111 Urban Vista Volunteers and discovered that age was not a discriminating factor in regard to satisfaction of volunteers whose ages ranged from 18 to 25. She also found that men and women were equally satisfied and that education and socio-economic status were significantly related to job satisfaction. The higher the educational level and socio-economic level, the greater the criticism of the agency. People on the higher socio-economic level tend to be less satisfied than those from less affluent backgrounds.

While job satisfaction research in industry is plentiful, studies devoted to measuring job satisfaction of volunteers, specifically college volunteers, are absent. Considering the wide scope of duties and responsibilities placed on volunteers, it would be of value to know the satisfactions they derive from their jobs. Such feedback may be of great value to (a) volunteer administrators who face practical problems screening and placing volunteers, (b) student volunteers who desire appropriate in-service training and (c) individual recipients of the voluntary efforts who are the main focus of the volunteer's attention.

A great deal has been written about college volunteers with respect to their roles and the need for their services. Little has been done, however, to examine their motives and needs. Allen (1971) pointed out that:

> It has been exceedingly easy for involved individuals to produce reams of descriptive material about volunteer programs, and there is a plethora of rambling discourses on the glories of the study center, on how to use the 1936 model bus a rich

> alumnus donated, or on how to transport a perfectly healthy 21 year old male college student to his volunteer assignment ten blocks away. . . . Yet there has been next to nothing written that tells why a student wants to get there in the first place. (P. 50).

The widespread involvement of college students as volunteers demands investigation into the matter of needs and motivations. In Allen's article "What Motivates Volunteers" (1971), he quotes Dr. Jules Coleman: "For volunteers to be most effective, they must have a real and meaningful relationship to the content of our agency's function. This requires an awareness of volunteer's motivations."

Finally, this study is important because previous research which has taken place regarding volunteers has focused on roles, expectations, descriptions of who they are and how many. The present study investigated the relationships between job satisfaction and personality needs of selected college student volunteers. If it can be found that significant relationships do exist between personality needs of volunteers and levels of job satisfaction, more volunteer administrators may want to consider the implementation of programs directed toward assessing and relating student personality needs with job requirements.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The social psychological term "altruism" could serve as a basis on which to build the theoretical framework of this study. The behavior of volunteers is frequently considered altruistic, meaning that volunteers act solely in consideration for others, while neglecting personal motives or needs. Volunteering is altruistic to the extent that the manifest motives for volunteers have to do with the needs of others. Volunteers do, however, volunteer for other than altruistic reasons. Loser (1974) commented that the majority of students do it

as much, if not more, to test their abilities and interests and to learn more about the world outside of Academia.

This study was not involved with finding out whether or not student volunteers were altruistic; instead, it pursued the motivation question based on Murray's theory of personality needs. This theory states that personality needs manifest themselves by leading the individual to search for or to avoid experiencing. In order to assess personality needs, observation of behavior is essential. However, a single observation or a report of a single behavior does not necessarily indicate which personality need is operating. Furthermore, Murray (1962) stated that to determine how to classify personality needs, additional data is needed. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule developed by Edwards (1959) is one way to gather such data. It provides measures of fifteen personality variables which have their origin in a list of manifest needs presented by Murray.

In the case of volunteers, it was assumed that they received a great deal of personal satisfaction from certain aspects of their experiences. It was also assumed that their needs were accompanied by particular feelings or emotions which manifested themselves by leading the individual to take some type of action. Furthermore, it was assumed that volunteers spent their time, exerted their expertise, and rendered services to others because of their need to fulfill personal needs. The personality needs theory set forth by Murray was important in this study because it had the power to explain student volunteer motives and behavior, and it had the potential to assist educators and volunteer administrators in structuring volunteer programs tailored to meet student needs.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study is delimited to Indiana State University students who registered to volunteer at the Center for Voluntary Services and to the act of volunteering. Students who volunteered as individuals and students who volunteered as members of a group were considered to be members of the same population. Students participating in this study were enrolled full time at ISU during the Fall semester of the 1975-76 school year.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to investigate the relationships between job satisfaction and personality needs of college student volunteers at Indiana State University.

This study was also limited to the extent that the instruments utilized produced reliable and valid results.

It should be pointed out that this study did not test the theory of altruism or of personality needs. This was a study to seek relationships between job satisfaction and personality needs in one setting.

Since the subjects for this study were volunteers from a group of student volunteers, generalizations beyond this group of subjects to the total group of college student volunteers should be attempted with caution.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of this study, the terms listed below should be interpreted according to the following definitions:

Volunteers. Students enrolled at Indiana State University during the Fall semester of 1975-76 school year who were referred and

placed on a job by an administrator of the Center for Voluntary Services, and who worked without financial remuneration.

Job Satisfaction. This term refers to the measurement of student volunteers' work adjustment as assessed by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

Personality Needs. Characteristics or traits of an individual's personality as derived from H.A. Murray's list of manifest needs as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

Intrinsic Satisfaction. The result of the volunteer's evaluation of work adjustment from an internal frame of reference as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (as modified).

Extrinsic Satisfaction. The result of the volunteer's evaluation of work adjustment from an external frame of reference as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (as modified).

General Satisfaction. The result of the volunteer's evaluation of work adjustment from their internal and external frames of reference as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (as modified).

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1 states the problem, the rationale for the study, the theoretical background, the delimitations of the study, the limitations of the study, and the definition of terms. Chapter 2 presents the review of related literature encompassing volunteerism, job satisfaction, personality needs, and altruism.

Chapter 3 provides information regarding the treatment of data and the specific statistical methodology and procedures that are employed.

Reports in Chapter 4 are the findings of the study.

Offered in Chapter 5 are the summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This writer assumed that personality characteristics, singly or in combination, are factors affecting the satisfactions volunteers derive from their jobs. Another assumption is that a highly-satisfied volunteer is a crucial element of an effective volunteer program. If these assumptions are true, assessing the relationships between personality needs and job satisfaction of college student volunteers should be valuable in identifying, and placing potential volunteers on jobs whereby their abilities and talents will be effectively utilized.

The purpose of this review of related research, therefore, was to examine writings having some relationship to the problem being studied. Specifically, the review covered the following: (a) Volunteers--support for volunteers; volunteer motivations; characteristics of volunteers; studies of college student volunteers; (b) Job Satisfaction--job satisfaction instruments; job satisfaction of educators; variables in the measurement of job satisfaction; job satisfaction and needs; (c) Personality Assessment--problems in personality research; trends in personality research; The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and its use; (d) Altruism--sex difference in altruism; age difference in altruism; family size and ordinal position; social class and altruism; effects of success and competence on altruism; and effects of failure and harming on altruism.

VOLUNTEERS

The concept of volunteering refers to people who, as part of their daily lives, contribute time, energy, and resources free of charge to someone in need or for some specific cause. The use of volunteers has been recognized as an effective means by which to mobilize as well as utilize human resources. While certain segments of the population have a past history of serving as volunteers more than other segments, college students have been recognized as being one group that has tremendous potential. Ostal (1974) commented on the role of colleges and universities in the area of volunteerism:

> The State College or University serves as the organizing force, a sort of volunteer vehicle for the energies and enthusiasm of students, collecting and directing volunteers to fulfill needs within the community. . . . Student volunteer work is a legitimate learning experience, whether it goes down in the registrar's office as credit or not. (P. 1).

Areas of concern in the review of literature and their relationship to the study were identified in the following manner: (a) support for volunteers, (b) motivation of volunteers, (c) characteristics of volunteers, and (d) studies of college student volunteers.

Support for Volunteers

The calls for volunteers have been numerous, and as we look into the future even more volunteers will be needed. According to Toffler (1971), in his book entitled Future Shock, as our society becomes more complex, many institutions in our communities will depend more on voluntary assistance.

There is a demand for volunteers in many fields. In the field of development, Delano (1966) stated:

> The demand for development experts far exceed the supply, and it is contended that volunteers can help bridge the gap. . . . Today, 18 government supported programs are responsible for 19,000 volunteers working in 91 countries under export programs. . . . Volunteer service has now grown to have a significant impact on the world's need for development experts. (P. 3).

The need for volunteers in the mental health field has been mentioned by Michener and Walzer (1970):

> It has been increasingly recognized that the available professional personnel is insufficient to attend to all needs of mental health programs and hospitals have begun using volunteers . . . . In working with mental patients, there is evidence that volunteers can accelerate the treatment process. . . . Many volunteers pursue professional careers in mental health as a result of their experience as a volunteer. (P. 60).

Heilig et al. (1968) concluded that nonprofessional volunteers, carefully selected and trained in crisis intervention techniques and personal counseling, can occupy an important place in the field of mental health and make a significant contribution to the mental health of the community.

The utilization of volunteer attorneys has been cited by Shamberg (1968):

> The solution of the problem of legal services for the poor may be in the untapped resource of the volunteer attorneys who are willing to spend some of their time servicing the poor. . . . The skill and enthusiasm of law students could also be utilized to a greater extent. (P. 168).

Volunteer expertise and talent is also needed on campus as well as off campus. Boylin (1973) designed a companion program at Southern Illinois University using college student volunteers willing to be a companion to the physically handicapped, the foreign student, the parolee, and the student isolated from the campus living area. The feedback from companions and friends, indicated that this program provided an important necessary contribution to the college community.

The need and involvement of volunteers has increased so much that universities are now offering course credit toward graduation and bachelor

degrees related to volunteering. Coleman (1966), in his article "A Discovery of Commitment" cites Michigan State University, Western Michigan University, and Franconia College as being leaders in this field.

Volunteer Motivations

An increasing number of researchers have devoted their energies to the study of motivations of volunteers. Albertson, et al. (1961) mentioned that motivation is one of the most important factors to be considered in the selection of volunteers, and that a humanitarian desire to serve others and a pioneering spirit must be present.

Gordon and Sizer (1963) undertook a study to find out the motivation of volunteers joining the Peace Corps in 1962. Applicants numbering 2,312 replied to a question on the application form: "What do you hope to accomplish by joining the Peace Corps"? They reported that almost all of them stated that they wanted to "help people." More than half of the applicants mentioned potential advantages to themselves--experience, knowledge, a chance to develop as individuals, and to further their careers or vocations. The advantages mentioned most often, however, were the opportunities the Peace Corps provided for learning about other cultures, getting to know and work with people of other nations, and becoming familiar with different customs, philosophies, and ways of life. Ninety-three percent of the applicants reported a desire to give as a basis to applying while sixty-five percent reported a desire to gain, and only two percent reported neither.

Arnold Zietlin, in the article "To The Peace Corps, with Love" (1965), mentioned that his primary motivation for joining the Peace Corps was that it offered "a challenge and a chance to help a worthy cause."

Dwarshuis, et al. (1973) conducted a study of 72 innovative drug programs initiated by young persons to help with drug problems. Through conferences and questionnaires, data were collected. Their findings indicated that volunteers' different motivations included (a) learning about the drug scene, (b) vicarious experiencing, (c) seeking personal meaning, (d) being a helper, (e) contributing skills, and (f) performing a parental role.

Coleman (1965) suggested that some of the primary reasons of being a volunteer includes the opportunity to test oneself, to become independent, to search for satisfying values, to cooperate rather than compete, and to satisfy the need to be needed and recognized.

Characteristics of Volunteers

There have been numerous efforts to identify characteristics of volunteers. Primarily on the basis of studies conducted with college student populations in a variety of experimental situations, Rosenthal (1965) postulated that those personal attributes likely to be associated with a greater degree of volunteering include the following: (1) greater intellectual ability, interest, and motivation, (2) greater unconventionality, (3) lower age, (4) less authoritarianism, and (5) greater sociability.

Jackson (1972) compared 108 college students who had planned to volunteer with a random group of 171 non-volunteer students at Michigan State University. He found that MSU student volunteers came from homes where parents had reached higher levels of formal education, earned higher incomes and were employed in professional occupations more often than the parents of MSU non-volunteer students. However, the difference between the MSU student volunteers and MSU non-volunteers was not statistically significant at the .05 level. A greater percentage of the

MSU student volunteers also rated themselves higher than MSU non-volunteers with regard to specific abilities (academic, leadership and social self-confidence).

Turner (1973) compared 64 campus hotline center volunteers with 41 non-volunteers and found that the volunteers were more self-controlled, tolerant, and dedicated to social improvement than the non-volunteers.

Engs and Kirk (1974) studied personality characteristics and health knowledge of volunteers working in crisis intervention centers in the State of Tennessee. The demographic information indicated that 55 percent of all volunteers were females and 45 percent were males. The percentage of volunteers seemed to peak at two age groups--the 20 to 24 year group had 24.3 percent, and the 40 and over group had 36.5 percent, with the mean age being 34.7. It was found that 14.9 percent of the volunteers were professionals (practicing physicians, nurses, clergy, social workers, psychologists, and students in the disciplines) while 85.1 percent were nonprofessionals. It was also found that both groups had similar personality traits. Professional volunteers, however, had a greater general health knowledge than nonprofessionals.

Tapp and Spanier (1973) compared 26 volunteer telephone counselors and 34 non-volunteer undergraduates on self-concept, personality, and self-disclosure. Results showed no difference between the groups on their self-concept except in their moral-ethical perceptions of themselves. The groups did differ on the other measures. Results from comparing their personalities suggested that they were more self-actualizing than the non-volunteer undergraduates, and they indicated a greater degree of openness in terms of self-disclosure.

In another study comparing volunteers and non-volunteers, Scott (1957) found that volunteers for community agencies tended to be white,

upper middle-class, and more socially oriented than non-volunteers.

Gerard (1972) studied personality characteristics of non-professional volunteer workers in 125 services selected at random. Four volunteers from each service were rated by its director in terms of their effectiveness. He found that the most effective volunteer workers rated higher on self-confidence and dominance and lower on abasement than the least effective workers.

Boyle and Douglah (1964) studied the possibility of recruiting voluntary youth leaders. The survey included a sample of 532 adults in Columbia County, Wisconsin. It was concluded that 50% of the adult population was willing to serve as youth leaders. Those most interested tended to be females, rural farm residents, married with children, better educated, and participators in community activities.

Studies of College Student Volunteers

Beck, et al. (1965) conducted a controlled experiment which attempted to determine whether measurable changes in their behavior occurred when chronic patients were exposed to undergraduate volunteers. It was hypothesized that following such exposure, patients would change so that they would be capable of increased social behavior. Two continuous treatment wards were used, one of which served as a control ward (N=29+29). The study lasted 18 months, and patients were exposed to about 1400 hours of student volunteer work during the first academic year and 700 hours during the second. The patients were interviewed three times. The major finding was that there was a significant increase in the measured social behavior of chronic psychotic patients in the first ward, but not in the second. The change was observed in an unrelated social context, which indicated that there was a persisting change.

Holzberg, et al. (1966) focused on three questions pertaining to college volunteers working with the mentally ill: (1) what is the effect on patients of a dyadic relationship between a mentally ill patient and a college student? (2) what are the qualities that identify the students who volunteer for this program? and (3) what are the effects on college student volunteers who participate in this social engagement? Most of the information on patients suggested that the introduction of young, intelligent students on a nonprofessional basis has been a positive influence on patients. They desired the companionship and sought to maintain it; many became more verbally interactive, showed increased self-confidence and greater interest in their surroundings. In regard to the students, careful studies were carried out on companion students and non-companion controls. They found that there were very few bases on which companion and control differed. However, after exposure to the program, the companion students tended to acquire more enlightened attitudes regarding the field of mental illness, they became more self-accepting of themselves and more tolerant of others and showed a tendency to increase self-awareness and self-examination.

In another study involving college students as companions, Arthur, et al. (1973) selected fifteen male and fifteen female elderly (mean age = 77 years) residents of a nursing home who were in need of special attention for companionship therapy with ten college student volunteers. Greater improvement in sociability and satisfaction with life was found among those elderly residents who received interpersonal contacts with several volunteers than those who experienced a single sustained relationship.

Witkin (1973) as a result of his working with student volunteer workers in a closely supervised relationship with emotionally disturbed children in an extended care program at a child guidance clinic, concluded

that his results demonstrated that college students are an effective, though under-utilized, source of therapeutic manpower.

Turner, (1972) wanted to show that aspects of students participating in a campus hotline program could be described in terms of personality, attitude, and program variables. In his study to demonstrate that volunteers' personalities and attitudes changed as a result of their service experience, Turner found that attitudes and personality traits of volunteers, as compared to a control group, changed little, as a result of twelve weeks of service experience. The changes that did occur were a more positive attitude toward the program concept and increases in self-criticism and in need for emotional support.

Kish and Stage (1973) studied college student mental health volunteers. They sent questionnaires requesting a variety of items of information relative to occupation, vocational activity, and opinions about the value of the voluntary experience to college alumni who had volunteered. The reports of the respondents indicated that they found the experience pleasurable, of some help in choosing their occupation, and of considerable educational and personal usefulness.

SUMMARY OF LITERATURE ON VOLUNTEERS

Volunteers in development, law and mental health are needed to help meet societal needs. College volunteers are being used to assist handicapped and needy individuals on campus. Volunteerism has expanded to the extent that some universities are offering course credits and undergraduate degrees in this area.

The motivation of an individual to volunteer continues to be of great importance. Results from this review of the literature on volunteers revealed that most Peace Corps Volunteers said they wanted to help people,

they wanted to gain personal experience, and they wanted to learn about other cultures. Volunteers in drug related programs indicated that their primary motivations were to learn more about drugs, to be a helper, and to perform a parental role. Other motivations cited include the following: to test oneself, to search for satisfying values, to satisfy the need to be recognized, and to cooperate rather than compete.

Comparisons between college volunteers and non-college volunteers revealed that college volunteers came from families with more formal education and higher incomes than non-college volunteers. Academically, the college volunteers rated higher, and they exhibited more self-control and self-confidence. College volunteers also possessed the following attributes: greater intellectual ability, greater unconventionality, less authoritarianism, and greater sociability. Results revealed that college volunteers did not differ in self-concept from non-college volunteers, however, results indicated that the college volunteers were more open and self-actualizing.

Results also indicated that the studies reviewed, females outnumbered males in volunteer projects and that generally volunteers are white, middle class, and socially oriented. In one specific study, it was revealed that the most effective volunteers rated high on self-confidence and dominance.

There have been numerous studies of college student volunteers. A large majority of the studies have involved student volunteers in the mental health field. Findings indicate that students are an effective source of therapeutic human power. Also, college students, as a result of their voluntary experience, tend to increase in self-awareness and tolerance for others. And in some cases, it was found that volunteering

helped students to select occupational vocations.

JOB SATISFACTION

While job satisfaction studies in industry have been numerous, there has been a complete void of job satisfaction research concerning college student volunteers. The extensive research in paid job satisfaction does, however, introduce dimensions of the topic. This review of the literature will cover studies relating to job satisfaction instruments, job satisfaction of educators, job satisfaction and variables such as age, and sex, and studies involving job satisfaction and needs. This review of research could possibly aid in interpreting and understanding results from job satisfaction studies of college student volunteers.

Job Satisfaction Instruments

Hoppock (1935) developed one of the most widely used and oldest measures of job satisfaction. The Hoppock Job Satisfaction Blank represents a global approach to the measures of job satisfaction. It is assumed that the worker adds together his likes and dislikes for the job and, in responding to the questions, weighs them subjectively according to their importance. The scores can be expressed in either a weighted index of satisfaction, based upon standard deviation values for each item, multiplied by the response percentage of a norm group, or a simple average. The internal consistency of the Job Satisfaction Blank is quite high. The split-half reliability of the first and third questions versus the second and fourth is .87.

Brayfield and Rothe (1951) developed the Brayfield-Rothe scale of eighteen items which correlated .92 with the Hoppock scale for a group

of employed persons in a personnel psychology class. For a group of 231 female office employees, the corrected odd-even internal consistency estimate of this scale was .87. Brayfield and Rothe agreed with Hoppock by stating a preference for an index of over-all job satisfaction. Requirements for a job satisfaction scale according to them should include: (a) applicability to a wide variety of jobs, (b) sensitivity to variations in attitudes, (c) ability to evoke cooperation from both management and workers, (d) reliability, and (e) validity.

The Kerr Tear Ballot (Kerr, 1948) has ten statements about various aspects of the job and work situation. Some of the areas concerned are: (a) attitude toward supervision, (b) working conditions, (c) co-workers, (d) income, (e) security and the company in general. There are no reported test-retest stability estimates, but its internal consistency coefficients range from .65 to .88, with a mean of .83, as determined in several samples (Kerr, 1952).

The Cornell Job Description Index (JDI), developed by Smith (1963) at Cornell University, consists of 72 items divided into five scales which measure satisfaction with work, pay, promotions, supervision, and people. The internal consistency coefficients of the JDI scales, corrected by Spearman-Brown, were all in the .80s for a sample of 80 male electronics workers (Locke, et al. 1963). The intercorrelations of the JDI scales for several different samples range from .10 to .70, with most of the r's in the .30s and .40s.

Johnson (1955) developed a 99-item questionnaire of job satisfaction primarily designed for use with teachers. A test-retest reliability of .90 and a correlation of .64 with self-estimates of job satisfaction for a group of 90 teachers was reported.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by Weiss, et al. (1967) is an instrument used to measure job satisfaction and work adjustment. It includes development and normative data on two forms, a twenty-one scale long form, and a three scale short form. The long-form MSQ consists of 100 items. Each item refers to a reinforcer in the work environment. The short-form consists of 20 items. Five response alternatives are presented for each item ranging from "Very Dissatisfied" to "Very Satisfied". On the long-form of the MSQ, Hoyt reliability coefficients ranged from a high of .97 on Ability Utilization (for both stenographers and typists) and on Working Conditions (for social workers) to a low of .59 on Variety (for buyers). The median Hoyt reliability coefficients ranged from .93 for Advancement and Recognition to .78 for Responsibility. For the MSQ Short-form, reliability coefficients were high. For the intrinsic satisfaction scale, the coefficients ranged from .84 for the two assembler groups to .91 for engineers. For the extrinsic satisfaction scale, the coefficients varied from .77 for electronics assemblers to .82 for engineers and machinists. On the general satisfaction scale, the coefficients varied from .87 for assemblers to .92 for engineers. Evidence for the validity of the MSQ is derived mainly from its performing according to theoretical expectations.

Job Satisfaction of Educators

In addition to numerous job satisfaction studies in industry, there have been several studies devoted to measuring job satisfaction of educators at the elementary, secondary and college level. Results of these studies could add another dimension to our knowledge of job satisfaction.

Hoppock (1935) studied 500 teachers in the metropolitan New York area and found that the satisfied teachers earned about the same as

the dissatisfied, that they were 7.5 years older, and they generally felt more successful.

Wurtz (1972) studied job satisfaction of 318 public school administrators, supervisors, and teachers and found that they were more satisfied if the discrepancy between one's self-ideal and self-concept was small. He also reported that females and those who had advanced degrees were more satisfied with their job.

Miskey (1972) studied 3,400 randomly selected public school teachers in Kansas. His findings indicated that female elementary and secondary teachers who scored higher on satisfaction were more job oriented and had a job in which there was a higher potential for personal challenge and development. He also found that the male teachers who scored higher in satisfaction were more job oriented.

Dietz (1972) studied 246 certified Tennessee school counselors regarding job satisfaction as related to the American School Counselor Association role and function recommendations. He reported that the counselors were most satisfied with placement activities and least satisfied with research activities.

Iannone (1973) used a semi-structured interview technique to determine the relevancy for 20 secondary and 20 elementary school principals of Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman's Motivational-Hygiene Theory of job satisfaction. He found that two job related factors or motivators, achievement and recognition, were significantly mentioned in periods of principal's job satisfaction. He also reported that five context-related factors--interpersonal relations with subordinates, interpersonal relations with peers, interpersonal relations with supervisors, with technical supervisors, and with school district policy and administration--were significantly mentioned in periods of

job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Sagen (1962), in an investigation of faculty satisfactions, found that personality traits and institutional variables were significantly related to satisfaction with present position.

Vincent (1972) studied job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of faculty members of nine private liberal arts colleges and concluded that they were satisfied in their work for reasons which were intrinsic to the work process, and dissatisfied in their work because of reasons which were extrinsic to the work process.

Nicholson and Milijus (1972), in their study of liberal arts college faculty members in Ohio, reported that the major contributors to faculty turnover were promotions, salary policies, and administrative practices. Data from this study also indicated that they were generally satisfied with the nature of their work, i.e., class size, courses taught, teaching load, and academic freedom.

Eckert, Stecklein, and Sagen (1959) administered a questionnaire to 706 college faculty members and found that the three most common reasons for job dissatisfaction were: (a) low salaries, (b) heavy workloads, and (c) general working conditions. Similar to the conclusion of Nicholson and Milijus, they also found that the most common source of satisfaction was the nature of the work itself. Results from the Eckert, Stecklein, and Sagen study also revealed that teachers in four-year colleges are generally more satisfied with their position than are teachers in junior colleges.

Variables in the Measurement of Job Satisfaction

Some studies seem to emphasize the importance of measuring different components of satisfaction. Some of the more important components of satisfaction seem to be: (a) sex, (b) age, (c) education, (d) occupational

level, (e) pay, and (f) organizational climate.

All of the studies pertaining to sex differences and job satisfaction have not yielded the same results. Jurgensen (1947), and Blum and Russ (1942) found some differences between men and women in their job factor preferences. Herzberg, et al. (1957) reported that of fourteen studies they reviewed, six showed women more satisfied with their jobs than men, three indicated men more satisfied, and five studies revealed no sex differences in job satisfaction. Strong (1958) questioned the practice of using the same measuring tool to determine satisfaction for men and women since the requirements for satisfaction may differ with the sexes.

Age is another important correlate to be considered. Super (1939) found satisfaction in the twenty to twenty-four age group, dissatisfaction between the twenty-five and thirty-four, satisfaction from thirty-five to forty-four, then another decrease in satisfaction with ages from forty to fifty-four.

Cantor (1968) studied 111 Urban Vista volunteers and found that age was not a discriminating factor with regards to satisfaction for the majority of volunteers whose ages ranged from 18 to 25.

Heron (1954) found no cyclical changes in satisfaction with age; however, he did find a slight and significant correlation between job satisfaction and age. Hoppock (1935) and Altimus and Tersine (1973) also found in their studies of job satisfaction that older workers tended to be more satisfied than younger ones. Herzberg, et al. (1957) concluded in their review of the literature, that age trends in satisfaction persist even with length of service held constant.

Education has been mentioned as another correlate. Jurgensen (1947) reported that changes in job factor preferences were affected more by educational level than by age. Vollmar and Kinney (1955) investigated

the relationships between age and education to job satisfaction. There was a direct relationship between dissatisfaction and level of education. They also found the younger worker, regardless of educational level, also expressed more dissatisfaction. Winpisinger (1973) also concluded in his article entitled "Job Satisfaction-A Union Response" that the most dissatisfied people he knew were college graduates who couldn't find a position that lived up to their expectations. Cantor (1968) found in her study of Vista volunteers that education and socio-economic status was significantly related to job satisfaction. The higher the educational level, the more critical they were of the agency, and they also tended to be less satisfied than those from less affluent backgrounds. Those with a college education expected more from their work than those with high school and grammar school educations. Schreiber, Smith and Harrell (1952) found that education was related to the feeling of ability to advance. Herzberg, et al. (1957) however, in their review of six studies dealing with educational level and job satisfaction, reported conflicting outcomes. Four of the six studies reviewed concluded that no relationships existed.

Occupational levels have been found to be related to job satisfaction. Super (1939) found that percentage of satisfaction varied remarkedly from one occupational level to another. Professional and managerial workers were more satisfied than commercial, skilled, and semi-skilled workers, but the relationship was not linear. The higher level blue collar workers scored higher in satisfaction than the low level white collar workers. Centers (1948) obtained similar results, except that in his sample skilled workers were even more satisfied than professional workers. He concluded that job dissatisfaction differed for groups of workers at different occupation levels.

Stagner, Rich, and Britton (1941) found that pay, too has a relationship to satisfaction. Their study revealed that attitude toward wages was the most important factor in distinguishing highly satisfied, and highly dissatisfied defense workers. Inlow (1951) using liberal arts graduates for his subjects, found that satisfaction was related to wages.

Weaver (1974) reported that findings from four Gallup polls covering years 1963 to 1969 and representing 4,000 fully employed males over twenty-one, showed that there was a positive relationship between job satisfaction and income.

Contrary to Weaver's findings, Stein (1960) studied business and professional men with an average age of 46 who had been working an average of twenty years. He revealed that satisfaction, enjoyment, happiness, and a chance to be of service were more important factors than the amount of money earned. Also, Gomberg (1973) reported that in 1970 scientists on the staff of the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan published a study based on interviews with a large number of workers. Pay ranked fifth in order of importance out of eight variables.

Organizational climate is also another variable mentioned with job satisfaction. Lawler, Hall, and Oldham (1974) examined the view that organizational structure and process were related to organizational climate which, in turn is related to organizational performance and employee satisfaction. Questionnaires were completed by 117 directors of research and development organizations and 291 scientists. They found that perceived climate was significantly related to measures or organizational performance and job satisfaction. Lyon and Ivancevich (1974) studied organizational climate and its impact on job satisfaction in a university teachning hospital. They reported that different climate dimensions

influence individual job satisfaction facets and that organizational climate had a significant impact on self-actualization, a lesser impact on autonomy, and only a slight impact on esteem.

Job Satisfaction and Needs

Schaffer (1953) and Kuhlen (1963) studied the relationships between job satisfaction and needs and arrived at similar conclusions. In Schaffer's study, subjects rated themselves by means of scales on the magnitude of needs such as recognition, affection, achievement, dominance, and economic security. Subjects also indicated the degree to which each need was being met on the job, the importance of the need, and overall job satisfaction. He found that overall job satisfaction correlated .44 with need satisfaction. Kuhlen studied need satisfaction potential, occupational satisfaction, and personality types using 203 teachers as subjects. As a result of the findings, he concluded that need satisfaction was related to vocational satisfaction.

Another relevant study was performed by Gordon (1955). Using a questionnaire containing items presumed to relate to seven need categories, subjects rated the degree to which need was satisfied on the job. A factor analysis showed that the questionnaire covered three broad factors. One of these, identified as over-all need fulfillment, was found to be positively associated with self-estimated job satisfaction.

Chernik and Phelan (1974) surveyed 662 bank employees on job satisfaction based on Maslow's need hierarchy, indicating sex, education, job level, and salary. Amount of need satisfaction was positively related to occupational level and negatively to hierarchical level of the need.

Huskey (1973) administered a questionnaire to 100 persons in each of 4 rank-structure groupings of the United States military population stationed in West Berlin, Germany. The research question asked whether the military worker, like his civilian counterpart, was tending to adopt self-actualization as an important part of the work ethic. Results showed that job satisfaction was closely related to the individual's feeling that his self-growth needs were being met in his work.

Hrebiniak and Roteman (1973) examined relationships between need satisfaction and absenteeism for a sample of 40 managers in a state organization. The data indicated a positive relationship between dissatisfaction and absenteeism. The larger the need deficiencies, as measured by Porter's (1962) questionnaire format, the greater the rate of absenteeism.

Sarveswara (1972) studied the determinants of perceived need satisfaction and the relative importance of these factors to 75 semi-skilled and 84 unkileed workers in a public industrial unit. He concluded that semi-skilled workers appeared to be more satisfied with job conditions than unskilled workers in that they mentioned fewer need deficiencies.

Several studies in the area of job satisfaction and needs have yielded negative results. Roberts, Gordon, and Miles (1971) completed a factor analytic study of job satisfaction items designed to measure Maslow's need categories. Using 300 managers from six organizations as subjects, they found that none of the 4 analyses produced Maslow's need dimensions in the job satisfaction context established. Neeley (1973) tested 2 hypotheses of Wolf's (1970) need gratification theory of job satisfaction-dissatisfaction which emphasizes the moderating influence of psychological needs on the relationship between job elements and satisfaction. The needs of a stratified random sample of 75 non-academic

college employees were assessed by a projective method (eg., the TAT). Neither of the original hypotheses was supported. It is suggested that the need gratification theory be expanded to include situation variables.

SUMMARY OF LITERATURE ON JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction measurement has been accomplished through the use of several procedures. Perhaps the most widely used has been the attitude questionnaire developed by Hoppock (1935). A number of other instruments have since been devised using the attitude questionnaire procedure. One of the most prominent and recently used instruments to measure job satisfaction is the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Weiss, et al. (1967).

In studies involving job satisfaction of educators, results reveal that teachers, both men and women, who have advanced degrees tend to be more satisfied with their work, and that the most satisfied teachers are more job oriented. In studies measuring the job satisfaction of college teachers, the results supported the idea that they were generally satisfied with the nature of their work; i.e., class size, courses taught, teaching load, and academic freedom. Achievement, recognition, and interpersonal relations with peers, supervisors, and subordinates are variables considered by school principals as being important in measuring job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

There are some conflicting results regarding job satisfaction and age. However, most researchers have reported that job satisfaction increased with age.

There appears to be no definite trend in sex research. Several studies reveal that women are more satisfied with their jobs than men while other studies make no such revelation.

In terms of education and job satisfaction, some studies show that the more educated populace tend to be more dissatisfied with their jobs. One of the major reasons cited has been the fact that they have tendencies to expect more from their jobs. Other studies have revealed that no such relationship exists.

While some researchers have found professional and managerial workers to be more satisfied than skilled and semi-skilled workers, others have found conflicting results. Therefore the relationship between job satisfaction and occupational level is apparently unclear.

The amount of pay one receives has been mentioned as an important variable in determining job satisfaction. Although pay is important, other factors such as enjoyment, happiness, and a chance to be of service have been found to rank higher than pay. The trend revealed by research thus far, indicates that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and income.

Organizational climate is another important element in the measurement of job satisfaction. Research results have shown that the conditions and atmosphere that prevail at work have the potential to affect the self-esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization of workers.

The relationship between job satisfaction and needs has been studied and the results are conflicting. In some studies, needs such as recognition, affection, achievement, dominance, and economic security were related to job satisfaction and in others they were not. However, when needs were being met, workers had a lower rate of absenteeism.

PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

Individual differences in personality needs, drives, motives, and general character traits are extremely important in the world of work. In the field of volunteer work, personality characteristics or traits of volunteers also play an important role in the choices they make in all stages of their development.

It must be remembered that the most important needs that characterize the personality of volunteers cannot be fully described by simple itemization. Motivation variables among people are less likely to be a matter of having, or not having, certain needs than of their relative importance for each person. In one person, a specific need may be most powerful. This does not necessarily indicate that the individuals are driven primarily by striving for one need at the expense of another; rather it infers that certain needs may be more powerful in directing their behavior than others. With this in mind, it can reasonably be predicted that when individuals are faced with a choice of action, to the degree that certain needs are predominant, they will behave in a manner that offers them chances to meet certain needs.

Realizing that personality needs of volunteers are important in light of structuring meaningful experiences, this portion of the review of related literature covers (a) problems in personality research, (b) trends in personality research, (c) the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, (d) and studies using the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

Problems in Personality Research

Burton (1974) mentioned that one of the greatest paradoxes in the study of personality is that those who work the most in personality, and know a great deal about it, do not write books on theories of personality.

Murphy (1964) questioned whether psychologists are not setting their sights too high in attempting to understand personality. He indicated that the difficulty of understanding the complete personality is related to the fact that half of what determines personality at a given time is situationally defined while the other half is tied up with almost invisible processes.

Holtzman (1964) identified a number of problem areas related to recurring dilemmas in personality assessment. He defined these problem areas as follows: (a) uncertainty of the meaning of personality assessment, (b) the large number of things which must be known about an individual in order to understand his/her personality, (c) the dangers involved in building a culture-bound theory and the difficulty in developing a technique of evaluating the theory, (d) the development of a systematic comprehensive personality theory closely linked with empirical data, and (e) the moral dilemmas created by personality assessment.

Murray (1962) claimed that there are a number of difficulties that confront investigators of personality. He listed the problem areas as follows: (a) limitation of time, (b) peculiar effect of the laboratory situation, (c) effect of the experimenter and the difficulty of estimating it, (d) limitations of perceptual ability, (e) limitations of apperceptual ability, (f) unreliability of subjective reports, (g) variability of the subject's personality, (h) limitation in the number and

variety of subjects, and (1) inadequate conceptual scheme.

Hathaway (1963) and Brody (1972) commented on problems associated with the role of observers in personality research. Hathaway mentioned that the possibility existed that personality development had been hampered by attempts to eliminate the observer. He proposed an approach based upon a combination of statistical and clinical processing. Brody, on the other hand, mentioned that using observers to develop descriptions of personality quite frequently presents problems because their judgments may not be impartial or objective, but may be influenced by characteristics of the person who is the judge.

Carlson (1975) indicated that one of the most serious problems remains the absence of any widely shared, comprehensive, and dynamic theoretical framework capable of posing significant, researchable questions or of tying together research findings.

Allport (1937) and Anderson (1969) both claimed that personality research was piecemeal and that what we have is a loose collection of topics, each of which more or less goes its own way. Anderson specifically refers to personality research as a "disconcerting sprawl."

Several writers in the area of personality research have commented on the lack of diversity of subjects utilized in personality research. Sechrest (1976) expressed that for too large a proportion of what we know about personality, particularly in experimental personality, is not in any way generalizable beyond the universe of university students enrolled in psychology. In an editorial in Child Development, Siegal (1967) also points to the common use of captive subjects which has led to the neglect of the study of personality of those age groups that are not in school.

Carlson's (1975) review of 226 articles indicates that fifty-seven percent of the studies published in the two major journals of personality disregarded subject variables and showed a "generalist" bias. Forty-three percent of the studies examined group differences but equally limited these differences to only one dimension such as regression-sensitization, birth order, or level of anxiety. She did not find a single article that carried out any extended examination or even a limited one into the way in which personality variables were organized in a given individual.

Another problem area deals with the matter of measuring change in personality. Holzman (1974), in his comments regarding personality, mentioned that personality never is, it is always in the stage of changing and becoming. Cattell (1957) commented that the handling of personality measurement assumed a stable personality entity to be measured at a given time but that attention to the measurement of personality was relatively meaningless without attention to the measurement of change.

Trends in Personality Research

Gaier and White (1965) reviewed the literature on the study of personality for the period from July 1961 to July 1964 and noted interesting changes from the studies prior to that time. The following change was noted: appraisal of other investigators' data as well as one's own data when the latter was being interpreted. They stated, however, that the studies during the previous three years reflected a picture of chaos, a kind of anarchy that plagued the literature in terms of an apparent lack of criteria that were generally acceptable even to investigators with comparable training, experience and stated commitments.

Cantril and Livingston (1963) mentioned that another important development in the study of personality is the emerging role of the central

Carlson's (1975) review of 226 articles indicates that fifty-seven percent of the studies published in the two major journals of personality disregarded subject variables and showed a "generalist" bias. Forty-three percent of the studies examined group differences but equally limited these differences to only one dimension such as regression-sensitization, birth order, or level of anxiety. She did not find a single article that carried out any extended examination or even a limited one into the way in which personality variables were organized in a given individual.

Another problem area deals with the matter of measuring change in personality. Holzman (1974), in his comments regarding personality, mentioned that personality never is, it is always in the stage of changing and becoming. Cattell (1957) commented that the handling of personality measurement assumed a stable personality entity to be measured at a given time but that attention to the measurement of personality was relatively meaningless without attention to the measurement of change.

Trends in Personality Research

Gaier and White (1965) reviewed the literature on the study of personality for the period from July 1961 to July 1964 and noted interesting changes from the studies prior to that time. The following change was noted: appraisal of other investigators' data as well as one's own data when the latter was being interpreted. They stated, however, that the studies during the previous three years reflected a picture of chaos, a kind of anarchy that plagued the literature in terms of an apparent lack of criteria that were generally acceptable even to investigators with comparable training, experience and stated commitments.

Cantril and Livingston (1963) mentioned that another important development in the study of personality is the emerging role of the central

nervous system in motivation. Basic systems are being discovered in the nervous system which do propel the organism toward or away from certain situations and further help to account for the interdependence of perception and motivation.

Because of tremendous strides and advancements in the area of computer technology, there is potential for personality researchers to take advantage of the use of computers in their research. Computers can handle vast amounts of data in a multivariate manner. Gaier and White (1965) offered the opinion that if educators and psychologists are to be in tune with personality theory, it will be necessary for them to be aware of details of computer programming.

The multivariate approach to studying personality is supported by Cattel (1965), Klein, Barr and Wolitzky (1967). Cattell commented on the scientific study of personality by emphasizing that a number of statistical concepts are essential to understanding what experimental psychology is saying that is different from past pronouncements. He indicated that the multivariate experiment approach handled numerous variables at one time, and in the study of personality the total organism must be studied, not bits and pieces of its behavior. Klein, Barr and Wolitzky claimed that the study of personality continues to be a multivariate approach to diverse psychological functions necessitated by omipresent individual differences. They also expressed that neurophysiological theory has influenced the trend toward an organismic view of diverse part functions and processes.

Holzman (1974) noted that for the most part, personologists have shied away from longitudinal studies for methodological reasons such as the investigation might outlive the investigator, and the measuring instruments adopted for one age range may be unsuitable for another.

Carlson (1975) analyzed hundreds of journal articles on the study of personality and found that the majority are carried out on predominately male psychology students, that most of the studies are experimental, almost invariably they involved a time span of a single session with the subject, and rarely did they examine in any detail the sex differences and the meaning of these differences on the measures employed in any given study.

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

Three common ways in which psychometrists of personality can observe behavior are: (a) ratings by the observers, (b) questionnaires, and (c) personality tests. As late as 1920, the questionnaire was one of the first mediums utilized in measuring personality. However, it had its short-comings: (a) subjects had no norms by which to compare their responses, (b) subjects wanted to make good impressions and often answered questions accordingly, and (c) subjects from different cultures showed differences in their readiness to express private evaluations publicly. In spite of these shortcomings, the questionnaire has been a useful tool in measuring personality traits.

Edwards and Abbott (1973) mentioned that the most widely used instruments which provide objective measurements of traits and characteristics of personality are: The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI), the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI), and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS).

Fiske (1959) stated:

> The EPPS has the advantage of being based on a more sophisticated theoretical formulation than most inventories. It assesses 15 of Murray's variables. In addition, it provides a measure of consistency

> of response within a single testing session and a measure of profile stability. . . . The inventory itself represents a distinct step forward in techniques for the measurement of personality. It is theoretically oriented and technically sound. (P. 119).

Ake (1959) in his review of the EPPS commented:

> It has been a drawback in many inventories that subjects tend to endorse desirable and reject undesirable items. One outstanding characteristic of the EPPS is the attempt to minimize this disturbing influence by means of a specific kind of forced choice. . . . . The EPPS is an instrument which has several unique and useful characteristics and which promises to be very helpful in general personality-oriented research. (PP. 117-118).

Stricker and Lawrence (1965) also commented:

> Since its appearance a decade ago, the EPPS has been very widely used and has generated a tremendous amount of research. . . . This popularity stems from the theoretical relevance and potential usefulness to the personality variables that is intended to measure 15 of Murray's needs. (P. 87).

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule consists of 15 of the variables of Murray's need system: achievement, deference, order, exhibition, autonomy, affiliation, intraception, succorance, dominance, abasement, nurturance, change, endurance, heterosexuality, and aggression. The schedule consists of 210 pairs of items in a forced-choice format, with items from each of the 15 scales being paired off twice against items from the other 14. In addition, 15 items are repeated in order to obtain an estimate of the respondent's consistency. The pairings of variables against one another yields an assessment of the relative strength of competing needs within the person; however, the relative strength of such needs in persons representative of the general population remains the basic point of reference.

Evidence regarding the construct validity of various EPPS scales has been reported in studies by Poe (1969), Richardson (1969), Weigel and Frazier (1968), and Williams and Bruel (1968). Scores on the EPPS scales have been found to be correlated with scales on the Strong

Vocational Interest Blank by Kohlan (1968) and the Personal Orientation Inventory by Lemay and Damm (1969). A detailed description of the EPPS appears in chapter 3 of this study.

Studies Involving the Use of the EPPS

Holt and Carr (1969) administered the EPPS to (a) 29 counselor aide university summer education students, (b) 30 National Defense Education Act Counseling and Guidance Institute students, and (c) 30 students in an advanced National Defense Education Act program. Overall, they found few significant differences between the National Defense Education Act groups. However, they found that the counseling aide summer education students scored higher on dominance, heterosexuality and lower in abasement than both National Defense Education Act students.

Evans (1972) studied 226 students at a small private college in Mississippi. Using the EPPS, the study was designed to determine the relationships between personality needs and student satisfaction with respect to selected dimensions of the college campus. Cannonical correlation analysis was used to test the degree of relationships among two domains of variables. Evans' findings revealed that the personality need factors which offered the highest degree of contribution to the relationships were autonomy, heterosexuality, deference, endurance, order and nurturance. Of the five possible relationships, only two were found to be statistically significant.

Rickey, et al. (1972) studied personality differences among community college students using the EPPS. The 327 students in the study were enrolled in engineering, art, and business classes. The results of the study indicated that freshmen scored higher than sophomores in dominance

and endurance while sophomores had higher scores on affiliation, succorance, and nurturance. With respect to fields of study, business majors were significantly superior in achievement, exhibition, affiliation, intraception, succorance, nurturance, dominance, endurance, and aggression. Engineering students were significantly superior in order, dominance, and consistency. No significant differences were found among art students.

Simon and Primavera (1972) compared the psychological needs, as measured by the EPPS, of a sample of 152 women attending a non-coed Catholic College with those of the normative sample. They found that the students who attended the non-coed Catholic College scored significantly higher on needs for autonomy, succorance, nurturance, heterosexuality, and aggression and significantly lower on the needs for achievement, deference, order, dominance, and endurance ($P < .01$ in all cases).

Simon, Wild, and Cristal (1973) used the EPPS to compare the psychological needs of 29 male police personnel with a normative sample of males selected from the general population and college males. They found that the police personnel differed significantly from the general population of males on 9 of the 15 EPPS needs and from the college males on 7 needs. In addition, it was revealed that the needs of those who had been involved in police work for more than six years were not different from those who had been involved in police work for a shorter period of time.

Kindall and McClain (1973) compared the EPPS scores of 90 males and 108 female students at Tennessee State University in 1970, to 63 male and 108 female students at Philander Smith College in 1955. They found that the men in 1970 had a higher mean score on exhibition, autonomy, dominance, heterosexuality, and aggression and that their mean scores

were lower on deference, affiliation and endurance. Mean scores for women in 1970 were higher on exhibition, autonomy, succorance, heterosexuality, and aggression while their mean scores were lower on achievement, deference, order, affiliation, and endurance.

Jericho (1972) using as his population, samples from participants in the Lakewood, Ohio Adult Education and Recreation Department's Class A Baseball Program, studied the relationships of certain personality needs, as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, to participation, perserverance, and performance. The study sample showed a lower need for order, dominance, nurturance, and change than did the EPPS normative sample, and a higher need for deference, exhibition, autonomy, abasement and aggression. The non-dropouts showed a higher need for achievement and endurance than did the dropouts, and a lower need for dominance and aggression. Also, the high performers showed a higher need for dominance, and endurance than the low performers, and a lower need for abasement.

Kaul (1971) administered the Hindi adaption of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule to 150 urban and 150 rural male, and identical cells of female, 13-16 year old students. Means and standard deviations were calculated separately for each group on each need, and analysis of variance was applied to test overall significance of difference between means of the 4 groups. Means differed significantly on need dominance, endurance, nurturance ($P < .05$), and aggression ($P < .01$). It was concluded that (a) need achievement and affiliation are equally dominant among urban and rural students; (b) urban boys are more dominant than students in the other three groups; (c) urban boys are more aggressive than rural girls; (d) rural girls are less dominant than urban girls or rural boys; and (e) rural girls are more enduring, hardworking, nurturing, and

sympathetic than students in the three other groups.

Randolph (1973) studied the personality needs of 120 doctoral students in counselor education who preferred functional specialities as administrators or practitioners. The students were selected from 20 southern universities. He found that the students who chose administration scored significantly higher ($P < .05$) on achievement, dominance, order and social recognition needs than did the students who chose to be practitioners.

SUMMARY OF LITERATURE ON PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

The review of literature identified some serious problems in the personality assessment arena. Specific problems cited pertained to the lack of the development of a systematic and comprehensive personality theory closely linked with empirical data, moral dilemmas, the role of the observers, the limitation of the variety of subjects, and how to assess personality change effectively. While those who know the most about personality tend not to write books on the subject, others are grappling with the difficulty in understanding what personality is at any given time and measuring the change that may occur in personality over an extended period of time.

There appears to be more of a tendency to appraise and analyze data, and to take into account the increasing role of the central nervous system in studying personality. It is believed by two researchers that certain systems within the nervous system help to explain the motivations of individuals in various situations.

There is also an increasing trend to utilize computers in personality research; they can provide the researcher with the ability to handle a vast amount of data in a multivariate manner.

There is a trend away from longitudinal studies because the investigation might outlive the investigator and because of problems encountered

in using adequate measuring devices.

College students continue to be the most widely used subjects in personality research because most personality researchers (college professors) use their students who are easily accessible.

There have been numerous studies using the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule as an instrument to measure personality needs and characteristics of students, counselors, and teachers. The primary reasons supporting the use of the EPPS have been its theoretical relevance and potential usefulness to the personality variables intended to measure Murray's 15 needs.

ALTRUISM

Altruism appears to be an obvious motivational factor in volunteering. However, in actuality this may not be the case. Quite frequently the term is associated with the behavior of individuals who voluntarily give assistance to others. Exploring research on altruism coupled with sex differences, age differences, family size and ordinal position, social class, effects of success and competence, effects of failure and harming will hopefully provide information that will contribute to a better understanding of motives of college student volunteers. There is a need to know what motivates the volunteer to be there in the first place.

Sex Differences in Altruism

Rosenhan and White (1967) found that fourth and fifth grade males gave more five cent gift certificates to winners of a bowling game than females after prior contact with a female model when the model was absent during the giving period. Bryan and Walbek (1969) later

found in their study of girls and boys in the third and fourth grades, that boys gave more after they were exposed to a charitable (versus non-donating) same sexed peer model.

While some studies found males to be more altruistic than females, one particular study found just the reverse. White (1967) found that fourth and fifth grade girls had a tendency to give more than boys after a few days delay, especially when they had an opportunity to observe an altruistic model.

There were studies that revealed consistent sex differences in terms of dependency. Schopler and Bateson (1965) found that females were most likely to volunteer for an unpleasant experiment when they were of low dependency. Another study by Schopler (1967) tested the hypothesis that males were reluctant to help a highly dependent male because he threatened their status. It was found that males (not females) helped less after receiving a request from their partner saying, "I think you should give me more money."

Contrary to the above findings, Fischer (1963) Gerwitz (1948), and Hartup and Keller (1960) all found in their studies no sex differences in altruism for nursery school children.

These findings reveal no clear tendency regarding sex differences and altruism.

Age Differences in Altruism

There is considerable evidence to support the idea that altruism increases with age. In reviewing studies involving students in the first three grades, Midlarsky and Bryan (1967), Staub and Feagans (1969), and Ugurel-Semin (1952) all found altruism to increase with age. Midlarsky and Bryan found that first graders who were exposed to expressive

cues gave less than second, third and fourth graders. Staub and Feagans found an increase in assistance in an emergency situation from kindergarten through the second grade. Ugurel-Semin also found an increase in generosity from age 6 to 8.

There is even more support for increases in altruism with age. Handlon and Gross (1959), Harris (1968) and Staub (1968) also found a similar developmental trend with altruism and age. Handlon and Gross found that the number of pennies or seals given to a partner increased from the kindergarten through the sixth grade and then giving leveled off. Harris found that children in the fifth grade gave more to charity in a control condition than children in the fourth grade. Staub in his study using success and failure, found a tendency toward an increase in sharing from the fourth to the fifth grade after an experience of success, but a decrease in sharing after an experience of failure.

Family Size and Ordinal Position

Although they are not entirely consistent, findings relevant to the relationship between family size and ordinal position and altruism suggest that children from large families are more altruistic than children from small families. Findings also indicate that other than only children are not more altruistic than only children, and children in families with fewer or greater than four or five siblings are less altruistic than children in families with four and five siblings.

Ribal (1963) found that the altruistic college students who scored high on need for nurturance and low on need for succorance tended to come from large families and to be the oldest children. A study by Ugurel-Semin (1952) also gives support to this position. He found that children in Istanbul from small families were more selfish than those from large families. And Sawyer (1966) found that altruism was correlated

with the number of older sisters.

Studies by Friedricks (1960), Handlon and Gross (1959), and Harris (1967) were neutral in this area. Friedricks, Handlon and Gross found no difference between the altruism evidence by only and other than only children. Harris also failed to find an effect for ordinal position in elementary school children.

Contrary to both of the above positions, Schaffer (1969), in her study of one hundred fifth and sixth graders in a predominantly middle and upper class grammer school of a Boston suburb, found that children in families with four and five siblings are more altruistic than children in families with fewer or greater than this number of siblings ($P < .05$).

Social Class and Altruism

While there has been a great deal of sociological discussion about the middle class in our society, it is rather interesting to note what researchers have found in regard to altruism and the middle class.

Muir and Weinstein (1962) compared upper middle and lower class norms of social obligation and found that although housewives from high and low socio-economic strata reacted similarly in most situations, upper middle class women were more likely to cut off the credit of dilatory debtors and to feel obliged to extra-familial creditors. Women from high socio-economic strata seemed most influenced by norms of reciprocity and exchange, while women from low socio-economic strata seemed most influenced by consideration of "mutual aid" and the norm of social responsibility.

Berkowitz and Friedman (1967) determined two sectors of the middle class where altruistic behavior was found to be divergent. They found that burearcratic (employed by others) middle class subjects were

more willing to aid others, regardless of how much or little the situation benefited them personally. But among entrepreneural (self-employed) middle class subjects, aiding behavior was much less in evidence, and seemed to occur when conditions of reciprocity were present.

Lowe and Ritchey (1973) in their research where 800 self-addressed envelopes were dropped between two cities, one populated by upper middle-class and one populated by lower middle-class, found that older and upper middle-classes displayed more altruism as measured by the greater return of lost letters.

Sawyer (1966) also found the YMCA students of the lower middle class, versus business students or social science students, indicated the greatest willingness to be altruistic toward friends, strangers, and antagonists. Business school students revealed that they were more likely to help themselves while hindering antagonists, and social science students were most oriented toward helping their friends.

Ugurel-Semin (1952) found that poor children from Istanbul were less selfish than children from middle-class or rich families. The middle-class children were also least generous, and children from rich families shared evenly least often. These findings imply that there may be class differences in altruism from one society to another.

Effects of Success and Competence on Altruism

Some research on altruism has manipulated variables to induce certain states and individuals to either increase or decrease the likelihood for altruistic responses. The finding in this part pertains to the effect of the experiences of success and competence on altruism.

Berkowitz and Connor (1966) tested the hypothesis that success

increases the salience of the social responsibility norm, which leads to altruism toward dependent others. They found that success on a simple task resulted in greater effort on behalf of a highly dependent peer than did failure or no experience at all. Success did not result in more helping for others of low dependency.

Staub's (1968) findings suggest that there may be developmental differences in reaction to success and failure. While fifth-grade children had a tendency to leave more candy for a hypothetical other after they succeeded (versus failed or did average) on a bowling game task, fourth-graders left more after they failed. The author suggested that a "norm of deserving" motivated the fourth graders but that the fifth graders were motivated by "norms or standards or values directly related to sharing."

A relationship between competence and altruism was found by Midlarsky (1968). Subjects who were told that they adapted well to electric shock took more shocks for another than those who were told they adapted poorly.

Form and Nosow (1958) and Torrance and Ziller (1957), in naturalistic reports relating to disasters, suggested that observers who perceive themselves as competent in emergency situations help more than those who do not. In experiments, the experience of success seemed to increase self-esteem, which led to increased affect and altruism.

Effects of Failure and Harming on Altruism

Contrary to what one would tend to believe, failure and inflicting harm has the potential to cause persons to act altruistically.

Darlington and Macker (1966) found that failure to complete a pencil and paper task correctly resulted in more agreement to donate blood when

the failure hurt a helpful other than when it did not. Another study by Rawlings (1968) found that the observation of a person receiving harm is enough in itself to induce altruism. Weiner (1968) and Regan (1971) also concluded as a result of their experiments to examine whether or not harm-doing leads to altruistic behavior that guilt and inequity were sources of altruistic acts of those who caused harm or witnessed no misfortunes.

Carlsmith and Gross (1969) and Freedman, Wallington, and Bless (1967) also found that harm-doing frequently motivates individuals to repay or repair the damages. Carlsmith and Gross found that subjects who delivered shocks to another were more likely to volunteer support for a humanitarian cause than those who did not shock another. In the experiment by Freedman, Wallington, and Bless they reported that subjects who knocked over a pile of index cards were more willing to volunteer for an experiment to help another than those who did not, providing the solicitor was not the owner of the index cards.

Berscheid and Walster (1967) also found that harm-doers were most likely to compensate their victims when they could make exact reparation. Female members of church auxiliaries who caused their partners to lose needed books of green stamps awarded bonuses to them if the bonuses were neither insufficient nor excessive depending on the original loss. It can be safely stated that as a result of the above reserach that harm-doing does elicit altruistic behavior.

SUMMARY OF LITERATURE ON ALTRUISM

Demographic characteristics of altruists have been studied by numerous researchers. This review of research has taken a look at

the findings in the areas of sex, age, family size and ordinal position, social class, effects of success and competence, and effects of harm and failure on altruism.

In terms of sex differences in altruism, researchers have reported that in some cases, boys were more altruistic and in another study, girls were more altruistic at the elementary school level. However at the nursery school level, research seems to prove that there are no sex differences in altruism.

The same trend does not continue when age and altruism are considered. Most of the findings, using children in grades one through six, support the premise that altruism tends to increase with age.

Although they are not entirely consistent, findings relevant to the relationship between ordinal position and altruism suggested that college students who possess a high need for nurturance and a low need for succorance came from large families and are more altruistic than children from small families, other than only children are not more altruistic than only children, and children in families with four or five siblings are more altruistic than children in families with more or less than this number of siblings.

Findings also imply that various social classes differ in altruisitc behavior from one society to another. Research results revealed that in the United States the upper middle-class is more altruistic than the lower middle-class, and in Istanbul poor children behaved more altruistically than middle-class and upper-class children.

In the area of the effects of success and competence in regard to altruism, research findings suggest that altruistic responses on behalf of dependent others are more likely to occur after success than after failure or after a neutral experience.

Individuals also behave altruistically as a result of afflicting harm or witnessing harm on another. Guilt feelings and equity have been reported to be a frequent source of altruistic behavior.

Chapter 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter contains a detailed description of the research design. It includes instruments used in gathering data, and procedures followed in collecting and analyzing the data.

In planning the research design, the foci of concerns were the following: what are the relationships between personality needs of selected student volunteers and job satisfaction, and what are the best combinations of personality variables for predicting high intrinsic, extrinsic and general job satisfaction.

COLLECTION OF DATA

Population of Study

The universe in this study was undergraduate and graduate students enrolled at Indiana State University during the Fall semester of the 1975-76 school year. In this research project, 190 students registered to volunteer at the Center for Voluntary Services and were placed on a job. Slightly over one-half (110) of the volunteers were at the Freshman or Sophomore level. Both males and females were almost equal in number as there were 91 men and 99 women. Almost all of the divisions within the University were represented, however, over 50% of the volunteers were enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences (88) and the School of Business (32). Student volunteers were utilized in a variety of capacities such as tutoring elementary and grade school children (32), serving as a

big brother or big sister (38), conducting clean-up projects (41), and collecting funds for community organizations (50). The number of students who participated in group projects totaled 91, while the remaining 99 volunteered on an individual basis. The amount of time spent on the job varied from one hour to twenty or more during the Fall semester of 1975-76.

Of the 190 student volunteers asked to participate in this study, 131 actually completed both questionnaires. Only one student out of all the volunteers who started responding to the questionnaires refused to continue to complete the instruments. The reason he gave was that he just did not care to answer them. Fifty-eight individuals failed to respond to initial correspondence and to follow-up phone calls. The one hundred and thirty-one student volunteers who completed the questionnaires constituted 69% of the population.

A distribution of the student volunteers involved in the study by class, sex, major, type of job, and whether they were involved on an individual or group basis is shown on pages 103 and 104 (Appendix A).

Procedure for Collecting the Data

The names and addresses of the student volunteers were obtained from the head administrator for the Center for Voluntary Services. Personal letters (Appendix B) were sent to each volunteer asking his/her participation by reporting to the Student Research and Testing Office at Indiana State University for the purpose of completing the EPPS and MSQ (Modified Short Form). Immediately after the deadline for responding, personal phone calls were made to all of the volunteers who had not yet participated in the research project.

The questionnaires, which required approximately fifty minutes to

complete, were administered by staff members of the Student Research and Testing Office at Indiana State University. Completed questionnaires and answer sheets were returned to the investigator within one month after the initial letters were mailed to all the student volunteers.

Answer sheets for the EPPS and the MSQ (Modified Short Form) were scored and tabulated by the Student Research and Testing Office. Computations were performed using the Indiana State University Computer (IBM 360/50).

INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

One of the first problems to be resolved in a study of this nature was the selection of a suitable instrument for the measurement of personality characteristics. The EPPS was selected as the most fitting instrument for the purpose of this study. Edwards (1959) mentioned that the EPPS was designed primarily as a tool for counseling and research, to provide insight on a number of independent, normal personality variables. The questionnaire usually takes approximately fifty minutes to complete.

The EPPS is an inventory which measures fifteen of the manifest needs as derived from H.A. Murray's Needs System by arranging 225 items made up of paired statements in a forced choice situation, with items from each of the fifteen scales being paired twice with items from all the other scales. Edwards suggested that the influence of social desirability on the responses is minimized by pairing items of approximately equal social desirability. The test manual by Edwards provides a description and explanation of the meanings of the variables.

Achievement (ach): To do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be able to do things better than others, to write a great novel or play.

Deference (def): To get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to follow instructions and do what is expected, to praise others, to tell others that they have done a good job, to accept the leadership of others, to read about great men, to conform to custom and avoid the unconventional, to let others make decisions.

Order (ord): To have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting on a difficult task, to have things organized, to keep things neat and orderly, to make advance plans when taking a trip, to organize details of work, to keep letters and files according to some system, to have meals organized and a definite time for eating, to have things arranged so that they run smoothly without change.

Exhibition (exh): To say witty and clever things, to tell jokes and stories, to talk about personal adventures and experiences, to have others notice and comment upon one's appearance, to say things just to see what affect it will have on others, to talk about personal achievements, to be the center of attention, to use words that others do not know the meaning of, to ask questions others cannot answer.

Autonomy (aut): To be able to come and go as desired, to say what one thinks about things, to be independent of others in making decisions, to feel free to do what one wants, to do things that are unconventional, to avoid situations where one is expected to conform, to do things without regard to what others may think, to criticize those in positions of authority, to avoid responsibilities and obligations.

Affiliation (aff): To be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to do things for friends, to form new friendships,

to make as many friends as possible, to share things with friends, to do things with friends rather than alone, to form strong attachments, to write letters to friends.

Intraception (int): To analyze one's motives and feelings, to observe others, to understand how others feel about problems, to put one's self in another's place, to judge people by why they do things rather than by what they do, to analyze the motives of others, to predict how others will act.

Succorance (suc): To have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be kindly, to have others be sympathetic and understanding about personal problems, to receive a great deal of affection from others, to have others do favors cheerfully, to be helped by others when depressed, to have others feel sorry when one is sick, to have a fuss made over one when hurt.

Dominance (dom): To argue for one's point of view, to be a leader in groups to which one belongs, to be regarded by others as a leader, to be elected or appointed chairman of committees, to make group decisions, to settle arguments and disputes between others, to persuade and influence others to do what one wants, to supervise and direct the actions of others, to tell others how to do their jobs.

Abasement (aba): To feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right, to feel that personal pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel the need for punishment for wrong doing, to feel better when giving in and avoiding a fight than when having one's own way, to feel depressed by inability to handle

situations, to feel timid in the presence of superiors, to feel inferior to others in most respects.

Nurturance (nur): To help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate, to treat others with kindness and sympathy, to forgive others, to do small favors for others, to be generous with others, to sympathize with others who are hurt or sick, to show a great deal of affection toward others, to have others confide in one about personal problems.

Change (chg): To do new and different things, to travel, to meet new people, to experience novelty and change in daily routine, to experiment and try new things, to eat in new and different places, to try new and different jobs, to move about the country and live in different places, to participate in new fads and fashions.

Endurance (end): To keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle or problem until it is solved, to work at a single job before taking on others, to stay up late working in order to get a job done, to put in long hours of work without distraction, to stick at a problem even though it may seem as if no progress is being made, to avoid being interrupted while at work.

Heterosexuality (het): To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to kiss those of the opposite sex, to read books and plays involving sex, to listen to or tell jokes involving sex, to become sexually excited.

Aggression (agg): To attack contrary points of view, to tell others what one thinks of them, to criticize others publicly, to make fun of others, to tell others off when disagreeing with them, to get revenge for insults, to become angry, to blame others when things go wrong, to read newspaper accounts of violence.

The establishment of percentile ranks for each of the variables provides an assessment of the relative strengths of competing needs of an individual. The normative samples consisted of 749 college women and 760 college men enrolled in day or evening liberal arts classes at various universities (Edwards, 1959).

The test manual by Edwards reported that split-half reliabilities ranged from a low of .60 on Deference to a high of .87 on Heterosexuality. Test-retest coefficients ranged from a low of .74 on Achievement and Exhibition to a high of .88 on Abasement. The test manual also reported that the variables indicate a sufficiently low intercorrelation which would suggest that the items being measured are relatively independent personality factors.

The validity of the EPPS personality measures is a difficult statistic to establish since the traits measured are not readily observable. This fact has resulted in presenting self-ratings or ratings by peers as criterion measures on which validity is presented. A second approach to presenting validity of the EPPS is by correlating results on various scales of the EPPS with other variables (on other instruments) which should be related. The test manual presents evidence of validity by comparing EPPS results with the Guilford-Martin Personal Inventory (undated) and the Manifest Anxiety Scale (Taylor, 1953). McKee, however, commented in Buros (1972) that the EPPS has had a deficiency from its inception in that validity was not emphasized in scale development.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire--Short Form

The Theory of Work Adjustment formulated by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1964) specified two variables as indicators of work adjustment: satisfaction and satisfactoriness. Weiss, Dawis, Lofquist, and England (1967) developed the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Long Form) to measure the satisfaction variable on twenty dimensions. The original long form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) measured job satisfaction on twenty different scales. The following is a list of the MSQ scale titles and satisfaction items which correlated highest with that individual scale for a group of 1,793 employed individuals:

1. Ability Utilization. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.
2. Achievement. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.
3. Activity. Being able to keep busy all the time.
4. Advancement. The chances for advancement on this job.
5. Authority. The chance to tell other people what to do.
6. Company Policies and Practices. The way company policies are put into practice.
7. Compensation. My pay and the amount of work I do.
8. Co-workers. The way my co-workers get along with each other.
9. Creativity. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.
10. Independence. The chance to work alone on the job.
11. Moral Values. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.
12. Recognition. The praise I get for doing a good job.
13. Responsibility. The freedom to use my own judgment.
14. Security. The way my job provides for steady employment.
15. Social Service. The chance to do things for other people.
16. Social Status. The chance to be "somebody" in the community.

17. Supervision-Human Relations. The way my boss handles his workers.

18. Supervision-Technical. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.

19. Variety. The chance to do different things from time to time.

20. Working Conditions. The working conditions.

Factor analysis of the MSQ scales yielded two factors of satisfaction identified as intrinsic and extrinsic which accounted for fifty-seven percent and forty-three percent of common variance respectively.

In order to shorten the time for administration of the instrument, a short form of the MSQ was constructed. Directions for the short form of the MSQ are identical to those of the long form. The respondents are directed to respond to the statement: "On my present job, this is how I feel about {the item in question}. Five alternative responses are provided for each item: Very dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Neither (dissatisfied nor satisfied); Satisfied; and Very Satisfied. The alternative responses are weighted one to five respectively for scoring purposes.

The MSQ short form, like the MSQ long form, yields measures of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction. Intrinsic scores were obtained from those satisfaction items related to ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral value, social service, social status, and working conditions. Satisfaction items contributing to extrinsic scores included authority, company policy, recognition, responsibility, security and variety. The general satisfaction score was determined by summing item scores for all twenty MSQ short form items which included the eighteen items accounted for in the intrinsic and extrinsic factors,

and two additional items identified as supervision-human relations and supervision-technical.

Using the short form of the MSQ, satisfaction data was obtained for a total group of 1,460 men representing six occupational classifications. Included in the total were engineers, assemblers, clerks, janitors, maintenance men, machinists, and salesmen. In general, the reliability coefficients were high for all three scales. Intrinsic scale coefficients ranged from .84 (for two assembler groups) to .91 for engineers. For the extrinsic scale the coefficients ranged from .77 (electronics assemblers) to .82 (for engineers and machinists). On the general satisfaction scale, the coefficients varied from .87 (for assemblers) to .92 (for engineers). Although Weiss, et al. (1967) report no direct data concerning the validity of the short form of the MSQ, validity may in part be inferred from validity of the long form MSQ since the short form is based on a proportional subset of the questions contained in the long form.

The manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (1967) reports validity for the MSQ based on a study of the Theory of Work Adjustment by Weiss, et al. (1965). The results of the study indicated that the MSQ measured satisfaction in accordance with expectations from the Theory of Work Adjustment. This would suggest that the construct validity of the MSQ is sufficient.

Concurrent validity is reported as satisfactory by comparing group differences in job satisfaction by occupation. An analysis of variance and Bartlett's test of homogeneity of variance (Walker and Lev, 1953), on the norm group of 2,955 verified that the scales of the MSQ were significantly different by occupation which is consistent with the research findings that there are occupational differences in job satisfaction (Herzberg, et al. 1957).

The MSQ short form (Appendix C) was slightly modified in this study to assess the job satisfaction of college student volunteers. Seventeen of the original twenty questions were used. The three questions omitted do not pertain to college student volunteers. The three questions omitted pertained to how respondents felt about the amount of pay, their chances for advancement, and the way their jobs provided for steady employment.

A pilot study was undertaken to establish reliability of the modified version of the MSQ short form. The instrument was administered to students at Indiana State University enrolled in the recreation department. The sample included two recreational classes with a total of thirty-five students. Hoyt's Reliability Coefficient Technique (1941) was used for the norm group. In general, reliability coefficients for each scale was quite high. The reliability coefficients for the intrinsic satisfaction scale was .80, for the extrinsic scale .83, and .87 for the general satisfaction scale.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Hypotheses to be Tested

This study attempted to answer the following questions:

A. What are the relationships between personality needs of selected college student volunteers as measured by the Edwards Personality Preference Schedule and measures of their job satisfaction as derived from the Minnesota Satisfaction (Modified Short Form) Questionnaire?

B. What are the best combinations of the 15 personality variables for predicting high intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction?

The following null hypotheses related to the first question were tested:

1. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and achievement.

2. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and deference.

3. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and order.

4. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and exhibition.

5. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and autonomy.

6. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and affiliation.

7. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and intraception.

8. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and succorance.

9. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and dominance.

10. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and abasement.

11. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and change.

12. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and endurance.

13. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and heterosexuality.

14. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and nurturance.

15. There is no significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and aggression.

16. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and achievement.

17. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and deference.

18. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and order.

19. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and exhibition.

20. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and autonomy.

21. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and affiliation.

22. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and intraception.

23. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and succorance.

24. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and dominance.

25. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and abasement.

26. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and nurturance.

27. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and change.

28. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and endurance.

29. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and heterosexuality.

30. There is no significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and aggression.

31. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and achievement.

32. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and deference.

33. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and order.

34. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and exhibition.

35. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and autonomy.

36. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and affiliation.

37. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and intraception.

38. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and succorance.

39. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and dominance.

40. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and abasement.

41. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and nurturance.

42. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and change.

43. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and endurance.

44. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and heterosexuality.

45. There is no significant relationship between general job satisfaction and aggression.

The following null hypotheses related to the second question were tested:

46. There is no significant relationship between the best combination of personality variables and intrinsic job satisfaction.

47. There is no significant relationship between the best combination of personality variables and extrinsic job satisfaction.

48. There is no significant relationship between the best combination of personality variables and general job satisfaction.

Procedures for Testing the Hypotheses

To provide solutions for question A and to test null hypotheses 1 through 45, this study was analyzed using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Technique (Ferguson, 1976). Each of the correlations was tested for significance at the .05 level against a two tail alternative. Next, to provide answers to question B and null hypotheses 46 through 48, three multiple linear stepwise regressions identified the sets of personality variables that contributed significantly to the explanation of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction. Computations were performed using the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences constructed by Nie, et al. (1965) on the Indiana State University Computer (IBM 360/50).

SUMMARY

The population of this study consisted of one hundred and ninety student volunteers. One hundred and thirty-one (69%) completed both questionnaires. Fifty-eight of the other student volunteers failed to respond to initial and follow-up communications within the allotted time.

Two instruments were used to obtain data for this study. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), to assess personality, and a modified short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), to measure job satisfaction. Both instruments were scored by the Indiana State University Testing Office.

Statistical analysis of the relationships between job satisfaction and personality needs were conducted by using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Technique. In addition, three multiple linear stepwise regressions identified the sets of personality variables that contributed significantly to the explanation of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction. Computations were performed using the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (Nie, et al. 1965) and employing the Indiana State University Computer (IBM 360/50).

Chapter 4

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

A compilation of the following findings of the study is reported in this chapter: (1) the correlations between intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction, as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Modified Short Form), and personality needs of college student volunteers as assessed by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and (2) the best combination of the 15 EPPS variables for predicting high intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction.

CORRELATION BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND PERSONALITY NEEDS

The first group of hypotheses investigated involved the relationships between personality needs of college student volunteers as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and three measures of their job satisfaction, intrinsic, extrinsic, and general, as derived from a modified form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, (Modified Short Form). The 45 hypotheses that evolved from the theses are listed in Chapter 3. The level of significance was set at .05 against a two tail alternative. Correlations between EPPS variables and job satisfaction are listed in Table I.

Table 1

Correlations between Scores on Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Modified Short Form) and Scores on Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

EPPS Variables	Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	General Job Satisfaction
Achievement	.068 (.440)	.129 (.142)	.083 (.344)
Deference	.044 (.620)	.056 (.522)	.036 (.682)
Order	.001 (.994)	-.019 (.832)	-.010 (.910)
Exhibition	.078 (.378)	.013 (.888)	.067 (.446)
Autonomy	.080 (.366)	-.049 (.578)	.041 (.646)
Affiliation	-.074 (.400)	-.070 (.424)	-.033 (.348)
Intraception	.060 (.498)	.065 (.460)	.069 (.432)
Succorance	-.183 (.036)*	-.072 (.412)	-.155 (.076)

Table 1 (continued)

EPPS Variables	Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	General Job Satisfaction
Dominance	.108 (.220)	.141 (.108)	.129 (.144)
Abasement	-.064 (.468)	-.078 (.374)	-.060 (.494)
Nurturance	-.060 (.494)	-.059 (.504)	-.063 (.476)
Change	-.050 (.574)	-.122 (.166)	-.074 (.404)
Endurance	-.005 (.952)	.070 (.424)	.032 (.714)
Heterosexuality	-.015 (.866)	-.047 (.592)	-.027 (.762)
Aggression	.095 (.280)	.077 (.380)	.076 (.386)

N = 131 for each correlation
* = Significant at .05 level (two tail)
The numbers within the parentheses indicate the levels of significance

Results of testing null hypotheses 1 through 15

Testing null hypothesis 1 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Achievement) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .068 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 2 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Deference) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .044 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 3 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Order) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .001 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 4 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Exhibition) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .078 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 5 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Autonomy) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .080 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 6 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Affiliation) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.074 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 7 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Intraception) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .060 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 8 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Succorance) resulted in its rejection. The coefficient of correlation was -.183 ($P < .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 9 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Dominance) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .108 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 10 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Abasement) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.064 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 11 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Nurturance) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.060 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 12 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Change) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.050 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 13 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Endurance) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient correlation was -.005 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 14 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Heterosexuality) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.015 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 15 (There is no significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Aggression) resulted in its

acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .095 (P> .05).

Results of testing null hypotheses 16 through 30

Testing null hypothesis 16 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Achievement) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .129 (P> .05).

Testing null hypothesis 17 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Deference) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .056 (P > .05).

Testing null hypothesis 18 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Order) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.019 (P > .05).

Testing null hypothesis 19 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Exhibition) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .013 (P > .05).

Testing null hypothesis 20 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Autonomy) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.049 (P > .05).

Testing null hypothesis 21 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Affiliation) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.070 (P > .05).

Testing null hypothesis 22 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Intraception) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .065 (P > .05).

Testing null hypothesis 23 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Succorance) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.072 (P >.05).

Testing null hypothesis 24 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Dominance) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .141 (P >.05).

Testing null hypothesis 25 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Abasement) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.178 (P > .05).

Testing null hypothesis 26 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Nurturance) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.059 (P > .05).

Testing null hypothesis 27 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Change) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.122 (P > .05).

Testing null hypothesis 28 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Endurance) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .070 (P > .05).

Testing null hypothesis 29 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Heterosexuality) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.047 (P > .05).

Testing null hypothesis 30 (There is no significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Aggression) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .077 (P > .05).

Results of testing null hypotheses 31 through 45

Testing null hypothesis 31 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Achievement) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .083 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 32 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Deference) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .036 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 33 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Order) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.010 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 34 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Exhibition) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .067 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 35 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Autonomy) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .041 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 36 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Affiliation) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.083 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 37 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Intraception) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .069 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 38 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Succorance) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.155 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 39 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Dominance) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .129 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 40 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Abasement) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.060 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 41 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Nurturance) resulted in its acceptance. The correlation of coefficient was -.063 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 42 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Change) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.074 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 43 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Endurance) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .032 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 44 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Heterosexuality) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was -.027 ($P > .05$).

Testing null hypothesis 45 (There is no significant relationship between General Job Satisfaction and Aggression) resulted in its acceptance. The coefficient of correlation was .076 ($P > .05$).

MULTIPLE CORRELATIONS OF PERSONALITY VARIABLES FOR PREDICTING JOB SATISFACTION

The second major investigation sought to identify the best significant combination of the 15 personality variables for predicting high

intrinsic, extrinsic and general job satisfaction. The three corresponding hypotheses are also listed in Chapter 3. The level of significance was set at the .05 level.

Analysis of the multiple correlations based on the MSQ scores and the best combination of EPPS scores are listed in tables 2, 3, and 4.

Results of testing null hypotheses 46 through 48

Testing null hypothesis 46 (There is no significant relationship between the best combination of personality variables and Intrinsic Job Satisfaction) resulted in its rejection. The multiple correlation of coefficient between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Succorance was -.183 ($P < .05$). Fourteen other multiple correlations coefficients, ranging from .205 to .260, were obtained. None of these were found to be significant at the .05 level.

Testing null hypothesis 47 (There is no significant relationship between the best combination of personality variables and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction) resulted in its acceptance. The obtained multiple correlations of coefficients ranged from .141, using the variable, Dominance, to .240, using a combination of eleven variables. None of these were found to be significant at the .05 level.

Testing null hypothesis 48 (There is no significant relationship between the best combination of personality variables and General Job Satisfaction) resulted in its acceptance. The obtained multiple correlations of coefficients ranged from -.155 using the Succorance variable, to .230, using a combination of all fifteen variables. None of these were found to be significant at the .05 level.

Table 2

Analysis of Multiple Correlations Based on Intrinsic Satisfaction Scores and Best Combination of EPPS Scores

Significant Predictor Variables	Stepwise Regression	Percent of Variance Explained	Multiple Correlation Coefficient	Degrees of Freedom	Obtained Values of F	Table Value of F
*Suc.	1	.03	-.183	1/129	4.485	3.920
Agg.	2	.04	.205	2/128	2.802	3.072
Exh.	3	.05	.219	3/127	2.137	2.680
Int.	4	.05	.225	4/126	1.682	2.447
Chg.	5	.05	.230	5/125	1.398	2.290
Aut.	6	.06	.238	6/124	1.236	2.175
Aba.	7	.06	.241	7/123	1.088	2.087
End.	8	.06	.247	8/122	.993	2.016
Het.	9	.06	.251	9/121	.905	1.959
Def.	10	.06	.252	10/120	.816	1.911
Dom.	11	.06	.253	11/119	.739	1.860
Nur.	12	.06	.254	12/118	.678	1.830
Aff.	13	.06	.254	13/117	.623	1.770
Ach.	14	.07	.255	14/116	.578	1.770
Ord.	15	.07	.260	15/115	.554	1.751

* = Predictor variable significant at .05 level

Table 3

Analysis of Multiple Correlations Based on Extrinsic Satisfaction Scores and Best Combination of EPPS Scores

Significant Predictor Variables	Stepwise Regression	Percent of Variance Explained	Multiple Correlation Coefficient	Degrees of Freedom	Obtained Values of F	Table Value of F
Dom.	1	.02	.141	1/129	2.611	3.920
Ach.	2	.03	.175	2/128	2.011	3.072
Int.	3	.04	.192	3/127	1.628	2.680
End.	4	.04	.206	4/126	1.402	2.447
Agg.	5	.05	.217	5/125	1.239	2.290
Def.	6	.05	.224	6/124	1.096	2.175
Ord.	7	.05	.230	7/123	.981	2.087
Chg.	8	.05	.233	8/122	.874	2.016
Aba.	9	.06	.237	9/121	.799	1.959
Aut.	10	.06	.239	10/120	.726	1.911
Aff.	11	.06	.240	11/119	.660	1.860
Het.	**					
Suc.	**					
Exh.	**					
Nur.	**					

* = Predictor variables significant at .05 level

** = Contributions of variables 12 through 15 were so slight that the program was terminated

Table 4

Analysis of Multiple Correlations Based on General Satisfaction Scores and Best Combinations of EPPS Scores

Significant Predictor Variables	Stepwise Regression	Percent of Variance Explained	Multiple Correlation Coefficient	Degrees of Freedom	Obtained Values of F	Table Value of F
Suc.	1	.02	-.155	1/129	3.181	3.920
Dom.	2	.03	.181	2/128	2.165	3.072
Chg.	3	.04	.193	3/127	1.639	2.680
Aba.	4	.04	.205	4/126	1.388	2.447
Int.	5	.04	.211	5/125	1.163	2.220
Agg.	6	.05	.218	6/124	1.028	2.175
Exh.	7	.05	.221	7/123	.902	2.087
Ord.	8	.05	.223	8/122	.798	2.016
Het.	9	.05	.224	9/121	.713	1.959
Aut.	10	.05	.226	10/120	.646	1.911
Ach.	11	.05	.227	11/119	.586	1.860
Def.	12	.05	.227	12/118	.536	1.830
Nur.	13	.05	.228	13/117	.493	1.770
End.	14	.05	.228	14/116	.455	1.770
Aff.	15	.05	.230	15/115	.428	1.751

* = Predictor variables significant at .05 level

SUMMARY

Data analyzed in this study were derived from the EPPS and the MSQ (Modified Short Form) questionnaires which were administered to 131 college student volunteers at Indiana State University. Data analysis was conducted using the Indiana State University Computer (IBM 360/50). Statistical analysis of the relationship between job satisfaction and personality needs were conducted by using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Technique (Ferguson, 1976). Also, three multiple linear stepwise regressions were used to identify the sets of personality variables that contributed significantly to the explanation of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction.

Analysis of the results of the relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and personality variables, indicated that only one of the first fifteen hypotheses was rejected. Specifically the correlation coefficient between intrinsic job satisfaction and succorance was -.183 ($P > .05$). A significant relationship was found between intrinsic job satisfaction and succorance.

The next group of null hypotheses (16 through 30) seeking the relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and personality variables, revealed that none of the 15 personality variables correlated significantly at the .05 level with extrinsic job satisfaction.

Testing the third group of null hypotheses (31 through 45) seeking the relationship between general job satisfaction and personality variables, revealed that none of the 15 personality variables correlated significantly at the .05 level with general job satisfaction.

The final and fourth set of null hypotheses (46 through 48) were tested and the results indicated that only one personality variable was significantly related to job satisfaction. Specifically, succorance

was significantly related to intrinsic job satisfaction. No other single or combinations of personality variables were found to be significantly related either to extrinsic or to general job satisfaction.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes this study and presents conclusions drawn from the results and discussion of the conclusions. It also contains recommendations for further research which were generated from the conclusions.

SUMMARY

The major focus of this research was to investigate the relationships between job satisfaction and personality needs of college student volunteers. The volunteers were those students who were placed on jobs and who worked without financial remuneration. The justification for this study was derived primarily from the fact that there is a tremendous need for volunteers; volunteering provides on-the-job experience, and there has been no research dealing with the relationships between job satisfaction and personality needs of volunteers.

The Personality Needs Theory set forth by Murray formed the foundation from which to explain student motives and behavior, and had the potential to assist in structuring volunteer programs to meet student needs. Since volunteering potentially provided the opportunity to fulfill personal needs, it was assumed that there were some significant relationships between job satisfaction and personality needs. A better understanding of personality needs and job satisfaction could be of great value to (a) volunteer administrators, (b) student volunteers, and (c) recipients of volunteer efforts.

Two research questions were considered in this study. The first asked what were the relationships between personality needs and job satisfaction of selected college student volunteers. The second asked

what were the best combinations of the 15 personality variables for predicting high intrinsic, extrinsic and general job satisfaction. To test these questions the responses of 131 volunteers at Indiana State University were studied. The subjects who participated in the study completed the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and a modified version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Modified Short Form) at the Student Research and Testing Office of Indiana State University or at their place of residence.

Statistical analyses of the results of the first question were conducted using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique. Next, multiple linear stepwise regressions were used to analyze results of the second question. Each of the correlations was tested for significance at the .05 level.

The results of testing the first fifteen null hypotheses, which related to the first question, indicated that there was a significant correlation between intrinsic job satisfaction and succorance. All of the other 14 comparisons were found to have no significant relationship.

The results of testing null hypotheses 16 through 30, which also related to the first question, indicated that no significant correlations existed between extrinsic job satisfaction and all 15 personality variables.

The results of testing null hypotheses 31 through 45, that also related to the first question, indicated that no significant correlations existed between general job satisfaction and all 15 personality variables.

Finally, as a result of testing null hypotheses 46 through 48, which related to the second question, the results indicated that succorance was the only personality variable which might contribute to the prediction of intrinsic job satisfaction. There were no significant multiple correlations between the best combination of personality variables and extrinsic or general job satisfaction.

CONCLUSIONS

Within its limitations, this study warranted the following conclusions based on the finding of the hypotheses tested.

1. The correlation of succorance with intrinsic job satisfaction was the only significant correlation computed. Succorrance as defined by Edwards (1959) means the following:

> . . . to have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be kindly, to have others be sympathetic and understanding about personal problems, to receive a great deal of affection from others, to have others do favors cheerfully, to be helped by others when depressed, to have others feel sorry when one is sick, and to have a fuss made over one when hurt. (P. 11).

Since the correlation was negative, this finding indicated that self-sufficient and independent students were more likely to be satisfied with their voluntary jobs.

2. The analysis revealed that the relationships between all other variables and the scales on the MSQ were not significant. Specifically, 44 out of 45 hypotheses were accepted which indicated that there was very little relationship between job satisfaction as measured by the MSQ and personality needs as assessed by the EPPS. Apparently, external and general reinforcements did not contribute to or fulfill a defined pattern of personality needs of college student volunteers.

3. An attempt to identify the best combination of personality variables which were related to job satisfaction resulted in finding only one possible significant relationship; that of succorance and intrinsic job satisfaction. All other attempts to combine need variables and various measures of job satisfaction resulted in non-significant relationships. Therefore, personality needs alone is not enough for the prediction of job satisfaction of college student volunteers.

It can be concluded that there were very few significant relationships between job satisfaction and personality needs of college student volunteers at Indiana State University, as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Modified Short Form).

Discussion of Conclusions

The first conclusion which stated that independent and self-sufficient volunteers are more likely to find satisfaction (intrinsic) with various dimensions of their voluntary job, indicated that their independence could have been manifested in their initial behavior to participate in a voluntary project, and secondly in the ability to select where and in what manner they would give of their time and resources for a meaningful purpose.

The first conclusion also gave limited support to the findings by Schaffer (1953) and Kuhlen (1963) which revealed that need satisfaction was related to job satisfaction and vocational satisfaction. It is supported by Ribal's (1963) study which found low succorance to be one of several factors associated with altruism. However, since only one significant relationship was found between EPPS variables and MSQ scales out of a possible forty-five, this supports findings by Roberts, Gordon and Miles (1971) and Neeley (1973) because they found no significant relationship between job satisfaction and needs.

The second conclusion which stated that an overwhelming majority of EPPS variables did not correlate significantly with MSQ scales, also supports the findings by Roberts, Gordon and Miles (1971) and Neeley (1973). This study considered persons who volunteered as group members and persons who volunteered individually to be members of the same population. This

consideration may have contaminated the results by considering what may have been two populations as one. There is a possibility that the results could have been contaminated because a large number of the volunteers were group members and volunteered in group projects. Their motives and needs could have been aimed at meeting group expectations or promoting the name of the organization rather than satisfying personal needs as measured by the EPPS. This suggests that the act of volunteering may be more complex than was previously assumed.

The third and final conclusion which stated that the best combination of variables for the prediction of either intrinsic, extrinsic, or general job satisfaction found that only succorance related significantly with intrinsic job satisfaction. This conclusion suggests that while self-sufficient and independent volunteers received intrinsic satisfaction as a result of their voluntary experience, it is not possible to predict extrinsic and general job satisfaction of volunteers using EPPS variables and MSQ scales. The regression analysis using EPPS variables as the independent variables and scales of the MSQ as dependent variables indicates that a high percentage of the unexplained variance existed. This suggests that the predicion of job satisfaction may be the result of combining personality need variables with situational variables such as peer pressure, types of supervision, and length of time on the job. Neeley (1973) also suggested, as a result of testing the need satisfaction of non-academic college employees, that the need gratification theory (Wolf, 1970) be expanded to include situational variables. Possibly the combination of need variables related to job satisfaction is unique to each individual and, as a result, no overall pattern can be identified even though the two variables are highly interdependent.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions reached in this study, the following recommendations for further studies emerge.

There is a continuing need to measure needs and satisfactions of college student volunteers in various professional fields of study. The results could provide data concerning volunteers that might prove beneficial in future placement of college student volunteers, Assuming that volunteers will be placed in environments where the maximum use of their skills and talents can be effectively utilized, increased productivity will hopefully result, and the satisfaction of all involved persons will be enhanced.

There is need for the development of a reliable and valid measuring instrument solely for the assessment of job satisfaction of volunteers. Presently, none exists, and therefore, existing job satisfaction instruments that were developed for industry or other fields of endeavors must be modified. The adaption of job instruments to measure satisfaction of volunteers is not extremely difficult; however, a careful analysis of the intent of the instrument as well as a thorough review of each item is necessary. Since volunteering plays such an important role in our society, it is important that a job satisfaction instrument for volunteers be devised. Such an instrument would not only make it easier to assess the satisfactions of volunteers, but would, hopefully, encourage those who are responsible for the administration of volunteer programs to undertake additional research in this field.

Future studies should investigate and compare motives of those who volunteer in group projects with those who volunteer on an individual basis. The results may prove beneficial to administrators who are responsible for

volunteer placement, proper utilization of volunteers, and the development of voluntary projects. A knowledge of motivational characteristics of various volunteers in various settings can help the understanding of why volunteers want to be there in the first place.

Future studies should also attempt to predict college student volunteer job satisfaction from other than personality traits or factors or combinations of factors. Situational factors such as peer pressure, types of supervision, and the length of time spent on a voluntary task should be considered along with personality needs. While personality may play an important role in the prediction of job satisfaction of college student volunteers, it is apparent that there may also be additional contributing factors.

Finally, there is a need for researchers to investigate areas of job satisfaction and job success of student volunteers. The development of a research project in this area would provide data and feedback that would, hopefully, assist in strengthening all aspects of voluntary programs.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Ake, Bjerstadt. Commenting on the Edwards Personnel Preference in Buros, O.K. The Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1959, PP. 117-118.

Albertson, Maurice L., Andres E. Rice, and Pauline E. Birkey. New Frontiers for American Youth. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1961.

Allen, Ken. "What Motivates Volunteers." Journal of Actions National Student Volunteer Program, Synergist, 1971, 1:49-54.

Allport, Gordon W. Personality. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1937.

Altimus, Cyrus A., and Richard J. Tersine. "Chronological Age and Job Satisfaction: The Young Blue Collar Worker." Academy of Management Journal, 1973, 16:53-56.

Anderson, Joseph Adelson. "Personality." Annual Review of Psychology, 1969, 20:217-351.

Arthur, Gary L., Hugh H. Donnan, and Charles U. Lain. "Companionship Therapy with Nursing Home Aged." Gerontologist, 1973, 13:167-170.

Beck, James C., David Kantor, and Victor Gelineau. "Impact of Undergraduate Volunteers on the Social Behavior of Chronic Psychotic Patients." International Journal of Social Psychaitry, 1965, 11:96-104.

Berkowitz, L., and W.H. Connor. "Success, Failure and Social Responsibility." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4:664-669.

_____ and P. Friedman. "Some Social Class Differences in Helping Behavior." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5:217-225.

Berscheid, E., and E. Walster. "When Does a Harmdoer Compensate a Victim?" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6:435-441.

Blatchford, Joseph H. "Action Supports Student Volunteers." Journal of Actions National Student Volunteer Program, Synergist, 1972, 3:1.

Blum, M.L., and J.J. Russ. "A Study of Employee Attitude toward Various Incentives." Personnel, 1942, 19:438-444.

Boyle, Patrick G., and Mohammad A. Douglah. "Who Will Serve as Youth Leaders." Journal of Cooperative Extension, 1964, 2:209-215.

Boylin, E. Robert. "The Companion Program: Students as Helpers." Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 1973, 10:242-244.

Brayfield, A.H., and H.F. Rothe. "An Index of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1951, 35:307-311.

Brody, Nathan. Personality Research and Theory. New York and London: Academic Press, Inc., 1972.

Bryan, J.H., and N. Walbek. "Words and Deeds about Sacrifice: Their Impact upon Children's Judgement and Behavior." Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Santa Monica, March 1969.

Buros, O.K. The Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1972.

Burton, Arthur. Operational Theories of Personality. New York: Brunner and Mazel, Inc., 1974.

Cantor, Marjorie H. Some Correlates of Success and Satisfaction in Urban Vista. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 037 642, July, 1968.

Cantril, H., and W.K. Livingston. "The Concept of Transaction in Psychology." Journal of Individual Psychology, 1963, 19:3-16.

Carlsmith, J.M., and A.E. Gross. "Some Effects of Guilt on Compliance." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 11:232-240.

Carlson, Rae. "Personality." Annual Review of Psychology, 1975, 26:393-413.

Cattell, Raymond B. Personality and Motivation: Structure and Measurement. Yonkers, New York: World Book Company, 1957.

_____. The Scientific Analysis of Personality. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965.

Centers, R. "Motivational Aspects of Occupational Stratification." Journal of Social Psychology, 1948, 28:187-217.

Chernik, Doris A., and Joseph Phelan. "Attitudes of Women in Management: 1. Job Satisfaction: A Study of Perceived Need Satisfaction as a Function of Job Level." International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 1974, 20:94-98.

Coleman, Joseph G. "Volunteerism: A Constructive Outlet for Youthful Energy." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1965, 27:171-175.

_____. "A Discovery of Commitment." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1966, 365:12-20.

Darlington, R.B., and C.E. Macker. "Displacement of Guilt-Produced Altruistic Behavior." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4:442-443.

Dawis, R.V., G.W. England, and L.H. Lofquist. A Theory of Work Adjustment. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, XV. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1964.

Delano, William A. "Volunteers and Development." International Development Review, 1966, 8:2-7.

Dietz, Siegfried C. "Counselor Role, Function, and Job Satisfaction." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 12:150-155.

Dwarshuis, Louis, Marilyn Kolton and Michael Gorodesky. "Types of Volunteers in Innovative Drug Treatment Programs." Proceedings of the 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada, 1973, 8:969-970.

Eberly, Donald, Richard A. Graham and Robert J. Havighurst. "American Youth in the Mid-Seventies." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1972, 56:1-14.

Eckert, R.E., J.E. Stecklein and H.G. Sagen. "College Faculty Members View Their Jobs." American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 1959, 45:513-528.

Edwards, Allen L. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule: Manual Revised 1959. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1959.

_____ and Robert E. Abbott. "Measurement of Personality Traits: Theory and Technique." Annual Review of Psychology, 1973, 24:241-277.

Engs, Ruth C., and Robert H. Kirk. "The Characteristics of Volunteers in Crisis Intervention Centers." Public Health Reports, 1974, 89:459-464.

Evans, Clyde E. "A Study of Personality Need Factors with Respect to College Student Satisfaction in a Small, Private College Located in Mississippi." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1972.

Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1976, 4th Edition.

Fischer, W.F. "Sharing in Preschool Children as a Function of Amount and Type of Reinforcement." Genetic Psychological Monographs, 1963, 68:215-245.

Fiske, Donald W. Commenting on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule in Buros, O.K. The Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1959, PP. 118-120.

Form, W.H., and S. Nosow. Community in Disaster. New York: Harper, 1958.

Freedman, J.L., S.A. Wallington, and E. Bless. "Compliance Without Pressure: The Effect of Guilt." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7:117-124.

Friedricks, R.W. "Alter Ego: An Exploratory Assessment of Altruism." American Sociological Review, 1960, 25:496-508.

Gaier, Eugene L., and William F. White. "Trends in the Measurement of Personality." Review of Educational Research, 1965, 35:63-81.

Gerard, Steve. "Personality Characteristics Associated with 'Good' Volunteers." Crisis Intervention, 1972, 4:90-92.

Gerwitz, J.L. "Succorance in Young Children." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Iowa State University, 1948.

Gomberg, William. "Job Satisfaction: Sorting Out the Nonsense." Federationist, 1973, 80:14-19.

Gordon, O.J. "A Factor Analysis of Human Needs and Industrial Morale." Personnel Psychology, 1955, 8:1-8.

Gordon, Suzzane N., and Nancy Sizer. "Why People Join the Peace Corps." Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

Guilford, J.P. The Guilford-Martin Personnel Inventory. Manual of Directions and Norms. Beverly Hills, California: Sheridan Supply Co., undated.

Handlon, B.J., and P. Gross. "The Development of Sharing Behavior." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59:425-428.

Harris, L.A. "A Study of Altruism." Elementary School Journal, 1967, 68:135-141.

Harris, M. "Some Determinants of Sharing in Children." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Stanford University, 1968.

Hartup, W.W., and E.D. Keller. "Nurturance in Preschool Children and Its Relation to Dependency." Child Development, 1960, 31:681-689.

Hathaway, S.R. "Problems of Personality Assessment." Proceedings of the 14th International Congress of Applied Psychology. Vol. 2. Personality Research, 1963, (37:4117), 144-160.

Heilig, Samuel M., Normal L. Farberow, Robert E. Litman, and Edwin S. Schneidman. "The Role of Non Professional Volunteers in Suicide Prevention." Community Mental Health Journal, 1968, 4:287-295.

Heron, A. "Satisfaction and Satisfactoriness: Complementary Aspects of Occupational Adjustment." Occupational Psychology, 1954, 28:140-153.

Herzberg, F., B. Mausner, R.O. Peterson, and D.F. Capewell. Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion. Pittsburg: Psychological Service of Pittsburg, 1957.

Holt, Fred D., and James G. Carr. "Manifest Needs of CAUSE Selectees and NDEA Institute Participants." Journal of Employment Counseling, 1969, 6:110-116.

Holtzman, Wayne H. "Recurring Dilemmas in Personality Assessment." Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1964, 28:144-150.

Holzberg, Jules D., Robert H. Kopp and John L. Turner. "Companionships with the Mentally Ill: Effects on the Personalities of College Student Volunteers." Psychiatry, 1966, 29:395-404.

Holzman, Philip S. "Personality." Annual Review of Psychology, 1974, 25:247-275.

Hoppock, Robert. Job Satisfaction. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1935.

Hoyt, Cyril J. "Test Reliability Estimated by Analysis of Variance." Psychometrika, 1941, 6:153-160.

Hrebiniak, Lawrence G., and Michael R. Roteman. "A Study of the Relationship between Need Satisfaction and Absenteeism among Managerial Personnel." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 58:381-383.

Huskey, Hyrum H. "Expressed Needs and Job Satisfaction among Military Personnel." Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1973, 22:44-49.

Iannone, Ron. "What Motivates Principals?" Journal of Educational Research, 1973, 66:260-262.

Inlow, Gail M. "Job Satisfaction of Liberal Arts Graduates." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1951, 35:175-181.

Jackson, Maxie C. Jr. "A Comparative Descriptive Study of MSU Student Volunteers and the Relationships of their Background and Individual Characteristics to Student Activists and to Non-Volunteer Students." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.

Jericho, Robert William. "An Analysis of Certain Personality Variables on Adult Team Sport Participation." Unpublished PhD dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1972.

Johnson, G.H. "An Instrument for the Measurement of Job Satisfaction." Personnel Psychology, 1955, 8:27-37.

Johnson, Homer H. "Motivating the Volunteer Worker." Volunteer Administration, 1973, 7:44-52.

Jurgensen, C.E. "Selected Factors Which Influence Job Preference." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1947, 31:553-564.

Kaul, Lokish. "Differences in some EPPS Needs Related with Academic Achievement among Rural and Urban Adolescents." Educational and Psychology Review, 1971, 11:11-14.

Kerr, W.A. "On the Validity and Reliability of the Job Satisfaction Tear Ballot." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1948, 32:275-281.

_____. "Summary of Validity Studies of the Tear Ballot." Personnel Psychology, 1952, 5:105-113.

Kindall, Luther M., and Edwin W. McClain. "The Southern Black College Student as Adolescent: A Psychohistorical Study." Journal of Negro Education, 1973, 42:5-10.

Kish, George B., and Thomas Stage. "College Student Mental Hospital Volunteers: Any Benefits to the Student or to Society." Journal of Community Psychology, 1973, 1:14-14.

Klein, George S., Harriet Linton Barr, and David L. Wolitzky. "Personality." Annual Review of Psychology, 1967, 18:467-473.

Kohlan, Richard G. "Relationships between Inventoried Interests and Inventoried Needs." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 46:592-598.

Kuhlen, Raymond G. "Needs, Perceived Need Satisfaction Opportunities, and Satisfaction with Occupation." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1963, 47:56-64.

Lawler, Edward E., Douglas T. Hall and Greg R. Oldham. "Organizational Climate: Relationships to Organizational Structure, Process and Performance." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1974, 11:139-155.

LeMay, M.L., and V.J. Damm. "Relationship of the Personal Orientation Inventory to the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule." Psychological Reports, 1969, 24:834.

Lippitt, Ronald, and Eva Schindler Rainman. "The Volunteer Community: A Model for Human Resources." Washington, D.C.: Center for Voluntary Society, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1970. (Mimeographed).

Locke, E.A., P.C. Smith, C.L. Hulin, and L.M. Kendall. Cornell Studies of Job Satisfaction: U Scale Characteristics of the Job Descriptive Index. Unpublished manuscript, Cornell University, 1963.

Loser, Herta. Women, Work and Volunteering. Boston: Beacon Press, 1974.

Lowe, Ronald, and Gary Ritchey. "Relationship of Altruism to Age, Social Class, and Ethnic Identity." Psychological Reports, 1973, 33:567-572.

Lyon, Herbert S., and John Ivancevich. "An Exploratory Investigation of Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction in a Hospital." Academy of Management Journal, 1974, 17:635-748.

Michener, Charlotte W., and Hank Walzer. "Developing Community Mental Health Volunteer System." Social Work, 1970, 15:60-67.

Midlarsky, E. Some Antecedents of Aiding under Stress. Proceedings of the 76th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1968, 3:385-386.

_____, and J.H. Bryan. "Training Charity in Children." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5:408-415.

Miskel, Cecil G. Public School Teacher's Work Motivation, Organizational Incentives, Job Satisfaction, and Primary Life Interests. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 072 000, June, 1972.

Muir, E., and E. Weinstein. "The Social Debt: An Investigation of Lower Class and Middle Class Norms of Social Obligation." American Sociological Review, 1962, 27-532-539.

Murphy, Gardner. "Shall We Ever Really Understand Personality?" Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1964, 28:140-143.

Murray, Henry A. Explorations in Personality. New York: Science Editions, Inc., 1962.

Neeley, James D. "A Test of the Need Gratification Theory of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57:86-88.

Nicholson, Edward A., and Robert C. Milijus. "Job Satisfaction and Turnover among Liberal Arts College Professors." Personnel Journal, 1972, 51:840-845.

Nie, Norman H., and others. Statistical Program for the Social Sciences. Second Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

Ostal, Allan W. "Volunteerism in State Colleges." Journal of Actions Student Volunteer Program, Synergist, 1974, 2:1.

Poe, C.A. "Convergent and Discriminant Validation of Measures of Personal Needs." Journal of Educational Measurement, 1969, 6:103-108.

Porter, L.W. "Job Attitudes in Management: I. Perceived Deficiencies in Need Fulfillment as a Function of Job Level." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1962, 46:375-384.

Purdy, Leslie. A Student Volunteer Service Bureau. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 053 719, September, 1971.

Randolph, Daniel L. "Personality and Functional Specialty Preference of Prospective Counselor Educators." Counselor Education and Supervision, 1973, 12:221-224.

Rawlings, E.I. "Witnessing Harm to Other: A Reassessment of the Role of Guilt in Altruistic Behavior." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10:377-380.

Regan, Judith W. "Guilt, Perceived Injustice, and Altruistic Behavior." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 19:124-132.

Ribal, J.E. "Social Character and Meanings of Selfishness and Altruism." Sociology and Social Research, 1963, 47:311-321.

Richardson, R.C. "Effects of 'Feeling' and 'Behavior' Instructions on Responses to the EPPS: A Replication." Journal of Educational Research, 1969, 62:399.

Rickey, George L., Jon C. Marshall, Victor H. Hoeman, and George Minkevich. "Personality Differences among Community College Students." College Student Journal, 1972, 6:30-36.

Roberts, Karlene H., Walter A. Gordon, and Raymond E. Miles. "A Factor Analytic Study of Job Satisfaction Items Designed to Measure Maslow Need Categories." Personnel Psychology, 1971, 24:205-220.

Rosenhan, D., and G.M. White. "Observation and Rehearsal as Determinants of Prosocial Behavior." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5:424-431.

Rosenthal, Robert. "The Volunteer Subject." Human Relations, 1965, 4:389-406.

Sagen, Harry B. "The Relationship of Certain Personality and Environmental Variables to the Satisfaction with Present Position of Faculty in Selected Liberal Arts Colleges." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1962.

Sarveswara, Rao, G.V. "Perceived Need Satisfaction and Importance of Semi-skilled and Unskilled Personnel." Indian Manager, 1972, 3:47-57.

Sawyer, J. "The Altruism Scale: A Measure of Cooperativeness, Individualistic, and Competitive Interpersonal Orientation." American Journal of Sociology, 1966, 71:407-416.

Schaffer, L.H. "Job Satisfaction as Related to Need Satisfaction in Work." Psychological Monographs, 1953, Vol. 67, No. 14.

Schaffer, Susan A. "Altruistic Behavior in Children as a Function of Differential Characteristics of the Object of Help." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Boston, 1969.

Schopler, J. "An Investigation of Sex Differences on the Influence of Dependence." Sociometry, 1967, 30:50-63.

Schopler, J., and N. Bateson. "The Power of Dependence." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2:247-254.

Schreiber, R.J., R.G. Smith and T.W. Harrell. "A Factor Analysis of Employee Attitudes." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1952, 36:247-250.

Scott, J. "Membership and Participation in Voluntary Association." American Social Revolution, 1957, 22:528-533.

Sechrest, Lee. "Personality." Annual Review of Psychology, 1976, 27:1-27.

Shamberg, Stephen C. "The Utilization of Volunteer Attorneys to Provide Effective Legal Services for the Poor." Northwestern University Law Review, 1968, 63:159-182.

Siegal, A.E. Editorial. Child Development, 1967, 30:901-908.

Simon, William E., and Louis H. Primavera. "EPPS Needs of Women Attending a Non-Coed Catholic College and Those of the Normative Sample." Psychological Reports, 1972, 30:966.

_____, Veronica Wild, and Robert M. Cristal. "Psychological Needs of Professional Police Personnel." Psychological Reports, 1973, 33:313-314.

Smith, P.C. Cornell Studies of Job Satisfaction: I. Strategy for the Development of a General Theory of Job Satisfaction. Unpublished manuscript, Cornell University, 1963.

Stagner, R., J.M. Richard, R.H. Britton. "Job Attitudes: Defense Workers." Personnel Journal, 1941, 20:90-97.

Staub, E. The Effects of Success and Failure on Children's Sharing Behavior. Paper presented at the 39th Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., April, 1968.

_____ and L. Feagans. "Effects of Age and Number of Witnesses in Children's Attempt to Help Another Child in Distress." Paper presented at the 40th Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April, 1969.

Stein, H.B. "Love Your Job?" Rotarian, 1960, 96:43-44.

Stricker, J., and J. Lawrence. Personality Tests and Reviews. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon, 1965.

Strong, E.K., Jr. "Satisfaction and Interests." American Psychologist, 1958, 13:449-456.

Super, E.D. "Occupational Level and Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1939, 23:547-564.

Swanson, Mary T. Your Volunteer Program: Organization and Administration of Volunteer Programs. Resources Information Center, Education ERIC Document ED 052 414, June, 1970.

Tapp, Jack T. and Deborah Spanier. "Personal Characteristics of Volunteer Phone Counselors." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 41:245-250.

Taylor, Janet A. "A Personality Scale of Manifest Anxiety." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1953, 48:285-290.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1971.

Torrance, E.P., and R.C. Ziller. Risk and Life Experience: Development of a Scale for Measuring Risk-Taking Tendencies. United States Air Force Personnel Training Research Report. NO 57-23V, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957.

Turner, John Redmond. "Personal and Situational Determinants of Volunteer Recruitment for a Campus 'Hotline' Program." Journal of the American College Health Association, 1973, 21:353-357.

_____. "Volunteer Participation as a Function of Personal and Situational Variables." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Utah, 1972.

Ugurel-Semin, R. "Moral Behavior and Moral Judgement of Children." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 463-474.

Vincent, John Morris. "Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction among Faculty in Selected Private Liberal Arts Colleges." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Tempe, Arizona State University, 1972.

Vollmar, H.M., and J.A. Kinney. "Age, Education and Job Satisfaction." Personnel, 1955, 32:38-43.

Walker, Helen M., and Joseph Lev. Statistical Inference. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1953.

Weaver, Charles N. "Correlates of Job Satisfaction: Some Evidence from the National Surveys." Academy of Management Journal, 1974, 17:373-375.

Weigel, R.G., and J.E. Frazier. "The Effects of 'Feeling' and 'Behavior' Instructions on Responses to the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule." Journal of Educational Measurement, 1968, 5:337-338.

Weiner, Judith Ann. "Guilt, Inequity and Altruistic Behavior." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Stanford University, 1968.

Weiss, D.J., R.V. Dawis, G.W. England, and L.H. Lofquist. An Inferential Approach to Occupational Reinforcement. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, XIX. Minnesota: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, 1965.

Weiss, D.J., R.V. Dawis, G.W. England, and L.H. Lofquist. Construct Validation Studies of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, XVIII. Minnesota: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, 1964.

_____, R.V. Dawis, G.W. England, and L.H. Lofquist. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, XXII. Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minneapolis: Industrial Center, University of Minnesota, 1967.

White, Glen Marlow. "The Elicitation and Durability of Altruistic Behavior in Children." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Princeton University, 1967.

Williams, C.D., and I. Bruel. "Evidence for the Validity of the Construct of Intraception." Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1968, 24:188-189.

Winpisinger, William W. "Job Satisfaction: A Union Response." Federationist, 1973, 80:8-10.

Witkin, Lynne J. "Student Volunteers in a Guidance Clinic." Social Work, 1973, 18:53-57.

Wolf, Martin G. "Need Gratification Theory: A Theoretical Formulation on Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Job Motivation." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54:87-94.

Wurtz, Philip J. "An Investigation of the Multiple Effects of Self-Concept and Other Independent Variables in the Prediction of Teacher Job Satisfaction." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Kansas, 1972.

Zeitlin, Arnold. To the Peace Corps, With Love. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965, P. 18.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

DISTRIBUTION OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

CLASSIFICATION	NUMBER	PERCENT
Freshman	44	33.6
Sophomore	40	30.5
Junior	27	20.6
Senior	18	13.7
Graduate	2	1.5
Total	131	

SEX OF STUDENTS WHO RESPONDED

SEX	NUMBER	PERCENT
Male	72	55
Female	59	45
Total	131	

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS FOR STUDENTS WHO RESPONDED

SCHOOL OR COLLEGE ENROLLED IN	NUMBER	PERCENT
Arts and Sciences	48	36.6
Business	20	15.3
Education	24	18.3
Nursing	6	4.6
Graduate	2	1.5
Non-Preference	23	17.6
Health Physical Education and Recreation	8	6.1
Total	131	

DISTRIBUTION OF JOB TYPES OF STUDENTS WHO RESPONDED

TYPE OF JOB	NUMBER	PERCENT
Tutor	25	19.1
Big Brother/Big Sister	21	16.0
Clean-Up Projects	36	27.5
Collecting Funds for Community Groups	40	30.5
Other	9	6.9
Total	131	

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS IN INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP PROJECTS

	NUMBER	PERCENT
Individual	55	42.0
Group	76	58.0
Total	131	

APPENDIX B

LETTER SENT TO STUDENT VOLUNTEERS

Center For Voluntary Services
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

December 2, 1976

Dear Volunteer:

Since you are a student volunteer, I would like to express my appreciation to you for sharing your precious time and energy to help others. I sincerely hope that your voluntary experiences are as enjoyable and satisfying to you as they have been to those whom you have assisted.

My reason for writing to you now is to ask that you participate in a study of your needs and satisfactions as a volunteer. This study is in connection with my Ph.D. program at Indiana State University and will aid my office (The Center for Voluntary Services) to improve our work with volunteers. What I am asking you to do is to spend about forty-five minutes to respond to two questionnaires. I hope that you will agree that aiding my study of volunteers is a worthy use of your time. To make it easy for this to fit into your schedule, the Testing Office on the basement level of the Administration Building, Room B4, will be open 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. beginning Thursday, December 4th and ending Friday, December 12th at 5:00 p.m. (The Testing Office will not be open Saturday, December 6th and Sunday, December 7th). In order to make things as comfortable as possible, free coffee will be provided. I hope you will be able to participate.

If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact me at 232-6311, extension 5550 or 5559. My office is located in Room 305 of the University Suite of Tirey Memorial Union Center.

My sincere thands to you in advance for your participation in this voluntary project.

Sincerely,

Manny Newsome
Assistant Dean of Student Life
for Student Activities

APPENDIX C

MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE - MODIFIED SHORT FORM

Instructions

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to tell how you feel about your present voluntary job. Read each statement carefully and decide how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job described by the statement.

VS - I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.
S - I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.
N - I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.
DS - I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.
VDS - I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

Please answer every item and be frank and honest!

On my present job, this is how I feel about:	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
1. Being able to keep busy all the time	___	___	___	___	___
2. The chance to work alone on the job	___	___	___	___	___
3. The chance to do different things from time to time	___	___	___	___	___
4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community	___	___	___	___	___
5. The way my boss handles his workers	___	___	___	___	___
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions	___	___	___	___	___
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience	___	___	___	___	___
8. The chance to do things for other people	___	___	___	___	___
9. The chance to tell people what to do	___	___	___	___	___
10. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	___	___	___	___	___
11. The way company or agency policies are put into practice	___	___	___	___	___
12. The freedom to use my own judgement	___	___	___	___	___
13. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job	___	___	___	___	___
14. The working conditions	___	___	___	___	___
15. The way co-workers get along with each other	___	___	___	___	___
16. The praise I get for doing a good job	___	___	___	___	___
17. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	___	___	___	___	___