



University of Tennessee, Knoxville
**TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative
Exchange**

Doctoral Dissertations

Graduate School

12-2007

An Investigation of the Relationships among Work Values, Personality Traits, Job Satisfaction, and Career Satisfaction

Shannon Danielle Salyer
University of Tennessee - Knoxville

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Salyer, Shannon Danielle, "An Investigation of the Relationships among Work Values, Personality Traits, Job Satisfaction, and Career Satisfaction. " PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 2007.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/296

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Shannon Danielle Salyer entitled "An Investigation of the Relationships among Work Values, Personality Traits, Job Satisfaction, and Career Satisfaction." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Psychology.

John W. Lounsbury, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Debra R. Baldwin, Eric D. Sundstrom, Tricia McClam

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Shannon Danielle Salyer entitled “An Investigation of the Relationships among Work Values, Personality Traits, Job Satisfaction, and Career Satisfaction.” I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Psychology.

John W. Lounsbury, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Debra R. Baldwin

Eric D. Sundstrom

Tricia McClam

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges, Vice Provost and
Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with the official student records.)

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG WORK VALUES, PERSONALITY TRAITS,
JOB SATISFACTION, AND CAREER SATISFACTION

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED FOR THE

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEGREE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

SHANNON DANIELLE SALYER

DECEMBER 2007

Copyright © 2007 by Shannon Danielle Salyer

The University of Tennessee

All rights reserved

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my mom, Connie Etta Salyer, and to my pops, Jerry Paul Salyer. Through your continual love and unwavering support, you have each contributed immeasurably to the attainment of my doctoral degree. I love you.

Acknowledgements

So many people have contributed to the completion of my dissertation. Although it would be impossible to convey to them the depths of my appreciation, I do wish to acknowledge several individuals for their endless support and considerable guidance.

There are several people within the University of Tennessee's Psychology department who have gone above the call of duty in helping me attain my goals. I wish to thank Dr. John Lounsbury, Dr. Eric Sundstrom, Dr. Deborah Baldwin, and Dr. Tricia McClam for serving on my doctoral committee. I owe much gratitude to Dr. Jim Lawler and Dr. Richard Saudargas for providing me with the financial support and the opportunity to finish my degree. Connie Ogle and Sandy Thomas have been my daily encouragements, shoulders to lean on, and close friends throughout my years at UT. Without them, I would not have finished. A special thanks goes to Dr. Anne McIntyre who has become my mentor, my adopted aunt, and my friend, I am honored to have worked with you and I look forward to many more dinners and chin-chins in the years to come.

I want to express my gratitude to my family and friends, who have prodded, encouraged, pleaded, reinforced, nagged, questioned, and loved me through this process. Jeremy, without you, my life would not be fun, thank you for helping me remember how important it is laugh and play. Kasi, thank you for sharing your family with me, when I needed to just take a break, I loved nothing more than coming over and talking with you and Danny and playing with Caleb and Sydney. Mom and dad, your infinite patience,

understanding, and love are more than a daughter could ever ask for. Many thanks to my GM, GD, and other family members who have given me steadfast support throughout this period of my life.

I am so grateful to have Patrick Sanford as my friend and partner. His love, concern, and strength, has helped me through the tribulations of finishing this degree and writing this dissertation. He has given me the courage to persevere and the encouragement to achieve my goals. I love you and I am excited about our future together. Thank you especially for the fishing trips and hair rubs.....

To all of my friends, especially: Dr. Marta Wayt and Tom Wayt, Hannah Sheard and family, Jennifer Hodges and family, Dr. Astrid Sheil, Cynthia Hackney, Dr. Tina Wu, Dr. Jill Compton, Dr. Kim Reed, Dr. Susan Perry, Dr. Toby Fugate, Todd Noblitt, Dr. Richard Gendron, Josh Quillen, and Deborah Davis, I am indebted and grateful for your friendship and support. To my students, both former and present, thank you for inspiring me to be a better person and for helping me remember the necessity for persistence and hard work.

Abstract

In this study, the relationships among work values, personality variables, job satisfaction and career satisfaction were investigated. The specific work values assessed in this research included: achievement, autonomy, challenge, creativity, ecology, family, informality, income, leadership, leisure, geographic locale, excitement, work space aesthetics, social responsibility, security, expertise, integrity, power and teamwork. Personality was assessed broadly by using the Big Five personality variables and narrowly, using more specific constructs of personality. An archival data source was used consisting of a sample of 457 employees from various industries. Several research questions were addressed including: How are work values related to broad and narrow personality traits? How are the work values related to job satisfaction and career satisfaction? And how are the Big Five and Narrow personality traits related to job and career satisfaction? Results of the study indicate several relationships between work values and the personality traits (both broad and narrow) in relation to each other and career and job satisfaction. Specifically, correlations showed a negative relationship between Emotional Stability and creativity ($r = -0.27, p < .001$), and intrinsic motivation and income ($r = -0.38, p < .001$). Work values were also related to both job and career satisfaction. However, more correlations were identified among the work values and career satisfaction. The results of a series of multiple regressions identified openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability as significant predictors of job satisfaction. The narrow personality traits identified in the multiple regression as significant predictors of career success were: tough mindedness, optimism, assertiveness,

customer service, and intrinsic motivation. Implications of the current study as well as future directions are discussed.

Table of Contents

Chapter I.....	1
Work Values: An Integrative Review of the Literature.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Definitions of Values and Work Values	1
History of Work Values	3
Measurements of Work Values.....	6
Scales using the Summative Approach.....	8
Scales using the Hierarchical Approach	14
Work values and similar constructs	17
Conservative Belief Patterns.....	18
Work Centrality	18
Alienation.....	20
Correlates of Work Values.....	21
Demographic Variables	21
Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement.....	23
Value Congruence.....	25
Job Satisfaction, Personality, and Theories	28
Career Satisfaction.....	31
Work Values and Personality.....	33
Chapter II	37
The Present Research.....	37
Rationale and Current Research Questions.....	37
Research Questions.....	40
Method	41
Overview.....	41
Participants.....	41
Measures	42
Personality.....	42
Work Values	45
Career and Job Satisfaction.....	46
Measures	47
Procedures.....	47
Chapter III.....	48
Results.....	48
Chapter IV.....	59
Discussion.....	59
Contribution to Current Knowledge	59
Limitations and Implications for Future Research.....	64
Conclusions.....	67
References.....	68
Appendix.....	81
Vita.....	86

List of Tables

Table 1: Correlations of Broad and Narrow Personality Traits with Work Values.....	49
Table 2: Correlations of Work Values with Job Satisfaction and Career Satisfaction	51
Table 3: Correlations of the Big Five and Narrow Personality Traits to Job and Career Satisfaction.....	53
Table 4: Results of a multiple regression predicting Job Satisfaction with Extraversion, Emotional Stability, and Conscientiousness as predictors.....	55
Table 5: Results of a multiple regression predicting Job Satisfaction with Openness and Agreeableness as predictors.....	55
Table 6: Hierarchical Regression entering Work Values to predict Career Satisfaction.	57
Table 7: Hierarchical Regression entering Work Values to predict Job Satisfaction.....	57
Table 8: Hierarchical Regression predicting Career Satisfaction entering Broad and Narrow Personality Traits and Work Values.....	57
Table 9: Hierarchical Regression predicting Job Satisfaction entering Broad and Narrow Personality Traits and Work Values.	58
Table A.1: Results of Hierarchical Multiple Regression for the Big Five Personality variables predicting Job Satisfaction.	82
Table A.2: Hierarchical regression of the Big Five Personality traits predicting career satisfaction	83
Table A.3: Hierarchical regression of Narrow Personality Traits predicting Career Satisfaction.....	84
Table A.4: Hierarchical Regression of Narrow Personality Traits predicting Job Satisfaction.....	85

Chapter I

Work Values: An Integrative Review of the Literature

Introduction

Throughout history, work has been a constant component of human life. It has been seen as an obligation to God, a source of income and opportunities, and a hopeful step to self-fulfillment. Traditionally, values have played an important role in understanding various facets of individual functioning related to many different areas of life. From the conceptual perspective, debating the origin and meaning of values (Cherrington, 1980; Locke, 1976, 1982; Nord, Brief, Atieh & Doherty, 1988; Pennings, 1970; Riesman, 1950; Rokeach, 1973) to the practical perspective, of how values affect job satisfaction, behavior, organizational climate, turnover, and overall success of an organization; (Cornelius, Ullman, Meglino, Czajka, & McNeely, 1985; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Elizur, 1984; England, 1967; Greenberg, 1977; Merrons & Garrett, 1975; Mobley, Griffith, Hand, & Mezlino, 1979; Schein, 1985) values have been integrated into most types of research dealing with human behavior and the workplace.

Definitions of Values and Work Values

The literature on personal values and work values dates back to the early 1900's. Many different ways to frame and conceptualize the concept of values have been presented. Values have been defined as “desirable, trans-situational goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in peoples’ lives (Schwartz, 1992).” Most

researchers consider values as the catalyst or foundation for behavior. Values are important for a person's frame of reference, (Pennings, 1970) and they are used as normative standards to decide which behavior to choose in situations (Becker & McKlintock, 1967).

According to Rokeach (1973), "Values are intrinsic, enduring perspectives of what is fundamentally right or wrong." Based on Rokeach's research, Martha Brown (1980) explains values as follows:

"A value is a single prescriptive or proscriptive belief which transcends objects and situations to which attitudes are tied. A value is not capable of being true or false, nor is the object of a value judged to be good or bad. To say that a person has a value is to say that he or she knows (cognition) the correct way to behave or the correct end-statement to strive for; can feel (emotion) about it, i.e. be for or against it, and will act a certain way (behavior) as a result of the way he or she feels about it. This article takes the position that values have been neglected as determinants of motivated behavior, and have much to offer to the understanding of relationships, particularly in the work arena." (p.16)

In 1991, a comprehensive overview of the conceptualization and definitions of values was given by Elizur, Borg, Hunt, and Beck. They summarized the work of several researchers who have different conceptualizations of values. Allport, Vernon, & Lindsey (1951) consider values as fundamental interests or motives and evaluative attitudes. Several other researchers, including Feather (1982), regard values as a particular class of motives. Still others see values as a basic component of cognitive theories of motivation (Porter & Lawler, 1968; Vroom, 1966). French and Kahn (1962) describe values as

having the conceptual property of the ability to motivate goal directed behavior in an individual by inducing valence on environmental objects, behavior, or situations.

Work values have been conceived of in terms of cultural or religious values (Parsons, Cable, & Wilkerson, 1999; Selmer & De Leon, 1996), and also in terms of personal values (George & Jones, 1997). Feather (1982), defined work values as “a class of motives that serve as standards or criteria to engender thought and action. They can be discrepant and congruent with particular environments, and people are motivated to find work environments that are congruent with their values.”

Drawing from the research on values and the changing world of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Max Weber proposed that the Protestant Reformation was responsible for changes in how individuals valued work (Weber, 1958). Religious reformers like Martin Luther, and John Calvin professed that all work had value, was meaningful, and the performance of work was the highest form of Christian obedience. Weber further expanded the understanding of Protestant Work Ethic (PWE) in his book, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Weber explained the success of European capitalistic countries in terms of hard work and industrious behavior, therefore providing moral justifications for the accumulation of wealth. In general, the PWE represents the degree to which individuals value work and place work at the center of their lives.

History of Work Values

By the 1920's, work values based on control, authority, and oversight had become the foundation of American management. Workers were not capable, nor were they

encouraged to contribute their ideas. In fact, most managers saw society as a collection of individuals who were unorganized and only trying to pursue their self interest. However, several social scientists, such as Hawthorne, Tavistock, and Lewin began investigating and redefining what people wanted from work. The period of work values based on religiosity and hopes for salvation was over.

The Hawthorne experiments, beginning in 1924, proved to be the beginning of a new view of work, work values, and the motivation of employees. “Beginning with the Illumination experiments and including the Relay Test Room and Bank Wiring efforts, Mayo and his colleagues noted that things other than the physical conditions of work might be of value in determining work output” (Mook, 1996, p. 450). Paying attention to employees by allowing them to actively participate in the experiments seemed to be essential. The importance of good social relations in the workplace and the social support of co-workers also shaped the work values of individuals.

During the thirties and forties, the Human Relations Movement guided management. The goal of this movement was to win the cooperation of employees by implementing communication between levels of the organization and including employees in decisions. Managers who treated employees badly were blamed for low morale in the workplace and also poor production. Because of the shift in worker mentality, from servant to collaborators, managers were required to develop systems to include everyone in the business. While employees reported an increase in work satisfaction, the Human Relations Movement had not improved overall output. But, the notion of a worker being committed to an organization was present and many researchers

and organizations began exploring ways to increase output while balancing employee involvement and control. During the last part of the twentieth century, this idea of worker commitment and the structure of the organizations guided a wide array of research. Chester Barnard advocated better upward communication and cooperation between managers and employees. He believed that organizations should no longer be based on coercion and force. Barnard stressed the importance of "natural groups" and believed employees would work more efficiently if they were allowed to work in these groups (Herzberg, 1966). Both scientists and managers designed projects to emphasize and measure employee empowerment and commitment. Managers and researchers also suggested changes to organizational structure in order to balance worker satisfaction and increase output (Cherrington, 1980).

In his research at the University of Iowa and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Kurt Lewin discovered that groups could modify individual work values that may be holding back changes in the workplace. He believed each group member could learn to participate in decision-making. Lewin (1952) believed that participation in itself would become an important source of motivation. Some organizations began exploring structural changes in order to cut back costs and respond to the demands of the changing work force. Organizations like Westinghouse employed self-administering teams in order to reduce the layers of management (Bruzzese, 21-22). At Milwaukee Electric Tool Company, self-directed teams were responsible for inventory control, quality and delivery. They were given additional pay for increasing their skill level and were made responsible for the final product. By treating employees as valuable and responsible

decision makers, this company increased productivity by sixty-five percent (CNBC Broadcast, 24 October 1995, 11:30a.m.). Because of business successes and the changing work force, research on worker motivation and work values became even more necessary.

Measurements of Work Values

Like most terms in the social sciences, work values -- as opposed to attitudes, behaviors, ethics, and beliefs--has become very hard to distinguish in the literature. In order to study work values, a clear operational definition and conceptualization of this term is needed. The meaning of values and work values in the literature, as well as, the relationship between values and related concepts, such as work ethics, job involvement, flow, work drive, and intrinsic motivation, has been the subject of considerable debate in the literature. A synopsis of how work values have been assessed will be presented, followed by an overview of related constructs.

There are two main approaches to studying and measuring work values: the summative approach and the hierarchical approach. The summative or cumulative approach consists of answering several items demonstrative of a particular value and adding the results together to get an overall score. Higher scores are interpreted as reflecting greater strength of the value being measured. The cumulative model is the most common because of its simplicity and logic. The summative approach edifies the importance of a wide span of values, variance in the importance of individual values, and the total importance of values (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987). Examples of this type of measurement is the Personal Values Questionnaire (PVQ) (England, 1975) and The Pro-

Protestant Work Ethic Scale (PPE) (Blood, 1969), Measurements using the summative approach have the advantage of making inter-subject comparisons possible. However, because values are socially desirable traits, many individuals will endorse these items. When values are measured independently of each other, the scores on each scale may be artificially inflated causing difficulty in between score comparisons. Using the summative approach also makes it difficult to determine which value and individual will tap into when making decisions (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987).

Values as motivational elements are also conceptualized as hierarchical and require a within-subject ipsative design for measurement. The hierarchical approach asks respondents to rank order the importance of items comparable to the other items. This approach suggests that individuals will have a preference ordering of values to which they refer to in making decisions. Allport, Vernon, and Lindsey (1960), and Rokeach (1973), used the hierarchical approach in their research on values. Because values are socially desirable, the hierarchical approach forces an individual to choose certain values over others, and thus gives insight into which value an individual is guided by the most. However, the hierarchical approach has several limitations. Because of the nature of this type of measurement, it is subject to limitations in making between-subject comparisons (Hicks, 1970). Since the score for each value is determined by the scores on the other values, correlations between values are meaningless and correlations between other variables are also constrained (Hicks, 1970). Both the summative and the hierarchical approaches have been used extensively. The following is a summation of the different scales and inventories used to assess work values.

Scales using the Summative Approach

The most widely used approach to work values employs the categories of intrinsic or extrinsic values (Herzberg, 1966; Wollock, Goodale, Wijting, & Smith, 1971).

Extrinsic values have been identified as rewards for working. These rewards can come in the form of money and prestige and extrinsic social and environmental concomitants of work (surroundings, supervisory relationships, associates). Intrinsic values are defined as satisfaction in working, for the sake of working (Mook, 1996). George and Jones (1997) noted that intrinsic work values, which are desired end states, are dependent on the content of work, whereas, extrinsic values are independent of the work content.

However, this dichotomy has been questioned since researchers have not used consistent operational definitions for these concepts (Billings & Cornelius, 1980; Dyer & Parker, 1975). Different paradigms and different assessment techniques have caused researchers, to conclude that the conceptualization of intrinsic and extrinsic work values be reevaluated. The intrinsic/extrinsic conceptualization is an area of dissention among researchers who cannot agree if intrinsic and extrinsic work values are separate constructs or if these values are facets of a single construct, or elements of a single facet (Wernimont, 1972).

One of the most parsimonious concepts in the area of work values is the Protestant Work Ethic (PWE). Max Weber (1930) suggested the rise of capitalism in Europe may have been accelerated by the Protestant Reformation. He argued the Protestant religions stress an individual relationship between individuals and God, instead of a relationship through the Catholic Church. Protestantism stressed the importance of

each individual seeking salvation, thus stressing the importance of personal initiative and self reliance. Weber notes that Protestant entrepreneurs were very successful in the capitalistic business world. Because they could not use money for personal indulgence, typically they would reinvest money in their businesses (Mook, 1996). In order to measure the prevalence of these work values, Weber (1958), outlined the principle components of PWE as individualism, asceticism, and industriousness.

In the late 1960's, Researchers investigated the relationship between PWE and work. A scale based on PWE was developed by Blood in 1969. He presumed that individual differences in work values would predict job satisfaction. Individual work values are typically assessed using a self-report measure and these work values have been linked to several variables. Many studies have investigated PWE and work, leisure, unemployment, personality, and demographics (Furnham, 1984). However, PWE has not been identified as a determinant of job satisfaction. The PWE scale used by Mirels and Garrett (1971) has 19 items which are rated on a 7-point scale ranging from agree to disagree. The PWE scale has been validated and used extensively by researchers (Kidron, 1978; Lied and Prichard, 1976; Furnham, 1982). Blood (1969), constructed the Pro-Protestant Ethic subscale which indicates the extent a person derives individual worth from work achievement.

In 1973, Gasson identified a list of twenty prominent work values, present in the farming industry, which were classified into four groups. Instrumental values are values concerning job security, adequate income, and pleasant working conditions. Social values include earning respect of workers, belonging to the farming community,

continuing the family tradition. In Gasson's view, values are mainly related to interpersonal relationships in the working environment. Expressive values consider farming as a means of self-expression, a challenge, and a personal achievement. Intrinsic values are demonstrated when farming is viewed as an activity in its own right. For example, doing work you like, purposeful activity, and control in a variety of situations. Gasson's research demonstrated that farmers held predominately intrinsic work orientation since they most valued the way of life and, independence, and work tasks over the other work values. Gasson also pointed out that differences in values may depend on farm size and type of farming. In other research with hop farmers (Ilbery, 1983), results were similar to Gasson's and reveal that farmers attach an importance to the intrinsic values above all the other categories. Gasson (1973) and Bowler (1975) drew attention to the onion model in value research. In the onion model, there is a layering of values from the external societal values to the core of values that individuals admit only to themselves. This layering effect proposed a difficulty in determining which values (societal-individual) people are using when making decisions. The onion structure of values also makes assessment complex, since we do not know which layer of values we are assessing or an individual is drawing from to answer items. Gasson assumed that the external socially accepted values are the ones most individuals are acknowledging. He believed that differentiating between levels or layers of values may not be necessary since values are socially learned and become internalized over time, this in turn will influence the motivation of an individual. As noted by Gasson, "Superficial answers are still meaningful and individual variations in what is thought to be socially acceptable can

be highly revealing (Gasson, 1973, p. 526).” Even knowing someone would answer in a socially desirable way, may be in itself, a value.

Super (1970) explored factors related to work preferences and the extent to which values such as financial rewards, job security, or prestige entered into the employment decisions and job satisfaction. Along these same lines, Buchholz (1977) developed a scale to assess beliefs about work. He contends that studies investigating the underlying beliefs people have about work and how workers derive fulfillment from their jobs are necessary. Buchholz’s Beliefs about work assessment consists of five subscales defined below.

1. The Work Ethic scale-- measures the belief that work offers dignity to a person and that success is dependent upon personal effort.
2. The Organizational Belief System measures the belief that meaning is derived from work only when it affects the organization or personal position within the organization.
3. The Marxist Related Beliefs subscale--assesses the belief that work is essential to life fulfillment but that organizations take advantage and exploit workers.
4. The Humanistic Belief System subscale--assesses the view that work allows for personal growth and development and that these qualities are more important than output in the job.
5. The Leisure Ethic scale—measures the view that work is a means to pursue leisure activities and that personal fulfillment is derived from these activities.

The Beliefs about work self-report measure consists of 45 items, spanning 5 subscales, rated on a 5-point scale ranging from agree to disagree and has been used in a number of studies (Buchholz, 1978; Dickson & Buchholz, 1977, 1979, Furnham, 1984). In Buchholz’s conclusion, he said the general work ethic was not held by a number of people. However, no other belief system emerged as a clear preference to work ethic. He compared American work beliefs with Scottish work beliefs and concluded that

Marxist-related and leisure belief systems most differentiated the workers from the American and Scottish cultures (Dickson & Buchholz, 1977). Furnham used a battery of scales, including Buchholz's, Beliefs about work scale, to assess work values and beliefs in Britain. His findings were consistent with what Dickson and Buchholz found. The older, less educated people were more interested in leisure ethic beliefs and younger well-educated people were more work involved.

Another scale that explores the relationship of values to other variables is The Survey of Work Values (SWV) developed by Wollack, Goodale, and Wijting (1971). The SWV measures six dimensions that together form the Protestant ethic. They are: status, activity preference, striving, attitudes towards earnings, pride in work, and job involvement. The level of one's status within a company or within society measures the effect the job itself has on the individual's personal standing, whether by the individual or perceived by others. Activity preference reflects the worker's preference to keep active and busy. The striving dimension represents the desire to seek a higher level job and a better standard of living. Attitude towards earning indicates the value the individual places on making money. Pride in work involves the satisfaction and enjoyment felt by the individual from doing the job well. Finally, job involvement measures the amount of interest an individual has regarding coworkers' and company functions as well as the desire to contribute to job related decisions. Of these six, job involvement, activity preference, and pride in work, were considered to be intrinsic motivation variables. Status and attitudes towards earnings were considered to be extrinsic motivation variables.

After reviewing the literature on values and work values, Elizur (1984) classified work values into two distinct components: work outcome modality and performance contingency. Work outcome modality is determined by one of the following:

1. Instrumental or material: Some of these outcomes can be applied directly, such as pay, others are more practical, such as work conditions. If the value helps one achieve a desirable outcome (i.e. promotions);
2. Cognitive: A belief system concerning behavior such as interest, achievement, or autonomy
3. Affective: These outcomes deal with interpersonal relations or fulfillment of application. For example, cooperating with colleagues, relationship with supervisor, etc.

System performance contingency refers to whether the outcome is contingent on performance or on ones membership in the organization. Organizational leaders are aware that motivating employees to join their organization and motivating their employees to concentrate on work is necessary for a successful organization. Benefits packages, subsidized meals, or transportation are examples of incentives organizations provide to employees based on their membership alone. Other outcomes, such as pay, status, or recognition are only provided after task performance.

Elizer's additional research on work values and motivation culminated in the construction of the Work Values Questionnaire (WVQ). The WQV consists of 24 items systematically designed to represent the various aspects of work values. The two basic components of the work value structure, modality and the system performance

contingency are embedded in the WVQ measure. To assess modality, items are classified into the facets of instrumental (ex. pay, benefits, work conditions); affective (ex. esteem, recognition, interaction); and cognitive (ex. advancement, personal growth, independence, and status). To assess system performance contingency, items pertaining to rewards and resources were employed. Elizer used several theories as a foundation to his assertions of work values. The foundational theories used to construct the WQV questionnaire were taken from basic theories of motivation, for example, need theories presented by Alderfer (1972), Maslow (1954), and McClelland (1961). Hackman and Oldam's job characteristics model (1980) is also incorporated into the WVQ scale.

Scales using the Hierarchical Approach

The hierarchical method has been employed by Locke (1976) and Rokeach (1973). Scales using a hierarchical approach employ an ipsative design, requiring individuals to rank order items from most important to least important. Another way to make use of the hierarchical approach is utilize forced response items. Using the forced response approach, respondents must choose the value most representative of them from a list of two values. Thus, respondents must have a preference of certain values, at the expense of other values (Allport, Vernon, & Lindsey, 1960; Rokeach, 1973). One advantage of using an ipsative measurement model is the social desirability factor. Most work values are strongly sanctioned by most individuals. Respondents are likely to affirm values even if they do not personally endorse them. Therefore, individual scores will be exaggerated if values are measured independently from each other, as in the

summative method, but the hierarchical method forces respondents to prioritize the most important values.

The Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) is an assessment tool that presents the respondent with two lists of values, instrumental and terminal. Instrumental values are guiding principles to help an individual attain an objective, for example, ambition, honesty, or cheerfulness. Terminal values represent guiding principles and a mode of behavior that is an end-point objective, for example, an exciting life. A person, who behaves in all the ways prescribed by their instrumental values, or modes of conduct, will be rewarded with all the end-states of existence specified by their terminal values. The RVS presents a combination of terminal and instrumental values that must be ranked by relative importance. The work values on the RVS are presented to the respondent in alphabetical order which may or may not lead respondents to answer in a particular way.

Based on Reisman's definitions of individuals being inner-directed or other-directed, Spindler characterized changes in Americans values as traditional or emergent. Traditional values are characterized into four categories: Puritan morality, individualism, work-success ethics, and future time orientation. The four categories that comprise the emergent values are: relativistic moral attitudes, conformity, sociability, and present-time orientation. Prince (1960) drafted the Differential Values Inventory (DVI) based on the traditional-emergent framework, in order to assess the level of values an individual held. The DVI contains sixty-four forced-choice items which assess whether an individual holds a traditional set of values, (puritan morality, individualism, work-success ethic); or an emergent set of values, (conformity, sociability, relativistic moral attitudes).

Respondents were asked to choose which choice most accurately reflected their feelings or actions. For example respondents choose between:

- A. Feel that the most important thing in school is to gain knowledge useful for me in the future.
 - B. Feel that the most important thing in school is to learn to get along well with people.
-
- A. Work as hard as I can to be successful.
 - B. Work as hard as I can in order to enjoy some luxuries of life.

In order to score the assessment, one point was given for each traditional value choice. Scores can range from 0 to 55. If an individual scored above a 32, they were considered traditional and below 32 emergent.

Cornelius, Ullman, Meglino, Czajka, and McNeely (1985) used a variant of the critical incidents technique (Flanagan, 1954), in order to assess work values. A sample of 966 employees at different levels of a variety of organizations throughout the United States was surveyed. The questionnaire asked employees to focus on an individual they knew well at work and to identify one value that person held about life in general. The respondents were then asked to explain an incident that happened at work that illustrated why they felt that individual held that value. These behavioral incidents were then sorted into different categories. The work values were divided into the following categories: achievement, concern for others, honesty, hard working, positive outlook, helping others, and fairness. Ravlin and Meglino used these categories as a foundation for their research in 1987, which compared different work value measures.

A well-known scale used to evaluate values is the Allport, Vernon, and Lindsey (A-V-L) Study of Values (1960). Allport, Vernon, and Lindsey (1951) asserted that work

values should be considered motivators. The A-V-L is used to quantify the comparative importance of six classes of values: theoretical, economic, aesthetic, political, social, and religious. Using the A-V-L, Keller (1975), found values were not significantly related to role conflict, ambiguity, or job satisfaction. Keller does go on to say that the A-V-L assessment did not capture the emotional content of values. He believes the A-V-L is simply an occupational interest scale rather than a scale of work values.

On the Comparative Emphasis Scale (CES), developed by Ravlin and Meglino (1987), individuals were presented with statements from four value orientation categories. The CES is comprised of 12 statements describing each of the four values: fairness, achievement (working hard), honesty, and concern for others. The 48 statements are divided into pairs so that each statement representing each of the four values are presented with each other value four items. For each pair the respondent must choose which statement is most indicative of their own behavior. The respondents' primary goal orientation is defined as the value most preferred over the other values.

Work values and similar constructs

Besides the scales used to measure work values, there are other similar constructs in the psychological literature which have been studied in relation to work values. A summary of the literature on conservative belief patterns, work centrality, work involvement, and alienation will be presented in the following paragraphs.

Conservative Belief Patterns

One construct that is similar to work values is conservative belief patterns. Wilson (1973) contends that there are many facets to the conservative belief patterns construct including religious fundamentalism, pro-establishment politics, insistence on strict rules and punishments, preference for convention (in clothes, art, etc.), an anti-hedonistic outlook, and opposition to scientific progress. These facets have been linked with and been found to predict work values and ethics (Furnham & Bland, 1983). Wilson and Patterson (1968) measured conservative beliefs with a 50-item inventory, rated on a 3-point yes/no scale. The Conservative Beliefs scale included the facets of religious fundamentalism, intolerance of minority groups, right-wing politics and conventionalism. Several studies have established the reliability and validity of Wilson and Patterson's conservative beliefs scale (Eysenck, 1976; Furnham & Bland, 1983; Wilson, 1973).

Work Centrality

Job involvement and work centrality are also related to work values. Until the mid 1980's job involvement was loosely defined and had run the gamut of being considered a situational trait to being considered a permanent, inherent, and unchangeable trait. As a result, work centrality/involvement frequently had been grouped with job involvement. In an attempt to understand the differences between job involvement and work involvement, Kanungo (1982) developed distinct measures for job involvement and work involvement. He defined job involvement as a specific belief regarding one's relationship with one's present job. Work involvement however, referred to the normative belief regarding how important work should be in one's life. Kanungo

also distinguished job involvement from intrinsic motivation. He emphasized that work involvement was distinct from the Protestant ethic and should not be interchanged. Elloy and Terpening (1992) studied the question raised by Kanungo regarding the ambiguity of the Job Involvement construct. They attempted to provide additional support for distinguishing job involvement from work involvement by specifying the identifying substantive relationships between the two constructs. Elloy and Terpening administered Kanungo's work involvement-Q and job involvement-Q and J-satisfaction scale, Mirels and Garrett's PE scale, and a Type A personality scale developed by Ivancevitch, Matteson, and Pestor (1982). Their results showed that individuals whose salient and non-salient needs were met experienced greater job satisfaction and increased job involvement, should they desire it. In addition, individuals with the Protestant work ethic and the Type A personality were more likely to be work-involved. This conclusion was parallel to Kanungo's study in which individuals that endorsed the PE and had a Type A personality tended to be work involved. Kanungo (1979) explained this discrepancy by classifying job involvement at the descriptive level and work involvement at the normative level.

Kanungo concluded that, since a job represented a category of work, a positive relationship between the two was expected (i.e. high work involvement was positively related with high job involvement). However, this was not necessarily true the other way around, because one might not be able to find a job that satisfied one's salient needs.

Paullay, Alliger, and Stone-Romero (1994) conducted a construct validation of job involvement and work involvement. Job involvement was defined as involvement

with present job, and work centrality defined as involvement with work or paid employment. They drew a distinction between job involvement-role and job involvement-setting. Job involvement-role was defined as the degree to which one is engaged in the specific tasks that make up one's job. Job involvement-setting was the degree to which one found carrying out the tasks of one's job in the present job environment to be engaging. Results indicated that while job involvement and work constructs shared moderate amounts of variance, they did not appear to be redundant. Also job involvement-role was correlated with job involvement-setting at 0.72, indicating that while they were highly correlated they were not fully redundant.

Alienation

A term that is found in the sociological and political literature is work alienation or anomie. Work alienation represents the extent to which a person is disengaged from their work, or a lack of positive affect for the world of work (Kunungo, 1982). Work alienation is seemingly the only construct that captures the (inverse) relationship of an individual's psychological engagement to their work. Alienation or anomie has been measured as a component of commitment disposition or "the propensity to involve oneself in whatever one is doing (Kobasa, Maddi, & Kahn, 1982, p. 169)" Power and decision making abilities have been shown to have an inverse relationship with alienation. The more power and decision making an employee has, the more likely they will not be alienated from their work. Alienation is usually present in workers who are at the lowest rungs in an organization. The removal from power and the inability to make decisions is associated with higher levels of alienation and thus, related to certain work

values (Josephson & Josephson, 1973). The work alienation measure (Maddi, Kobasa, & Hoover, 1979) has been used to investigate the relationship of work alienation with work commitment (Hirschfeld & Field, 2000). Sample items of the work alienation measure include:

1. Those who work for a living are manipulated by those who run things.
2. I wonder why I work at all.
3. It doesn't matter if people work hard at their jobs; only a few 'higher ups' really profit.
4. I find it hard to believe people who actually feel that the work they perform is of value to society.

Correlates of Work Values

Work Value researchers have employed correlational methods to investigate the relationship between work values and many other variables. The following paragraphs include a summation of how work values are related to other variables such as: demographics, job satisfaction and job involvement, and personality.

Demographic Variables

A variety of demographic variables have been studied in relation to work values. In a large American study, Buchholz examined the relationship between age, sex, education, and job with work values in the general population. Marxist-related beliefs differentiated between people of dissimilar backgrounds. Marxists ideas were supported by the younger rather than older; female rather than male; poorly educated rather than

educated; black rather than white; and working class rather than management. Younger workers showed higher scores on the work ethic scale and leisure ethic was negatively related to occupational status. Top management specified they liked their work and were not willing to accept leisure as a substitute for the benefits of working. The demographics that tended to support Marxist ideas were: female, younger, poor, black, and workers (as opposed to management). Leisure ethic was related to occupational status. Top managers indicated they enjoyed their work and were not willing to sacrifice their work for leisure activities.

Furnham (1984) also studied work values in relation to demographic factors. He found that age and education were significantly related to work beliefs and values. Older, less-educated people were found to be more alienated and more conservative in their beliefs. While younger, better-educated people tended to be more involved in work. Younger employees were also more humanistic oriented, less alienated, less conservative, more sympathetic to leisure ethic, and Marxist related beliefs.

Cherrington, Conde, and England (1979) found that age, education, and seniority related to moral importance of work, pride in work, and importance of money. They also found that, compared to women, men were more concerned with money, independence, dominance, competitiveness, and long-term career goals. Several researchers (e.g., Elizer, 1994; Furnham, 1984; Lynn, 1993) have found that women tend to be more concerned with social approval, job affiliation, and short-term career goals. However, because of women's more equal participation in the work force, the lack of concern for long-term career goals and money may dissipate (Tait, Padgett, & Baldwin, 1989).

Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement

Several researchers investigated the relationship between work values and job satisfaction or job involvement. Blood (1969) developed an 8-item scale measuring pro- and anti- Protestant ethic behavior. His results indicated that one's work values influenced job satisfaction since endorsement of the PWE positively correlated with job satisfaction. He also concluded that job satisfaction was not significant in the development of work values. Blood believed it more logical to assume that work values precede and affect job satisfaction rather than job satisfaction affecting values. Although, he goes further to say that the causal relationship between satisfaction and work values is a viable research question.

Locke (1976) suggested that job satisfaction is partially determined by the degree to which the work environment allowed or encouraged value attainment. He suggests that organizational work values, the work values emphasized within an organization, may influence the attractiveness of work environments to individuals.

Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) reviewed the literature on job involvement and defined job involvement as related to three types of variables: personal characteristics, situational characteristics and the interaction between the situation and the individual. Their initial conclusion was that job involvement was related to three classes of working variables: personal characteristics such as age, situational characteristics such as job stimulation, and work outcomes such as satisfaction. Also, they concluded that job involvement was quite stable and that much of its variance was still unexplained. In addition, the data on job involvement was more consistent with the “importance of work”

definition than the “extent to which performance affects self esteem” definition. Job involvement seemed to be a feedback variable that was both a cause and effect of job behavior. Personal and situational variables had independent effects on involvement. Situational variables had more of an effect on the attitudes of low job involved persons than on highly job involved persons. Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) also investigated the effect of individual differences on locus of control and job involvement. There tended to be a decreased amount of job involvement in those who perceived reinforcement as being contingent of outside forces. However, those who perceived reinforcement as being contingent on inside forces did not necessarily have a high job involvement.

Lawler and Hall (1970) studied the relationship between job involvement, satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. Job involvement was defined as the degree of psychological identification with one's work. More specifically Lawler and Hall conceptualized job involvement as an attitude that was separate from satisfaction and intrinsic motivation concepts. In their view, job involvement reflected the importance of a person's entire work situation in his or her life. Thus, a highly job-involved individual would be greatly affected by his or her job situation. Lawler and Hall (1970) also indicated a distinction between job involvement and satisfaction. They described job involvement as being related to only self-perceived measures, while satisfaction included both objective and self-perceived job design characteristics.

Saal (1978) examined the characteristics of job-involvement correlates and divided the correlates into three areas: personal demographics, personal psychological traits, and situational characteristics. Situational characteristics (such as feedback and

autonomy at work) and personal psychological traits (such as pro-Protestant ethic and achievement motivation) had a greater influence than personal demographic traits, such as sex and community where raised with job involvement. Work outcomes such as satisfaction or performance were not consistently related to job involvement but there was a strong negative relationship between job involvement and absenteeism.

Lodahl and Kejner's scale (1965), incorporated several aspects of job involvement. The first facet of job involvement is related to the extent which job performance affects a person's self-esteem. The second conceptual dimension Lodahl and Kejner employed concerning job involvement was the internalization of values about the goodness of work, or the importance of work for the person. Both dimensions were represented in their scale of job involvement, but much subsequent research has used a shortened version of their scale (Morrow, 1983).

Value Congruence

Work values have been investigated as a part of an organization's culture. Work value congruence research has revealed that organizational environments play an important role in shaping employees' intrinsic career success. Work value congruence has been defined as the degree an individual's work values match the values of the organization (Chatman, 1989; Kristof, 1996). Work value congruence is a significant form of person-organizational fit because values guide actions and develop attitudes (Rokeach, 1968). Investigating the concept of values, specifically work values, should yield insight not only to how people behave in their work setting but also should further advance the understanding of person-job-fit. Generally it is accepted that individuals

have fairly stable values across life experiences and that neither organizational values nor the socialization process do much to change these individual values (Judge & Bretz 1992; Lusk & Oliver, 1974). Research has also shown that individuals make job choices consistent with their work goals (Vroom, 1966). Organizations with strong corporate cultures demonstrate superior performance. Better performance is attributed to socialization and techniques that emphasize the core values of the organization. If values are shared by employees, they can work more efficiently as a team, or individually (Barney, 1986; Tichy, 1983). Work value congruence is positively correlated with job satisfaction (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Chatman, 1991). Work value congruence has been explained using Schneider's attraction-selection-attrition model (ASA). Individuals are more likely to choose organizations with values that are consistent with their own (Cable & Judge, 1996; Judge & Bretz, 1992). The results of several studies have found that individuals tend to be selected by organizations with whom their values match (Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Cable & Judge, 1997). Cable and Parsons (2001) found that people were more likely to leave an organization if their values did not match. Chatman (1989) observed that when employers' values and the values of employees do not match, the employee will be less satisfied. Several studies have examined the relationship between value congruence and work attitudes (Kristof, 1996). Value congruence has been found to be positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). Although a number of institutional socialization practices have been shown to predict changes in work value congruence, eliminating

incongruence completely has not been accomplished (Cable & Parsons, 2001; Chatman, 1991).

Value congruence is assessed by comparing self-reported individual work values to the values of the organization (assessed by peers). Individual and organizational values are measured by the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) developed by O'Reilly et al. (1991). The OCP consists of 54 values that are sorted into nine categories describing how desirable each value would be in a hypothetical organization. The answers range from "most desirable" to "least desirable". Organizational values are assessed by peers using the OCP. The respondents must place the 54 values into nine categories ranging between 1= very uncharacteristic of my organization and 9= very characteristic of my organization, following a forced distribution (O'Reilly et al, 1991). The peer ratings are then averaged to create the value profile for that particular organization.

External adaptation and internal integration are terms coined by Schein (1985) to describe the functions of work values. External adaptation is demonstrated by employees being influenced, by their values, to behave in a manner that is necessary for the organization to survive in the environment. Internal integration is related to interpersonal interactions and the effect of shared values on those interactions. Schein believes that shared values are related to shared cognitive processing, interpreting, classifying, and responding to certain events. Because of these shared mental processes, a common communication system should also be present. Therefore, shared values reduce or eliminate uncertainty, stimulus overload, and many other negative features of work interactions. The success of interpersonal activities in the workplace is driven by shared

work values (Schein, 1985). Shared values also enhance coordination, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

When shared work values are present, it is assumed that certain behaviors will be predictable. Kluckholm (1951) proposed that when employees possess similar values, they have clearer role expectations because they can accurately predict their colleagues' behaviors. Fisher and Gitelson (1983) found that when individuals experience less role ambiguity and conflict, they are more satisfied and committed to their organization.

Job Satisfaction, Personality, and Theories

Job satisfaction has been studied in conjunction with many other variables, especially the dispositional source of job satisfaction. One typology of personality that has been studied is positive affectivity (PA) and negative affectivity (NA). Individuals who have a PA disposition are likely to exhibit positive emotions like joy and enthusiasm; while individuals who experience NA are more likely to exhibit negative emotions like anger and fear (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). In a meta analysis investigating the relationship of affectivity and job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negative affectivity were significantly correlated with job satisfaction, .49 (k=15) and -.33 (k=27) respectively (Connolly & Viswesvaran, 2000). With this typology of disposition, only two traits are studied. However, the Big Five model of personality was developed to measure the most salient aspects of personality.

The Big Five model of personality is comprised of Openness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism (Goldberg, 1990). Judge, Heller, and Mount (2002) in their meta-analysis of the five-factor model of personality and job

satisfaction, made a strong case for studying the dispositional source of job satisfaction.

Their rationale and results are summarized below:

People who score high on Neuroticism experience more negative life events than other individuals (Magnus, Diener, Fujita, & Pavot, 1993). Because Neuroticism is highly correlated with NA, it is not surprising that it emerged as the strongest and most consistent correlate of job satisfaction. Individuals who score high on Extraversion are predisposed to experience positive emotions (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Because Extraverts enjoy being around people and seek out social relationships, they are likely to find interaction at work more rewarding. Extraversion showed strong correlations across studies with job satisfaction. Extraverted individuals seem to be happier in their work as well. Tokar, Fischer, and Subich (1998) addressed the relationship of job satisfaction with Extraversion and Neuroticism in their qualitative review saying, "Greater job satisfaction is related to lower neuroticism and its variants, as well as to higher extraversion and its related traits" (p. 144) The other Big Five trait that exhibited a strong relationship with job satisfaction was Conscientiousness. Conscientiousness is the disposition to be purposeful, determined, hard-working and controlled. Organ and Lingl (1995) believed Conscientiousness would be related to job satisfaction because people who score high on conscientiousness tend to be more work involved. This involvement allows high Conscientious individuals to experience more work rewards like feelings of personal accomplishment and recognition. The meta-analysis supported this reasoning. Conscientiousness displayed the second highest correlation with job satisfaction.

Mook (1996) summarized two theories explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and work values. The first theory used to describe job satisfaction and work values is the value discrepancy theory (Locke, 1976). Locke believed satisfaction resulted from the fulfillment of desires, or fulfillment of what a person values. His basic proposition is that satisfaction with some factor or aspect of the job is the result of a dual judgment. A person will first judge a job factor in terms of importance. The second judgment involves how much the factor is desired compared to how much will be received. In Locke's view, satisfaction with a job factor depends on the importance of the factor and on the difference between what is desired and what is received. Higher levels of satisfaction are associated with less discrepancy between what is desired versus what is received. Locke (1976) suggested that job satisfaction is partially determined by the degree to which the work environment encourages value attainment. This suggests that organizational work values may influence the attractiveness of work environments to individuals.

A second theory linked to work values is Lawler's Facet Theory. Lawler and Porter (1967, 1968) incorporated concepts from expectancy theory to explain job satisfaction in a motivational framework. They proposed that motivation results from the perceived instrumentality of an action producing an outcome and the value of that outcome. Lawler's facet theory extends this basic presumption further in order to predict satisfaction with different aspects of a job. He proposed that the level of satisfaction with a particular job aspect is determined by comparing what is expected to be received and what is actually received. Expectations of what should be received from a particular job

facet are determined by perceptions of input to the job, inputs and outcomes of others, and the demands of the job. Perceptions of what is actually received are determined by equity considerations. Satisfaction results when the amount received is the same or commensurate with what is expected.

Career Satisfaction

While much research has been conducted on job satisfaction dating back to the mid 1900's, career satisfaction has a more recent history. To date, there is no meta-analysis on the topic of career satisfaction and much of the research has addressed career satisfaction as secondary to other research questions (See list of articles in next paragraph). Following the conceptualization of Judge, Cable, Bourdreau, and Bretz (1995), career satisfaction is most often defined as an individual's feelings of satisfaction with their career as a whole. Career satisfaction may also be conceptualized as a part of the larger construct of career success (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999).

Career satisfaction has been studied in different contexts and within various populations. In their article on personality and career success, Lounsbury, Loveland, Sundstrom, Gibson, Drost, and Hamrick, (2003) identified the following research citations for career success: school teachers' skills, values, and professional accomplishments (Chapman, 1982); role harmony of female physicians (Walfish, Polifka, & Stenmark, 1985); salary and promotions (Seibert, Crant, & Kraimer, 1999), burnout and career stress of counselor education professionals (Bozionelos, 1996); organizational support and work pressure of female professionals and managers (Richardsen, Mikkelsen, & Burke, 1997); career salience and role-management strategies of dual

career couples (Bird & Russell, 1986); career mentoring (Nash, Norcross, & Prochaska, 1984); differences between physicians and psychiatrists (Sturm, 2001); career choice factors for social workers (Hanson & McCullagh, 1997); work-family integration and structural work variables (Aryee, Chay, & Tan, 1994); work-personal life balance of female professionals and managers (Burke, 2001); career status of female psychologists in medical schools (Nathan, Rouse, & Lubin, 1979); and demographic, human capital, motivational, organizational and industry/region variables (Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1995). Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, and Barrick (1999) investigated the “Big Five” personality traits (cf. Costa & McCrae, 1985; Digman, 1990; John, 1990) in relation to intrinsic career success.

The most relevant findings, to the current research, in relation to personality and career success are from Boudreau, Boswell, and Judge (2001). They investigated personality variables and career success among U.S. and European executives. For the U.S. sample, they found that Neuroticism, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness were negatively and significantly related to career satisfaction, and Extraversion was positively and significantly related to career satisfaction. For the European sample, they found that Neuroticism was significantly, negatively related to career satisfaction while Extraversion was significantly, positively related to career satisfaction. Because the results for Conscientiousness and Agreeableness were inconsistent with previous findings, the researchers argued the need for replication of their study. Lounsbury, Loveland, Sundstrom, Gibson, Drost, and Hamrick, (2003) conducted research to not only replicate the personality and career success relationships, but they also investigate narrow

personality traits along with the Big Five. Their results were consistent with the body of knowledge linking Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Conscientiousness. Further, the researchers identified optimism and work drive as important correlates of career satisfaction, and arguing for more studies to investigate the nomothetic span of personality traits in relation to career success and other organizational outcomes.

Career success has also been linked to Type A behavior. Burke and Deszca (1982), hypothesized that Type A individuals would be more susceptible to career success and personal failure experiences than would individuals with a Type B personality. Individuals with a Type A personality were more anxious, more alienated socially and more disappointed with their work experiences than Type B individuals. They summarized their findings by saying people with a Type A personality, experience more undesirable work experiences and outcomes than their Type B counterparts.

Work Values and Personality

While researchers have investigated the relationship between personality and job satisfaction, few have examined the link between personality and work values. The work that has been done on personality and work values has typically focused on the impact values have on job decisions, including vocational choice. There is considerable evidence to support the proposition that work values affect the occupational decision making process (Judge & Bretz, 1992, Ravlin & Meglino, 1987). Judge and Bretz (1992) found that people are more likely to choose jobs that are consistent with their values. Feather (1988) studied the career choice decisions of college students and found that self-efficacy plays an important role in which career a student chooses.

Holland (1985) proposed that people choose environments that are congruent with their personality type. By classifying people into six classes: realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising, and conventional he suggested the environments in which people live and work would also be reflective of these classes. Because the different types of people have varying interests and competencies, they tend to surround themselves with people and situations congruent with their interests. Holland believed, for instance, that social people will choose to work in a social environment. Furnham and Koritsas (1990) tested Holland's ideas. Using Holland's vocational types and several measures of PWE, Furnham and Koritsas (1990), found that people who endorsed the PWE preferred occupations of and had work values associated with the realistic and conventional types. The individuals who believed in the PWE were less likely to choose occupations associated with the social type.

Several other researchers agreed with the proposition that personality is related to job variables. In longitudinal studies by Schneider and Dachler (1978) and Staw and Ross (1985), people's feelings about their job were stable over time. Staw, Bell and Clausen (1986) found that measures of disposition and job satisfaction were consistent throughout a period of almost 50 years. Supporting evidence from the twin studies conducted by Arvey, Bouchard, Segal and Abraham (1989) sustain the conclusion that inherited traits determine job satisfaction over time. All of the aforementioned studies lead researchers to believe that job variables may be a function of specific personality traits. Staw et al. (1986) provided two possible explanations for why work values and personality are related. The first possibility is that personality influences how people

view the world, including their jobs (Hochwarter, Zellars, Perrewe, & Harrison, 1999).

The second possible explanation linking personality and work values, asserts that personality guides job related choices, for example, individuals who are high in openness may seek out job opportunities that present them with novelty and opportunities for learning (Dormann & Zapf, 2001). People with dissimilar personalities tend to react differently to aspects of their working environment. Furnham (1992) compared many employees and their work values in the same job; however, because of the vast amount of variables measured, differences among people measured may be attributed to personality, demographic variables, or a combination of the two.

Furnham, Petrides, Tsaousis, Pappas, and Garrod (2005) investigated the relationship between the Big Five personality variables and an individual's work values, specifically the values of work relationships, influence and advancement, financial and working conditions, and autonomy and use of skills. Extraversion and Agreeableness were significant positive predictors of work relationships. People who score high on Agreeableness and Extraversion were more likely to rate relationships with coworkers as important. Extroverts were more concerned with Influence and Advancement than the Introverts. Neuroticism was also a significant predictor of valuing relationships with coworkers. People who score high on Neuroticism tend to believe they need coworkers for support. Openness was a negative predictor of financial and working conditions.

Although the above cited literature is a summary of the knowledge base existing in psychological journals on work values, job satisfaction, career satisfaction, and personality, there are still unanswered questions about these constructs. Because the

previously cited research was one of the first to investigate work values and the Big Five personality variables, there is a need to not only replicate the findings but to also expand the variables studied. The present research will also integrate several personality variables yet to be studied in conjunction with work values and satisfaction measures.

Chapter II

The Present Research

Rationale and Current Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to examine broad and narrow personality traits in relation to work values, job satisfaction, and career satisfaction. As established in the previous literature review, work values have been related to several organizational outcome measures such as job satisfaction and work involvement, and a few studies have established the link between work values and personality. Future research is needed in several areas, including: employing a more comprehensive measure to assess work values; work values and their relationship to broad and narrow personality traits; and work values' relationships to job satisfaction and career satisfaction.

Several measures of work values have been used in order to assess how an individual prioritizes their work values, an ipsative design, and several other measures use the summative approach in order to make between-subject comparisons. Few of these instruments allow respondents to identify which work values are most indicative of their values and few measures allow for comparisons between individuals in a specific organization. The work value measures used in the past are also heavily laden with religious connotations and vocabulary. The use of a work values scale that makes no mention of religiosity is necessary for respondents' comprehension and accurate results.

Of the work value instruments reviewed, most use a broad categorization of values (ex. Extrinsic vs. Intrinsic values) or measure a few isolated values (ex. DVI, RVS). One focus of the present research will be to use a more robust measure of work values to allow for between subject comparisons in combination with a multi-faceted measure of personality.

Previous research on values and personality revealed some of the relationships between the Big Five, PA and NA. While the Big Five approach to personality is well established, it has not been often utilized in the study of work values. (Furnham, Petrides, Tsaousis, Pappas, & Garrod, 2005). There is evidence that personality should be studied in conjunction with work values. As previously mentioned, Staw et al. (1986) provided two possible explanations for why work values and personality may be related. The first possibility is that personality influences how people view the world, including their jobs (Hochwarter, Zellars, Perrewe, & Harrison, 1999). The second possible explanation linking personality and work values, asserts that personality guides job related choices, for example, individuals who are high in openness may seek out job opportunities that present them with novelty and opportunities for learning (Dormann & Zapf, 2001). The lack of research in this area, especially including the Big Five and narrow personality traits, needs to be addressed. The first broad research question to be addressed is: *How are the work values related to broad and narrow personality traits?*

While the link between work values and personality has been somewhat addressed in the literature, the link between work values and job satisfaction or career satisfaction has been scarce. Several researchers have argued the theoretical questions

surrounding work values and satisfaction. For instance, Locke (1976) suggested that job satisfaction is partially determined by the degree to which the work environment allowed or encouraged value attainment. He suggests that organizational work values, the work values emphasized within an organization, may influence the attractiveness of work environments to individuals, (see previous section on value congruence). Some research has looked at the role organizations encourage value attainment, or as in Shapira and Griffith's article (1990) on comparing work values between different vocations, work values are treated as indicators of job behaviors like absenteeism and tardiness. However, aside from the occasional mention of career success, measured by a 1-item response, there is a large gap in the literature dealing with work values and career success. The present research hopes to lessen this gap in knowledge. The second broad research question to be addressed is: *How are the work values related to job satisfaction and career satisfaction?*

The articles reviewed in this paper clearly established a link between job satisfaction and personality traits. While career satisfaction is not as heavily researched, there is a foundation established that links personality and career satisfaction. The strongest predictors of job satisfaction are extraversion, emotional stability and conscientiousness. The previously mentioned study is one of the first to include all of the Big Five personality traits. The present study is a partial replication of the study conducted by Furnham, Petrides, Tsaousis, Pappas, and Garrod, (2005). However, the current study will also serve as an extension of their results by examining additional personality variables and work values in relation to job satisfaction and career

satisfaction. The third broad research question to be addressed is: *How are the Big Five and Narrow personality traits related to job and career satisfaction?*

The following are specific research questions the present study addresses:

Research Questions

1. Because work values are relatively broad in scope, will the Big Five traits, as a set, have higher correlations with the work values than narrow traits?
2. Because work values are relatively broad in scope, will they, as a set, have higher correlations with career satisfaction than job satisfaction? (The rationale for this hypothesis is that career satisfaction represents a larger frame of reference (one's career) than job satisfaction (one's job).)
3. Will the Big Five traits, as a set, have higher correlations with career satisfaction than the narrow personality traits?
4. Will the Big Five traits, as a set, have higher correlations with career satisfaction than with job satisfaction?
5. Will Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Emotional Stability be more highly related to job satisfaction than the other two Big Five traits? (The rationale for this research question is based on the meta-analysis of Judge, Heller and Mount (2002), which found that Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, and Extraversion were the Big Five traits most highly related to job satisfaction.)
6. When each of these is considered as a set, how much unique and common variance in job and career satisfaction is accounted for by the Big Five personality traits, the narrow traits, and the work values?

7. How much of the relative amounts of job and career satisfaction variance will be accounted for by the personality traits (Big Five and narrow) as a whole versus the work values?

Method

Overview

This is an archival data collection study (Breakwell, Hammond, & Fife-Schaw, 1995, 390) using a secondary data source developed by eCareerFit.com. Secondary analysis is defined as “the extraction of knowledge on topics other than those, which were the focus of the original surveys.” (Hyman, 1972). This data source is a convenience sample collected via the internet from individuals receiving services of an international strategic human services company. This data source was chosen because it includes people in a range of occupations and encompasses several personality measures, a work values measure, and multi-item job and career satisfaction scales. All data were collected between October 2001 and January 2002. Permission to analyze this data was obtained from Dr. John Lounsbury of Resource Associates.

Participants

The sample consists of individuals in occupations ranging from accounting and human resources to manufacturing and sales. A sample size of N=457 was used in data analysis. Of the respondents, 59% were male and 41% were female. The respondents' ages were recorded by category, the percentages are as follows: 0.9% were 19 or

younger; 10.3% were 20-29 years old; 34.2% were 30-39; 42.5% were 40-49; 11.2% were 50-59; 0.7% were 60-69; and 0.2% were 70 or above. Only industries with more than 25 individuals were used in analysis. The industries used in analysis along with the percentage of the sample they represent are as follows: Consumer Products 6.2%, Government 17.6%, Manufacturing 10.5%, Oil, Gas and Petroleum 20.3%, Retail and Wholesale 20.5%, Science 19.2%, and Technology 5.7%.

Measures

Personality

Personality traits were assessed using a personality measure developed and validated by researchers at Resource Associates (PSI) (for reliability and validity information see: Lounsbury & Gibson, 2000; Lounsbury, Loveland, & Gibson, 2001; Lounsbury, Tatum, Chambers, Owens, & Gibson, 1999). A brief description of each of the personality constructs examined in the present study is given below along with the number of items in the scale; this information was provided in the technical manual for the PSI assessment (Lounsbury & Gibson, 2000).

Assertiveness—refers to people asserting themselves and being forceful. People in the lower range are more accommodating and mild mannered. People high on assertiveness can take charge of situations and impose their will on others. They will not back down from tough situations or difficult people and will speak their mind on matters of importance to them. (8 items)

Introversion - Extraversion— contrasts people who refuel by spending time alone vs. people who refuel by spending time with others. As such, Introverts will likely be

relatively quiet and will like to minimize social distractions so they can concentrate on what they are doing. Extroverts, on the other hand, tend to be sociable, and outgoing. (7 items)

Agreeableness -- measures a propensity for self-reliance and doing things on one's own, listening to a private drumbeat vs. working as part of a team; helping other people; being cooperative, agreeable, and participative; and contributing to interdependence and cohesion in a work group. (5 items)

Customer Service Orientation — contrasts a rather pure involvement with the tasks that need to be accomplished against a striving to provide responsive, personalized, quality service to (internal and external) customers; wanting to satisfy them, even if it means going above and beyond the normal job description or procedural policy. (6 items)

Impression Management—is derived from the Self-Monitoring construct. It reflects a person's disposition to monitor, observe, regulate, and control self-presentation and image during sales or other situations. The scale contrasts those who are candid, matter-of-fact, non-duplicitous, and direct, pretty much irrespective of context vs. people who are concerned about making a good impression, so they present themselves in the most positive possible light in response to a given context. (6 items)

Work Centeredness -- contrasts an investment in one's life outside the world of work, that is, in personal activities or involvements with friends or family vs. a disposition to work hard and for long hours, investing everything into job and career, doing whatever is necessary to finish projects, meet deadlines, attain quotas, and achieve job success. (7 items)

Conscientiousness -- refers, at one pole, to spontaneous people who feel restricted by rules and regulations and who prefer discretionary freedom vs., at the other pole, people who feel organized by standards and regulations and who, therefore, appreciate clearly defined policies, and guidelines and who operate in a loyal, dedicated, rule-following fashion. (8 items)

Openness to Change -- contrasts people who prefer stability, familiarity, tradition, and predictability vs. those who prefer novelty and variety and who are interested in innovation, new experience, and learning and who display a willingness to try out new procedures and ways of doing things in the workplace. (9 items)

Pessimism - Optimism -- compares those who are attuned to possible difficulties that could occur and who readily envision negative outcomes, anticipating problems, vs. those who have an optimistic, hopeful outlook toward the future. People high on this dimension tend to be trusting and have positive expectations for themselves, their work, and the people with whom they work. (6 items)

Emotional Stability -- contrasts relatively sensitive people, who are more at home in a calm, low-stress work environment, with those who handily manage substantial work pressure and even want high-pressure work demands. (6 items)

Operational vs. Visionary—distinguishes focusing on practicality, operational processes, near-term goals, and immediate, tangible results vs. focusing on long-term planning, strategy, future possibilities, envisioning possibilities. (7 items)

Tender/Tough-Mindedness—refers to being sensitive, considerate, empathetic, and willing to use personal feelings and values as decision-criteria versus being analytical,

realistic, objective, and unsentimental when making judgments and drawing conclusions about what needs to be done. (8 items)

Participative vs. Directive Managerial Style—this is a basic dimension of leadership referring to an individual's preference for a managerial style emphasizing participation, delegation of responsibility, and loose supervision vs. a managerial style emphasizing directive oversight in the form of planning, scheduling, monitoring, and organizing the work environment and the tasks of subordinates. (8 items)

Human Relations—Human Relations vs. Role Relations – refers to a sensitively attuned concern for the welfare of others and consideration of their needs and feelings in a managerial role versus being role-defined and keeping an emotional distance from employees--striving to keep work relationships free from bias or favoritism and avoiding personal involvements. (9 items)

Work Values

Work values were assessed by the eCF ® Work Values Inventory also developed by resource associates. Work values are defined as “enduring, fundamental priorities and standards for meaning and significance in the world of work.” (Lounsbury, Gibson, & Drost, 2007) The work values inventory is administered online consisting of 56 bipolar items. For each item, the respondent must indicate on a 5-point scale which of the contrasting statements best describes his or her situation. The values evaluated include achievement, autonomy, challenge, creativity, ecology, family, informality, income, leadership, leisure, geographic locale, excitement, work space aesthetics, social responsibility, security, expertise, integrity, power, and teamwork. The feature of the

eCF ® Work Values Inventory that distinguishes it from other measures of work values is its use of composite scores based on bi-polar ratings. Respondents are asked to mark the box closest to the statement that best describes them when they are at work. A sample item from this assessment is in Figure 1. This approach is much sounder than the rank-order methods used in other assessments of values since it allows for cross-population comparisons. Each scale of the eCF ® Work Values Inventory is comprised of 3 items which limits the internal reliability. However, the 18 scales have a median internal consistency of .75.

Career and Job Satisfaction

Career satisfaction was assessed using the framework of Judge, Cable, Boudreau, and Bretz (1995). Career satisfaction was defined as the satisfaction of a career as a whole. Career satisfaction was measured by 5 items with an internal consistency of (alpha = .85). Also based on the work of Judge, Cable, Boudreau, and Bretz (1995), job satisfaction was defined as the overall satisfaction with one’s present job. Job satisfaction was assessed by seven items with an internal consistency of (alpha = .79) Respondents were presented with two phrases and asked to indicate which phrase was most indicative of how they act most of the time or how they feel or think when they are working. Sample items are listed below in Figure 2.

At this stage in my career, it is very important for me to be able to achieve at a high level in my work.	1 2 3 4 5 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	At this stage in my career, it is not important for me to achieve at a high level in my work.
---	---	---

Figure 1: Sample item from the work values inventory.

I am very dissatisfied with the way my career has progressed so far.	1 2 3 4 5 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	I am very satisfied with the way my career has progressed so far.
I am very satisfied with my job and benefits	1 2 3 4 5 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	I am very dissatisfied with my pay and benefits.

Figure 2: Sample items for Career Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction

Measures

Job satisfaction was measured by a cumulative score on the 7 item scale. Career satisfaction will be measured by a cumulative score on the 5 item scale. Work values and personality variables were measured by a cumulative score on the respective scales, after adjusting for reverse scored items.

Procedures

Permission was requested and obtained from eCareerFit.com to utilize this particular data. eCareerFit.com managed and performed the assessments in different organizations. The records consisted of personality, work value, and demographic data. Because the assessments used are proprietary instruments, some of the specific details contained in certain parts of the assessments and specific organizations names cannot be published.

Chapter III

Results

The first research question addressed the relationship between the broad and narrow personality traits with work values. As illustrated in Table 1, several personality traits, both broad and narrow are related to work values (All tables can be found in the appendix). The strongest positive correlations with Conscientiousness were ecology ($r = 0.15, p \leq .001$) and security ($r = 0.13, p \leq .01$); and the strongest negative correlations were with power ($r = -0.14, p \leq .001$) and leisure ($r = -0.12, p \leq .01$). The most significant correlations with Emotional Stability were creativity ($r = -0.27, p \leq .001$); leadership ($r = -0.32, p \leq .001$); and power ($r = -0.23, p \leq .001$). For Extraversion, the only significant relationship was with leadership ($r = -0.09, p \leq .05$); Openness was negatively and significantly correlated with leadership ($r = -0.18, p \leq .001$) and with geographic locale ($r = -0.12, p \leq .01$); Agreeableness was positively correlated with teamwork ($r = 0.34, p \leq .001$) and negatively correlated with autonomy ($r = -0.18, p \leq .001$) and with power ($r = -0.16, p \leq .001$). While a number of relationships were identified with the Big Five personality traits, there were also significant relationships between work values and narrow personality traits. Most significantly, yet not surprising, were the relationships between intrinsic motivation and various work variables: income ($r = -0.38, p \leq .001$), leadership ($r = -0.29, p \leq .001$), and power ($r = -0.36, p \leq .001$). Also not surprising were the relationships identified between impression management and income ($r = 0.31, p \leq .001$) and impression management and work space aesthetics ($r = 0.23, p \leq .001$). Customer service had a negative and significant relationship with

Table 1: Correlations of Broad and Narrow Personality Traits with Work Values.

	Achievement Motivation	Autonomy	Challenge	Creativity	Ecology	Family	Informality
Conscientiousness	0.11*	-0.08*	0.05	-0.04	0.15***	-0.03	-0.09*
Emotional Stability	-0.19***	-0.08*	-0.16***	-0.27***	-0.06	0.03	-0.03
Extraversion	-0.06	-0.06	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04	0.04	0.00
Openness	-0.11*	-0.08*	-0.03	-0.07	0.05	-0.11*	0.04
Agreeableness	-0.03	-0.18***	-0.04	-0.10*	0.09*	0.01	0.00
Visionary Leadership	-0.01	0.07	0.10*	0.20***	0.08	0.03	0.09*
Work Drive	0.08	0.01	0.04	-0.08	-0.00	-0.07	-0.02
Assertiveness	-0.16***	-0.04	-0.16***	-0.07	-0.06	-0.09*	0.04
Customer Service	-0.22***	-0.08	-0.19***	-0.20***	-0.02	0.01	-0.02
Impression Management	-0.06	-0.01	-0.17***	-0.02	-0.16***	-0.03	0.15***
Optimism	-0.11*	0.04	0.14**	-0.07	-0.11*	-0.07	-0.11*
Intrinsic Motivation	-0.26***	-0.09*	-0.12**	-0.20***	-0.03	0.07	-0.01
Tough Mindedness	0.14**	0.11*	0.11*	-0.07	0.10*	-0.01	-0.11*

	Income	Leadership	Leisure	Geographic Locale	Excitement	Work Place Aesthetics	Social Responsibility
Conscientiousness	0.02	-0.06	-0.12**	0.00	-0.03	-0.04	-0.02
Emotional Stability	0.00	-0.32***	0.07	-0.02	-0.18***	0.00	-0.13**
Extraversion	0.00	-0.09*	0.03	-0.01	0.00	0.03	-0.01
Openness	0.02	-0.18***	-0.05	-0.12**	-0.05	0.02	-0.08
Agreeableness	-0.05	-0.01	-0.02	-0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00
Visionary Leadership	-0.10*	0.13**	0.11*	0.04	0.10**	-0.00	0.17***
Work Drive	0.11*	-0.08	-0.06	0.03	0.0	-0.05	-0.04
Assertiveness	0.10*	-0.15***	0.04	-0.04	-0.11	0.08	-0.12**
Customer Service	-0.02	-0.31***	0.08	-0.03	-0.15***	0.02	-0.02
Impression Management	0.31***	-0.02	0.09*	0.09*	0.00	0.23***	-0.05
Optimism	-0.02	-0.07	-0.09*	-0.13**	0.00	-0.10*	-0.09*
Intrinsic Motivation	-0.38***	-0.29***	0.05	-0.03	-0.19***	-0.10*	0.00
Tough Mindedness	-0.13**	0.02	-0.09*	-0.02	-0.00	-0.08	-0.12**

	Security	Expertise	Integrity	Power	Teamwork
Conscientiousness	0.13**	0.04	0.11*	-0.14***	0.09*
Emotional Stability	0.05	-0.14**	-0.06	-0.23***	-0.09*
Extraversion	-0.00	-0.05	-0.05	-0.06	-0.01
Openness	-0.10*	-0.05	0.00	-0.11*	-0.06
Agreeableness	0.03	0.04	0.04	-0.16**	0.34***
Visionary Leadership	-0.08	0.02	0.08	0.12**	0.10*
Work Drive	0.05	0.05	0.01	-0.04	-0.08
Assertiveness	-0.03	-0.14**	-0.12**	0.00	-0.17**
Customer Service	0.04	-0.14**	-0.02	-0.22***	-0.09*
Impression Management	-0.01	-0.10*	-0.23***	0.19***	-0.15**
Optimism	-0.22***	0.02	0.03	-0.04	0.03
Intrinsic Motivation	0.02	-0.15**	0.03	-0.36***	-0.02
Tough Mindedness	0.00	0.08	0.02	-0.14**	0.16**

* p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01 *** p ≤ .001

leadership ($r = -0.31, p \leq .001$) and with power ($r = -0.22, p \leq .001$). The median correlation for the Big five with work values was ($r = -0.13, p \leq .01$), and the highest correlation was between Agreeableness and teamwork ($r = .34, p \leq .001$). The median correlation for the narrow personality traits in relation to work values was ($r = 0.14, p \leq .01$), with the highest correlation of ($r = 0.38, p \leq .001$) between intrinsic motivation and income. Therefore, the narrow personality traits showed stronger relationships with the work values.

Research question 2 asked if work values had higher correlations with career satisfaction as opposed to job satisfaction. Another correlational analysis was conducted with results illustrated in Table 2. Ecology ($r = 0.10, p \leq .05$), income ($r = -0.17, p \leq .001$), leadership ($r = 0.19, p \leq .001$), leisure ($r = -0.19, p \leq .001$), geographic locale ($r = -0.10, p \leq .01$), had significant relationships with job satisfaction. Seven of the work values were significantly related to career satisfaction: achievement motivation ($r = 0.29, p \leq .001$), challenge ($r = 0.38, p \leq .001$), informality ($r = -0.11, p \leq .05$), excitement ($r = 0.17, p \leq .001$), expertise ($r = 0.25, p \leq .001$), integrity ($r = 0.17, p \leq .001$), and teamwork ($r = 0.28, p \leq .001$). In general, the highest correlations were between career satisfaction and the work values and more relationships were identified between the work values and career satisfaction.

The correlations of the Big Five personality traits and narrow personality traits with job and career satisfaction are shown in Table 3. The third research question dealt with the relationship of broad and narrow personality traits in relation to career satisfaction. Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, Openness, and Agreeableness

Table 2: Correlations of Work Values with Job Satisfaction and Career Satisfaction

	Job Satisfaction	Career Satisfaction
Achievement Motivation	0.29***	0.29***
Autonomy	0.00	0.05
Challenge	0.32***	0.38***
Creativity	0.05	0.07
Ecology	0.10*	0.08
Family	0.01	0.01
Informality	-0.10*	-0.11*
Income	-0.17***	-0.11*
Leadership	0.19***	0.15***
Leisure	-0.19***	-0.18***
Geographic Locale	-0.10**	-0.06
Excitement	0.14**	0.17***
Workspace Aesthetics	-0.19***	-0.16***
Social Responsibility	0.06	0.05
Security	0.04	-0.03
Expertise	0.21***	0.25***
Integrity	0.14**	0.17***
Power	-0.03	-0.06
Teamwork	0.24***	0.28***

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$

showed significant correlations with career satisfaction, with the strongest relationship of Conscientiousness ($r = 0.18, p \leq .001$). Several narrow personality traits were also significantly related to career satisfaction, with the strongest relationship of tough-mindedness ($r = 0.33, p \leq .001$). The Big Five median correlation with career satisfaction was ($r = .12, p \leq .01$), and the narrow personality trait median correlation was ($r = .14, p \leq .001$). Therefore both the narrow personality traits and the Big Five personality traits were related to career satisfaction.

Research question four asked if the Big Five personality traits would have higher correlations with career satisfaction than with job satisfaction. The results of the correlational analysis are also shown in Table 3. Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, Openness and Agreeableness were significantly related to career satisfaction. These relationships were higher than those than with job satisfaction. Conscientiousness was significantly correlated with job satisfaction and career satisfaction. A comparison of the significant difference of these correlations was conducted yielding a $T = 1.38$ which does not meet the criteria for a significant difference. Therefore, there was no difference between the scores of Conscientiousness and job and career satisfaction. While on the surface, Openness showed a higher correlation with job satisfaction ($r = -0.16, p \leq .001$) as opposed to career satisfaction ($r = -0.09, p \leq .05$). A comparison of the significant difference of these two correlations showed no significant difference ($T=1.92$) which is less than the .01 cutoff score necessary to establish significance. Therefore, the only traits that showed a significant difference between job and career satisfaction were Emotional Stability and Agreeableness.

Table 3: Correlations of the Big Five and Narrow Personality Traits to Job and Career Satisfaction.

Variables	Job Satisfaction	Career Satisfaction
Conscientiousness	0.13**	0.18***
Emotional Stability	0.05	0.12**
Extraversion	0.00	0.00
Openness	-0.16***	-0.09*
Agreeableness	0.07	0.13**
Visionary Leadership	-0.06	-0.09*
Work Drive	-0.03	0.00
Assertiveness	-0.24***	-0.23***
Customer Service	-0.16***	-0.14***
Impression Management	-0.22***	-0.25***
Optimism	0.17***	0.22***
Intrinsic Motivation	-0.03	0.00
Tough-mindedness	0.27***	0.33***

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$

The fifth research question asked which model, consisting of various personality traits, predicts job satisfaction better. Table 4 displays the results of Extraversion, Emotional Stability, and Conscientiousness predicting job satisfaction. Table 5 displays the results of Openness and Agreeableness predicting job satisfaction. As shown in the first model, Extraversion, Emotional Stability, and Conscientiousness demonstrated a significant $R = .58$ ($p \leq .000$). The second model including Openness and Agreeableness produced an $R = .46$ ($p \leq .000$). The best model, as indicated by the highest R includes Extraversion, Emotional Stability, and Conscientiousness.

Research question 6 asks how much unique and common variance in job and career satisfaction is accounted for by the Big Five personality traits, the narrow traits, and the work values. A series of hierarchical regressions were conducted to answer this question (see Tables A.1-A.4 in appendix and 6, 7 in text). First, I examined the results of the Big Five personality traits predicting job satisfaction (Table A.1). The model containing Openness, Conscientiousness, and Agreeableness created an $R^2 = .07$ ($p = .001$). Adding in Emotional Stability increased the R^2 to $.09$ ($p = .016$). As predictors of career satisfaction, Agreeableness, Openness, and Emotional Stability produced an R^2 of $.09$ ($p = .000$), Conscientiousness and Extraversion were not significant predictors (Table A.2).

The narrow personality traits were entered into a multiple regression predicting career satisfaction (Table A.3). The significant predictors were: tough mindedness, optimism, assertiveness, customer service, and intrinsic motivation. This model produced an $R^2 = .19$ ($p = .002$). Table A.4 illustrates the narrow personality traits as

Table 4: Results of a multiple regression predicting Job Satisfaction with Extraversion, Emotional Stability, and Conscientiousness as predictors.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics			
				F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.58 ^a	.34	1.148	76.459	3	434	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), EXTRAVERSION, EMOTIONAL STABILITY, CONSCIENTIOUSNESS

Table 5: Results of a multiple regression predicting Job Satisfaction with Openness and Agreeableness as predictors.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics			
				F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.46 ^a	.218	1.25477	60.466	2	435	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), OPENNESS, AGREEABLENESS

predictors of job satisfaction. Assertiveness, optimism, and tough mindedness were the best predictors producing an R^2 of .14 ($p = .000$).

Work Values were entered into another regression predicting career success (Table 6). The best model contained achievement, challenge, and informality ($R^2 = .11$, $p = .02$). Surprisingly, the other work values were not significant predictors of career satisfaction. However, a different set of values were predictive of job satisfaction. Achievement, leadership, security, leisure, and family produced an $R^2 = .16$ ($p = .003$). The seventh research question is directed at the amount of variance in job and career satisfaction accounted for by the personality traits (both broad and narrow) and the work values. Tables 8 and 9 display the results of hierarchical multiple regressions with personality traits entered first followed by the work values. For career satisfaction, the personality variables (both broad and narrow) produced an R^2 of .28 ($p = .000$). When the work values were entered, along with the personality variables, the $R^2 = .37$ ($p = .000$). The R^2 change was .09. The addition of the work values to the regression model added significantly. The work values accounted for 9% of the variance. When the process of entering all the personality variables in step 1 and the personality variables and work values in step 2 was repeated for job satisfaction, an $R^2 = .38$ ($p = .000$) was observed. Adding work values accounted for 17% of the variance in the model.

Table 6: Hierarchical Regression entering Work Values to predict Career Satisfaction.

Step	Variables	R	R Square	R Square Change	Sig. F Change
1	Achievement	.27	.07	.07	.00
2	Achievement, Challenge	.31	.10	.09	.00
3	Achievement, Challenge, Informality	.33	.11	.10	.02

Table 7: Hierarchical Regression entering Work Values to predict Job Satisfaction.

Step	Variables	R	R Square	R Square Change	Sig. F Change
1	Achievement	.29	.08	.08	.00
2	Achievement, Leadership	.34	.11	.02	.00
3	Achievement, Leadership, Security	.37	.13	.02	.00
4	Achievement, Leadership, Security, Leisure	.38	.14	.01	.01
5	Achievement, Leadership, Security, Leisure, Family	.40	.16	.01	.00

Table 8: Hierarchical Regression predicting Career Satisfaction entering Broad and Narrow Personality Traits and Work Values.

Step	Variables	R	R Square	R Square Change	Sig. F Change
1	Tough mindedness, Assertiveness, Conscientiousness, Image Management, Agreeableness, Visionary, Intrinsic Motivation, Work Drive, Extraversion, Optimism, Emotional Stability, Openness, Customer Service	.53	.28	.28	.000
2	Tough mindedness, Assertiveness, Conscientiousness, Image Management, Agreeableness, Visionary, Intrinsic Motivation, Work Drive, Extraversion, Optimism, Emotional Stability, Openness, Customer Service, Excitement, Autonomy, Achievement, Work space Aesthetics, Expertise, Leisure, Security, Teamwork, Integrity, Geographic Locale, Power, Social Responsibility, Informality, Income, Creativity, Family, Ecology, Challenge, Leadership	.61	.37	.09	.000

Table 9: Hierarchical Regression predicting Job Satisfaction entering Broad and Narrow Personality Traits and Work Values.

Step	Variables	R	R Square	R Square Change	Sig. F Change
1	Tough mindedness, Assertiveness, Conscientiousness, Image Management, Agreeableness, Visionary, Intrinsic Motivation, Work Drive, Extraversion, Optimism, Emotional Stability, Openness, Customer Service	.46	.21	.21	.000
2	Tough mindedness, Assertiveness, Conscientiousness, Image Management, Agreeableness, Visionary, Intrinsic Motivation, Work Drive, Extraversion, Optimism, Emotional Stability, Openness, Customer Service, Geographic Locale, Integrity, Workspace Aesthetics, Autonomy, Ecology, Family, Social Responsibility, Informality, Security, Expertise, Teamwork, Income, Achievement, Creativity, Challenge, Leisure, Excitement, Leadership	.62	.38	.16	.000

Chapter IV

Discussion

The major focus of this research was to investigate the relationships between the Big Five personality variables, narrow personality variables, and work values. Several research questions were addressed and each will be detailed below with a description of the findings. A discussion of how the current research adds to the foundation of knowledge of work values will also be presented.

Contribution to Current Knowledge

The first research question asked which set of personality variables (the Big Five or narrow) had stronger relationships with work values. Previous research indicated relationships between work values and various personality traits. Mudrack (1999), established a link between PWE and Type A behavior; and Furnham, Petrides, Tsaousis, Pappas, and Garrod (2005) found links between the Big Five personality variables and work values. In the current research, narrow personality traits and the Big Five personality traits showed correlations with work values, overall, the narrow traits had stronger relationships. Specifically, intrinsic motivation had a strong negative correlation with income. Since people who are intrinsically motivated put less value on money and more value on internal feelings (George & Jones, 1997), this finding is not surprising. Impression management was related to income and work place aesthetics. Because people high in impression management are focused on the image they project, the amount of money they have and the beauty of their work place may be important for those

outward appearances. Of the relationships of work values with the Big Five personality variables, Agreeableness and teamwork showed a significant positive relationship. Because most agreeable people naturally enjoy helping other people; being cooperative, and participative; and contributing to interdependence and cohesion in a work group, this may be why there is a relationship with teamwork. Similar results were found by Furnham, Petrides, Tsaousis, Pappas, and Garrod (2005). Their research established that Extraversion and Agreeableness were significant positive predictors of work relationships. Individuals who scored high on Agreeableness were more likely to value relationships with coworkers. Although the present study did not find many significant relationships between Extraversion and work values, the work value of power was significantly related to Extraversion. The latter result is similar to Furnham, Petrides, Tsaousis, Pappas, and Garrod's (2005) finding that Extroverts were more concerned with Influence and Advancement than the Introverts.

The second research question asked if work values had higher correlations with career satisfaction as opposed to job satisfaction. The work values were significantly related to both job and career satisfaction. While there was not an explicit distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic values in the work value measure used in this study, interestingly, the values related to career satisfaction dealt more with intrinsic values such as achievement motivation and excitement than the extrinsic values like income and geographic locale. While job and career satisfaction are separate constructs, some researchers believe job satisfaction may be the most salient aspect of career satisfaction (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999). A practical explanation of the relationship

of work values and job and career satisfaction may also be related to findings of Judge, et al, (1999) who in essence said, the variables that make individuals satisfied with their jobs are those same variables that make them satisfied in their careers. In the current research, these variables are not only personality traits but also work values.

The third research question was concerned with which set of personality traits (broad or narrow) were more strongly related to career satisfaction. The narrow personality traits showed more relationships with career satisfaction than the Big Five personality traits. One example is the correlation of tough-mindedness and career satisfaction which suggests that individuals who are more analytical, realistic, objective, and unsentimental when making judgments and drawing conclusions about what needs to be done at work are more satisfied with their careers. Of the Big Five personality traits, Conscientiousness had the highest correlation with career satisfaction. Conscientious individuals have a strong achievement orientation which has been linked to career and life success (Barrick & Mount, 1991; McCrae & Costa, 1991; Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999) Conscientiousness is a valid predictor of success at work, being linked to effective job seeking behavior (Wanberg, Watt, & Rumsey, 1996), retention (Barrick, Mount, & Strauss, 1994), and salary and earnings (Barrick & Mount, 1991). It is not hard to imagine why Conscientiousness would be linked to career satisfaction in the current study. However, Bourdreau, Boswell, and Judge (2001) investigated personality variables and career success among U.S. and European executives and found a different pattern of relationships with career success and Conscientiousness. In the U.S. sample, they found that Neuroticism, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness were negatively and

significantly related to career satisfaction, and Extraversion was positively and significantly related to career satisfaction. In the European sample, they found that Neuroticism was significantly, negatively related to career satisfaction while Extraversion was significantly, positively related to career satisfaction. While these results seem to counter the previously stated positive relationship of Conscientiousness and satisfaction, several explanations exist. The sample used in Bourdreau, Boswell, and Judge (2001) study included high-level executives which may not have been represented before. Organ and Lingl (1995) described the negative relationship of Conscientiousness and satisfaction with co-workers by saying, Conscientious people demand much from themselves, and others, even in mundane matters that others might not consider important. When others do not meet these lofty expectations as the conscientious individual does, the conscientious individual may react with criticism which, in turn, causes work relationships to be strained.

The fourth research question asked if the Big Five personality traits would have higher correlations with career satisfaction than with job satisfaction. Results indicated a relationship between Emotional Stability and Agreeableness had higher significant relationships with career satisfaction as opposed to job satisfaction. The relationship of Emotional Stability with job satisfaction has consistently been documented in the literature (Furnham & Zacherl, 1986; Judge & Locke, 1993; Oran & Near, 1983). Employees prone to negative emotions are more likely to experience negative job-related thought processes like overgeneralization, perfectionism, and therefore lower job satisfaction (Judge & Locke, 1993). In Great Britain, two studies uncovered a

relationship between Emotional Stability and Career Success. Self-confidence (Emotional Stability) was associated with higher occupational status (Melamed, 1996a, 1996b). Judge, et. al (1999) notes the consistency of the relationship of Emotional Stability with satisfaction measures. Because of the lack of studies measuring career satisfaction, the relationship of Agreeableness and career satisfaction is not well documented. The positive correlation does suggest that individuals who get along with co-workers and maintain friendly relationships are more satisfied in their careers.

The fifth research question asked if Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Emotional Stability are more highly related to job satisfaction than the other two traits. When comparing the two regression models (Extraversion, Emotional Stability, and Conscientiousness vs. Openness and Agreeableness), the model containing the three variables was a better predictor of job satisfaction confirming earlier results from the meta-analysis of Judge, Heller and Mount (2002). They found that Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, and Extraversion were the Big Five traits most highly related to job satisfaction and supplied the following rationale: Employees who are emotionally stable, extraverted, and conscientious may be happier at work because they are more likely to achieve satisfying results. Extraverted employees may spend more time in social interactions, Conscientious individuals may receive more rewards because of their high performance, and emotionally stable individuals are able to control their mood at work (p. 536).

The sixth and seventh research questions were concerned with the relative amounts of variance in job and career satisfaction that would be accounted for by the Big

Five personality traits, the narrow traits and the work values. Results of the hierarchical multiple regressions suggest the inclusion of the personality traits and work values are necessary for the best prediction of job and career satisfaction. It is not just an individual's personality but the values they hold that makes them satisfied in their jobs and career. Such results are consistent with Super (1953)'s observation that "Work satisfaction and life satisfaction depend upon the extent to which the individual finds adequate outlets for his abilities, interests, personality traits, and values; they depend upon his establishment in a type of work, a work situation, and a way of life in which he can play the kind of role which his growth and exploratory experiences have led him to consider congenial and appropriate. (p.189-90)"

Limitations and Implications for Future Research

Because the research used archival data, the amount of knowledge and control the researcher had on specific questions and methods of collection were limited. The assessments were collected on a voluntary basis; therefore, there is an element of self-selection. As with any self report measure, the concern of self-monitoring or faking good is present.

While work values have a long history in the psychology literature, using more robust measures, such as the one used in this research, should yield insight into specific relationships of work values with other job performance measures. The measure used in this research comprised 19 work values; however, the list is not exhaustive and other work values could be considered in research in this area, such as affiliation, physical

challenge, meaning, and time freedom—which are measured in other work values inventories (E.G., ASVAB, 2007; DirectGov, 2007)

Future research should focus on the long term implications of work values, organizational variables (such as performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover), and person-organization fit. Kristof (1996), defines person-organization (P-O) fit as “the compatibility between people and organizations that occur when: at least one entity provided what the other needs, they share similar fundamental characteristics, or both (p. 45). Individuals are attracted to organizations that match or provide the opportunity for attainment of their work values. Need fulfillment results in attitudes such as satisfaction (Arthur, Bell, Villado, & Doverspike, 2006). As suggested by Chatman (1989), person-organization fit is best determined by scales that measure both individual and organizational characteristics. Assessments that include personal work values as well as work values promoted by the organization may help establish this link. One possible way to investigate the long term repercussions of work values and organizational outcome variables would be to utilize a longitudinal study with multi-faceted assessments for both employees and employers.

The question of why work values are related to job and career satisfaction may be answered by two explanations. First, like personality, work values tend to be stable over time (Judge & Bretz 1992; Lusk & Oliver, 1974), and may influence how individuals view their work and how they respond to different aspects of their work environment. For example, if an individual values autonomy, they may concentrate more on the projects at work that allows them to be autonomous than those projects that are being

strictly overseen. By focusing on the project that fulfills their work value, they may report being satisfied with their work. Second, it is possible that work values influence job related choices. People with different values may sort themselves into particular work environments that satisfy those particular values. For instance, a person who values income may not be satisfied in a work environment that depends on more intrinsic rewards. Because of the inconsistency of the work environment fulfilling a particular work value, employees are faced with the decision of modifying their behavior to somehow fulfill that value (work overtime) or find another outlet for this value to be fulfilled (new job). If expectations of work values are not met, an individual can either adapt their behavior or cognitions to be satisfied, or they may find a new job.

Because of the link between work values, job and career satisfaction, a more detailed look at the congruence of organizational values and work values may yield insight for companies in order to recruit and retain employees. The finding that not only personality traits, but also work values influence job and career satisfaction lends support for this proposition and should motivate psychologists to further investigate these findings, as well as, the directionality of these relationships. Because values seem to be a central component of organizational culture, Ravin and Meglino (1987), note the importance of organizational factors to individuals choosing between job opportunities.

Along those same lines, the Big Five personality traits, narrow personality traits, and work values were predictive of job and career satisfaction. If employers want satisfied employees, determining specific personality variables and work values existing

in an organization can assist in management development by offering incentives relative to what employees' value (money vs. casual Friday dress)

Previous studies (e.g., Elizer, 1994; Furnham, 1984; Lynn, 1993) have found that women tend to be more concerned with social approval, job affiliation, and short-term career goals. However, because of women's more equal participation in the work force, their concern for long-term career goals and money may not be significantly different than men's (Tait, Padgett, & Baldwin, 1989). Future analysis on gender differences and other demographic differences in work values might help clarify if there are differences in how individuals view work in general, or if those views are shifting.

Conclusions

The current research extends the existing knowledge of work values and their relation to personality variables, career satisfaction, and job satisfaction. Specifically, the Big Five personality variables, narrow personality variables, and work values were found to be significant predictors of job and career satisfaction. An important finding in this study is that personality traits and work values were uniquely and jointly related to job and career satisfaction. Both types of variables appear to be useful in the prediction and explanation of job and career satisfaction. Further research is necessary in order to understand the implications of these relationships.

References

- Adkins, C.L., Russel, C.J., & Werbel, J.D. (1994). Judgments of fit in the selection process: The role of work value congruence. *Personnel Psychology, 47*, 605-623.
- Alderfer, C. (1972). *Existence, relatedness, and growth*. New York: Free Press.
- Allport, G.W., Vernon, P.E., & Lindsey, G. (1951). *Study of Values: Manual of directions*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- Arthur, W., Bell, S.T., Villado, A.J., & Doverspike, D. (2006). The use of person-organization fit in employee decision making: An assessment of its criterion-related validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(4), 786-801.
- Arvey, R.D., Bouchard, T., Segal, N., & Abraham, L. (1989). Job Satisfaction: environmental and genetic components. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74* (2), 187-192.
- Barney, J. B. 1986, Organizational culture: Can it be a source of sustained competitive advantage? *Academy of Management Review 11*, 656–65.
- Becker, G.M. & McClintock, C.G. (1967). Value: Behavioral decision theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 18*, 239–286.
- Billings, R.S., & Cornelius, E.T. (1980). Dimensions of work outcomes: A multi-dimensional scaling approach. *Personnel Psychology, 33*, 151-162.
- Blood, M. R. (1969). Work values and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 53*, 456-459.
- Boudreau, J.W., Boswell, W.R., & Judge, T.A. (2001). Effects of personality on executive career success in the United States and Europe. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*, 53-81.

- Bowler, I. R. (1975) Factors affecting the trend to enterprise specialization in agriculture: a case study in Wales. *Cambria*, 2, 100-111
- Bretz, R. D., Jr., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44, 32-54.
- Brown, M. (1980). Values: A necessary but neglected ingredient of motivation on the job. *The Academy of Management Review*, 1 (4), 15-23
- Buchholz, R.A. (1977), "The belief structure of managers relative to work concepts measured by a factor analytic model", *Personnel Psychology*, 30, 567-87.
- Buchholz, R. (1978). An empirical study of contemporary beliefs about work in American society. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 219–227.
- Burke, R.J. & Deszca, E. (1982). Career success and personal failure experiences and Type A behaviour. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 3, 161-170.
- Cable, D. M. & Judge, T.A (1996), 'Person-Organization Fit, Job Choice Decisions, and Organizational Entry', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes (September)* 67(3), 294–311.
- Cable, D. M., & Parsons, C. K. (2001). Socialization tactics and person-organization fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 1-23.
- Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 333-349.
- Chatman, J. A.: (1991), Matching People and Organizations: Selection and Socialization in Public Accounting Firms, *Administrative Science Quarterly* 36, 459–484.

- Cherrington, D. J. (1980). *The work ethic: Working values and values that work*. New York: AMACOM.
- Cherrington, D. J., Conde, S.J., & England, J.L. (1979), Age and Work Values, *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 617-623.
- Cornelius, E. T., Ullman, J. C., Meglino, B. M., Czajka, J., & McNeely, B. (1985, November). *A new approach to the study of worker values and some preliminary results*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southern Management Association, Orlando, FL.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Dickson, J.W. and Buchholz, R.A. (1977), "Managerial beliefs about work in Scotland and the USA", *Journal of Management Studies*, 14, 80-101.
- Dormann, C. & Zapf, D. (2001). Job satisfaction: a meta-analysis of stabilities. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 483-504.
- Dyer, L. & Parker, D.F. (1975). Classifying outcomes in work motivation research: An examination of the intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 455-458.
- Elizer, D. (1984). Facets of work values: A structural analysis of work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 379-389.
- Elizer, D. (1994). Gender and work values: a comparative analysis, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 134, 201-212.

- Elizer, D., Borg, I., Hunt, R., & Beck, I.M. (1991). The structure of work values: A cross-cultural comparison, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12, 21-38.
- England, G. W. (1967). Organizational goals and expected behavior of American managers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 10, 107-117.
- England, G. W. (1975). *The manager and his values: An international perspective from the United States, Japan, Korea, India, and Australia*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Elloy, D.F. & Terpending, W. (1992). A conceptual empirical distinction between job involvement and work involvement: Some further evidence. *The Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 10, 120-127.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1976) *The measurement of personality*. Baltimore: U. Park, Press.
- Feather, N. T. (1982). *Expectations and actions: Expectancy-value models in psychology*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Feather, N. T. (1988). *The Psychological Impact of Unemployment*, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Fisher, C., & Gitelson, R. (1983). A meta-analysis of the correlates of role conflict and role ambiguity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68,320-333.
- Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51, 327-358.
- French, J.R.P., Jr. & Kahn, R.L. (1962). A programmatic approach to studying the industrial environment and mental health, *Journal of Social Issues*, 18, 1-47.

- Furnham, A. (1982). Why are the poor always with us? Explanations for poverty in Great Britain. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 21*, 311-322.
- Furnham, A. (1984). The Protestant work ethic: A review of the psychological literature. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 14*, 87-104.
- Furnham, A. (1987). Work related beliefs and human values. *Personality and Individual Differences, 8*, 627-637.
- Furnham, A. & Bland, C. (1983). "The Protestant Work Ethic and Conservatism", *Personality and Individual Differences 4*(2), 205-206.
- Furnham, A. & Koritsas, E. (1990). The Protestant Work Ethic and Vocational Preference, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*(1), 43-55.
- Furnham, A., Petrides, K.V., Tsaousis, I., Pappas, K., & Garrod, D. (2005). A cross cultural investigation into the relationships between personality traits and work values. *Journal of Psychology 139*, 5-32.
- Gasson, R (1973). Goals and values of farmers. *Journal of Agricultural Economics, 24*, 521-542.
- George, J. M. & Jones, G. R. (1997). Experiencing work: Values, attitudes and moods. *Human Relations, 50*, 393-416.
- Greenberg, J. (1977). The Protestant work ethic and reactions to negative performance evaluations on a laboratory task. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62*, 682-690.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Herzberg (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland, World Publishing.

- Hicks, L.E. (1970), Some Properties of Ipsative, Normative, and Forced-Choice Normative Measures, *Psychological Bulletin*, 74 (September), 167-184.
- Hirschfeld, R.R., Field, H.S. (2000), "Work centrality and work alienation: distinct aspects of a general commitment to work", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 789-800.
- Hochwarter, W., Zellars, K., Perrewé, P., & Harrison, A. (1999). The interactive role of negative affectivity and job characteristics: Are high NA employees destined to be unhappy at work. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29, 2204-2219.
- Holland, J. L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Ilbery, B.W (1983). Goals and values of hop farmers. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 8, 329-341.
- Judge, T.A., Heller, D., & Mount, M.K. (2002) Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 530-541.
- Judge, T.A., Higgins, C.A., Thoresen, C.J., & Barrick, M.R. (1999). The Big Five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 621-652.
- Josephson, E. & Josephson M.R. (1973) "Alienation: Contemporary sociological approaches." in Frank Johnson (Ed.).*Alienation. Concept, Term, and Meaning*. New York: Seminar Press, Inc.
- Judge, T.A. & Bretz, R.D. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decisions, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 261-271.

- Judge, T.A., Cable, D.M., Boudreau, J.W., & Bretz, R.D. (1995). An empirical investigation of the predictors of executive career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(3), 485-519.
- Judge, T.A., Heller, D, Mount, M.K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3) 530-541.
- Kalleberg, A.L. (1977). Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 42(1), 124-143.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1979). The concepts of alienation and involvement revisited. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 119-138.
- Kanungo, R.N. (1982). *Work alienation*. New York: Praeger.
- Keller, L.M., Bouchard, T.J. Jr., Arvey, R.D., Segal, N.L. & Dawis, R.V. (1992). Work values: Genetic and environmental influences, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 79-88.
- Kidron, A. (1978). Work values and organizational commitment, *Academy of Management Journal*, 21, 239-247.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Values and value-orientation in the theory of action. In T. Parsons, & E. Shils (Eds.), *Towards a general theory of action* (pp. 388–433). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualization, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 1-49.

- Kobasa, S. C., Maddi, S. R., & Kahn, S. (1982) Hardiness and health: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 168–177.
- Lawler, E. E., & Hall, D. T. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54, 305-312.
- Lawler, E. E., & Porter, L. W. (1967). The effects of performance on job satisfaction. *Industrial Relations*, 7, 20-28.
- Lewin, K. (1952). Constructs in field theory [1944]. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers by Kurt Lewin* (pp. 30-42). London: Tavistock.
- Lied, Terry R. and Robert D. Pritchard (1976), "Relationships between Personality Variables and Components of the Expectancy-Valence Model," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61(4), 463-467
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and consequences of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Locke, E. A. (1982). *A new look at motivation: Theory V* (Tech. Rep. GS-12). College Park: University of Maryland, College of Business and Management.
- Lodahl, T. M., & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49(1), 24-33.
- Lounsbury, J.W., Gibson, L.W. & Drost, A.W. (2007) eCF[®] *Work Values Inventory* Technical Report May 2007.

- Lounsbury, J.W., Loveland, J.M., Sundstrom, E.D., Gibson, L.W., Drost, A.W., Hamrick, F.L. (2003). An investigation of personality traits in relation to career satisfaction. *Journal of Career Assessment, Volume 11(3)*, 287-307.
- Lusk, E., Oliver, B. (1974). American managers' personal value systems - revisited, *Academy of Management Journal, 17*, 549-554.
- Lynn, R. (1993). Sex differences in competitiveness and the valuation of money in twenty countries, *Journal of Social Psychology, 133*, 507-511.
- Maddi, S. R., Kobasa, S. C., and Hoover, M. (1979). An alienation test. *The Journal of Human Psychology, 19*, 73-76.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.
- Matteson, M. T., & Ivancevich, J. M. 1982. *Managing job stress and health*. New York: Free Press.
- McClelland, David C. (1961) *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.
- Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., & Adkins, C. L. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 424-432.
- Merrens, M. R., & Garrett, J. B. (1975). The Protestant ethic scale as a predictor of repetitive work performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*, 125-127.
- Mirels, H. L., & Garrett, J. B. (1971). The Protestant ethic as a personality variable. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 36*. 40-44.

- Mook, D. G. (1996). *Motivation: the organization of action*. 2nd ed. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Nord, W., Brief, A., Atieh, J., & Doherty, E. (1988) "Work values and the conduct of organizational psychology." In Staw, B. and Cummings, L. (Eds) *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 10, 130-153.
- Ravlin, E. C., & Meglino, B. M. (1987). Effects of values on perception and decision making: A study of alternative work values measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 666-673.
- Riesman, D. (1950). *The lonely crowd*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Saal, F. E. (1978). Job involvement: A multivariate approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 53-61.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, B. & Dachler, H.P. (1978). A note on the job descriptive index. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 650-653.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65.

- Selmer, J. & De Leon, C. (1996). Parent cultural control through organizational acculturation: HCN employees learning new work values in foreign business subsidiaries”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 557-572.
- Staw, B.M., & Ross, J. (1985). Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to job attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 469-480.
- Staw, B. M., Bell, N. E., & Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 56-77.
- Super, D.E. (1953) A theory of vocational development, *American Psychologist*, 8, pp. 185-190.
- Super, D.E. (1962). The structure of work values in relation to status, achievement, interests, and adjustment, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 46, 231-239.
- Tait, M., Padgett, M.Y., & Baldwin, T.W. (1989). Job and life satisfaction: A reexamination of the strength of the relationship and gender effects as a function of date of the study, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 502-507.
- Tichey, N.M. (1983). *Managing strategic change: Technical, political, and cultural dynamics*. New York: Wiley.
- Vroom, V. H. (1966). Organizational choice: A study of pre- and post decision processes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1, 212-225.
- Weber, M. (1930). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, George, Allen, and Unwin, London.
- Weber, M. (1958). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. New York: Scribner.

Wernimont, P. F. (1966). Intrinsic and extrinsic factors in job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 50*, 41-50.

Wilson, G. (1973). *The psychology of conservatism*. New York: Academic Press.

Wilson, G., and Patterson, J. (1968). A new measure of conservatism. *British Journal of Social Clinical Psychology, 8*, 264–269.

Wollack, S., Goodale, J. G., Wijting, J. P., & Smith, P. C. (1971). Development of the survey of work values. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 55*, 331-333.

Appendix

Table A.1: Results of Hierarchical Multiple Regression for the Big Five Personality variables predicting Job Satisfaction.

Step	Variable	R	R Square	R Square Change	Sig. F Change
1	Openness	.16(a)	.02	.02	.00
2	Openness, Conscientiousness	.24(b)	.05	.03	.00
3	Openness, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness	.28(c)	.07	.02	.00
4	Openness, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability	.30(d)	.09	.01	.01
5	Openness, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability, Extraversion	.30(e)	.09	.00	.48

Table A.2: Hierarchical regression of the Big Five Personality traits predicting career satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
				R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.18 ^a	.03	.795	.03	14.32	1	426	.00
2	.25 ^b	.06	.783	.03	13.48	1	425	.00
3	.31 ^c	.09	.770	.03	16.11	1	424	.00
4	.31 ^d	.09	.770	.00	.89	1	423	.34
5	.31 ^e	.10	.770	.00	.85	1	422	.35

a. Predictors: AGREEABLENESS

b. Predictors: AGREEABLENESS, OPENNESS

c. Predictors: AGREEABLENESS, OPENNESS, EMOTIONAL STABILITY

d. Predictors: AGREEABLENESS, OPENNESS, EMOTIONAL STABILITY, CONSCIENTIOUSNESS

e. Predictors: AGREEABLENESS, OPENNESS, EMOTIONAL STABILITY, CONSCIENTIOUSNESS, EXTRAVERSION

Table A.3: Hierarchical regression of Narrow Personality Traits predicting Career Satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Squar	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.22 ^a	.05	.04	.78	.05	22.55	1	426	.00
2	.28 ^b	.08	.07	.77	.03	15.43	1	425	.00
3	.40 ^c	.16	.16	.73	.08	42.15	1	424	.00
4	.42 ^d	.17	.17	.73	.01	6.28	1	423	.01
5	.44 ^e	.19	.18	.72	.01	9.60	1	422	.00
6	.44 ^f	.20	.18	.72	.00	1.53	1	421	.21
7	.45 ^g	.20	.18	.72	.00	1.34	1	420	.24
8	.45 ^h	.20	.18	.72	.00	.39	1	419	.53

a. Predictors: (Constant), TOUGHMIN

b. Predictors: (Constant), TOUGHMIN, OPTIMISM

c. Predictors: (Constant), TOUGHMINDEDNESS, OPTIMISM, ASSERTIVENESS

d. Predictors: (Constant), TOUGHMINDEDNESS, OPTIMISM, ASSERTIVENESS, CUSTOMER SERVICE

e. Predictors: (Constant), TOUGHMINDEDNESS, OPTIMISM, ASSERTIVENESS, CUSTOMER SERVICE, INTRNSIC MOTIVATION

f. Predictors: (Constant), TOUGHMINDEDNESS, OPTIMISM, ASSERTIVENESS, CUSTOMER SERVICE, INTRINSIC MOTIVATION, IMAGE MANAGEMENT

g. Predictors: (Constant), TOUGHMINDEDNESS, OPTIMISM, ASSERTIVENESS, CUSTOMER SERVICE, INTRINSIC MOTIVATION, IMAGE MANAGEMENT, VISIONARY

h. Predictors: (Constant), TOUGHMINDEDNESS, OPTIMISM, ASSERTIVENESS, CUSTOMER SERVICE, INTRINSIC MOTIVATION, IMAGE MANAGEMENT, VISIONARY, WORK DRIVE

Table A.4: Hierarchical Regression of Narrow Personality Traits predicting Job Satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Squar	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.19 ^a	.03	.03	.66602	.03	16.81	1	426	.00
2	.34 ^b	.11	.11	.63800	.08	39.25	1	425	.00
3	.38 ^c	.14	.14	.62825	.02	14.29	1	424	.00
4	.39 ^d	.15	.14	.62683	.00	2.91	1	423	.08
5	.40 ^e	.16	.15	.62399	.01	4.86	1	422	.02
6	.41 ^f	.16	.15	.62269	.00	2.76	1	421	.09
7	.41 ^g	.17	.15	.62214	.00	1.75	1	420	.18
8	.41 ^h	.17	.15	.62250	.00	.51	1	419	.47

a. Predictors: (Constant), ASSERTIVENESS

b. Predictors: (Constant), ASSERTIVENESS, OPTIMISM

c. Predictors: (Constant), ASSERTIVENESS, OPTIMISM, TOUGHMINDEDNESS

d. Predictors: (Constant), ASSERTIVENESS, OPTIMISM, TOUGHMINDEDNESS, CUSTOMER SERVICE

e. Predictors: (Constant), ASSERTIVENESS, OPTIMISM, TOUGHMINDEDNESS, CUSTOMER SERVICE, INTRINSIC MOTIVATION

f. Predictors: (Constant), ASSERTIVENESS, OPTIMISM, TOUGHMINDEDNESS, CUSTOMER SERVICE, INTRINSIC MOTIVATION, IMAGE MANAGEMENT

g. Predictors: (Constant), ASSERTIVENESS, OPTIMISM, TOUGHMINDEDNESS, CUSTOMER SERVICE, INTRINSIC MOTIVATION, IMAGE MANAGEMENT, VISIONARY

h. Predictors: (Constant), ASSERTIVENESS, OPTIMISM, TOUGHMINDEDNESS, CUSTOMER SERVICE, INTRINSIC MOTIVATION, IMAGE MANAGEMENT, VISIONARY, WORK DRIVE

Vita

Shannon Danielle Salyer was born in Kingsport, Tennessee, on December 5, 1976. She graduated from Sullivan North High School in 1995 and began her undergraduate studies at the University of Tennessee (1995). After graduating with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology and Sociology (1999), Shannon furthered her education at UT, by attaining a Masters degree in Experimental Psychology with a minor in Statistics in 2001.

Shannon taught as an Assistant Professor at Tusculum College in Greeneville, TN (2002-2005) and Pfeiffer University in Misenheimer, NC (2007). Shannon Salyer received her Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in December of 2007. Shannon now works for the United States Army as an Educational Researcher/Analyst and Assistant Professor. She currently resides in Monterey, CA.