

AN EVALUATION OF JOB SATISFACTION AMONG SALESPERSONS
IN A SMALL DEPARTMENT STORE USING
FOUR PSYCHOLOGICAL MEASURES

Ruth Sherrill Webb, B. A., M. A.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2002

APPROVED:

F. Andrew Schoolmaster, Major Professor
Diane Allen, Committee Member
M. Jean Keller, Committee Member and Dean of
the College of Education
Jeff M. Allen, Coordinator of the Program in
Applied Technology, Training, and
Development
Jon I. Young, Chair of the Department of
Technology and Cognition
C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse
School of Graduate Studies

Webb, Ruth Sherrill, An evaluation of job satisfaction among salespersons in a small department store using four psychological measures. Doctor of Education (Applied Technology, Training, and Development), May 2002, 91 pp., 8 tables, references, 64 titles.

The purpose of this study was to examine the potential of three independent psychological scales (Rotter's Locus of Control, Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire [non-injury job stress], and Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale) to predict job satisfaction, as measured by Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction, among salespersons in a small independent department store in Wichita Falls, Texas. An 82-item survey which examined the dynamics of a salesperson's work life was administered to 20 individuals who were full-time employees of the department store. Demographic data were also gathered although these factors were not entered into the regression analysis.

A multiple regression procedure examined the responses of the 20 employees who participated in the study. The R-squared coefficient indicates that 41 percent of the variance in Job Satisfaction was explained by the three predictor measures. A major proportion of this unexplained variance may be in variables outside the scope of this study, e.g., salaries, vacation time, benefits, bonuses, or commissions. Results suggest that the independent variables measured by the Locus of Control Scale and the Job Content Questionnaire in combination were the best predictors of job satisfaction with a significance level of .01. The single best predictor was the Job Content Questionnaire, significant at .03. The three instruments (Locus of Control, Self-Esteem, and Job Content

Questionnaire) which comprised the independent variables, reached a significance level of .03 in their prediction of job satisfaction (Brayfield-Rothe Index of Job Satisfaction).

Study results indicate that a majority of the employees in the sample population were satisfied with their jobs and with the leadership style manifested by the store manager. In addition, job security was believed to be satisfactory. Inasmuch as there is a void in the literature regarding personal characteristics of salespersons as variables that interact with job satisfaction, comparisons of the findings of this research with other studies that have explored the intricacies of job satisfaction among salespersons who work in small, independent department stores cannot be made.

Further research on the predictability of job satisfaction among salespersons in small, independent retail operations such as the department store investigated in this study would be useful not only to managerial staff in decision making and personnel management but would promote greater understanding of the personal characteristics of salespersons as human investment capital which has the potential to create the effective competitive edge required for survival in the new economy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In my journey toward this goal, I have encountered various individuals whom I would like to thank for their having gone beyond the call of duty. First, I would like to express my gratitude to Andrew Schoolmaster, my advisor and committee chair. I deeply appreciate the benefits I have reaped from his sharing of his high standards of research. He has given me much of his valuable time, and his patience and forbearance in dealing with my misconceptions has been exemplary.

I would also like to acknowledge my committee members, M. Jean Keller and Diane Allen who have had a most important impact on my perseverance toward this goal. They never let me think that my grasp was beyond my reach. I appreciate the support and mentoring that each of them has given me.

And finally, without the statistical help of Randy Schumacker who has always been the statistical guru on whom I could rely, this research endeavor would be deficient in statistical design. The statistics and research courses I have had the privilege of studying with him have always increased my determination to learn more about this difficult subject.

Each of you, in your own way, has had a substantial impact on my learning.
Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | ii |
| LIST OF TABLES | v |
| Chapter | |
| 1. BACKGROUND | 1 |
| Introduction to the Study | |
| Statement of the Problem | |
| Need for the Study | |
| Purpose of the Study | |
| Research Questions | |
| Study Parameters | |
| Definition of Terms | |
| Summary | |
| 2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE | 10 |
| Job Satisfaction | |
| Self-Esteem | |
| Locus of Control | |
| Work-Related Stress | |
| Summary | |
| 3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY | 30 |
| Design | |
| Population/Sample | |
| Instrumentation | |
| Collection of the Data | |
| Treatment and Data Analysis | |
| Summary | |

| | |
|--|----|
| 4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES | 40 |
| Collection of the Data | |
| Treatment of the Data | |
| Analysis of the Data | |
| Summary | |
| 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 58 |
| Review of Research Questions and Interpretation of Data Analysis | |
| Relation of Findings to Literature Review | |
| Application of Research Findings | |
| Recommendations | |
| APPENDIXES | 65 |
| REFERENCES | 82 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Description of Demographic Data | 43 |
| 2. Description of Psychological Measures | 45 |
| 3. Cronbach Reliability Coefficients | 50 |
| 4. Correlation Matrix with Means and Standard Deviations | 51 |
| 5. Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction | 53 |
| 6. Significance of Regression Weights Predicting Job Satisfaction | 54 |
| 7. Best Predictor Set for Job Satisfaction | 55 |
| 8. Structure Coefficients | 56 |

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND

Over the past 3 decades, the American economy has undergone profound changes, a phenomenon that has shifted the country's profile from an industrial economy to one that is based on knowledge and technology, and has been termed the "globalization of markets" (Bernhardt, 1999). The "old" industrial markets emphasized trade barriers and the differences among isolated protective national systems (Katenova, 1999). The "new" economy features an emphatically global approach in which national trade barriers have been neutralized, and competition for markets is centered on value pricing, which Baker (1999) defined as a producer's ability to render a service or a product "that is so good people are willing to pay a profit" (p. 1). Katenova outlined two landmark events that she believes were responsible for changes in the economic environment: (a) subsequent to World War II, goods, services, capital, and investments were permitted to move more freely among nations, and (b) the rapid development of technology allows instantaneous passing of communication and information.

In the current competitive and unpredictable global environment, the very nature of salaries, competition, and company loyalties has assumed a different perspective from that which dominated the industrial economy. The issue of the effective use of human capital and human resources is making its presence known; more than a decade has passed since Michael Porter wrote that, in a global economy, competitive advantage for

any business endeavor depended on the caliber of its human resources (as cited in “Global Scenarios”, 1989).

In 1948, following the close of World War II, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) was created. The agreement was established to provide an international forum that would facilitate regulation of tariffs and encourage free trade among its members. In 1994, a legal institution, the World Trade Organization (WTO), which encompassed GATT, was created. Among its provisions is an Agreement on Textiles and Clothing (IISDnet, 2001), which delineates the following principles: (a) the imports of all countries must be treated equitably; and (b) once a good enters a country, it must be treated no differently than a good manufactured domestically. World Trade Organization members are also required to enhance access potential for small suppliers and new entrants to the field of textiles and clothing.

Programs focusing on rural and urban renewal and the preservation of the small business should be as important in globalized markets as high tech skill formation is for the leading edge of the workforce (“Global Scenarios”, 1989). Small independent business continues to play an important role in the economy of the United States in its contribution to the Gross National Product (GNP) and in its creation of jobs, especially at the entry level (Chowdhury & Adams, n. d.). At this time, small businesses employ 54% of the private work force and spawn two out of every three jobs (Small Business Administration [SBA], 2001).

Historically, the federal government has encouraged the maintenance and growth of small business enterprises. In 1932 Herbert Hoover created the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC), whose purpose was to moderate a number of the crises related to the Great Depression (SBA, 2001). This agency later became the parent of the Small Business Administration (SBA). Since its inception, the SBA has undergone a number of changes -- both in name and in mission. During World War II, as the Smaller War Plants Corporation (SWPC), it increased its activity because smaller businesses were unable to compete with large industries that could accommodate the production stipulated by wartime defense contracts. Congress created a similar agency during the Korean War. In 1952 President Eisenhower proposed the creation of the Small Business Administration, and in 1953 Congress officially created the SBA, whose function was to aid and protect the interests of the small business. Most recently, the SBA has increased its focus on minority small business programs (SBA, 2001).

The Small Business Administration (2001) has confirmed that there are approximately 25 million small businesses in the United States. Furthermore, small businesses provide 67% of the net new jobs added to the economy, and represent over 99% of all employers. Surprisingly, small businesses also “account for 38% of jobs in high technology” (Marcy, 2000, p. 1).

Of necessity, a primary goal of a business organization is the improvement of employee productivity, and it has long been accepted as a fact that this goal can be

facilitated by employees' level of work-related satisfaction. Falcione, McCroskey, and Daly (1977) hypothesized, "While the assumption that 'a happy employee is a productive employee' is an over generalization of the relationship between job satisfaction and employee productivity, the assumption is more likely true than false in many instances" (p.1).

Job satisfaction has been operationally defined in various ways: expectancy of rewards, responses to the work environment, possibilities for advancement, commitment to the organization, and the work itself. However, variables that determine satisfaction or dissatisfaction remain unclear although they have been analyzed by leading theorists such as Argyris (1999), Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959), McClelland (1953), McGregor (1960), and others. Many studies have explored the intricacies of job satisfaction encountered by manufacturing industries, but little attention has focused on the lower-wage service areas, especially those whose employees must work onsite. The small number of research studies found tended to emphasize the effects of job satisfaction on productivity or on successful sales performance and to ignore the personal characteristics of salespersons as variables that interact with job satisfaction.

For the small business dependent on direct sales, managing human capital is becoming increasingly challenging. As stated by Barney in 1995, "the human element is the cornerstone of the internal resources of an organization, and effective management of this element can make or break a business" (as cited in Parks, 2000, p. 1).

Statement of the Problem

Numerous studies using psychological measures to predict or explain job satisfaction have been conducted in a variety of work environments. However, few research studies have examined the dynamics of the quality of the work life of salespersons employed in small retail “Main Street” stores. In particular, little notice has been afforded the small department store that employs fewer than 100 salespersons. The problem explored by this study was the following: Are there psychological characteristics of salespersons that explain or predict the dimensions of job satisfaction in the small independent retail department store?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the use of four psychological measures in evaluating job satisfaction among retail salespersons in a small department store. Specifically, this research (a) reviewed the literature addressing the use of the four psychological measures in a retail environment; (b) used the following four measures to conduct a survey of salespersons: Brayfield and Rothe’s Index of Job Satisfaction (1951), Rotter’s Locus of Control Scale (1966), Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale (1965), and Karasek’s Job Content Questionnaire (1985); (c) answered two key research questions as part of the analysis concerning to what extent do the Rotter Locus of Control Scale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and the Karasek Job Content Questionnaire predict job satisfaction as measured by Brayfield and Rothe’s Index of Job Satisfaction and to what

extent each of the predictor variables contributes to the prediction of job satisfaction as measured by Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction; and (d) made recommendations as to how the results of the research contributed to the general body of knowledge of job satisfaction in a small retail environment and how these results could be applied in a real world situation.

Significance and Utility of the Study

Issues that are related to work satisfaction are essential to human resource development programs. Small stores are facing challenges brought about by the information age. Alignment with the new economy will not come about easily. The department store used as a case study for this research has never had an employee orientation or implemented a human resources training program. A predictive model for employee satisfaction has the potential to contribute data that could be used by the manager (a) to provide training that would stimulate more effective use of human capital, (b) to assess satisfactory or unsatisfactory working conditions, (c) to utilize as an evaluation for hiring, and (d) to suggest intervention procedures that would prevent rapid employee turnover.

Study Parameters

In conducting this study, the following parameters were incorporated into the research design and implementation of the employee survey:

1. This study was limited by the use of a small size sample. No randomization of subjects was attempted. As such, the results have limited generalizability to other samples or populations.

2. Results were limited by the subjective attitudes of respondents as they responded to survey questions. Confounding variables could include: fatigue, the degree of wellness, the events of the day, and respondents' ability to recognize their own attitudes and to respond successfully.

3. It may be that subjects with certain personality traits cluster in certain occupations rather than others.

4. A single instrument that is capable of assessing all of the variables that are related to the research questions does not exist at the present time.

5. This investigation was limited to a group of salespersons who are involved in direct sales in a small department store in Wichita Falls, Texas, which is a medium-sized town in North Central Texas.

6. None of the subjects were mandated to participate in this study by the store management or the researcher.

7. Subjects were requested not to discuss the questions or their answers with other subjects until all survey instruments had been collected by the researcher.

Definitions of Terms

To eliminate semantic difficulties, the following definitions were applied to these terms:

Globalization: a worldwide phenomenon in which national trade barriers have been neutralized and competition for markets is centered on value pricing; the new economy.

Locus of control: the perceived ability to regulate or direct the events in one's life as measured by Rotter's Locus of Control Scale (1966).

Internal locus of control: a situation in which individuals believe that they direct or regulate what happens to them.

External locus of control: a situation in which individuals believe that outside forces regulate or direct their lives.

Work-related stress (also referred to as job strain): those aspects of work that have the potential for causing psychological, social, or physical distress (excluding injuries) as measured by Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire (1985).

Self-esteem: an individual's sense of his or her value or worth, or the extent to which a person likes him- or herself as measured by Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (1965).

Job satisfaction: an employee's degree of contentment regarding his or her work environment as measured by Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction (1951).

Small department store: a retail store that employs fewer than 100 individuals.

Summary

This research sought to supplement existing knowledge on employee satisfaction in a small retail department store. Four psychological measures were used in this study: Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction (1951), Rotter's Locus of Control Scale (1966), Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (1965), and Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire (1985). Chapter 2 is a review of the literature on the changing nature of the small-scale retail environment in the United States and how these four psychological measures have been used in research studies.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of literature on small retail operations and the shift in retail structure and activity. This is followed by a review of the literature pertinent to the use of the four psychological measures that formed the basis for this study and a description as to how each related to retail salespersons' job satisfaction: job satisfaction as measured by Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction (1951); self-esteem as measured by Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (1965); locus of control as measured by Rotter's Locus of Control Scale (1966); and work-related stress (job strain) as measured by Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire (1985).

Shift in Retail Structure and Activity

Although most consumer goods continue to be sold in "bricks and mortar" stores, retailing encompasses all types of selling to the final consumer. In the 19th century, general stores were to be found throughout rural areas. They sold a wide variety of merchandise from farming equipment to food and clothing. After the American Civil War, single-line stores such as bakeries, apparel, and fresh-produce markets, among others, began to appear. "If a large collection of specialty and limited-line stores is brought together into one building under a single ownership, the result is a department store" ("Marketing" 1998, p. 12).

The human factor is rapidly replacing the managerial hierarchy in becoming the largest driver of profit in the Post-Industrial Age economy. An employee's knowledge, skills, and his or her ability to innovate are the intangible assets that lead to company profit (Shellenbarger, 2000). No matter the size of the business, employers are trying to ascertain the boundaries of human investment capital that will assure company profits. It is clear that small businesses, as well as large ones, face new sets of standards of global performance. Human capital is an important new competitive edge.

In spite of a strong economy and a reduced level of unemployment that persisted through the 1990s, small retail businesses have confronted all sorts of challenges. Historically, the establishment of a small business has a positive impact on a local economy. According to a report from the House Small Business Committee, "A small business with 100 employees in a town adds: 351 more people; 79 more school children; 97 more families; \$490,000 more bank deposits; one more retail establishment; \$565,000 more real estate sales per year; and \$1,036,000 more personal income per year" (Small Business Facts," 1994, p. 6). In the past, small retail organizations and the well-known retail chains such as J. C. Penney and Sears managed to coexist peacefully because the larger chains were designed to be a part of the "Main Street" environment, as described above, and they did not seek to compete with local department stores (Shils, 1997).

However, with the advent of the mega-giant discount stores, rural and small town retailing changed drastically. The large discount organizations have presented such strong competition that small local department stores have been unable to combat their

influence. A business tactic termed partnering has enabled the large retail discount chains to buy directly from manufacturers, thereby bypassing and occasionally wiping out the regional wholesalers who served the small retail stores as well as the chains. Kenneth Stone, a professor of economics at Iowa State University, argued that the wealth generated by super stores is actually revenues that have been lost by local merchants in a displacing of market shares (as cited in Shils, 1997). The Wal-Marts, Kmart, and Targets reduced employment in the everyday community stores by compelling them to reduce wages and benefits, which in turn increased the already rapid turnover of personnel inherent in the small retail store climate. Bernhardt (1999) argued that the new economy has not enhanced the well-being of the average worker in the retail industry. She further stated that, while new technologies have had an impact on the retail production chain, they have primarily affected the back-end of the organization; “the actual tasks that retail workers perform have generally not been transformed” (p. 1).

Sales people work under marked pressure to make sales, and turnover is typically high in the apparel industry as a result of high pressure and low salaries (Bernhardt, 1999). As a general rule, no formal training is required, yet retail salespersons have to stay on top of the latest developments in their product lines in order to maintain the confidence of their customers. In most small stores, an experienced employee instructs new employees in how to make out sales slips and how to operate the cash register. Although all retail sales people need to continually upgrade their knowledge bases, very few individuals who work in the small department store have had the option to benefit

from formalized training programs that lead to increased sales productivity. “The quality of employees and their development through training and education are major factors in determining long-term profitability of a small business” (Employee Training, 2001, p. 1). If available at all, training is frequently considered appropriate only for new employees in the small independent department store.

Research has demonstrated the benefits that a small business receives from training and developing its employees (Employee Training, 2001): productivity increases while employee turnover decreases; a knowledgeable staff assists in the development of the company’s ability to utilize advances in technology; and employees often develop a greater sense of self-worth as they realize that they are valuable to the organization and to society. Issues related to team building and training have demonstrated the greatest impact on employee satisfaction (Neuman, Edwards, & Raju, as cited in Parks, 2000).

Employee turnover costs money, and a major issue facing the small business owner is finding and keeping good employees. With the rate of job displacements increasing while the job market remains generally strong, job satisfaction is reported to be at an all-time low (McGinn and Naughton, 2001). Although organizational restructuring has contributed to loss of work for many employees, management continues to need to recruit qualified people (Jacobs, 1998). Jacobs asserted that “if management wants to develop a cohesive, loyal, and dedicated work force, a clear and nurturing policy must be in place” (p. 13). He further stated that a firm does not have to forego profit in order to maintain a

culture that assures employees of job security and satisfaction. Porter (as cited by Gavel, 2000) concurred:

Viewing economic and social issues as separate agendas was not only wrong but counterproductive. A successful economy depends on people who feel safe at work, who are healthy, and who have a sense that if they work hard, they will have the opportunity to do better. (p. 4)

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction, the dependent variable of this study, was operationalized using the 18 items from Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction (1951). Originally, scale construction was a class project for a group of personnel psychology students who were members of a United States Army specialized training program (Miller, 1991). Because a general measure of job satisfaction was desired, any item that referred to specific job characteristics was eliminated from the scale. A Likert scoring system of five categories, Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree, with a Neutral response in the center, was adopted. The revised scale was implemented as part of a study of 231 office employees (Miller, 1991). Although the Brayfield and Rothe Index (1951) was developed 50 years ago, it continues to be used in research investigations that require a measure of general job satisfaction.

Lucent Technologies (2000) conducts annual surveys on job satisfaction with network professionals. Slightly under 65% of all respondents reported themselves to be satisfied with their jobs. Lucent asserted that the level of dissatisfaction is still

unacceptable with 35% of the respondents reporting themselves to be somewhat or completely dissatisfied with their jobs. The number of years that an individual has worked at his or her job appears to be related to his or her job satisfaction. According to their statistics, 73% who have been network professionals for less than 3 years express satisfaction with their jobs. However, after 3 years, a marked decline in overall satisfaction occurs, and levels drop to 51%. Job satisfaction also tends to correlate inversely with the number of companies worked for, which is not unexpected. After the 3-and 4-year dip, satisfaction recovers in those individuals who have stayed with one employer. Lucent hypothesized that careful planning of strategies could reduce turnover among individuals who fall in the 3-and 4-year category.

The Office of Scale Research at Southern Illinois University has placed online a list of corporations that have used the measure Role Analysis (Salesperson and Product Manager) (OSR, 2001), which investigates the degree of an employee's perceptions of role ambiguity "by noting the reported amount of uncertainty a salesperson has about his/her responsibilities" (OSR, p. 1). The scale was originally developed by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) in their study of role ambiguity in complex organizations. The measure comprises a six-item, 7-point Likert-type summated scale with responses ranging from Very False to Very True. The analysis includes an impressive array of corporations: a midwestern corporation's industrial sales force, product managers in consumer package goods industries, insurance agents throughout the United States, retail salespersons employed in a department store chain with five outlets, a national

pharmaceutical manufacturer's sales force, salespeople of an industrial building materials manufacturer, a sample of industrial buyers, and firms selected from the American Marketing Association Membership Directory. It was found that role ambiguity had a negative relationship to job satisfaction in all analyses.

Pettijohn, Pettijohn, and Taylor (2000) conducted an exploratory analysis of the relationships among a facet of performance appraisals, the perception of salespersons about the appropriateness of appraisals, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction. The authors speculated about the impact on job satisfaction and commitment when salespersons might feel that they were being evaluated with inappropriate criteria. In this study, their research question was based on the assumption that salespeople might not believe that certain topics in the performance appraisal were the most appropriate ones for their circumstances. Only full-time employees participated in the study. Each salesperson had to be engaged in the sale of goods and involved in the traditional selling tasks of approach, presentation, and close. The sample was stratified into high performers and low performers and into two groups according to length of time with the firm. Correlation analyses indicated a significant relationship between job satisfaction and inappropriateness of the job performance criteria. Results also revealed that job satisfaction and perceived appropriateness of the evaluation criteria were not significantly related to level of performance or amount of experience. These researchers concluded that appraisals can positively relate to job satisfaction when employees believe that the criteria by which they are being measured are "proper". They further conjectured

that a strong case can be made for including salespersons' participation in the evaluative process.

Blancero, Johnson, and Lakshman (1995), in a grant supported by the Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies at Cornell University, investigated "the relationships among the psychological contract, fairness, OCB, and customer service" (Blancero et al., p. 2). The authors postulated that the psychological contract between employer and employee may have changed under the new economy. The traditional exchange of job security for productivity may no longer be realistic. How employees perceive fairness could very well serve to alter their organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as well as their customer service behavior.

Nowhere in the organization are the issues of psychological contract violation and OCB more important than for employees in positions of external customer contact. These employees, as providers of customer service, have prescribed work roles spanning the boundary between external customer demands and internal organization goals; as such, they are sensitive to customer requirements and organizational practices in relation to the provision of service. (Schneider, Parkington, & Buxton, 1980, as cited in Blancero et al., p. 3)

In short, organizations need to ensure that they have placed the right salespeople in customer service areas inasmuch as these individuals possess information that may be valuable to the organization (Schneider et al., 1980, as cited in Blancero et al.,(1995). The authors questioned whether the contract is solely between the employee and the

organization or between the employee and the customer or among all three of them. Their findings led them to theorize that effective customer service is built on relationships, both internally between the employer and the employee and externally between customers and employees. They also asked if the psychological contracts between customer service salespersons differ from those of nonservice employees.

Self-Esteem

Theories of the development of the human personality and the essence of “self” can be traced to the late 19th and early 20th centuries, which attended the birth of the concepts of modern psychology. In 1890 William James (as cited in S. Ward, n.d.) provided the first reference to “self-esteem,” which he defined as a ratio of actuality to perceived potentiality. It was not until the 1940s and 1950s that the initial experimental clinical studies of self-esteem began to appear in the literature. It soon became the darling of social psychologists; according to S. Ward, “Self esteem was fast becoming a central concept for psychologists without the cultural and reputational capital to be called theorists” (p. 6).

During the 1960s, two outstanding works on self-esteem were published. One was Morris Rosenberg’s Society and the Adolescent Self-Image (1965), and the other was Stanley Coopersmith’s The Antecedents of Self-Esteem (1967). Each of the authors developed survey research instruments to explore the factors inherent in the concept of self-esteem. Although their approaches to the influence of the theory differed in many

respects, both concluded that stable and effective parenting was a major factor in the development of high self-esteem in the child (S. Ward, n. d.).

A series of scales developed to measure self-esteem soon appeared. Ward mentioned the following instruments: The Twenty Statements, Sherwood's Self-Concept Inventory, The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, The Self-Esteem Scale, Social Self-Esteem Scale, and the Inferred Self-Concept Scale. Ward also reported that by the early 1970s, hundreds of studies of self-esteem and its effects on various issues had been produced. It was not long before it became a staple in the self-help literature (S. Ward, n. d.).

Among measuring instruments, however, Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (1965) continues to be the standard by which other self-report scales are judged. Rosenberg's scale comprises 10 items that ask subjects to choose among categories (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree) on a 4-point Likert-type scale. The scale was originally designed to measure global self-esteem among adolescents, but it has been employed extensively in diverse research studies (Rosenberg, Schooler, Schoenbach, & Rosenberg, 1995).

Rosenberg and Pearlin's 1978 investigation determined that the relationship of self-esteem to social class (SES) found minimal association between the social class of parents and self-esteem of the small child, a modest association between adolescents, and a moderate association between adults. Apter asserted that self-esteem is necessary for the child between the ages of 5 and 15 to develop into an effective adult (as cited in McKenzie, 1999). A number of sources have suggested that students who have high self-

esteem adapt socially with greater ease; they are found to be more willing to work with others.

Using Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale, an interesting study by Parker (as cited in McKenzie, 1999) compared the self-esteem of prisoners with their educational status. Results demonstrated that educational level had a significantly positive relationship to self-esteem; subjects' reports of self-esteem escalated with each level of education.

Hernandez (1998) studied the relationship of conformity and self-esteem, using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and a self-developed scale. The purpose behind this investigation was to add to the literature on which college students are most likely to engage in "dangerous activities due to peer pressure" (p. 1). She found a negative relationship between conformity and self-esteem; individuals who scored high on the conformity scale tended to have low scores on the self-esteem scale.

Personality traits and their relation to health issues have been widely investigated. Keppel and Crowe (2000) examined the perceived impact of stroke on self-esteem and body image of 40 subjects in Australia. Before the onset of a stroke, only physical self-esteem and body image were found to be associated with each other. Poststroke, all measures of self-esteem were negatively related to perception of body image ($p = 0.001$). Body image was found to be a dependable predictor of global self-esteem. Another study (Riley, n. d.) asked to what extent is body image is influenced by gender and self-esteem. While this study supported the investigator's hypothesis that males displayed higher levels of body image than females and that there was a significant difference in body

image between individuals with high or low body image that positively correlated with self-esteem, the author did not find a relationship between gender or self-esteem with body image.

Bailey (1997) focused on the correlation of clinical depression with self-esteem. He theorized that “a dynamic process begins which, if not altered, may make one vulnerable to a depression episode” (p. 8). He found that his data did not confirm his theory, nor did they indicate that a loss of self-esteem accompanied depression. He pointed out that an obvious limitation of his research was the use of self-report measures, which frequently tended to incorporate self-report bias. In another mental health study, Van Dongen (as cited in Keck, 1996) postulated that work and gainful employment were closely related to self-esteem in persons with severe, persistent mental illness. Self-esteem was found to be significantly higher in individuals who worked. Workers reported that work made them feel better, and in some instances, it helped to distract them from the hallucinative voices they heard.

Bonner, Lauletta, O’Neil, and Gubicza (1999) investigated the relationships among helping behavior, self-esteem, and gender. They posed the question, “Could a person who does not feel favorably about himself or herself have the motivation to make another person’s day easier?” (p. 1). Results indicated that women with low self-esteem ratings were more likely than men to stop to help a stranger. They were surprised to find that, at least in this sample, men had lower self-esteem ratings than women.

In one of Rosenberg's last studies, he and his colleagues examined the relationship between global self-esteem and specific self-esteem (Rosenberg et al., 1995). They argued that the study of any attitude must take into account that an individual may have an attitude toward an object as a whole (global self-esteem) while having a contradictory attitude about specific facets of that object (specific self-esteem). In short, it is possible to have a very favorable attitude toward one's job or profession, but have a different attitude toward one's immediate supervisor. They further noted that global and specific self-esteem are not "equivalent nor interchangeable" (p. 17). They believe that the Rosenberg Scale is a global self-esteem scale, whereas others (such as the Coopersmith scale) are more closely related to a specific self-esteem scale.

Locus of Control

Julian B. Rotter, whose classic work, Social Learning and Clinical Psychology was published in 1954, credited Alfred Adler with being a major influence in the development of Rotter's social learning theory (as cited in Stevick, Dixon, & Willingham, 1980). The concepts that Rotter developed in his book provided the impetus for the locus of control philosophy and the scale that he later published.

The term locus of control can be defined as "internal versus external control of reinforcement" (Rotter, 1975). Individuals with an internal locus of control are confident that events are dependent on their own actions and behaviors and that they are in control of them. Conversely, those with an external locus of control are certain that what happens to them is the result of external events or of chance and are beyond their control. A high

score on the scale places one in the external category, while a low score indicates an individual with internal locus of control. Rotter's 1954 work (as cited in Feinstein, 1999) hypothesized that individuals with internal locus of control attributes were better able to process environmental information and were more stable in their response to external influences.

Since its publication in 1966, the Locus of Control Scale has been the subject of innumerable research undertakings, many of them presenting contradictory outcomes. Feinstein (1999) used information obtained from a 1970 cohort study which focused on the characteristics and abilities that children developed by the age of 10 to predict the subsequent course of economic success. They found that, at age 10, a conduct disorder predicted future male adult unemployment quite well. However, it was self-esteem that predicted most accurately how much males would earn. For females, the locus of control variable was revealed to exhibit a positive significance for employment, but girls with high self-esteem were more likely to have longer periods of unemployment.

An economic model of how the locus of control of teenagers would affect human capital investment was developed by Coleman and DeLeire (2000). They stated that "the model allows locus of control to operate through teenagers' assessment of the return to human capital investments and has testable implications that distinguish it from a model in which locus of control is a proxy for unobserved ability" (p. 1). The model allows individuals to assess the relation of their success in the labor market and his or her level of human capital investment (education) against their internal-external locus of control.

The results of this research indicated that locus of control was a strong influence on the decision to invest in education.

Salespersons are subject to diverse pressures in that they must try to reach managerial and organizational goals at the same time they are attempting to satisfy the requirements of their customers (Nonis & Logan, 1995). Nonis and Logan examined upward influence tactics as related to three personality characteristics: need for achievement, need for power, and locus of control. Salespersons who view themselves as “internals” feel themselves to be in control of their job settings and generally are more satisfied with their work situations. They tend to establish longer job tenures. As expected, the authors found that an internal locus of control was associated with upward influence tactics.

In their study of entrepreneurial orientation, Lumpkin and Erdogan (2000) compared personality characteristics (locus of control, tolerance for ambiguity, risk-taking propensity, affiliation need, and achievement motivation) as predictors of entrepreneurial orientation. They theorized that identification of a relationship between personality traits and entrepreneurial orientation had importance for both practical and theoretical reasons. Their research instrument was a mailed questionnaire. Correlation and stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to examine the contribution of each of the predictor variables to the outcome variable. The results of their regression equation indicated that locus of control and risk-taking propensity were significant predictors of entrepreneurial orientation.

The Locus of Control Scale has potential use as an instrument to aid in the selection of candidates for managerial jobs. De Brabander, Hellemans, and Boone (1999) examined its propensity for distortion under selection-pressure. Items of the scale are forced choice items; one of the choices reflects external locus of control, while the other reflects internal locus of control. The investigators conjecture that, in our intensely competitive society, self-confidence is a desirable trait. If perceptive respondents are aware of this aspect of the measure, they may be able to guess which of the two item choices exhibits “the right stuff”. Their data, when analyzed, indicated that their subjects provided consistent answers even under the conditions simulating selection-pressure. They concluded that Rotter’s Locus of Control Scale remained stable under selection-pressure.

Work-Related Stress (non-injury)

Psychological aspects of work have been the target of investigation since the 1950s (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, 2000). Initially, research centered on the worker’s adjustment to the workplace rather than the stressful characteristics of the workplace itself. An online report revealed the following:

How common is stress? Consider these facts from the American Psychological Association: 43 percent of adults suffer adverse health effects from stress; 75 to 90 percent of all physician office visits are for stress-related complaints; and in terms of lost hours due to absenteeism, reduced productivity and workers’

compensation benefits, stress costs American industry more than \$300 billion annually. (Expert commentary, (1997, p. 1)

Among the factors that are assumed to be related to job stress are job insecurity, decision control, impersonal relationships at work, job dissatisfaction, lack of social support, carryover of work and family problems, large-scale technological changes, and alterations in traditional job hierarchies. There is even some recent evidence that changes which would be assumed to enhance the work environment can actually produce the reverse effect.

Robert Karasek, of the Department of Work Environment at the University of Massachusetts, developed a job strain measure derived from his 1985 Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) [personal communication, February 7,2001]. This instrument, from which 25 items were used in this research, replicates questions from the U.S. Department of Labor's National Quality of Employment Survey and focuses on two key elements of stressors: decision latitude and psychological job demands. The Job Strain Model posits that strain results from the characteristics of work rather than from subjective perceptions of the individual worker. Strain originates as a result of imbalance between demands and decision latitude in the workplace. For example, a waiter's job comprises high demand (either psychological or physical) associated with low personal control over his tasks.

The first scale, decision latitude, is the sum of two subscales given equal weight: skill discretion and decision latitude. The second scale is psychological job demands. Karasek's model of work-related stress states that the greatest risk to health from stress is

to the worker faced with high psychological workload demands combined with low decision-making authority to meet those demands. The association between job strain and heart disease demonstrates the broadest base of empirical support for Karasek's model (Karasek et al., 1998). Karasek (1999) stated that the questionnaire can be applied to all jobs and job holders in the United States with reliability.

Definitions of stress are varied. Physiologically, it has been described as "the inability of an organism to adapt or respond to external stimuli or maintain homeostasis" (Desai, 1999, p. 2). However, after the 1970s, stress began to be conceptualized as an input stimulus into an individual; the input might be a certain occasion (happy or sad), a critical life event, or a daily routine. Generally speaking, it is not the stressor that is stressful; it is the individual experiencing the stimulus who perceives it to be threatening or harmful (Lazarus, 1990, as cited in Desai, 1999). The perception of what constitutes a stressor remains a highly subjective process. In the Wall Street Journal, Shellenbarger (2001) reported an incident in the office of a large corporation where ongoing managerial pressure ultimately caused a usually quiet man to break down, stand up, and start to scream. In another Wall Street Journal article of the same date, (2001) suggested that, "first there was road rage, then air rage. Now there's desk rage", (p. B1).

Any number of stressful work situations such as repetitive work, electronic monitoring or surveillance, poor supervision, inflexible hours, inadequate information about one's work role, or lack of job security enhance the probability of work strain. Workload was one of the first facets of work to be recognized as a major problem. Both

overload and underload, or both, are susceptible. These two dimensions are independent, and it is possible to have quantitative overload and qualitative underload simultaneously (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, 2000).

Most small business owners start their careers with high expectations that, over time, may turn to burnout (Olsen, 2000). Olsen hypothesized that there may be two separate causes of burnout. One theory suggest that individuals burn out because of job pressures; trying to do it all is a fact of life for the small business manager. Another theory, however, is that certain individuals are predisposed to burn out. Olsen suggested that it is more important to address the change that alters internal responses to business pressure than to attempt to change the stressors.

New patterns of work organization such as downsizing and globalization of information may actually present new demands to both managers and workers. Changes that have profound influence on the way a business operates may be accompanied by potential hazards to the health and well-being of managers and employees. Work-related stress, or job strain, is an increasingly major influence on the human being in this two-income, fast-moving, computer-bound environment.

Summary

Chapter 2 explored literature about the development of small retail operations. It examined how the shift in retail activity has affected small “bricks and mortar” stores and the individuals who work in them. This chapter has reviewed the following: the four psychological measures used in measuring job satisfaction, including (a) job satisfaction

as measured by Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction; (b) self-esteem as measured by Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale; (c) locus of control as measured by Rotter's Locus of Control Scale; and (d) work-related stress as measured by Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire. It has also reviewed research studies that illustrate the impact of these concepts on diverse samples. In each of the articles examined, human psychological or psychosocial characteristics demonstrate a relationship to job satisfaction.

In Chapter 3, the research design for implementing the proposed survey research is examined. The methods, hypotheses, and statistical treatment of the data are described.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to explore self-reported roles of locus of control, work-related stress, and self-esteem and their association with employee job satisfaction. A questionnaire was distributed to all of the sales personnel actively employed by a small department store in Wichita Falls, Texas. The overall intent of this research was to determine whether job satisfaction could be predicted by the independent or predictor variables, as they exerted their influence collectively, and as they contributed their influence individually.

This chapter describes the methods and procedures used in this study. These are covered under the following headings: (a) Design; (b) Selection of the Subjects; (c) Instrumentation; (d) Collection of the Data; and (e) Analysis of the Data. The chapter restates the research questions and the statistical hypotheses and outlines the statistical procedures that were used.

Design

A small-scale purposive research design, incorporating four survey instruments that measured the effect of three predictor variables on a single outcome variable was employed in the investigation. Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction (1951) served as a measure of the dependent or outcome variable. The following predictor

variables comprised the independent variables: Rotter's Locus of Control Scale (1966), Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire (1985), and Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (1965).

Selection of the Subjects

Subjects comprised the sales personnel of a small independent department store in Wichita Falls, Texas, who work in direct sales and who have been employed for varying lengths of time. This small department store sells both apparel and a limited amount of general merchandise. An application for approval of the investigation was submitted to the University of North Texas Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. This application received approval. A copy of the form and the approval letter can be found in Appendix A.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire used in this study was an 82-item survey that included items from these four psychological measures: Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction, the Rotter Locus of Control Scale, the Karasek Job Content Questionnaire, and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. Demographic data were addressed by six additional items. The questionnaire was self-administered by the research population and returned to the researcher when completed.

Brayfield-Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction, the outcome variable, is designed to give a general measure of job satisfaction rather than to examine specific aspects of job content. The scale was constructed according to Thurstone's method of equal-appearing intervals and utilizes a Likert scaling system (Miller, 1991). Subjects are presented with a

5-point Likert scale that has undecided as a neutral response in the center. For consistency of data entering, no values were entered for undecided, thus permitting similar scoring. The scoring weights for each item range from 1 to 2. As employed in the present study, the range of scores is from 18 (low satisfaction) to 72 (high satisfaction), with 45 as the central point. An odd-even reliability coefficient computed for a prior sample was .77, which was corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula to a reliability coefficient of .87.

The Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control scale comprised 29 forced-choice statements. The subject is asked to choose one statement from each pair which best reflects his or her viewpoint. Six of the 29 items are “filler” items. The remaining 23 items are scored either one or zero. A high score indicates an external locus of control; the individual perceives himself or herself to be governed by events (i.e., fate, powerful persons, chance) beyond his or her control. A low-scoring individual, indicating an internal locus of control, believes that events result primarily from his or her actions or behavior and is more likely to assume that his or her actions will be successful. Internal consistency validity of the scale is reported as .65. Test-retest reliability coefficients are .60 to .83 (Rotter, 1966).

Karasek’s Job Content Questionnaire, version 1.7, is a 4-point Likert-type scale. An advantage of this questionnaire is that it can be adapted to accommodate the individual researcher’s needs. The survey was adapted to include the following job contents: (a) decision latitude, (b) decision authority, (c) psychological job demands, (d) physical job

demands, (e) job insecurity, and (f) social support. Validation studies on samples drawn from different samples and different countries indicate that the JCQ is useful in capturing elements of work-related job strain. Internal consistency is reported to be stable across samples, with an overall Cronbach's alpha of .73 for females and .74 for males (Karasek, 1997).

Morris Rosenberg's work on self-esteem has been widely used. He developed and validated an easily understood measure of self-esteem comprising 10 items (Hewitt, 1998). Respondents are asked to respond to each statement in terms of a 4-point Likert type scale. The measure was originally treated as a Guttman scale, but scoring was revised later as a Likert scale with items scored from strongly agree to strongly disagree. A 1 or 2 was assigned for a low self-esteem answer and a 3 or 4 for each high self-esteem response. A score of 20 or above indicates a high self-esteem response on all items, and a score below 20 indicates low self-esteem on the items; individuals can then be compared numerically. The coefficient of reliability is 92%; test-retest correlations are .85 and .88 over 2 weeks (Rosenberg, 1965).

Collection of the Data

A pretest of the questionnaire was conducted to determine whether respondents experienced any difficulty in completing the survey. This sample comprised 8 employees of a small apparel store in Wichita Falls, Texas. Scoring difficulties arising during the pretest were addressed before administering the measure to the larger sample.

The investigator met with the prospective sample population at an off-work time, during the work day, which was determined by the store manager. They were presented with an informed consent letter. The informed consent letter did not require a signature inasmuch as completing the survey implied voluntary participation in the study. Subjects were assured that their answers would be seen by no one but the researcher and that the researcher would not be able to distinguish which person completed an individual instrument. Although demographic data were requested, no identification of any individual was made. Subjects were also informed that, although the store manager had given his consent to conduct this investigation, he would not be provided with a copy of the survey instruments used in the research. Subjects were requested to answer all survey items as quickly and honestly as possible and were told that there were no right or wrong answers. They were requested to avoid discussion of their answers among themselves in order to minimize the influencing of another respondent. Surveys were to be completed in off-work periods and returned as quickly as possible.

Treatment and Data Analysis

Research Questions

This research attempted to answer two questions:

1. To what extent do the Rotter Locus of Control Scale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and the Karasek Job Content Questionnaire predict Job Satisfaction as measured by Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction?

2. To what extent does each of the predictor variables contribute to the prediction of job satisfaction?

These questions clearly distinguish between the use of multiple regression for prediction (first question) and multiple regression for explanation (second question). The use of multiple regression for prediction focuses on testing the significance of R-squared (R^2), while the use of multiple regression for explanation focuses on testing the regression equation as a theoretical model. In this instance, the regression weights of the predictor variables were tested for significance in the theoretical model depicted by the regression equation.

Regression Equation

The regression equation is stated as: $\hat{Y} = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + \epsilon$

Where:

\hat{Y} = Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction scores

X_1 = Rotter's Locus of Control scores

X_2 = Rosenberg's Self-Esteem scores

X_3 = Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire scores

a = Y intercept term

b_1, b_2, b_3 = regression weights for the predictor variables $X_1 - X_3$

ϵ = residual errors based on the least squares criterion, i.e., $Y - \hat{Y}$.

Statistical Hypotheses

The statistical hypothesis for the first research question can be formulated as:

$$H_0: R^2 = 0$$

$$H_A: R^2 > 0$$

$$F = \frac{R^2 / p}{1 - R^2 / n - p - 1}$$

The statistical hypothesis for the second research question can be formulated as:

$$H_0: \beta_i = 0$$

$$H_A: \beta_i > 0$$

Data Analysis

The scores for the three predictor variables and the dependent variable were entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, SPSS v. 10.0 program. An Alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests to assess an a priori probability of a Type I error, thus falsely rejecting a null hypothesis. An ordinary least squares regression program was run to compute the R-squared value for the first research question. The second research question was answered by running several direct-entry subset regression equations to determine the significance of the regression weights. For example, three single predictor equations were run to measure the significance of each regression weight individually, followed by three equations to measure pairs of predictor variables (X_1 and X_2 , X_1 and X_3 , X_2 and X_3), and finally a single three-predictor equation. A copy of the computer programs that were directly entered is in Appendix C.

Reliability of Instruments

As previously indicated, the instruments used in this study do yield reliable scores; however, one must determine whether reliable scores were obtained for the sample of participants in this study. Therefore, a Cronbach Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficient was computed using SPSS v. 10.0 for each of the instruments used in the study.

Statistical Procedures

A correlation matrix was established to indicate the relationship between the criterion variable (Y) and the three predictor variables (X_1 , X_2 , X_3). Means and standard deviations are included.

The statistical results of the first research question yielded an R-squared value and an F-test of the significance of the R as well as the unstandardized, error, standardized regression coefficients, t-test values, and significance level for each of the predictor variables using the direct-entry method in multiple regression.

The second research question involved running a series of regression programs, which were entered directly, to determine the best set of independent predictors for predicting job satisfaction. The outcome summarizes the R-square values and regression weights from the series of SPSS program runs. The regression equation with the highest R-square value provides the best prediction of job satisfaction. The highest R-square value could result from using a single predictor, two predictors, or even all three predictor variables. The score reliability of each instrument used in this study was

assessed with Cronbach's Alpha, which measures the internal consistency of participants' responses across items.

A new method of determining the best predictors, in addition to the R-squared values (all possible subsets method), is to compute structure coefficients. Structure coefficients, which determine whether independent variables are related to each other, were computed as the correlation between the raw score predictor values (X_1, X_2, X_3) and the predicted \hat{Y} scores. Given the above analyses with the study participants, the best regression equation would be: $\hat{Y} = \underline{a} + ? + ? + ? + \epsilon$.

In order to ensure consistency of data entry, data analysis, and interpretation of results, the following were carefully checked because instruments are scaled differently. The following values were assigned: SA = 4, A = 3, D = 2, SD = 1. No values were entered for undecided, thus permitting similar scoring, and in the same direction, for instruments. Special care was given to "Reverse Score" for certain items on the instruments to further maintain direction and score value for interpretation of results. For reverse score items, the values were assigned as: SD = 4, D = 3, A = 2, SA = 1.

All questionnaires utilized in this study are reported to be both reliable and valid. Although none of them are recently developed measures, they are assessments that are considered to be standards in the field of psychometric measurement. The Institutional Review Board of the University of North Texas gave its approval to this research project. All subjects signified consent regarding participation in the study. Data gathering was in accordance with the department store's scheduling of work time. The subjects were given

instruction about how to respond to the questionnaires. Confidentiality was maintained throughout the research project. Analysis of the data was performed by Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 10.0 for Windows. A multiple regression procedure was used to examine these data in order to answer the research questions.

Summary

This chapter has described the design of the research, the survey instrument, and the sample from which data were collected. This research employed use of an 82-item survey instrument to assess the four measures of employee job satisfaction. The chapter restates the research questions and the statistical hypotheses and outlines the statistical procedures that were utilized in the project. A multiple regression procedure from SPSS v. 10.0 was used to analyze the data.

In Chapter 4, results of the statistical treatment of the data are examined and reported. The demographic profile of the sample population is summarized.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES

The overall intent of this study was to determine whether job satisfaction (measured by Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction) among salespersons in a small independent department store could be predicted by any or all of three psychological measures: Rotter's Locus of Control, Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire (non-injury job stress), and Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale. An 82-item questionnaire was self-administered by the sample research population. This chapter restates the research questions and statistical hypotheses developed for the study and briefly summarizes the statistical procedures used. It reports the statistical results of the regression analysis and presents an analysis and interpretation of the data. The demographic profile of the sample, which comprised six additional items, is summarized.

A pretest of the questionnaire was administered to a sample of 8 employees of another small apparel store in Wichita Falls, Texas. Results indicated that respondents frequently chose the undecided category of the Brayfield-Rothe measure, which would be entered into the data as "no value" for the item. As a consequence, this item category was removed before the measure was administered to the sample population of the department store. There are arguments for including or not including a neutral point among the response options; removing the option forces the respondent away from a "comfortable" answer. Additionally, prior research has indicated that reliability is

independent of the number of points on a scale (NCS Pearson, Inc., 1996). Expressing a response that delineated between satisfied or dissatisfied was considered desirable for this study.

Initially, the sample population was to have included 55 individuals who work in direct sales in a small department store. However, in the time interval between specifying the expected number of the sample and the collection of the data, the store manager informed this researcher that the number of salespersons had been reduced to 30 individuals.

The 82-item questionnaire was administered to voluntary participants in the research population; an informed consent form was provided. Subjects were given instructions about how to respond to the questionnaires, including watching for items that were reverse scored. All subjects were required to be 18 years of age or older. Respondents were assured that confidentiality would be maintained and that their answers would in no way affect their work in the future. No one except the researcher would be privy to their responses. A box was placed in their “break room,” and surveys were gathered at the end of each day by the researcher, just prior to the store’s closing. Twenty-one surveys were collected, a return of 67%. Two individuals refused to participate, and one instrument was not included in the data analysis because the information was incomplete. During the data collection, up to seven responses were lost when maintenance personnel inadvertently discarded the collection box.

The characteristics of the sample population are summarized in Table 1. All respondents were female with the exception of one male. The median age was found to be in the 50-59 year category; the 65+ classification made up 30% of the employee population. Fifty-five percent were married, and 20% were widowed. Forty percent of the respondents had 20+ years retail experience. Thirty percent of the employees had fewer than 5 years experience, and 30% had more than 20 years experience. It is interesting to note that longevity is reflected in age, in retail experience, and in continued employment at this same store. Age of the respondents appeared to be a significant factor for Job Satisfaction in this study; as age increased, so did job satisfaction.

Investigation of individual item responses reveals that salespersons in this sample population tend to believe that they are not appropriately respected or rewarded for the work that they do. Almost two thirds of the 20 respondents answered this item negatively.

The Brayfield-Rothe Index of Job Satisfaction (item 6 = “I am often bored with my job”) generated a response from 40% of the respondents that they agreed with the statement. In more affirmative feedback, the Brayfield-Rothe Index of Job Satisfaction (item 17 = “I find real enjoyment in my work”) indicated that 60% of this sample population of salespersons reported liking their jobs.

Table 1

Demographics of the Respondents

| | n | % |
|----------------------------|----|------|
| <u>Age</u> | | |
| 19-29 years | 2 | 10.0 |
| 30-39 years | 2 | 10.0 |
| 40-49 years | 3 | 15.0 |
| 50-59 years | 4 | 20.0 |
| 60-65 years | 3 | 15.0 |
| 65+ years | 6 | 30.0 |
| <u>Gender</u> | | |
| Female | 19 | 95.0 |
| Male | 1 | 5.0 |
| <u>Marital status</u> | | |
| married | 11 | 55.0 |
| divorced | 2 | 10.0 |
| widowed | 4 | 20.0 |
| never married | 3 | 15.0 |
| <u>On the job training</u> | | |
| yes | 15 | 75.0 |
| no | 5 | 25.0 |
| <u>Retail experience</u> | | |
| 5 or fewer years | 2 | 10.0 |
| 5-10 years | 3 | 15.0 |
| 10-15 years | 3 | 15.0 |
| 15-20 years | 4 | 20.0 |
| 20+ years | 8 | 40.0 |
| <u>Store experience</u> | | |
| 5 or fewer years | 6 | 30.0 |
| 5-10 years | 4 | 20.0 |
| 10-15 years | 2 | 10.0 |
| 15-20 years | 2 | 10.0 |
| 20+ years | 6 | 30.0 |

Total sample size = 20.

The Job Content Questionnaire was effective in this research in predicting .40 as the proportion of the variance in Job Satisfaction. Although it cannot be considered a strong predictor, it is not often that a single variable can account for all of the variance in an outcome variable. Job Content Questionnaire items 17 and 18, which were stated as: “My supervisor is concerned about the welfare of those under him” (item 17) resulted in 8 negative answers and 12 positive answers, and “My supervisor is successful in getting people to work together” (item 18) provoked 9 negative responses (45%) and 11 positive responses (55%). There were no responses that indicated a very positive attitude in either item, thus indicating that this sample population found managerial leadership questionably adequate.

An important feature of Karasek’s Job Content Questionnaire is the Job Strain measure, which includes the domain of decision authority that investigates the amount of job freedom that the respondent believes he or she has in the freedom to make decisions, choices in how to perform work, and freedom to express opinions regarding job performance. Responses indicated a marked difference in perception of decision authority, with 8 individuals expressing the opinion that they had very little freedom to decide how their work was done and 12 persons feeling quite satisfied with their on-the-job freedom.

Description of the Four Measures

To test the prediction that a relationship exists between the outcome variable Job Satisfaction (Brayfield-Rothe) and the three predictor variables (Rotter's Locus of Control, Rosenberg's Self-Esteem, and the Job Content Questionnaire), a multiple regression analysis was performed. A description of the four measures, Job Satisfaction, Locus of Control, Self-Esteem, Job Content, used in this study is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Description of Psychological Measures

| | Job Satisfaction Brayfield-Rothe | Locus of Control Rotter | Self-Esteem Rosenberg | Job Content Karasek |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Number of Items | 18 | 23 | 10 | 25 |
| Scoring Range | 18 ↔ 72 | 0 ↔ 23 | 10 ↔ 40 | 25 ↔ 100 |
| Scale Definition | 1 ↔ 4 | 0 ↔ 1 | 1 ↔ 4 | 1 ↔ 4 |
| Number of Respondents | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Range of Scores | 40 ↔ 67 | 2 ↔ 16 | 25 ↔ 36 | 58 ↔ 75 |
| Mean (\bar{x}) | 49.25 | 9.8 | 30.3 | 67.17 |
| Variance (s^2) | 34.78 | 17.22 | 6.01 | 15.64 |
| Standard Deviation (s) | 6.15 | 4.15 | 2.45 | 3.95 |
| Cronbach Alpha | .88 | .76 | .58 | .55 |

Accordingly, the outcome variable and the three predictor variables were entered into the regression equation to determine whether a predictive effect existed.

Regression Equation

As stated in the preceding chapter, the regression equation was expressed as:

$$\hat{Y} = \underline{a} + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + \varepsilon$$

Where:

\hat{Y} = Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction scores

X_1 = Rotter's Locus of Control scores

X_2 = Rosenberg's Self-Esteem scores

X_3 = Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire scores

\underline{a} = Y intercept term

b_1, b_2, b_3 = regression weights for the predictor variables X_1, X_2, X_3

ε = residual errors based on the least squares criterion, i.e., $Y - \hat{Y}$.

Research Questions

The following two research questions were stated for this study.

1. To what extent do the Rotter Locus of Control Scale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and the Karasek Job Content Questionnaire predict Job Satisfaction as measured by Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction?

2. To what extent does each of the predictor variables contribute to the prediction of job satisfaction?

These questions distinguish between the use of multiple regression for prediction (first question) and multiple regression for explanation (second question). The use of multiple regression for prediction focuses on testing the significance of R-squared (R^2),

while the use of multiple regression for explanation focuses on testing the regression equation as a theoretical model. In this instance, the regression weights of the predictor variables are tested for significance in the theoretical model depicted by the regression equation. According to Osborne (2000),

When one uses multiple regression for explanatory purposes, that person is exploring relationships between multiple variables in a sample to shed light on a phenomenon with a goal of generalizing this new understanding to a population.

When one uses multiple regression for prediction, one is using a sample to create a regression equation that would optimally predict a particular phenomenon within a particular population. Here, the goal is to use the equation to predict outcomes for individuals not in the sample used in the analysis. (p. 3)

When using multiple regression for prediction, there are two categories of relevant scores: (a) scores that are predicted for the original sample, and (b) scores that can be predicted for individuals who were not part of the original sample and its regression line. For example, the goal may include other individuals who are part of the population from which the original sample was drawn. Generalization to the population is not implied.

Data Analysis

The scores for the three predictor variables and the dependent variable were entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, SPSS v. 10.0 program. A significance level of $p < .05$ was selected. An ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regression program was run to compute the R-squared value for the first research question. The

second research question was answered by running several direct-entry subset regression equations to determine the significance of the regression weights. For example, three single predictor equations were run to measure the significance of each regression weight individually, followed by three equations to measure pairs of predictor variables (X_1 and X_2 , X_1 and X_3 , X_2 and X_3), and finally a single three predictor equation. A copy of the computer programs that were directly entered is in Appendix C.

Statistical Hypotheses

The statistical hypotheses for the first research question are answered as follows:

$H_0: \underline{R}^2 = 0$: Rejected. There is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. The \underline{R}^2 value is significant at .41, which indicates that, while there can be many other factors that can explain variation in Job Satisfaction as measured by Brayfield-Rothe's Index, this model, which includes the three independent variables, Locus of Control, Self-Esteem, and the Job Content Questionnaire, can account for .41 of that proportion.

$H_A: \underline{R}^2 > 0$: Data indicate that the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Statistical evidence supports the alternative hypothesis that the predictors Locus of Control, Self-Esteem, and Job Content Questionnaire are significantly related to the outcome variable, the Brayfield-Rothe Index of Job Satisfaction.

The statistical hypotheses for the second research question are answered as follows:

$H_0: \beta_i = 0$: Data indicate that the null hypothesis is rejected. None of the beta (β) coefficients is equal to zero, and the beta weight for Job Content Questionnaire is significant at .04. The values of the beta weights represent the changes of the outcome

variable (Job Satisfaction) resulting from a one-unit change in the predictor variables (Job Content Questionnaire, Locus of Control, and Self-Esteem measures).

$H_A: \beta_i > 0$: Data indicate that the alternative hypothesis is accepted. None of the beta (β) coefficients are equal to zero. Statistical analysis of the data indicates that the measures Locus of Control and Job Content Questionnaire contribute .41 of the proportion of variance in Job Satisfaction Index at a significance of $p > .01$. H_A is, therefore, accepted. Although Self-Esteem contributes a very small portion of the variance, as a suppressor variable it serves to increase R^2 when entered with Locus of Control in the prediction of Job Satisfaction. It was, therefore, maintained in the regression equation.

Statistical Procedures

To determine whether reliable scores were obtained for the participants in this study, a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was computed using SPSS v.10.0 for each of the instruments used in this study. This procedure measures the internal consistency of participants' responses across items to examine whether all items are measuring the same concept. "Alpha reliability averages the scores of two or more items from a multi-item questionnaire" (Hopkins, 2000, p. 7) by assuming that the means of the selected items represent a re-test of a single item. Therefore, Cronbach's alpha is not a test-retest reliability measure. In general, a scale is considered to be internally consistent if all of the items in the measure are substantially correlated (Hanneman, 2000). Likert scales are

frequently treated this way. Table 3 reports the score reliability of each instrument used in this study.

Table 3

Cronbach Reliability Coefficients

| Instrument | Cronbach alpha |
|---|----------------|
| Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction | .88 |
| Rotter Locus of Control Scale | .76 |
| Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale | .58 |
| Karasek Job Content Questionnaire | .55 |

As demonstrated in Table 3, both the Brayfield-Rothe (Job Satisfaction, the outcome variable), and Rotter's Locus of Control (predictor variable) have ample internal consistency as measured by Cronbach's alpha. In Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale and Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire, the weaker intracorrelations do not meet the common rule of thumb which dictates that the alphas should be greater than .80 (Hanneman, 2000). The JCQ items selected for this study are from different domains of the Job Content Questionnaire, and, as a consequence, items may not react appropriately to internal consistency procedures because underlying concepts are measuring several different attributes of job content simultaneously. The lower score associated with the Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale also indicates that it is not measuring the same attributes of the Job Satisfaction Index (Brayfield-Rothe) as the other two independent variables (Rotter's Locus of Control Scale and Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire).

A correlation matrix was established to indicate the relationship between the criterion variable (Y=Job Satisfaction) and the three predictor variables (X_1 = Locus of Control), (X_2 = Self-Esteem), (X_3 = Job Content). Means and standard deviations also are included. Table 4 displays the correlation matrix.

Table 4

Correlation Matrix With Means and Standard Deviations

| | Y Job Satisfaction | X_1 Locus of Control | X_2 Self-Esteem | X_3 Job Content Questionnaire |
|-------|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Y | 1.0 | | | |
| X_1 | -.47* | 1.0 | | |
| X_2 | .18 | -.56** | 1.0 | |
| X_3 | .48* | -.12 | -.32 | 1.0 |
| M | 49.25 | 9.80 | 30.3 | 66.8 |
| S | 6.15 | 4.15 | 2.45 | 3.37 |

*. $p < .05$, one-tailed

** . $p < .01$, one-tailed

Pearson correlations between the outcome variable of Job Satisfaction and the three predictor variables, Locus of Control, Self-Esteem, and Job Content Questionnaire were modest, with the Job Content Questionnaire exhibiting the strongest positive correlation (.48) with Job Satisfaction, significance $p < .05$, one-tailed. The Self-Esteem measure indicated a minimal correlation of .18 with Brayfield-Rothe's measure of Job Satisfaction. It may also be noted that Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire exhibited a weak negative correlation with Rotter's Locus of Control scale.

The Locus of Control scale correlated negatively with Job Satisfaction at $-.47$, significant at $p < .05$. A probable explanation of this phenomenon is that individuals who manifest a predominantly internal locus of control, as was the case in the sample population of this study, may find retail sales confining, especially in being unable to make independent decisions or in being unable to use their talents as they perceive them. When Self-Esteem and Locus of Control scores were examined together to ascertain their relationship to Job Satisfaction, the negative correlation increased to $-.56$, significant at $p < .01$. In other words, Rosenberg's Self-Esteem measure acts as a suppressor variable on Rotter's Locus of Control measure. One definition of a suppressor variable is that it is "a variable which increases the predictive validity of another variable (or set of variables) by its inclusion in a regression equation" (Conger, 1974, as cited in Wooley, 1977). The above is demonstrated by an examination of the relationships in the correlation matrix. Self-Esteem was not significantly correlated with the outcome or dependent variable (Job Satisfaction), but it exhibited a correlation with Locus of Control that was significant at $.01$. Applying these data to the sample population of the present study with its definitely positive responses both to individuals who believe themselves to possess an internal locus of control and who also possess a positive self-esteem, it becomes evident that the two variables share some of the variance, which indicates that Self-Esteem is a suppressor variable for Locus of Control.

The small correlations between the independent predictor variables indicate that multicollinearity was not a major problem in the data analysis; the value of observations

in each of the predictor measures is not significantly related to the value of each of the other measures. These data, therefore, add to the stability of the regression equation.

Table 5 reports the F-test for significance of the R-square value obtained from the regression equation predicting job satisfaction.

Table 5

Analysis of Variance on Job Satisfaction

| Model | SS | df | MS | <u>F</u> | <u>p</u> |
|------------|--------|----|-------|----------|----------|
| Regression | 297.39 | 3 | 99.13 | 3.77 | .03* |
| Residual | 420.35 | 16 | 26.27 | | |
| Total | 717.74 | 19 | | | |

R-squared = .41

The first research equation yielded an R-squared value of .41 and an F-test (3.77) of the significance of the R-squared value. Because the p-value is less than .05, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the predictors Locus of Control, Self-Esteem, and Job Content Questionnaire are related to the outcome variable. The R-squared coefficient indicates that 41% of the variance in Job Satisfaction is explained by the three predictor measures. At the same time, 59% of the variance remains unexplained, demonstrating that other independent variables accounted for the variance in job satisfaction as measured by Brayfield-Rothe's Index. A major proportion of this unexplained variance may be in variables outside the scope of this study, that is, salaries, vacation time, benefits, bonuses, or commissions. The ANOVA table provides a measure of whether all of the regression coefficients are zero in the population, and tests whether there are linear

relationships between the predictors (Locus of Control, Self-Esteem, Job Content) and Job Satisfaction, the outcome variable.

Table 6 indicates the unstandardized regression weight, standard error, standardized regression coefficients, t -test values, and significance level for each of the predictor variables using the direct-entry method in multiple regression. Regression weights, b values, can vary from -1.00 to 1.00. A separate weight was calculated for each predictor variable.

Table 6

Significance of Regression Weights Predicting Job Satisfaction

| Regression weights: | Unstandardized b | St error SE_b | Standardized β | t | p |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|------|
| X_1 | -.485 | .37 | -.33 | -1.32 | .21 |
| X_2 | .379 | .65 | .15 | .58 | .57 |
| X_3 | .759 | .34 | .49 | 2.25 | .04* |

* $p < .05$, Intercept = -8.49 (38,47), $t = b/SE_b$.

The second research question involved running a series of regression programs, which were entered directly, to determine the best set of independent predictors for predicting job satisfaction. Table 7 summarizes the R -square values and regression weights from the series of SPSS program runs. The regression equation with the highest R -square value will provide the best prediction of job satisfaction. The highest R -square value could result from using a single predictor, two predictors, or even all three predictor variables.

Table 7

Best Predictor Set for Job Satisfaction

| Equation | <u>R</u> -square | <u>F</u> | * <u>p</u> < .05 |
|--|------------------|----------|------------------|
| X ₁ | -.22 | 5.06 | .04* |
| X ₂ | .03 | .60 | .45 |
| X ₃ | .23 | 5.35 | .03* |
| X ₁ , X ₂ | .23 | 2.53 | .11 |
| X ₁ , X ₃ | .40 | 5.71 | .01* |
| X ₂ , X ₃ | .35 | 4.59 | .03* |
| X ₁ , X ₂ , X ₃ | .41 | 3.77 | .03* |

The regression equation which best predicts Job Satisfaction for this sample is:

$$\hat{Y} = -8.49 + (-.485)X_1 + (.759)X_3 + 5.12 \quad \text{or}$$

$$\hat{Y} = -8.49 + (-.485)\text{Locus of Control} + (.759)\text{Job Content Questionnaire} + 5.12.$$

Although X₃ remains the best single predictor with a p-value of .03, the combination of X₁ (Locus of Control) and X₃ (Job Content Questionnaire) is significant at p < .01, and therefore is demonstrated to be the best predictor set for the population under study.

A newer method of determining the best predictors, in addition to the R-squared values (all possible subset method) in Table 7, is to compute structure coefficients.

Structure coefficients, which determine if independent variables are related to each other, are computed as the correlation between the raw score predictor values (X₁, X₂, X₃) and the predicted \hat{Y} scores. When predictor variables are perfectly uncorrelated, the structure coefficient yields the same interpretation as the beta weight or the individual correlation

of the predictor variables with \hat{Y} (Whitaker, n. d.). Table 8 indicates structure coefficients.

Table 8

Structure Coefficients

| | \hat{Y} |
|-------|-----------|
| X_1 | -.73 |
| X_2 | .28 |
| X_3 | .74 |

Given the above analyses with these study participants, the best regression equation for these data would continue to be:

$$\hat{Y} = -8.49 + (-.485)X_1 + (.759)X_3 + 5.12.$$

Because the four measures employed in this study were scaled differently, the following values were assigned in order to ensure consistency of data analysis and interpretation of the results: SA = 4, A = 3, D = 2, SD = 1. No values were entered for undecided, thus permitting similar scoring, and in the same direction, for these instruments. Special care was given to evaluating the “Reverse Score” for certain items on the instruments in order to maintain direction and score value for interpretation of results. For reverse score items, the values were assigned as: SD = 4, D = 3, A = 2, SA = 1.

Although none of the questionnaires used in this study are recently developed measures, they are assessments that are considered to be standards in the field of psychometric measurement.

Summary

A multiple regression procedure was used to examine these data in order to answer the research questions. Multiple regression procedures were successful in accounting for a modest proportion of the variation in the outcome variable Job Satisfaction using the Job Content Questionnaire and the Locus of Control measures as the best predictor variables. If approximately 41% of the variation in Job Satisfaction is accounted for by these three predictor variables, 59% of the variation is not accounted for by these measures in the sample population used in this study. Although it is apparent that other variables, such as salaries and benefits, are of major importance in the prediction of job satisfaction, this study focused on psychological variables and measures rather than on economic rewards. It is expected that, under similar working environments, another small sample population or a group of individuals would produce comparable outcomes.

In Chapter 5, results of the statistical treatment of the data are examined and reported. The demographic profile of the sample population is summarized.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the potential of three independent psychological scales (Rotter's Locus of Control, Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire [non-injury job stress], and Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale) to predict job satisfaction, as measured by Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction, among salespersons in a small independent department store in Wichita Falls, Texas.

In this chapter: (a) results of the data analysis are summarized and interpreted, (b) research questions will be answered, (c) findings are related to the literature review of the small retail business environment, (d) the application of the research findings to the manager of the store is addressed, and (e) recommendations for future research are made. This chapter also includes a discussion of the limitations of the study.

Summary

This study included a total of 20 subjects who were employed as salespersons in a small department store. The survey presented to the voluntary participants comprised an 82-item questionnaire. Demographic data were also collected but were not entered as research variables. Respondents were assured that confidentiality would be maintained throughout the study and that their participation or their answers would in no way affect their job status. Completed surveys were collected each afternoon, just prior to the closing of the store, by the researcher. When data gathering was concluded, data were

then scored, coded, and entered into SPSS v.10 for Windows. The three predictor variables and the outcome variable were subjected to analysis by multiple regression procedures. Two research questions were proposed, and two statistical hypotheses were developed in conjunction with them. A significance level of .05 was selected as the basis for retention or rejection of the null hypotheses.

Research Questions and Statistical Hypotheses

1. To what extent do the Rotter Locus of Control Scale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and the Karasek Job Content Questionnaire predict Job Satisfaction as measured by Brayfield and Rothe's Index of Job Satisfaction? Subsequent to analysis, the statistical hypotheses for the first research question resulted in the following:

$H_0: R^2 = 0$: Rejected.

$H_A: R^2 > 0$: Accepted.

2. To what extent does each of the predictor variables contribute to the prediction of job satisfaction? Following multiple regression analysis, the statistical hypotheses for the second research question resulted as below:

$H_0: \beta_i = 0$: Rejected.

$H_A: \beta_i > 0$: Accepted.

Limitations

This study is not without its limitations, the first of which is the sample size. Although there are no rigid rules about sample size for multiple regression procedures, a general tenet holds that 15 subjects for each predictor variable is acceptable. As

originally designed, 55 salespersons would have formed the sample instead of 20.

Therefore, caution must be exercised in attempting to generalize the results of this study to other samples or populations.

In a self-report survey, the researcher has no control over confounding variables that may have relationships to both the predictor and the outcome variables. Personal attitudes, or events of a day, may influence responses. Also, the loss of surveys and data points that could have modified statistical results and contributed to both reliability and validity was unfortunate.

Although undeniably important, the consideration of salaries or other forms of financial reimbursement as predictor variables was omitted. Other variables that might conceivably be important in research relating to job satisfaction among retail salespersons include: medical benefits, retirement benefits, sick time, vacation time, commissions, child care, and potential for promotion. It can be conjectured that at least one or more of the above variables would be influential in explaining the 59% of the proportion that was unexplained by the present study.

Conclusions

This study provides increased evidence of the predictive validity of Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire and Rotter's Locus of Control Scale. Of the three predictor measures utilized in this research, the best discriminator for Job Satisfaction was a combination of the Job Content Questionnaire and the Locus of Control Scale. The single

best discriminator was Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire, which may serve managers as a valuable tool to ascertain specific levels of job satisfaction among their sales staff.

Among the findings of this study was that Rotter's Locus of Control Scale was negatively correlated with Job Satisfaction. (It is important to realize that a negative correlation does not indicate that the regressor has no relationship with the outcome variable. It indicates that for every unit the independent variable (regressor) increases, the outcome variable decreases.) Inasmuch as this sample population exhibited a distribution that tended to be skewed toward an internal locus of control, the results are not surprising; individuals who believe themselves to be in command of their actions and behaviors may chafe under the pressure to reach managerial and organization goals for which they have little input and little decision control. If managers are aware of this phenomenon, they may be able to place an employee in a working environment that increases decision control and creativity. Moreover, some individuals simply are averse to selling or dealing with customers. Rotter's Locus of Control Scale demonstrates potential for addressing risk factors for managers using this measure in selection of applicants for employment.

Many small business managers believe that employee training is something that only very large businesses can afford to do. However, training doesn't have to be expensive; a considerable amount of education can be initiated using in-house resources. A mentorship program for new employees might be effective in orientation. Most suppliers are only too willing to provide classes about their products.

As noted in Lucent Technology's study of its own employees (Lucent, 2000), the number of years that an individual has worked at his or her job appears to be related to his or her job satisfaction. According to their statistical records, 73% of employees who have worked fewer than 3 years are satisfied with their jobs. However, subsequent to this interval, there is a decline in overall satisfaction to 51%. If, however, the employee stays with the same employer, satisfaction recovers in those individuals. If one accepts Lucent's theory that the number of years that an employee has worked in one job is an indication of job satisfaction, then examining the demographics in the present research presents a modest analogy. In the department store under study, there is a slow, steady decline in the category "store experience" following 5 or fewer years employment, which does not reverse itself until the individual achieves about 20 years employment at the department store. Lucent hypothesized that careful strategic planning could reduce employee turnover among those individuals in the potentially dissatisfied time frame. It would also appear to be advantageous for small local retail business to institute a program that surveyed job satisfaction of its employees annually.

Recommendations

Although the research literature is replete with studies that have examined predictor variables to improve job performance, studies that investigate job satisfaction from the standpoint of the salesperson in a small, independent department store are virtually nonexistent. Specifically, there appears to be a void in the literature concerning

studies about “Main Street” America. Increased research at local levels would prove to be beneficial to similar sample populations.

The size of this sample population was small for using in regression analysis; therefore, replication of this study with a larger randomized sample might improve statistical reliability. The present study would also be enhanced by replication using a more ethnically diverse sample. The department store that served as the foundation for this study would attract a greater customer response by increasing its appeal to a more diverse population. The explosive growth in information systems offers small businesses, as well as large ones, the opportunity to monitor consumer trends in ethnically different markets.

Additional demographic information would improve generalizability of the study. Surveys such as the present study are subject to each individual’s experiences, and more demographic information would be useful.

In order to gain information, a study of this type could possibly be improved by retaining Karasek’s Job Content Questionnaire but substituting other instruments to serve as predictor variables because of the problems that demonstrate either negative correlation or poor prediction with the outcome dependent variable.

Continued research on the predictability of these measures would prove beneficial to managers who are concerned about the retention of valuable employees and the placement of salespersons in the right service area. Both the Locus of Control Scale and the Job Content Questionnaire could be used to improve selection of new employees. In

addition, store managers could use these instruments to measure changing attitudes among salespersons and, perhaps, find solutions that would surmount difficulties.

Johns, Xie, and Fang (1992) asserted “researchers and practitioners who are interested in the impact of jobs on employees might consider measuring psychological states more often than is commonly done” (p. 672). Further research on the predictability of job satisfaction among salespersons in small, independent retail operations such as the department store investigated in this study would be useful not only to managerial leadership for decision making and personnel management but would promote greater understanding of the personal characteristics of salespersons as human investment capital that has the potential to create the effective competitive edge required for survival in the new economy.

APPENDIX A
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

CONSENT FORM

I am voluntarily participating in this research project about job satisfaction which is entitled "The Roles of Three Psychological Measures as Predictors of Job Satisfaction among Salespersons in a Small Department Store" being conducted by Ruth Webb, a graduate student in the department of Technology and Cognition at the University of North Texas in Denton, Texas. I will permit Ruth Webb to administer four questionnaires as part of this study. Completing all four questionnaires will only take about 25-35 minutes of my time.

Although I will receive no monetary benefit from participation in this study, I understand that the above investigation may be of interest to me and/or others by providing a more complete understanding of how working in a small department store relates to my opinions about myself and my work. An offer to answer all questions regarding the study has been made. I further understand that I may terminate my participation at any time without any penalty. All information and the answers on the questionnaires will be held in confidence.

Please do not place your name on this page or on any page of the questionnaire. Your answers will be completely private, and there will be no attempt to identify any individual. No one but the researcher will see your responses.

Thank you for your help. Please call me, or my faculty advisor, if you need any assistance in answering questions.

Ruth Webb

(940) 767-0907 (Ruth Webb)

(940) 565-2091 (Andrew Schoolmaster at UNT)

APPROVED BY THE UNT IRB
FROM 04/05/01 TO 04/04/02
(21)

This project has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board of the University of North Texas for protection of the human subjects who participate in research studies. 940/565-3940

APPENDIX B
SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

INFORMATION ABOUT YOU

DIRECTIONS: Complete each question by circling the appropriate answer. Your information will not be seen by anyone who works in the store -- neither the store manager or any other employee. DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS SHEET OF PAPER.

2. What is your age group?

19 to 29 30 to 39 40 to 49 50 to 59 60 to 65 65+

3. I am a:

Female Male

4. What is your marital status?

Married Divorced Widowed Separated Never Married

5. How many years have you worked in the retail business?

5 years or less 5 to 10 years 10 to 15 years 15 to 20 years 20 years +

6. How long have you worked in this store?

5 years or less 5 to 10 years 10 to 15 years 15 to 20 years 20 years +

7. Have you had on-the-job training at this store?

Yes No

YOUR OPINIONS

DIRECTIONS: This questionnaire asks your opinions about certain issues. Each statement is marked with a or b. Read both statements and select the one with which you most agree. Even if you agree (or disagree) with both of them, mark the one that is closest to your opinion. This survey is about opinions, and there are no right or wrong responses. Do not put your name on any page of this questionnaire.

-
1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
 b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
-
2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
 b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
-
3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
 b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
-
4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
 b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
-
5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
 b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
-
6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
 b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
-
7. a. No matter how hard you try, some people just don't like you.
 b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
-
8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
 b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.
-
9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
 b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
-
10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely, if ever, such a thing as an unfair test.
 b. Many times, exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.
-

-
11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.
 b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
-
12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
 b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
-
13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
 b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
-
14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
 b. There is some good in everybody.
-
15. a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
 b. Many times, we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
-
16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
 b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
-
17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
 b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs, the people can control world events.
-
18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
 b. There really is no such thing as "luck."
-
19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
 b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
-
20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
 b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
-
21. a. In the long run, the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
 b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
-
22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
 b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
-

-
23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
 b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
-
24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
 b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.
-
25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
 b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
-
26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
 b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people; if they like you, they like you.
-
27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
 b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
-
28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
 b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
-
29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave as they do.
 b. In the long run, the people are responsible for bad government on a national, as well as on a local level.
-

YOUR JOB CONTENT

DIRECTIONS: Please answer each question by checking off the one answer that best fits your job situation. Sometimes none of the responses fits exactly. Choose the answer that comes closest. Do not put your name on any page of the questionnaire.

-
1. My job requires that I learn new things.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
2. My job involves a lot of repetitive work.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
3. My job requires me to be creative.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
4. My job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
5. My job requires a high level of skill.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
6. On my job, I have very little freedom to decide how I do my work.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
7. I get to do a variety of different things on my job.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
8. I have a lot of say about what happens on my job.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
9. I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
10. My job requires working very fast.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
11. My job requires working very hard.

| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 12. My job requires lots of physical effort. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 13. I am not asked to do an excessive amount of work. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 14. I have enough time to get the job done. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 15. I am free from conflicting demands that others make. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 16. My job security is good. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 17. My supervisor is concerned about the welfare of those under him. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 18. My supervisor is successful in getting people to work together. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 19. People I work with are competent in doing their jobs. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 20. People I work with take a personal interest in me. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 21. People I work with are friendly. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

22. People I work with are helpful in getting the job done.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

23. I often get to know clients or customers as individuals on my job.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

24. Satisfying the customer provides me with an important source of challenges on the job.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

25. I am appropriately respected and rewarded by my company for my work.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

FEELINGS ABOUT YOURSELF

DIRECTIONS: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please check the response that best fits your feelings. Sometimes none of the responses fits exactly. Choose the response that is the closest to the way you feel. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not put your name on any page of the questionnaire. Read carefully — on some statements, “strongly agree” and “strongly disagree” are reversed.

-
1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
2. At times I think I am no good at all.
 Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
-
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
 Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
-
6. I certainly feel useless at times.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
 Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
-
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
-
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

JOB SATISFACTION

DIRECTIONS: It is important to know how people feel about different jobs. This questionnaire contains 18 statements about jobs. Check the phrase below each statement that best describes how you feel about your present job. We would like your honest opinion; there are no right or wrong responses. Do not put your name on any page of the questionnaire.

1. My job is like a hobby to me.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from being bored.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. It seems that my friends are more interested in their jobs.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

4. I consider my job rather unpleasant.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. I enjoy my work more than my leisure time.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. I am often bored with my job.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

7. I feel fairly well satisfied with my job.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

8. Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. I am satisfied with my job for the time being.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

10. I feel that my job is no more interesting than others I could get.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

11. I definitely dislike my work.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

12. I feel that I am happier in my work than most other people.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

13. Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

14. Each day of work seems like it will never end.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

15. I like my job better than the average worker does.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

16. My job is pretty uninteresting.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

17. I fine real enjoyment in my work.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

18. I am disappointed that I ever took this job.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

APPENDIX C
COMPUTER PROGRAMS

COMPUTER PROGRAMS

Research Question 1

```
REGRESSION  
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT y  
/METHOD=ENTER x1 x2 x3
```

Research Question 2

```
REGRESSION  
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT y  
METHOD=ENTER x1
```

```
REGRESSION  
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT y  
/METHOD=ENTER x2
```

```
REGRESSION  
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT y  
/METHOD=ENTER x3
```

```
REGRESSION  
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT y  
/METHOD=ENTER x1 x2
```

```
REGRESSION  
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT y  
/METHOD=ENTER x1 x3
```

```
REGRESSION  
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
```

```
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT y  
/METHOD=ENTER x2 x3  
REGRESSION  
/MISSING LISTWISE  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT y  
/METHOD=ENTER x1 x2 x3
```


REFERENCES

- Argyris, C. (1999). Flawed advice and the management trap. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bailey, J. P. (1997). Loss of self-esteem prior to the onset of depression. UMI Dissertation Services. Retrieved October 32, 2000, from <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/8452/doneit.html>
- Baker, R. J. (1999). Book summaries. The professional's guide to value pricing 2000. (1999). New York: Harcourt Trade Publishers. Retrieved July 30, 2001, from <http://www.coleman.bc.ca/booksummaries/valuepricing.html>
- Bernhardt, A. (1999, July). The future of low wage service jobs and the workers that hold them. Institute on Education and the Economy Brief. Retrieved January 14, 2001, from <http://www.tc.columbia.edu/~iee/BRIEFS/Brief25.htm>
- Blancero, D., Johnson, S. A., & Lakshman, C. (1995). Psychological contract, ocb, and customer service: An exploratory examination. Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies. Retrieved June 11, 2001, from Web site: <http://ilr.cornell.edu/CAHRS/>
- Bonner, V., Lauletta, J., O'Neil, E., & Gubicza, K. (n. d.). Helping behavior and the influence of self-esteem and gender. Retrieved February 27, 2001, from <http://www.classes.seattleu.edu/psychology/psyc305/Hy/convertAPA.htm>
- Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951, October). An index of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, *35*, 307-311.

Chowdhury, J., & Adams, D. C. (n. d.). The most pressing problems of small businesses: Some observations based on two sample surveys. Small Business Institute. Retrieved January 12, 2001, from <http://www.sbaer.uca.edu/docs/proceedings/89sbi091.txt>.

Coleman, M. & DeLeire, T. (2000, August). An economic model of locus of control and the human capital investment decisions. Irving B. Harris of Public Policy Studies. Retrieved February 27, 2001, from http://www.harrisschool.uchicago.edu/wp/wp_00-19.htm

Costello, D. (2001, January 16). Incidents of 'desk rage' disrupt America's offices. Wall Street Journal, B1.

DeBrabander, B., Hellemans, J., & Boone, C. (1999, January 12). Selection pressure induces a shift towards more internal scores on Rotter's 1-e locus of control scale. Current Research in Social Psychology, 4 (1). Retrieved February 9, 2000 from <http://www.uiowa.edu/~grpproc/crisp/crisp4.1.htm>

Desai, N. (1999, April 9). The role of social support in prevention of preterm birth: A case/control study of pregnant women in southwest and west Philadelphia. A senior thesis in anthropology. (University of Pennsylvania). Retrieved January 29, 2001, from <http://www.sas.upenn.edu/anthro/CPIA/PAPERS/ndesai.htm>

Employee training and development. (2001). Retrieved March 3, 2001, BizMove.com from Web site: <http://www.bizmove.com/personnel/m4d.htm>

Expert commentary: Stress, part one — Understanding the problem. (1997, November 7). Retrieved December 27, 2000, from <http://www.intelihealth.com/IH/ihtIHEMIHC000/333/350/151838.html?d=dmtICNNews>

Falcione, R. L., McCroskey, J. C., & Daly, J. A. (1977). Job satisfaction as a function of employees' communication apprehension, self-esteem, and perceptions of their immediate supervisors. Communication Yearbook, 1. Retrieved November 2, 2000, from <http://www.as.wvu.edu/~jmccrosk/72.htm>

Feinstein, L. (1999, June 17). The relative economic importance of academic, psychological and behavioural attributes developed in childhood. Web site: Centre for Economic Performance and University College London. Retrieved February 13, 2002, from <http://www.essex.ac.uk/ilr/eeeg/Conference1/Feinstein.pdf>

Gavel, D. (2000, December 7). Michael Porter named university professor. Harvard University Gazette. Retrieved February 3, 2001, from <http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2000/12.07/01-michaelporter.html>

Global scenarios in human resource development and the role of technical & vocational education and training. (1996). Retrieved November 10, 2000, from http://202.160.13.194/virtual_lib/Expert96_Lead1.htm

Hanneman, R. A. (2000). Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis with SAS. Sociology 203B Home Page. Retrieved September 3, 2001, from <http://wizard.ucr.edu/~rhannema/soc203b/examples/alpha.html>

- Hernandez, J. L. (1998). Conformity and self-esteem: Possible correlation? Missouri Western State College. Retrieved February 25, 2001, from <http://www.clearinghouse.mwsc.edu/manuscripts/143.asp>
- Herzberg, K. F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). The motivation to work. New York: Wiley.
- Hewitt, J. P. (1998). The myth of self-esteem: Finding happiness and solving problems in America. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Hopkins, W. G. (2000). Summarizing data: Precision of measurement. A new view of statistics. Retrieved September 20, 2001, from <http://www.sportsci.org/resource/stats/precision.html>
- IISDnet Trade & Investment. General agreement on tariffs and trade (GATT). (2001). Retrieved July 2, 2001, from <http://iisd1.iisd.ca/trade/wto/gatt.htm>
- Jacobs, R. L. (1998). A win-win paradigm for quality of work life and business performance. Human Resource Development Quarterly, *9* (3). Retrieved January 28, 2001, from <http://www.josseybass.com/JBJournals/tocs/hrdq9-3art.html>
- Johns, G., Xie, J. L., & Fang, Y. (1992). Mediating and moderating effects in job design. Journal of Management, *18*, 657- 676.
- Karasek, R. A. (1997). Job content questionnaire and user's guide. (Rev. ed.). Lowell: University of Massachusetts.

Karasek, R. A., Brisson, C., Kawakami, N., Houtman, I., Bongers, P., & Amick, B. (1998). The job content questionnaire (jcq): An instrument for internationally comparative assessments of psychosocial job characteristics. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 3 (4), 322-355.

Katenova, S. A. (1999). Problems of small business globalization: World tendencies and peculiarities in the republic of Kazakhstan. Journal "Vestnik KazGU", 1. Retrieved January 12, 2001, from [http://www. Kazsulib.uni.sci.kz/LibrEn/Vestnik/Econom/year99/N1/4.htm](http://www.Kazsulib.uni.sci.kz/LibrEn/Vestnik/Econom/year99/N1/4.htm)

Keck, J. (1996). A job is more than punching a time clock. University Publications. Retrieved November 3, 2000, <http://www.uwosh.edu/univpub/contest/1996/jobmorepay.html>

Keppel, C. C. & Crowe, S. F. (2000, May). Changes to body image and self-esteem following stroke in young adults. Neuropsychological Rehabilitation, 10 (1). Retrieved February, 2001, from <http://www.dcn.ed.ac.uk/step/may2000/ref11.htm>

Lucent Technologies. (2000). Overall job satisfaction. Retrieved January 27, 2001, from <http://www.lucentnps.com/knowledge/surveys/00jobs/overall.asp>

Lumpkin, G. T., & Erdogan, B. (2000). If not entrepreneurship, can psychological characteristics predict entrepreneurial orientation? Venture 2000 research grant by University of Illinois at Chicago College of Business Administration. Retrieved January 27, 2001 from www.sbaer.uca.edu/Docs/proceedingsIII/99usa475.htm

Marcy, K. M. (2000). Small business “vital statistics”. U. S. Small Business Administration. Retrieved March 25, 2001 from <http://www.sba.gov/aboutsba/textonly/Marketing>. (1998). Compton’s Encyclopedia Online. Retrieved February 8, 2001 from http://www.comptons.com/encyclopedia/ARTICLES/0100/01162496_A.html

McClelland, D. C. (1953). The achievement motivation. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

McGinn, E. & Naughton, K. (2001, February 5). Laid off: How safe is your job? Newsweek: 36-45.

McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

McKenzie, J. K. (1999, December). Correlation between self-efficacy and self-esteem in students. Master’s Thesis. The Graduate College, University of Wisconsin-Stout. Retrieved February 12, 2001, from www.uwstout.edu/lib/thesis/1999mckenzie.pdf

Miller, D. C. (1991). Handbook of research design and social measurement (5th ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

NCS Pearson, Inc. (July, 1996). Response scales: How many points and what labels? Research Notes. Retrieved November 9, 2001 from <http://www.ncs.com/ncscorp/research/76-7.htm>

Nonis, S. A., & Logan, L. B. (1995, March). Personal characteristics of salespeople and their use of upward influence tactics. Proceedings of the Southwest Small Business Institute Association. Retrieved November 3, 2000, from <http://www.sbaer.uca.edu/docs/proceedingsII/95swa118.htm>

Olsen, D. C. (2000, March 20). Small-business owners must guard against problems of burnout. Capital District Business Review. Retrieved January 12, 2001, from <http://www.bizjournals.com/albany/stories/2000/03/20/focus6.html>

Osborne, J. W. (2000). Prediction in multiple regression. Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, *7* (2). Retrieved from <http://ericae.net/pare/getvn.asp?v=7&n=2>

Parks, C. A. (with R. D. Waldo). (2000). Enhancing the human side of the organization: The faces model. Journal of Performance Measurement. Retrieved May 18, 2000, from <http://www.dcpres.com/jpm/faces.htm>

Pettijohn, C. E., Pettijohn, L. S., & Taylor, A. J. (2000). An exploratory analysis of salesperson perceptions of the criteria used in performance appraisals, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management. Retrieved June 11, 2001, from http://www.zigonperf.com/resources/pmnews/salesperson_pas.html

European agency for safety and health at work. (2000, May 18). Research on work-related stress. (2000, May 18). Retrieved November 11, 2000, from <http://agency.osha.edu.int/publications/reports/stress.php3>

Riley, L. (n. d.). The relationship between gender and self-esteem with body image. Retrieved March 12, 2001, from <http://userpages.umbc.edu/~lriley4/240INTRO.html>

Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, June 15, 150-163. Retrieved June 11, 2001, from <http://www.siu.edu/departments/coba/mktg/osr/534v1.htm>

Rosenberg, M. (1965). The Rosenberg self-esteem scale. Department of Sociology, University of Maryland. Retrieved February 26, 2001, from <http://www.bsos.umd.edu/socy/rosenberg.htm>

Rosenberg, M., & Pearlin, L. (1978). Social class and self-esteem among children and adults. American Journal of Sociology, 84 (1), 53-77.

Rosenberg, M., Schooler, C., Schoenbach, C., & Rosenberg, F. (1995). Global self-esteem and specific self-esteem: Different concepts, different outcomes. American Sociological Review, 60 (1) 141-156.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Locus of control scale. Retrieved January 12, 2001, from <http://www.bal-larat.au.bssh/psych/rot.htm>

Rotter, J. B. (1975). Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43 (1), 56-67.

Shellenbarger, S. (2000, October 11). Companies are finding real payoffs in aiding employee satisfaction. Wall Street Journal, B4.

Shils, E. B. (1997, February 7). Surviving the invasion of the mega stores: The impact of mega-retail discount chains on urban, suburban and rural economics. Chapter 1. Retrieved February 2, 2001, from <http://www.lawmall.com/rpa/chap1.html>

Small Business Administration. (January 11). 47 years of service to America's small business: The U. S. small business administration, 1953-1993. Small Business Administration. Retrieved March 12, 2001, from <http://www.sba.gov/aboutsba/sbahistory.html>

Small business facts. (1994). House Small Business Committee: Handbook of small business data (GPO Stock #045-000-00270-5). Washington DC: Government Printing Office. Retrieved March 20, 2001, from www.house.gov/smbiz/facts/

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. [Computer software]. (2000). SPSS, Inc. [version 10.0]. Chicago: Author.

Stevick, R. A., Dixon, P. N., & Willingham, W. K. (1980). Locus of control and behavioral versus self-response measures of social interest (Reprint). Journal of Individual Psychology, 36, (2), 1-8. <http://www.messiah.edu/hpages/facstaff/rstevick/articles/jip.htm>

Ward, S. (n. d.). Filling the world with self-esteem: A social history of truth-making. CJS Online. Retrieved February 20, 2000, from <http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/csncpy/articles/ward.html>

Whitaker, J. S. (n .d.). Interpretation of structure coefficients can prevent erroneous conclusions about regression results. Retrieved June 15, 2001, from Texas A&M University 77843-4225 <http://ericae.net/ft/tamu/STRUCT~1.htm>

Woolley, K. K. (1997, January 7). How variables uncorrelated with the dependent variable can actually make excellent predictors: The important suppressor variable case. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, TX. Retrieved September 30, 2001, from <http://ericae.net/ft/supres-htm>. (1 of 7)