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The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between personality traits and job satisfaction among music teachers.

The research problems were

1. to investigate the areas of job satisfaction of music teachers;
2. to investigate the patterns of personality traits that were common among music teachers;
3. to determine whether relationships existed between the areas in which the music teachers showed job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and their personality profiles.

The 107 subjects were drawn from the experienced music teacher population of graduate music education majors attending North Texas State University, and tested between the summers of 1983 and 1985. The results should not be applied to any other group.

The 21 scale *Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire* (MSQ) was used to investigate job satisfaction and the 18 scale *California Psychological Inventory* (CPI) was used to
investigate personality traits. The correlation coefficient was used to determine if there was a relationship between job satisfaction and personality traits. The Bonferroni formula was used to compensate for the type I error.

Men and women's scores were treated as a group because there was no significant difference due to gender found on either test. The results of the MSQ indicated satisfaction on Social service; Moral Values; Activity; Achievement; Creativity; and Ability Utilization. The results also indicated dissatisfaction on Company policies and practices; Advancement; and Compensation. The areas of job dissatisfaction confirmed the findings of other studies.

It was determined that there were no common patterns of personality traits for the music teachers in the current study. This finding agreed with prior research.

It was determined that there were no significant relationships between personality traits and job satisfaction at or beyond the level set by the Bonferroni formula. This finding was in agreement with several studies but did not agree with others.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The concept of work has changed through the years (22, p. 65). At one time work had only the meaning of physical labor (3, p. 530); however, that meaning has been expanded so that it now means not only physical but mental effort, and in addition may assume the meaning of employment in general (8). In contemporary American thought, it is assumed that one of the outcomes of work should be job satisfaction (8, pp. 72-74). The term "job satisfaction" means "a pleasurable affective condition resulting from one's appraisal of the way in which the experienced job situation meets one's needs, values, and expectations" (8, p. 72). The concepts of needs, values, and expectations are very closely associated with several theories of personality (8, p. 73).

"Work has been considered in different ways at different times and in different types of societies" (22, p. 65). In current Western Civilization, work has come to mean an activity that one is engaged in to earn pay or to make a living (8, p. 3).

Paleontologists and anthropologists have presented a picture of the hunter-gatherer societies that indicated the
members of the society had a very different concept of work. In primitive societies people frequently had to work all the time in order to survive. There were no divisions of specialized workers; everyone had to be able to do everything. Men and women, however, often had different roles to perform in their society and frequently assumed different duties. An indirect, yet impressive, piece of data to support this statement is seen in studies of the languages of primitive societies. The research of Boas (5) and Elkin (9) indicates that some primitive societies had no words for work or leisure; however, their languages are often rich in words that conveyed detailed information about other areas of human life. To these people work was, in fact, life (22, pp. 72-75).

In societies based on agricultural and pastoral life styles, there was a greater division of labor due to a stable, adequate food supply. People were freed from working only for survival. Others were freed from manual work and were permitted to perform mental tasks, which were not considered as work or labor (22, pp. 75-78).

Wooley (36) and Frankfort (12) have noted that the first people to have been freed from manual work were the priests, who did astronomical observations, which were in turn used to inform farmers when to plant (22, pp. 75-78). Swanton (29) and Opler (23) believed the next group to have been freed from physical work may have been the war
leaders, who then became the political leaders. Around these two groups additional groups were formed, including scribes, teachers, clerks, weapon-makers, who were considered to be in the employment of the political groups (22, pp. 78-79).

In Western Culture, the ancient Greeks considered work to be a curse (30, p. 8), a punishment (3, p. 530) and degradation (22, p. 82). In fact, the Greek word for work had the meaning of manual labor or mechanical skill (3, p. 530). The male citizens pursued knowledge, culture and political activities. Slaves or free people (who were considered little better than slaves) did all the physical work. Of all labor, only agriculture was thought to be worthy of a citizen (3, p. 530; 22; 30, pp. 3-7). In ancient Rome there were only two types of work considered proper for a free man: agriculture and business. In business the goal was to earn enough money to buy a farm (3, p. 530; 30, p. 8).

In Hebrew culture, work was considered a duty. It atoned for the original sin of Adam and Eve in Paradise, and for an individual's sins (3, p. 531; 30, pp. 11-18). The early Christians added the concept that work was the means to an end. By working they could earn money which could be shared with needy Christians (3, p. 531; 30, p. 29).
In Medieval Christian Europe work was considered to be important because it made a person humble (28, p. 38). The ideal situation was to pray and to work (3, p. 531). The general feeling of the time was that agriculture was the most important form of work for the layman, the hand crafts were next in importance and commerce was considered the least important. Money-lending was considered wrong. It was assumed that people were placed on the earth to work for money, and money was not to work for people (3, p. 531; 30, p. 39).

Two early Protestant leaders had a great impact on the concept of work. Martin Luther suggested it was necessary for every person, and that being idle, being a beggar, and lending money to earn interest was wrong (30, p. 47). He felt all work, whatever the station, was a service to God (3, p. 532). John Calvin thought work took people's minds off evil (8, p. 5). He also said one way a person could tell if he had received salvation was by the amount of God's favor, as seen through the financial gains he received (3, p. 51-62). For the chosen people of God, goods would be multiplied, and these in turn should be reinvested, to earn more money (3, p. 533). This has been considered the beginning of the Protestant Work Ethic (22, pp. 84-86) and the foundation of capitalism (3, pp. 533-34; 8, p. 5; 30, pp. 51-62).
During the Industrial Revolution, with the use of more machines, people began thinking about what work meant to them in their search for a personal identity. Machines reduced workers to a part of a system; some felt they were no longer individuals. The "Second Industrial Revolution" was seen as dehumanizing the workers even more, making people only machine watchers (8, p. 5).

The attitude toward work in the United States has its greatest contrast to the attitude expressed by Classical Greece and Rome. From early colonial times work was thought of as being good and important in itself. This may have been because many of the settlers were believers in the protestant work ethic. For many years no country was as work-oriented as the United States. It should be noted, however, that there were never sharp distinctions drawn between mental and manual work, as was true in other countries. All classes in America were expected to work. A person who did not work was considered, by many, to be a parasite. If a person was poor, he was regarded as someone who did not really want to work. If a person was rich, and did not work, he was tolerated, but never respected. America may have been one of the few societies in which even the very rich were expected to work. People were evaluated by their work, in a kind of occupational hierarchy. All work may be "good" but some kinds of work were considered "better." The blue-collar worker, for
example, was not valued as highly as the white-collar worker, while a person who put in long hours in an office was very respected (22, pp. 87-89).

In the United States, a very close association between work and identity has developed. This may be observed in the way people introduce themselves to strangers. Often one of the first questions asked is: "What do you do for a living?," "Where do you work?," or "What are you?" William Glasser has called this an example of a "role" society. The other types of societies were labeled "goal" societies. In goal societies, people work to accomplish goals in life. He pointed out that there could be goals in a role society; however, the role a person plays in society has become more important to them than their personal goals in life (15). Glasser has also noted the concern in psychology and counseling with the search for identity and its association with work in the American culture (15). In vocational counseling circles, the view that there may be a close association between job satisfaction and certain personality traits has gained some degree of acceptance since the 1940's.

It has been pointed out by Roe (25), Rychlak (26), and others that one of the problems in the study of personality is the lack of general agreement on a basic personality theory (25, p. 79; 26, pp. 1-2).
There remains a basic disagreement about the definition of personality. Some psychologists, representing behaviorism theory, believe that a personality does not exist (26, pp. 1-2). They believe individuals behave in a predictable fashion, based on stimulus and response. Other psychologists disagree, believing people have some control over how they behave (26, p. 2). In general terms, personality has been defined as being "concerned with the various styles of behavior that different organisms habitually reflect" (26, p. 2). The specific personality traits that are often associated with work have been called the work personality. The work personality is the name that has been given to the collective characteristics of the personality that an individual brings into the work environment (8, p. 25).

In a comparison of the theories of Super, Roe, Holland, Ginzberg, and Tiedeman several observations have been made about the work personality. First, it has been thought to have been rather autonomous. Second, it merits study on its own right, and third, it may not have been greatly influenced by events in the early life of the child. There is a general belief that the work personality is influenced by the environment (22, pp. 142-143).

The work personality has two important features: structure and style. Structure has two dimensions: abilities and values. Abilities are the skills a person
brings into the work environment. Values are the needs of a person; the work environment should meet these needs. The personality style refers to the way a person responds to the stimulus of the work environment (8, p. 25). One basic dimension of personality style has been called the characteristics of response, which includes celerity (speed), pace (level of activity), rhythm (typical pattern of pace), and endurance (duration of response) (8, pp. 30-33).

It is postulated that if the individual has the skills needed to perform the duties of a job and the job meets the needs of the worker, that person will do a satisfactory job in the work environment and will be satisfied with his/her job (8, pp. 60-61). The personality style has been considered to be important in the concept of correspondence (mutual responsiveness) between the individual and the environment. It aids in the "degree of fit between work personality structure and work environment structure" (8, p. 61).

Research has indicated several personality traits may be very important in personality style: flexibility, activeness, and reactiveness (8, pp. 61-68). There may be other personality traits that could have importance in the personality style.

The view that personality traits may influence job satisfaction is supported in the studies of Fisher and
Hanna (11), Friend and Haggard (13), Walker and Guest (32), Tydlaska and Mengel (31), Hoppock (17), Barth (2) and Wink (35). They have all suggested that people who are better adjusted psychologically tend to be more satisfied with their work.

In the field of education, the view that personality traits are associated with job satisfaction has been indicated in the studies of Asher (1), Barth (2), Mauldin (21), Fawlery (10), Biondalillo (4), Little (19), Kuhn (18) Greenstein (16), and Smith (27).

In the field of music education there have been several studies that have associated various personality traits with success in music teaching. But, there have been very few studies that have examined job satisfaction among music teachers, although some of the reasons for job dissatisfaction have been documented by Brodanske (6), Rhinehart (24), Calder (7), Funk (14), White (33, 34) and Snapp (28).

Because of the importance of job satisfaction in the work environment and the close association that has been predicated between it and personality traits, this relationship should be investigated for music teachers.
Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between personality traits and job satisfaction among music teachers.

Research Problems

The research problems were

1. to investigate the areas of job satisfaction among music teachers;
2. to investigate the patterns of personality traits that were common among music teachers;
3. to determine whether relationships existed between the areas in which music teachers showed job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and their personality profiles.

Delimitations

The subjects of this study were limited to, and drawn from, the population of graduate students on campus at North Texas State University during the years 1983 to 1985 who had teaching experience; thus the results may or may not be applied to any other group.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED MATERIALS AND LITERATURE

The literature related to this investigation is concerned with material and reports that deal with the determination of job satisfaction and personality characteristics of teachers. The information is presented in four sections: (A) the major measurement instruments frequently employed in the field of personality testing, (B) selected studies in the area of job satisfaction, (C) selected studies in the area of personality factors, and (D) selected studies that have examined the relationship between job satisfaction and personality traits.

Personality Tests

Anastasi states, "'Personality tests' are instruments for the measurement of emotional, motivational, interpersonal, and attitudinal characteristics, as distinguished from abilities" (1, p. 493). There are several hundred personality tests commercially available. The following section addresses the issue of personality testing.

Many different approaches have been used in constructing personality inventories. The current procedures now being used "are those based on content
validation, empirical criterion keying, factor analysis, and personality theories" (1, p. 493). These different procedures form the basis for the discussion. The four sections are: 1) content validation, 2) empirical criterion keying, 3) factor analysis, and 4) personality tests based on psychological theories. These procedures and approaches are not "alternative or mutually exclusive techniques" (1, p. 493). Some personality inventories use two or more of these approaches (1, pp. 493-494).

**Content Validation**

Anastasi defines content validity as "the systematic examination of the test content to determine whether it covers a representative sample of the behavior domain to be measured" (1, pp. 134-135). This form of validity is often associated with achievement tests, but personality inventories may also contain it. Achievement tests measure how well people have mastered skills or understand information, after a period of instruction. Content validity must be "built into a test from the outset through the choice of appropriate items" (1, p. 135).

The first personality inventory was constructed by Woodworth. It was a content validity type inventory and was first used during World War I. "It was an attempt to standardize a psychiatric interview and to adapt the
procedure for mass testing" (1, p. 494). The Woodworth Personal Data Sheet gathered information about such behavior deviations as abnormal fears or phobias, obsessions and compulsions, nightmares and other sleep disturbances, excessive fatigue and other psychosomatic symptoms, feeling of unreality, and motor disturbances such as tics and tremors (1, p. 494).

The content of the test was based upon symptoms that were described in the psychiatric literature or were obtained through conferences with psychiatrists (1, p. 494). Another example of the content validation method was the Mooney Problem Check List. It was developed to identify problems for individual or group counseling. This instrument was available in a number of forms, for use with various age groups ranging from junior high school students to adults. The check list requested responses concerning the individual's feelings about areas that were assumed to be related to the various needs of each age group (1, p. 494). "The Mooney Problem Check List does not yield trait scores or measures of degree of adjustment" (1, p. 495).

In many inventories of this type some efforts have been made toward empirical validation of scores in each problem area. Few personality tests in use today rest their claims entirely on content validity. The tests cited . . . have relied principally on content validity in the formulation, selection, and grouping of items (1, pp. 495–496).
Empirical Criterion Keying

The term "empirical criterion keying" refers to the "development of a scoring key in terms of some external criterion. This procedure involves the selection of items to be retained and the assignment of scoring weights to each response" (1, p. 496). When the criterion keying method is used the answers to the questions are scored in "terms of their empirically established behavior correlates" (1, p. 496). They are scored like any other psychological test. "That questionnaire responses may correspond to the subject's perception of reality does not alter this situation. It merely provides one hypothesis to account for the empirically established validity of certain items" (1, pp. 496-497).

An example of this type of inventory is the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). Because several studies that used the MMPI are discussed later, this instrument will be covered in some detail. As of 1976 it had been employed in over 3,500 studies (18).

In the inventory there are 550 statements to which the subject responds by answering: "True," "False," or "Cannot say." The MMPI has ten clinical scales

1. Hs: Hypochondriasis: The first scale published on the MMPI was an attempt to measure the personality characteristics related to the neurotic pattern of hypochondriasis. Persons diagnosed to have this disorder show an abnormal concern for their bodily functions (24, p. 178).
2. **D: Depression**: The second scale published in the clinical profile was established empirically to measure the degree or depth of the clinical symptom pattern of depression. This mood state is characterized generally by pessimism of outlook on life and the future (24, p. 184).

3. **Hy: Hysteria**: This scale was developed to aid in identification of patients using neurotic defenses of the conversion form of hysteria. These patients appear to use physical symptoms as a means of solving difficult conflicts or avoiding mature responsibilities (24, p. 191).

4. **Pd: Psychopathic deviate**: This scale was developed to measure the personality characteristics of the amoral and asocial subgroup of persons with psychopathic personality disorders termed in this setting psychopathic deviates. The major features of this personality pattern include a repeated and flagrant disregard for social customs and mores (24, p. 195).

5. **Mf: Masculinity-femininity**: Scale 5 was designed to identify the personality features related to the disorder of male sexual inversion. The syndrome is another homogeneous subgroup in the general category of psychopathic personality sometimes called pathological sexuality (24, p. 201).

6. **Pa: Paranoia**: This scale was developed to evaluate the clinical pattern of paranoia, a diagnostic evaluation that is seldom used by itself but is frequently applied as a modifier of some other personality reaction. The concept of paranoia involves a set of delusional beliefs, frequently including delusions of reference, influence and grandeur (24, pp. 206-207).

7. **Pt: Psychasthenia**: This scale was derived to help in the evaluation of the neurotic pattern of psychasthenia, or the obsessive-compulsive syndrome. The personality features included, in addition to the obsessive ruminations and the compulsive behavioral rituals, are some forms of abnormal fears, worrying, difficulties in concentrating, guilt feelings and excessive vacillation in making decisions (24, p. 211).

8. **Sc: Schizophrenia**: The psychotic pattern of schizophrenia for which this scale was derived is very heterogeneous and contains many contradictory behavioral features. . . . Most commonly persons characterized as constrained, cold and apathetic or indifferent (24, p. 215).

9. **Ma: Hypomania**: The personality pattern for which this scale was derived is the affective disorder hypomania. Three features characterize this pattern: overactivity, emotional excitement, and flight of
ideas. The activity may lead to a great deal of accomplishment but is frequently inefficient and unproductive. The mood may be good-humored euphoria but may on occasion be irritable and temper out bursts are frequent (24, p. 220).

D. Si: Social introversion: A particular person need not be generally introverted in all aspects of his personality. . . at the same time his social preferences could be extroverted and his thinking patterns occupy some middle range, neither markedly introverted nor extroverted (24, p. 224).

Eight of the ten scales consist of items which differentiate between subjects under psychiatric treatment and a control group of about 700 "normal" individuals. The Masculinity-femininity (Mf) scale consists of items in which men and women evidenced a different frequency of responses. A high score on this scale suggests interest in the things that are considered to be typical of the opposite sex. The Social introversion scale was derived from the responses of two groups of college students. These students were selected on the basis of extreme scores on an Introversion-extroversion test (1, p. 498).

There are also three "validity scales." These do not measure validity in the technical sense. Rather they check "carelessness, misunderstanding, malingering, and the operation of special response sets and test-taking attitudes" (1, p. 498). The validity scales are

The Lie Score (L): Some items make the individual look good, but are not likely to be answered truthfully in the favorable manner (1, p. 498).
The **Validity Score** (F): These are items that are seldom answered in the direction of scoring by the standardization group. It is considered unlikely that an individual would have all or even most of the symptoms. A high score shows errors in marking of answers, carelessness, eccentricity, or malingering (1, p. 498).

The **Correction Score** (K): This is a set of items that measure test-taking attitude and believed by the test maker to be more subtle than the L or F scales. Extreme scores indicate an attempt to "fake good" (a high score) or to "fake bad" (a low score). To "fake good" indicates defensiveness and to "fake bad" indicates self-criticism and excessive frankness (1, p. 498-499).

If a subject's results on either the **Lie** or **Validity** scales exceed specified values the findings of the entire **MMPI** are considered unreliable. The K (Correction) score is used to give an adjusted score on some of the clinical scales. A very high K scale may also cause a test to be considered invalid (1, p. 499).

The results are reported in standard T scores, with a mean of 50.00 and a standard deviation of 10.00. Any score more than two standard deviations above the mean (70.00 or more) is usually taken to indicate pathological deviations (however, low scores have no meaning). "There is considerable evidence to suggest that, in general, the greater the number and magnitude of deviant scores on the
MMPI, the more likely it is that the individual is severely disturbed" (1, pp. 499-500). The main use of this instrument is in differential diagnosis. "The MMPI is essentially a clinical instrument whose proper interpretation calls for considerable psychological sophistication" (1, p. 504). Care should be taken on the part of the test interpreter with the use of the MMPI. This inventory, as a personality measure, has limitations. The inferences drawn from the responses may have questionable validity. This is because the MMPI has a psychopathological basis which may be inappropriate and inadequate for the understanding of normal behavior (65, p. 226).

The MMPI was normed on subjects who were psychiatric patients and should only be used as a part of a clinical battery. It is for clinical assessment and a major problem in using it with "normal" people is that it may overestimate the extent of a disturbance (59, p. 251).

The Eyseneck Personality Inventory (EPI) by Eyseneck and Eyseneck, measures personality in terms of extroversion-introversion (E) and neuroticism-stability (N). There are only fifty-seven items and it typically is completed in about ten to fifteen minutes. There are data that indicate a significant relationship between the EPI and the MMPI and the California Psychological Inventory (CPI). The test-retest reliability indicates coefficients
from .92 to .94 and a split-half reliability of .75 to .91 (4, pp. 132-134).

By its construction the CPI is also an empirical criterion keying test. It is discussed in detail later.

**Factor Analysis**

"The principal object of factor analysis is to simplify the description of data by reducing the number of necessary variables, or dimensions" (1, p. 362). Factor analysis is important in the construct validity of a test. It is "a statistical procedure for the identification of psychological traits" (1, p. 153), and it is a "refined technique for analyzing the interrelationship of behavior data" (1, p. 153).

Factor analysis has been used by a number of psychologists to arrive at a systematic classification of personality traits. Guilford and his co-workers were among the first to use this method. Guilford computed the intercorrelations among individual items for many personality tests. Three different personality inventories were developed and combined into the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (1, p. 506). It reports scores for the following traits

G. General Activity: Hurrying, liking for speed, liveliness, vitality, production, efficiency vs. slow and deliberate, easily fatigued and inefficient.

R. Restraint: Serious-minded, deliberate, persistent vs. carefree, impulsive, excitement-loving.
A. Ascendance: Self-defense, leadership, speaking in public, bluffing vs. submissiveness, hesitation, avoiding conspicuousness.

S. Sociability: Having many friends, seeking social contacts and limelight vs. few friends and shyness.

E. Emotional Stability: Evenness of moods, optimistic, composure vs. fluctuation of moods, pessimism, daydreaming, excitability, feeling of guilt, worry, loneliness, and ill health.

O. Objectivity: Thick-skinned vs. hypersensitive, self-centered, suspicious, having ideas of reference, getting into trouble.

F. Friendliness: Toleration of hostile action acceptance of domination, respect for others vs. belligerence, hostility, resentment, desire to dominate, and contempt for others.

T. Thoughtfulness: Reflective, observing of self and others, mental poise vs. interest in overt activity and mental disconcertedness.

P. Personal Relations: Tolerance of people, faith in social institutions, vs. faultfinding, critical of institutions, suspicious, self-pitying.

M. Masculinity: Interest in masculine activities, not easily disgusted, hard-boiled, inhibits emotional expression, little interest in clothes and style vs. interest in feminine activities and vocations, easily disgusted, fearful, romantic, emotionally expressive (1, pp. 506-507).

The reliability of the various factors are considered to be high for this type of inventory. The reliability for the sub-tests, using the split-half method, range from .75 to .85 (1, p. 507).

Another personality inventory based on the factor analysis method of test development is the Catell Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF). It has been used in several of the studies that will be examined in the review section. The sixteen scales of this instrument are

A cool vs. warm
B dull vs. bright
C easily upset vs. stable
E: not assertive vs. dominant
F: sober vs. enthusiastic
G: expedient vs. conscientious
H: shy vs. venturesome
I: tough-minded vs. sensitive
L: trusting vs. suspicious
M: practical vs. imaginative
N: forthright vs. shrewd
O: self-assured vs. experimenting
Q₁: conservative vs. experimenting
Q₂: group-oriented vs. experimenting
Q₃: undisciplined vs. controlled
Q₄: relaxed vs. tense (22)

The scales are short and as a result the reliabilities of the factor scores for any single form of the 16PF are generally low. Using two parallel forms, the combined reliabilities are in the .50's and the retest a week or less later often falls below .80 (1, pp. 508-510; 4, pp. 146-148).

The Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) is a 385 item test. There are fourteen scales: thinking introversion, theoretical orientation, aestheticism, complexity, autonomy, religious orientation, social extroversion, impulse expression, personal integration, anxiety level, altruism, practical outlook, masculinity-femininity, and response bias. The OPI has been correlated with the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and others. The OPI has been correlated with the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and others. The interval consistency reliability coefficients, using the Kuder-Richardson formula 21, were .67 to .89 on the subtests (4, pp. 141-143).
Personality Theory in Test Development

Personality theories have been at the foundation of several personality inventories. These theories often start in clinical settings. The test is constructed in the framework of the proposed theory. An example is the manifest need system of Murray and his associates from the Harvard Psychological Clinic, which inspired the design of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS). Edwards took Murray's theory and prepared a set of questions "whose content appeared to fit each of these needs" (1, p. 510).

These are

1. Achievement: To do one's best, to be successful, accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort.
2. Deference: To get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to follow instructions and do what is expected.
3. Order: To have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting on a difficult tasks.
4. Exhibition: To say witty and clever things, to tell amusing jokes and stories.
5. Autonomy: To be able to come and go as desired, to say what one thinks about things.
6. Affiliation: To be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups.
7. Intraception: To analyze one's motives and feelings, to observe others.
8. Succorance: To have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others.
9. Dominance: To argue for one's point of view, to be a leader in groups to which one belongs.
10. Abasement: To feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right.
11. Nurturance: To help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate.
12. Change: To do new and different things, to travel, to meet new people.
13. Endurance: To keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken.
14. Heterosexuality: To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex.
15. Aggression: To attack contrary points of view, to tell others what one thinks about them (25, p. 11).

The test-retest reliabilities of the fifteen scales as reported in the manual range from .74 to .88 and the split-half reliabilities range from .60 to .87 (4, pp. 130-132). Anastasi states "both sets of values may be somewhat inflated; the first, through recall of responses over the short interval employed (one week); the second, because of the repetition of identical statements three or four times in different pairs within each scale" (1, p. 512).

There are difficulties with these and most personality inventories. Part of the problem is that "the behavior measured by personality tests is . . . more changeable over time than that measured by tests of ability" (1, p. 524).

Job Satisfaction

This section will examine selected studies in the area of job satisfaction for music teachers. Dawis and Lofquist (53) noted that job satisfaction has been defined in various ways. Hoppock said, in 1935, that job satisfaction was a person's feelings of liking or disliking a job. Others have seen job satisfaction as a person's needs being met, or "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of how well one's job situation fulfills one's values, taking into account the
congruence of these values with one's needs" (53, p. 72).

Dawis and Lofquist have defined job satisfaction as

a pleasurable affective condition resulting from one's appraisal of the way in which the experienced job situation meets one's needs, values, and expectations. Conversely, job dissatisfaction is an unpleasant affective condition resulting from the perception that the experienced job situation fails to meet one's needs, values, and expectations (53, p. 72).

There have been several instruments that have attempted to measured job satisfaction. Some early instruments were the inventories of Hoppock in 1935, Kerr in 1948, Brayfield and Rothe in 1951, Baehr in 1953, Morse in 1953, Johnson in 1955, and Twery, Schmid, and Wrigley in 1958 (53, p. 72). Many of these instruments are now out of print or unavailable. Hoppock's inventory, which is a four-item test to measure job satisfaction overall, is still in use. Its reliability has been reported as being in the .80s (53, p. 73). Two of the most recent measures are the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) of Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, developed in 1969 and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) of Lofquist, Dawis, Weiss, and English.

The main difference between the MSQ and the JDI is that the MSQ has four times as many sub-test scales. The MSQ has twenty, the JDI has five. The MSQ also has a general satisfaction scale which the JDI does not have.

Evaluations of construct validity for the MSQ are based on confirmation of predictions from theory; for the JDI they are based on factors analyses . . . the MSQ factor
analysis are based on scales; for the JDI, they are based on individual items. The MSQ manual provides occupational norms; the JDI manual provides norms on demographic groups (19, p. 1680).

Kuhn stated that the disadvantages of the JDI were

First, the number of categories of work satisfaction were few, and they made no distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic factors of job satisfaction. Second, the instrument's length was so limited in scope for discrimination purposes that it tended to give more general than specific information. Third, the JDI made no attempt to determine the importance or degree of satisfaction that particular items hold for a particular respondent (50, p. 35).

Kuhn noted there was no single measurement instrument of job satisfaction that was preferred over all others (50, p. 28). She concluded that "continued usage of non-replicated measures may be doing a disservice to the job satisfaction field" (50, p. 29).

Job Satisfaction of Teachers

In the field of education the term "job satisfaction" was almost unknown before 1920, and it received very little attention until 1938 (14, p. 200). Burton, in 1938, observed the lack of research about job satisfaction in education compared to the work done in industry (20). By 1952 there were still few studies done in this area of education (64). As late as 1957, Redeffer pointed out the small amount of job satisfaction research in education, he stated that education might do well to follow the example of industry by employing this type of research (69).
A study by Hoppock (1935) indicated that more satisfied teachers had good relations with both superiors and co-workers, and were generally not emotionally maladjusted; they also seemed to be located in towns with populations over ten thousand (46).

McClusky and Strayer (57) and later Garrison (36) asked teachers to write about experiences that resulted in either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. This method revealed that many of the situations that cause teachers dissatisfaction were beyond the control of the school administrator (36, 57).

Chase found satisfaction was affected by many factors including pay, an administrator's attitude toward teacher's participation in policy making, the amount of freedom a teacher has in planning lessons, and the quality of leadership (14, p. 201; 23).

Knox used a modified form of the McClusky survey and found a relationship between efficiency of the teacher and the kind of people in the community (48). Monford found that helpful administrators, planning freedom, and having good relationships with co-workers were all important to job satisfaction (60).

Some recent pertinent studies also reviewed deal in job satisfaction of teachers. In these studies two different assessment instruments were employed: the MSQ, which was used by Becvar (10), Bullock (17), Kuhn (50), Biondolillo
Becvar's 1969 study of "Job Satisfaction of First-Year Teachers" investigated (a) whether first year teachers experienced the job satisfaction they were anticipating before they became teachers, (b) whether these discrepancies were related to specific job characteristics and (c) whether these discrepancies were associated with the background history of the teachers (10). He modified the MSQ to measure anticipated job satisfaction and administered it to 233 1968 graduates from the University of Minnesota who were about to start their careers as teachers. Toward the end of the school year (March, 1969) 136 teachers were asked to complete an unmodified copy of the MSQ. He found that first year teachers were less satisfied than they had anticipated. Some of these discrepancies were in the areas of Ability Utilization, Achievement, Advancement, Company policies and practices, Compensation, Recognition, Supervision-human relations, and Supervision-technical. However, there was more satisfaction than expected in the areas of Authority, and Independence. He found that married teachers were more satisfied with their job than were single teachers. He also noted that the people who were undecided about their careers were less satisfied than the ones who were decided (10).
Becvar's sample (136 teachers) only represented about fifty-eight per cent of the original population. That the sample was not selected randomly may have biased the results. The loss of subjects may have altered some of the findings of the study.

Kuhn's 1981 study, "Teacher Personality Types and Job Satisfaction," used the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to identify subjects' personality types (50, pp. 49-50). In addition a version of the MSQ short form, modified for education, was used to measure job satisfaction (50, pp. 50-53). Four hundred eighty-three Florida teachers, 375 women and 108 men, were tested. Most of the teachers (369) had six or more years experience (50, p. 58). These teachers recorded a mean score on the General Satisfaction scale of the MSQ of 73.58 points out of 100 points. The norm for elementary teachers was listed as 82.14 and the standard deviation of the group was listed as 7.82 (80, p. 58). The scores Kuhn reported were the lowest scores for any group in the selected studies which used the MSQ. These were the only scores to be more than a standard deviation below the norm's mean for teachers. Kuhn reported that all MBTI personality types were satisfied with their work. Satisfaction in teaching was established as a score of sixty per cent, which was arbitrary and had no foundation in her related literature (50, p. 80). She also stated that
extroverts tended to be more satisfied with their jobs than introverts (50, p. 91).

The overall results indicated that teachers were most satisfied about working with students and were less satisfied with administration, policies, pay, and working conditions (50, p. 100). The teachers were more satisfied with the intrinsic factors of their work than the extrinsic factors (50, p. 100). About forty per cent of these teachers reported they would not become teachers "if they had it to do over again" (50, p. 87, p. 100).

Kuhn's arbitrary setting of sixty as the level of satisfaction was rather low. A score of sixty would indicate "neither" satisfied or dissatisfied. If, for example, the researcher had set the level of satisfaction at seventy-five per cent, then the teachers would have only been satisfied with ten items, and if it had been eighty per cent, they would have only been satisfied with eight items out of twenty (50, p. 112).

Plessman's 1985 study employed the short form of the MSQ and the Myers-Briggs Personality Indicator. The findings of the personality test found that the ESTP, ESTJ, and ENTJ were the most common personality types for secondary marketing education teachers. The personality profile for marketing teachers was different from that of most high school teachers. Most of the marketing teacher indicated about "average" job satisfaction on the MSQ (68).
The purposes of Fawley's research were to "determine what, if any, relationship exists between personality traits and teaching level and what relationship, if any, exists between teachers of different grade levels and job satisfaction" (27, p. 7). The population consisted of 425 teachers. This included 155 elementary (four males, 151 females), 117 middle school (twenty-five males, ninety-two females), and 153 secondary school teachers (fifty-seven males, ninety-six females) (27, p. 40). She used these divisions of her subjects to form groups for analyzing the data.

Fawley used the **Comrey Personality Scale Inventory** to measure personality traits and the **MSQ short form** to measure job satisfaction (27, pp. 37-38). The raw scores of the **MSQ** ranged from thirty-nine to ninety-nine out of a possible range of twenty to 100 (27, p. 44). The mean for the general satisfaction scale of the **MSQ** for the total population was 78.6 (27, p. 44). The mean for the elementary teachers was 79.56, middle school was 76.03 and high school was 79.59 (27, p. 56). The analysis of variance was employed in evaluating the data and "there was a significant difference between teachers on the three school levels on the job satisfaction variable" (27, p. 54). She reported a significant difference between male and female teachers on the job satisfaction index (27, pp. 56-57).

Her conclusions were
1. Secondary teachers exhibited more emotional stability and masculinity than elementary and middle school teachers.
2. Elementary teachers exhibited more empathy than middle and secondary school teachers.
3. Female teachers exhibited more orderliness and empathy than male teachers.
4. Male teachers exhibited more masculinity than female teachers.
5. Middle school teachers exhibited less job satisfaction than elementary and secondary school teachers (27, p. 61).

It was unfortunate that Fawley did not report the rank-order of the items or use the complete MSQ which yields more data about which aspects of work were deemed less objectionable.

Biondolillo (12) used the MSQ to measure job satisfaction of both traditional and individually prescribed instruction (I.P.I.) teachers. There were seventy-eight teachers who took part in the study, twenty-six at each level (elementary, middle, and high school). Half were I.P.I. teachers and half were traditional teachers (12, p. 62). "This study has shown that there is a different level of job satisfaction, as measured by the MSQ, between I.P.I. teachers and traditional teachers" (12, p. 110). The mean I.P.I. teachers' MSQ general satisfaction scale score was 83.77 while the traditional teachers score was 79.92. Because of these findings the I.P.I. teachers were considered to have been significantly more satisfied with their jobs (12, p. 101). The I.P.I. teachers scores were the highest for any
group among the studies that were reviewed. It should be noted that these significantly higher scores were based on only thirteen subjects from one middle school.

Greenstein used the MSQ to measure job satisfaction (37, pp. 47-48, 58-63) among a sample of 119 teachers (eighty-six females and thirty-three males) from five elementary schools and two high schools. He found the mean score for the general satisfaction scale of the MSQ to be 78.25 (37, p. 83). There was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores on the general satisfaction scale of the MSQ for the teachers in different buildings (37, pp. 156-159).

There were two major weak points with this study. First, Greenstein did not make use of, or even list, the results of the twenty MSQ scales. A rank-order list of this information would have been of value. The second point was that he used a great many terms which are not familiar to most people and he sometimes did not define them clearly.

**Summary of the MSQ Studies**

The general satisfaction scale of the MSQ is the only score common to each of the aforementioned studies. The range of the results for this scale were from 73.58 to 83.77, the norm for teachers has been reported as 82.14, with a standard deviation of 7.82 (80, p. 58). Only Kuhn's study showed teachers to be more than a standard deviation
below the norm mean score of the MSQ. Pawley (78.6),
Greenstein (78.25) and Biondolillo's traditional teachers
(79.92) all reported scores in a normal range from 78 to
79. The highest scores reported were Biondolillo's I.P.I.
teachers (83.77). This higher mean score was influenced by
the unusually high scores of thirteen middle school
teachers. Greenstein found different levels of satisfaction
between teachers in various school buildings and felt it
was due to "Expectation-Perceptions congruence." These
studies indicate the MSQ is an adequate measure to assess
the job satisfaction of teachers.

The JDI Study

Mauldin's 1973 study employed the JDI. He investigated
personality traits and job satisfaction of experienced
elementary and secondary school teachers (56, p. 88).
Mauldin's population consisted of 179 public school
teachers, ninety-eight elementary (fifteen males and
eighty-three females), and eighty-one secondary teachers
(thirty-eight men and forty-three women (56, p. 88)).

Mauldin's findings suggested that: the elementary
teachers were more satisfied than the secondary teachers
(56, pp. 95-98), and the female elementary teachers were
more satisfied with their jobs than were the male
elementary teachers (56, p. 99).
Job Satisfaction of Music Teachers

Another approach to examining job satisfaction is to assess job attrition. There have been several studies that have discussed the attrition rate of music teachers. Bodanske (15) studied 760 currently employed teachers and 219 former high school music teachers. He found that a significantly larger number of teachers leave the profession than change their place of employment. "The total population, number-wise, evidences complete turnover in slightly over five years" (15, p. 32). This is a much larger change than is seen among high school teachers in general (15, pp. 10-21).

The major reasons listed by Missouri teachers for considering leaving the profession were: salary, advancement, long hours, poor working conditions, desire for new experiences, job security, social restrictions, problems with administration, and not liking to work with students (15, p. 190).

Charles Rhinehart (71) polled 273 music education graduates (bachelors and masters degrees earned between 1950 and 1956 or doctors degrees earned from 1950 to 1960) from Florida State University (71, pp. 50-53). He noted that seventy-two per cent of the men polled and sixty-five per cent of the women were not teaching music in the public schools (71, p. 53). Of those graduates still teaching,
sixty per cent of the men and forty-five per cent of the women had seriously considered leaving (71, p. 65).

Eighty-one percent of the respondents listed poor pay as one of the reasons for "a school music teacher to transfer to other vocational fields" (71, p. 85). Another factor also listed by eighty-one percent of the former music teachers was "Inadequate or unsatisfactory space facilities" (71, p. 86). Other reasons listed were (in order of the respondents ranking)

- inadequate equipment, seventy-nine per cent;
- unsatisfactory class scheduling, seventy-nine per cent;
- inadequate financial appropriations for music, seventy-seven per cent;
- tension evolving from noise and physical effort, seventy per cent;
- additional duties other than music, sixty-five per cent;
- quality of school discipline, sixty-five per cent;
- unfavorable attitude of administrators and/or faculty, sixty-five per cent;
- physical effort, sixty per cent (71, p. 86).

A study by Robert Calder (21) indicated that poor rewards have for many years influenced music teachers to leave the profession. In 1962 he studied 207 male graduates from nine Pennsylvania colleges and universities. This number included 119 men who left the teaching profession and an additional eighty-eight who never entered it. Reasons for leaving or not entering the field included poor pay, poor working conditions or low prestige (21, p. 60).

Occupations that former public school music teachers frequently transfer into are: teaching a subject other than music, teaching music in college, became a graduate
student, school administration, salesman, church musician, member of the Armed Forces, teaching in a private school, minister, professional musician, private music teacher, and insurance agent (21, pp. 48-49).

He listed the fifteen most important factors that influenced music teachers to leave the profession:

1. Opportunity for other position offering better salary, better working conditions, or more prestige
2. Opportunities for advancement too limited in public school music teaching
3. Unsatisfactory maximum salary potential
4. Inadequate physical plant and equipment
5. Starting salary too low
6. Administration disinterested in and unsympathetic toward your problems
7. Administration seemed to consider music program primarily for public relations
8. Lack of interest by administration in raising musical standards of school and/or community
9. Unsatisfactory teaching schedule
10. Student attitudes not conducive to raising and maintaining musical standards
11. Necessity of finding additional employment to supplement public school salary
12. Insufficient respect for your capabilities by administration
13. Musical immaturity of your students
14. Change in standard of living values by you or your wife
15. Your dissatisfaction with the type of music with which you were working (21, p. 57)

Calder did not include women in the study because he had accepted the findings of six studies (Davis, Reiner, Walters, Harris, Sperry, and Crane and Erviti) that indicated women left the profession primarily because of marital or family reasons (21, p. 16).
Kenneth Snapp's 1953 study indicated that many music teachers had an underlying desire to work in some area of music other than public school music teaching. He administered an interest inventory to 472 college music teachers, 391 public school music teachers and 298 professional symphonic musicians. Only one per cent of the college teachers and professional musicians rated public school music teaching as their first occupational choice (75, p. 77). He also said "...the low esteem in which public school teaching is held by members of the other 'specialty groups' is striking" (75, p. 78). More notable was the fact that just forty-one per cent of the teachers in public school music rated it as their first choice; however, among the college music teachers and the symphony musicians there had only been one per cent who had wanted to go into public school music teaching (75, p. 77).

Funk's 1973 study, examined reasons for conflicts between music teachers and school administrators. He surveyed a number of studies which documented the poor relationships between music teachers and administrators (33, pp. 9-106). He included the studies of Barth (8), Bodanske (15), Calder (21), Rhinehart (71), Snapp (75), and White (82, 83). His findings indicated that many conflicts may be due to the differences between the personality traits of teachers and administrators (33, p. 144). The areas of conflicts were pay, working conditions,
scheduling, auditions, rehearsals, budgets, equipment, the physical plant, and transportation (33, pp. 127-135). The personality factors that were found to have a significant difference between the two groups were: brightness, sensitivity, seriousness, self-sufficiency, creativity, neuroticism, tension, and anxiety, which all had music teachers scoring higher; and social boldness, trust, extroversion, warmth, emotional stability, calmness, self-assurance, self-control, will-power and leadership, which all had administrators scoring higher (33, pp. 124-125).

The purpose of Bullock's 1974 study "was to examine and describe selected personal and professional qualities common to a group of superior instrumental music teachers of junior high school in New York State (17, p. 133)." The "superior" junior high school instrumental music teachers were nominated by high school instrumental music teachers from the upstate New York area. There were 125 junior high school instrumental music teachers nominated. Twenty-six men and one woman who agreed to take part in the study (17, p. 133).

Bullock formed a control group consisted of twenty-five music teachers, twenty-two men and three women. This was not a random sample, and the selection process was not adequately described. Four measuring instruments were used (a) the 16PF, (b) the MSQ, (c) the Training and Experience
Questionnaire (TEQ) and (d) the Personal Interview Questionnaire (PIQ). The TEQ and the PIQ were developed by Bullock. The study group was given all four measures but the control group was not given the PIQ; he stated it was not necessary (17, p. 134).

Bullock compared his study group with the MSQ norms for elementary school teachers. He found the norm scores of the elementary teachers were significantly higher than the scores obtained by the study group. He stated this was not unexpected, as several studies had indicated that junior high school teachers were frequently less satisfied with their jobs than were elementary school teachers (17, pp. 76-79). He found the greatest areas of teacher satisfaction were with social services, achievement, moral values, and ability utilization. He found that only the achievement scale results correlated with the findings in other studies. The lowest factors were advancement and compensation. These results may be attributed to the fact that males tend to place greater importance on advancement and compensation (17, pp. 76-79).

Summary

In conclusion, there were certain areas of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction that have been reported in several studies dealing with teachers. Dissatisfaction was reported in teachers' dealings with administrators by
Beaver (9, pp. 72-73), Mann (55, pp. 106-107), Rhinehart (71, p. 86), Funk (33), Chase (23), and Monford (60). One of the primary reasons for dissatisfaction was poor pay (17, 29, 71). Other areas of dissatisfaction of music teachers included low prestige, poor working conditions, poor or, in some cases, no equipment, unsatisfactory class scheduling, poor funding, personal tension, non-musical duties, poor school discipline and conflicts with the school administration and school faculty over the place of music in education (15, 17, 33, 71).

One problem with the MSQ rests in the norms listed in the Manual (80). The norms for teachers appear to be too high. Norms made in former times may not be applicable for the current time or they may never have been properly developed. In looking at the studies which used this instrument, there was only one group in one study which had norms as high as the norm group. It should be noted that, as Bullock pointed out, several studies indicate elementary teachers may be more satisfied with the work than secondary school teachers. Bullock's study indicated that music teachers were significantly different than elementary classroom teachers (17).

Personality Profiles

The second research problem was to investigate the patterns of personality traits that were common among music
teachers. There have been several studies that have examined personality traits of music teachers. Many of these studies examined the association between personality traits and success in music teaching. Betz (11, pp. 123-124) noted an association between success and job satisfaction. These studies thus had a direct bearing on the current investigation.

Six different personality tests were employed in the following studies under review. The MMPI was used by Fosse (32), Lutz (54), and Slack (73). Mann (55) employed the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI). The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was utilized by Anderson (2, 3) and Beaver (9). The 16PF was used in four studies, by Bullock (17), Barth (8), Funk (33) and Krueger (49). The studies that made use of the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI), were written by Banks (6) and Farmilo (26). Wink (84) turned to the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) for his study.

**Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory**

In 1961 Flanagan investigated the use of the MMPI with regards to its relationship to effectiveness ratings of teachers by their supervisors. He pointed out several times that many studies had shown there was no correlation between teachers ratings by their administrators and amount their students had learned (29, p. 329). Betz had similar
findings (11, pp. 123-128). Flanagan attempted to find MMPI scales that might predict success (good ratings by a supervisor). He found high scores on the Hysteria and Masculinity-femininity scales were related to teaching success. Woman who scored high on the Hysteria scale had high ratings by their supervisors (29, p. 350). Almost fifty per cent of his male population scored high on the "Masculinity-Femininity" scale (this would be expected; fifty per cent should always be above the norm). He found other studies also reported that this scale was frequently high among male teachers (29, p. 350). He reported an inverse relationship between the Depression scale and positive ratings for women. He stated that the MMPI was good as a predictor of teacher effectiveness and should be used as a screening test for people entering teacher education (29, pp. 329-353). Several additional studies, which employed the MMPI, have given support to some of Flanagan's conclusions. One problem with Flanagan's study was the small sample of males, only twenty, while there were over 140 women.

Fosse stated that his purpose was to "discover criteria which could be used to predict the future teaching effectiveness of persons intending to become high school band directors" (32, p. 1). Fosse's criterion of effectiveness was based on the 1961 Illinois state Music Festival ratings of the subjects' high school bands.
Seven subjects' bands received superior ratings; 2) ten subjects' bands received excellent ratings; 3) five subjects' bands received good ratings; and 4) eight subjects' bands did not enter the Festival. The subjects were males who taught three years or more in their then present high school positions (32, p. 3).

The findings of the MMPI were that the band directors who received Superior ratings "tended to be aloof, energetic, other-directed, imaginative, and tend not to be introspective" (32, p. 264). The directors of bands that were rated Excellent were also "somewhat aloof, sensitive, idealistic and more introspective" (32, p. 264). The directors whose bands were rated Good were "morose, and hypochondriacal, religiously oriented, a worry-wart, and unable to handle contact with authority figures with any degree of success. He also tended to reveal his inner self quite frankly" (32, p. 264). (Sic) The directors of bands not entered in the Festival were somewhat similar to the first two groups, but "without their competitive drive and with mild depressive symptoms" (32, pp. 264-265). It should be noted that these groups were very small, only ten or less in each group. This may cast some doubts on the findings. The use of the MMPI was not a good choice, as it was not designed for use with "normal" people, and is not a tool with a known capability to predict success in a professional field.
Lutz also used the MMPI to measure personality characteristics of music teachers. His study looked at "the professional background and experiences and the personality characteristics of successful high school instrumental music teachers" (54, p. 2). He had a "basic hypothesis underlying the entire investigation . . . that successful high school instrumental music teachers have a common identifiable pattern of personality characteristics" (54, p. 2). The 103 teachers who took part were either teaching in Kentucky or were graduates of the University of Kentucky and teaching in another state (54, p. 15). "Seventy-five were judged successful in the opinion of their administrators, fellow teachers, and students" (54, p. 30).

In the analysis of the composite MMPI profiles of the successful and unsuccessful teachers he was led to the conclusion that

1. The MMPI group profile for successful teachers was very similar to that for the unsuccessful teachers.
2. The differences in personality characteristics between successful and unsuccessful teachers are in degree rather than direction.
3. Unsuccessful teachers, as a group, scored consistently higher on the 9 clinical scales of the MMPI than did the successful teachers.
4. The undesirable personality characteristics suggested in the interpretations of the MMPI scales were present to a greater degree in the group of unsuccessful teachers than the in the group of successful teachers.
5. High School instrumental music teachers, as a group: (a) are more sensitive and emotionally labile (Sic) than the general population.
(b) are extremely similar to the general population in terms of masculine interests and extroversion.
(c) tend to experience physical sickness more frequently than the general population.
(d) are less likely than the general population to be concerned with social mores.
(e) are more likely than the general population to commit asocial acts such as lying, stealing, alcohol or drug addiction, and sexual immorality.
(f) tend to be more self-critical and greater worriers than the general population.
(g) tend to be more moody and hostile than the general population (54, pp. 144-145).

In a review of Lutz's study Krueger reports three major points that were considered important to the development of his own study. These are

First, he found significant relationships between personality variables and instrumental music teaching success. Second, profiles between the two groups were quite similar, differences only in degree; yet, when compared to the general population, he found similar results to indicate that music educators were homogeneous as a group, quite different from the general population. Third, the criterion variables indicated a need to be investigated as well (49, p. 164).

Some of the problems of Lutz study were the lack of acceptable reliability and validity for the instruments which he developed for the study, and the small amount of agreement observed among his ratings. For example, the teachers rated most successful by other teachers were rated lowest by their own students. The unsuccessful teachers were rated highly successful by their students and lowest by administrators (54, pp. 133-134).
Slack's in-depth study of high school choral directors in Arizona in the 1974-1975 school year sought the answers to the following questions (a) What are the personality traits and values of these to music teachers? (b) How do these music teachers compare with the national norms established for people in general and for people with similar education and interests? She used the MMPI to measure personality traits. She had a rather small percent of the total population take part in her study. Out of ninety-six high schools offering performing choirs, only thirty-three of the choir directors completed the MMPI (73, pp. 2-4).

A significant number of the subjects had scores greater than two standard deviations above the mean (50.00) on eight of the nine MMPI clinical scales and the K and L factor scales. These scores were beyond the range of "normal" scores. Men had an significantly high mean score on the Masculinity-femininity scale (70.6). A high score on this scale suggested interest in the things that were considered to be typical of the opposite sex. This finding was very similar to other studies using the MMPI, and will be checked in the current study. The mean value for women, on the Masculinity-femininity scale, was significantly low at 42.5. It was concluded that this group was idealistic, sensitive and intense, with strong inner resources to cope with the anxieties shown by the MMPI reports (73, pp.
Slack's study had two serious problems first, the population was small; and second, the MMPI should not have been selected for use with "normal" people.

The most serious problem in all of the studies using the MMPI were the inherent difficulties of using a test which may not be appropriate for the population. Care should be taken with the use of the MMPI. This instrument, as a personality measure, has serious limitations. The inferences drawn from the responses to this inventory may not be valid. The MMPI has a psycho-pathological basis which may be inappropriate or inadequate for the understanding of normal behavior (65, p. 226).

The MMPI was normed on subjects who were psychiatric patients and thus should only be used as a part of a clinical battery. It was designed for clinical assessment, and a major problem in using it with "normal" people is that the results of the test may overestimate the extent of disturbances (59, p. 251). This may have been the case with Lutz, Fosse, Slack and some of the other studies using the MMPI.

**Eysenck Personality Inventory**

Mann looked at the relationships that existed between festival ratings, teacher background, teacher personality, teaching techniques, band student's characteristics, and school conditions among public high school band directors.
in Mississippi (55, pp. 1-3). There were 132, out of the 156 directors who entered bands in the 1978 Mississippi High School Band Festival, who completed the Eysenck Personality Inventory and a questionnaire Mann developed (55, pp. 15-16). The EPI "tested two major dimensions of personality" (55, p. 16) which Mann felt were important extroversion-introversion, and neuroticism-stability.

Mann's findings indicated that "festival success of . . . band directors can best be predicted by variables related to the director's teaching environment" (55, p. 106). These were (1) school enrollment; (2) number of outside teachers employed in the pre-season training; (3) the number of students in the "top" band; (4) the number of marching contests attended; (5) having an assistant band director; (6) there was an inverse relationship between the number of hours the director spent in home room and other duties and ratings; (7) the band's budget (55, pp. 106-107). These variables were almost the same ones listed by Rhinehart as the reasons given by music teachers for leaving the music teaching profession (71, p. 86). Rhinehart's findings of inadequate salary, poor facilities, and poor or no equipment, were in agreement with Mann's findings. Mann's study had an adequate sample, but he used a limited personality test. His data supported the findings of Beaver (9), Anderson (2, 3) and Rhinehart (71).
Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey

Anderson and Beaver employed the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (GZTS) to identify personality traits of music teachers.

The purpose of Anderson's study was to find the existing evaluative instruments which measure qualities that leading American educators have considered important as characteristics of successful music teachers. Further, it was the purpose to determine the relation of these various quality measures to successful student teaching in music (2, p. 2).

He used the GZTS to measure the personality traits (2, pp. 58-60) of three samples which consisted of (a) nineteen music student teachers from the University of Southern California in the 1964-65 school year, (b) twenty tenured teachers, and (c) ten master teachers. The student teachers were divided into a high potential group, made up of student teachers who had good ratings from their master teachers and music education coordinator, and low potential group, made up of student teachers who had low ratings from their master teachers and music education coordinator (2, pp. 69-77).

When compared to all the student teachers, the tenured teachers record significantly higher scores in friendliness and objectivity, but student teachers scored higher than the tenured teachers on the masculinity scale (2, p. 84). There was no significant difference between the high
potential student teachers and master teachers on any of the GZTS scales (2, p. 84). One of Anderson's conclusions was that the lack of difference between the high potential student teachers and master teachers would seem to suggest that the high potential student teachers may have the same personality characteristics as the sample of master teachers (2, pp. 85-86). Anderson's study employed a small sample of subjects. Thus the results of the study have a limited application to a more general population.

Beaver's study investigated (A) "the personality and value characteristics of successful high school band directors in North Carolina" (9, p. 1), and determined (B) "whether successful high school band directors differ from a random sampling of high school band directors in tests of personality, cultural values, and administrative practices" (9, p. 1).

The GZTS was used (9, pp. 27-28). His sample was made up of fourteen high school band directors, chosen by a jury as being successful. A control group, of twenty three band directors, was selected at random from a list of North Carolina high school band directors (9, p. 28-32).

Beaver found the GZTS scores of the sample group differed significantly from the published norms on the General Activity and Masculinity scales. He found a significant difference between the scores on three scales with the control group and the sample. These were
Objectivity, Thoughtfulness, and Masculinity (9, pp. 71-72). The low scores in masculinity in Beaver's study supports the findings in Anderson's research (2, p. 84).

A comparison of the sample (Group I) and control group (Group II) suggested

1. Group I members taught in larger high schools,
2. Group I members had larger high school band programs,
3. Group I members all held the master's degree,
4. Group I members were more likely to work for administrators who considered the band program an integral part of the total school program,
5. Group II members felt that moral support of the band program was an important way in which their administrators could help the band program,
6. Group I members were more likely to have teacher assistants to help with the band program (9, pp. 72-73).

These findings are very much like Mann's list of predictors of success in the teaching environment (55, pp. 106-107). Rhinehart's list of reasons for teachers leaving the teaching profession was also reflected in Beavers findings (71, p. 86). Although the Beaver study used a small population to gain these findings, he did a good job anyway.

**Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire**

Four pertinent studies using the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) were selected.

Barth's study determined an objective method to improve the guidance, selection, and admission of students into a music education program (8, p. 2). Barth used the 16PF to
measure personality characteristics which he compared with music teacher effectiveness (8, pp. 47-51).

He used 316 school music teachers in his research; they were placed into two contrasting groups. One group had 156 music teachers, nominated by specialists. The general sample had 160 teachers who were unselected certificated music teachers (8, pp. 40-42). He found when comparing mean scores on the 16PF, only factor B (General Mental Ability), had a statistical difference between selected and general sample (8, p. 157).

Bullock's finding of the interaction of the 16PF and the MSQ indicated the junior high school instrumental music teachers who were rated "superior" by high school instrumental music teachers possessed the following attributes shy, sober, humble, reserved, and self-sufficient. They were concerned about their compensation, but not about praise. They enjoyed doing things for other people without thought of advancement. They were creative people with high ego strength, who were realistic, tough-minded, conscientious, persistent, and conservative, with practical down-to earth concerns. They are also unpretentious and genuine, willing to accept other's judgements. They were satisfied doing the same job many times and are not concerned with community status. (17, pp. 124-131). One of his conclusions was that "these may be necessary ingredients for the successful junior high school
instrumental music teacher" (17, p. 141). His population was small and he only used one form of the 16PF, which he said was a weakness, but he felt it would have a better chance to be completed than if he had used both forms.

Funk examined the personality variables, professional practices, opinions and attitudes of high school band and choir teachers and high school administrators in southern Arizona (33, p. 1). Funk noted the existence of serious conflicts between high school administrators and music teachers in his review of literature (33, pp. 9-105).

Funk assumed that basic differences in personality traits of music teachers and administrators might underlie the friction (33, p. 1). His study population was drawn from thirty-four southern Arizona high schools. Fifty-five music teacher and fifty-five administrators took part in the study (33, pp. 106-109).

Funk used the 16PF (Form A) (33, pp. 109-114). He concluded that his findings "coupled with strong evidence from earlier research, affirms the existence of distinctive personality and interest patterns in music teachers, as well as in other groups of teachers working in a single subject area" (33, p. 150). He found a significant difference at the .05 level or beyond in sixteen of twenty-three personality factors, between the music teachers and school administrators (33, p. 145).
The scores of the 16PF indicated that the music teachers were outstanding in creativity, social polish, sensitivity, conscientiousness, self-sufficiency, neuroticism, imaginativeness, tenseness, anxiety, self-discipline, will power and social boldness. They were conservative, introverted, serious-minded and rather carefree (33, p. 150). Funk's findings indicated that both the music teachers and administrators lacked objectivity and tended to react on the basis of feeling rather than thought (33, pp. 152-157).

Krueger's study looked at personality and success in music teaching. Krueger was influenced by the research of Lutz and Fosse (49, pp. 164-165). He investigated the relationships between personality, motivational factors and music teaching success. Two of the questions he examined were

... What are the relationships and inter-relationships of personality variables measured by the 16PF and ... Do personality profiles differ for successful and unsuccessful male and female music teachers (49, p. 4)?

Krueger employed two samples: music teachers (N=209) and student music teachers (N=73). The subjects came from eighty school districts in sixteen state, and Puerto Rico (49, pp. 342-343).

He concluded "that personality and motivational factors are related to music teaching success in some fairly
powerful ways" (49, p. 368). The findings of the 16PF indicated that the successful music teacher was more traditional, serious and accommodating, less experimenting and assertive, and more attached to the home. These music teachers would not "rock the boat" or irritate those in charge (49, pp. 323-333).

In the four studies that used the 16PF, Barth said that teachers with high satisfaction were higher on general mental ability, perseverance, persistence, more self-sufficient, accepting outgoing, understanding, permissive, confident, self-secure, less tense and anxious, were more active and have greater leadership qualities, and were emotionally stable (8, pp. 153-154). Bullock found the "superior" teachers were shy, sober, humble, reserved, and self-sufficient, concerned about compensation, but not praise, also they like doing things for people, were creative, realistic, tough-minded, conscientious, persistent, and conservative (17, p. 141). Self-sufficient and persistent were the only traits on both of these lists. Bullock's findings were in agreement with Rhinehart (71).

Funk showed music teachers were high in creativity, social polish, sensitivity, conscientiousness, tenseness, anxiety, self-discipline, will power and social boldness, introverted, serious minded and rather carefree (33, pp. 152-157). This list was not in agreement with either Bullock's or Barth's findings. Krueger stated that
successful music teachers were more traditional, serious, and accommodating, less experimenting and assertive (49, pp. 323-333).

An important point was presented in the eighth edition of the Mental Measurements Yearbook (MMY) which stated that the B, M, N, and Q₂ scales of the 16PF should not be used. This was due to the low test-retest reliability on these scales. The findings were revealed that after just two to seven days the retest on the B, L, M, N, and Q₁ were all less than .70, when using both the A and B forms of the 16PF. Using forms C and D the reliability on the M, N, and Q₂ were less than .70. The article goes on to say that a two month test-retest on only the B form showed there was less than a .70 correlation. This indicated substandard reliability (less than .70) on the B, M, N, and Q₂ scales of the 16PF. These scales had content sampling problems "where their reliability is demonstrable" (19, p. 1078) is also made. This would be the case when only one form of the inventory was used. This was true with Funk's and Bullock's studies. Krueger and Barth used both the A and B forms.

**Omnibus Personality Inventory**

There were two studies that used the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI); these were by Banks and Farmilo.
The purpose of Banks's study was to determine if there was a difference between entering freshmen in two and four-year colleges in the area of music by personality characteristics (6, pp. 6-9). He used the OPI to measure personality characteristics (6, p. 23).

The findings of the OPI indicated that a "significant difference existed between the males and females in personality characteristics" (6, p. 57). He also noted that four-year college males scored higher on the intellectual disposition, thinking introversion, theoretical orientation, estheticism, complexity, autonomy, religious orientation and response bias scales than the two-year college males (6, p. 57). From the OPI scores he concluded that four-year college males may have had a greater interest in learning, have been more independent, more liberal, less committed to fundamental beliefs, and were highly sensitive to artistic stimulation. The two-year college students worked better with concrete facts rather than with abstract ideas, they prefered short factual questions over those that require organization. The two-year college students were more authoritarian, less independent and more conservative than four-year college students (6, pp. 57-58).

Farnilo researched a theoretical basis for understanding the relation of creativity and teaching style in elementary school music teachers. She also looked for
different personality characteristics among elementary music teachers with different teaching styles (26, pp. 188-211).

Farmilo used the scores of the OPI to develop a personality profile for a group of fifty-three female subjects (26, pp. 102-108). Based on the OPI scores Farmilo concluded that the personality traits of an outstanding female elementary music teacher were

- enjoys pondering ideas
- enjoys a wide variety of music and art
- enjoys complex many-faceted problems
- enjoys ambiguity
- is independent, not dependent on others for enjoyment although liking to be with others
- is sometimes anxious
- is highly ethical and enjoys helping others
- is not pragmatic
- is artistic as opposed to scientific
- is not insecure (26, p. 202).

It should be noted that the OPI was designed for use with college freshman. It should not have been used to test teachers in the profession.

Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

Wink studied the possible relationships between self-concept, personality need system, and anxiety level of music student teachers and their achievement in their student teaching (84, pp. 6-8). The population was composed of the entire population of music student teachers at The Ohio State University for the 1966-67 academic year. The number of students that completed the requirements were
thirty-two (84, p. 37). The EPPS was used to measure the personality of the student teachers (84, pp. 38-47).

Among the findings of the EPPS was that the subjects in Wink's study were significantly higher than the normal population on scales which measured self-concept, deference, and order, they were significantly lower on scales which measured affiliation, interception, and anxiety (84, pp. 147-152).

It should be noted that the test-retest reliability of the EPPS is listed as being from .74 to .88 and the split half reliability is .60 to .87, yet Anastasi states that these scores "may be somewhat inflated" (1, p. 512).

Summary

These have been a number of different tests that have been used to measure personality traits of music teachers. Several factors should be noted about these various measures. There were several studies which used tests that were not appropriate for the population that were tested. In this category could be included the studies of Fosse (32), Lutz (54), and Slack (73), which made use of the MMPI and Farmilo (26), who used the OPI. There were several studies which had small population, this cast doubt on these findings. Studies with small population included those by Fosse (32), Slack (73), Anderson (2, 3), Beaver (9), Farmilo (26), Wink (84), and Bullock (17). Several
studies used tests which have sub-tests with poor reliability; this included the studies of Barth (8), Bullock (17), Funk (32), Krueger (49), and Wink (84). Mann (55) used a test with limited scope. Anderson (2, 3) and Beaver (9) used a test that may have been out of date.

Several studies had similar findings; among them were Krueger (49), Lutz (54), and Anderson (2, 3), who noted that music teachers were a homogeneous group; this was according to scores on their personality tests. Anderson (2, 3), Beaver (9), Flanagan (29), Posse (32), and Slack (73) noted that male music teachers scored low on the masculinity scales of the various personality tests that were used.

Personality Factors and Job Satisfaction

This section examines the literature relating to the relationships which have been shown to exist between job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and personality traits among music teachers. There are three parts in this section. The first part examines the relationship between job satisfaction and personality traits in general. The second part examines the relationship between job satisfaction and personality traits for teachers. The third part examines the relationship between job satisfaction and personality traits for music teachers.
Personality Factors and Job Satisfaction
in the General Population

Herzberg wrote that personality was an important factor in job satisfaction (44, p. 215). Ward and Rushton noted that job satisfaction was a function of the more positive aspects of a person's personality (79, p. 358). Bullock concluded that job satisfaction could be traced to definite personality traits (17, p. 3). Hoagland (45), Moore (61), Heron (43, pp. 15-20), and Urban (77) have all associated specific personality traits of teachers with job satisfaction (17, p. 6).

Fisher and Hanna wrote

...much of the vocational maladjustment in American industry is the result neither of intellectual deficiency nor technical incompetency, nor of objectionable factors inherent in the work itself, but rather of non-adjustive emotional tendencies within the individual which make a reasonable degree of harmony between him and most types of work impossible (28, p. 1).

However, other writers disagree (85, p. 11).

Friend and Haggard asked vocational counselors to interview factory workers. The vocational counselors rated the workers on a 173 item inventory. They obtained information on the subjects background, character, and job satisfaction. The subjects were placed into high and low groups based on their answers to questions dealing with work adjustment (30).

Friend and Haggard found that the personality characteristics of satisfied workers were those seen in
well-adjusted people. The dissatisfied workers tended to have poor-health, drank heavily, were fearful of failure, and tended to be self-defeating. Friend and Haggard concluded that these finding were "graphic demonstration that job adjustment is an integral part of the workers' entire way of life" (30, p. 20).

Walker and Guest findings indicated that in work which was repetitive or boring, on an assembly line for example, about twenty-five per cent of the workers either liked the work or were indifferent toward their jobs. Walker and Guest state that the capacity for liking or being indifferent toward a boring job appeared to lie in the personality of the worker (78, p. 55).

Tydlaska and Mengel (76) examined fifty workers at the Columbia-Southern Chemical Corporation in Louisiana. These workers were felt to have good work attitudes based on good work records for two or more years. Another group of sixty Air Force personnel, who were considered to have poor work attitudes because of forty-three A. W. O. L. cases, seven with disciplinary problems, and ten with other problems. All the subjects were white males. Both sets of subjects were matched on intelligence, age, education, and marital status. All the subjects were given the MMPI test. Of the fifty subjects who had good work records only one subject had scores two standard deviations above the norm (T=70 or more) on two or more scales. The discipline cases had
seventy-two per cent of their population with scores two
standard deviations above the norm on one or more scales
and, even more important, over forty-six per cent had T=70
or more on three or more scales. The writers "emphasize the
experimental nature" (76, p. 476) of the study and their
results (76, pp. 474-477).

Woodworth's study showed strong relations between
personality and job satisfaction. He used forty-five
research scientists for his subjects. He employed the
**Johnson Job Satisfaction Inventory** to measure job
satisfaction in general and on nine sub-tests for specific
aspects of job satisfaction. The subjects were given
sixteen different measures of personality by the University
of California's Institute of Personality Assessment and
Research. Woodworth's findings indicated that about
twenty-five per cent of the tests and sub-tests correlated
with general satisfaction scale at the .1 level or beyond.
The areas of correlation were freedom from anxiety,
personal stability, socialization, and potential for
achievement (85). Woodworth concluded that his findings
agreed with current theories on motivation, and that job
satisfaction was the results of the amount of agreement
between personality and the work environment (85).

The .1 level of chance lead to the type I error (reject
a null hypothesis when it is true). There were about 780
personality scores which were correlated with the ten job
satisfaction scales. The large number of significant findings were not unexpected. If the .01 or .001 level of chance had been used the only scales that would have been significant would have been from the MMPI and the CPI, which had the highest correlations with each of the job satisfaction scales.

**Personality Factors and Job Satisfaction Among Teachers**

Several writers have noted importance of personality traits of teachers in an education setting. Heddendorf stated that teacher education programs need to identify the personality characteristics which their students bring with them into the teacher education program (41, p. 310). Linden and Linden stated that there was a need for more research in the area of the personality traits of student teachers (51, p. 351). Henjum believed information pertaining to personality traits of teachers would help individuals reach their potential effectiveness and reduce the number of teachers leaving the teaching profession (42, pp. 143-147).

There have been several studies that have found no relationship between job satisfaction and personality traits of teachers Barnes (7), Forman (31), Hammer (39), Kuhn (50), Murphy (62), Parkay (66), and Urban (77). The following studies found job satisfaction increases with age Bishop (13), Hamlin (38), Hoagland (45), and Moore (61).
Mauldin reported that elementary teachers were more satisfied with their work than were high school or junior high school teachers (56). Fawley concluded that high school teachers were more stable emotionally and exhibited more masculinity than elementary and junior high school teachers. Elementary teachers were more empathic toward their students than were junior high or high school teachers. Junior high teachers were less satisfied with their jobs than elementary and high school teachers (27).

Biondolillo stated that teachers who used "individually prescribed instruction" (I.P.I.) were more satisfied with their work than were teachers who used regular teaching methods (12). Greenstein found different level's of job satisfaction of teachers in different buildings. He felt this was due to the expectations of the job not matching the perceptions of the teachers role in the school (37).

Asher concluded that job satisfaction of both elementary and junior high school school teachers was affected by the educational environment of the school (socioeconomic status of the student population of the school) and by the ability to teach in an understanding, friendly manner (5). Little found a significant difference in both personality traits and job satisfaction between distributive education teachers and a random sample of teachers (52). Bodenstab found teachers were psychologically heterogeneous (16).
Smith studied personality traits of first year elementary school teachers; he found female teachers were higher in scales measuring friendliness, cheerfulness, and admired factors than male teachers. Professionally certified teachers were higher than provisionally certified teachers on poise and strict control factors (74).

**Personality Factors and Job Satisfaction Among Music Teachers**

Schneider and Cady stated "further analysis of the music teacher personality should be conducted using a wide variety of instruments and a large population so limits and tolerances can be established for the purpose of guidance, selection and retention at the undergraduate level" (72, p. 323).

Bullock examined both personality traits and job satisfaction among music teachers. He stated there was no significant difference between his study and control groups in their personality traits and job satisfaction levels (17, p. 70). He did, however, also looked at the correlation between the 16PF and the MSQ factors of his study group only. He found correlations between 16PF factor A and MSQ Social Service and Recognition; 16PF factor C and the MSQ scales of Variety, Co-workers, Achievement, Ability Utilization, Responsibility, Creativity, Social Status, and Recognition; 16PF factor E with MSQ Compensation and Working Conditions; 16PF factor F with Activity and
Recognition; 16PF factor M with Working Conditions and Creativity; 16PF factor Q2 with Recognition, Supervision-Human Relations, Responsibility, Co-Workers, Supervision-Technical, Creativity, and Security; and the 16PF factor Q3 with the MSQ Advancement scale (17, pp. 125-130). Because of the large number of correlations there was a chance for the type I error.

Barth used the 16PF to measure personality characteristics which he compared between groups of music teachers, which were determined by the type of teaching certification they held (8, pp. 47-51). Barth noted that ninety-three selected teachers expressed the highest degree of job satisfaction and they differed on specific test areas from a ninety-five member general sample of teachers who expressed less job satisfaction. The satisfied teachers scored significantly higher on the 16PF than the less satisfied teachers on the general mental ability, perseverance and persistence subtests. The satisfied teachers were more self-sufficient, more accepting, outgoing, understanding, and permissive, more confident and self-secure, less tense and anxious, more active, possessed, had more leadership qualities, and were more emotionally stable (8, pp. 153-154). Barth's study had a large population; he used both the A and B forms of the
16PF, which gave him better reliability than if he had only
used one form.

**Summary**

Beaver (9), Chase (21), Funk (33), Mann (55), Monford
(60), and Rhinehart (71) reported conflicts between
teachers and administrators. Low pay has been listed as a
cause for dissatisfaction of music teachers (17, 71). Other
areas of their work that music teachers have reported
dissatisfaction about have been poor working conditions,
poor or no equipment, poor scheduling of classes, poor
funding, having non-musical duties, low prestige, and
conflicts with other school faculty members (17, 71).

In the area of personality traits there was little
agreement about common traits for music teachers. A study
by Nerviano and Weitzel indicated that two major
personality tests, even when traits have the same name, or
were said to have been measuring the same factor, were
shown not to be measuring the same thing (63).

Doubt has been cast on the findings of several studies
because of the use of small sample sizes or the use of a
test which was inappropriate for the population being
studied. However, one finding did turn up in several
studies which was the low masculinity score for male
teachers. This finding was reported by Anderson (2, 3),
Beaver (9), Flanagan (29), Fosse (32), Lutz (54), Slack (73), and others.

In the studies that examined the relationships between personality factors and job satisfaction, there has been general disagreement. Many studies have shown no relationship existed between personality factors and job satisfaction.
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CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The current study sought to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and personality traits of music teachers. The research problems were

1. to investigate the areas of job satisfaction among music teachers;

2. to investigate the patterns of personality traits that were common among music teachers;

3. to determine whether relationships existed between the areas in which music teachers showed job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and their personality profiles.

The current chapter will discuss (a) the selection of the measurement tests, why they were selected and their reliability and validity; (b) the selection of the subjects; (c) the administration of these tests to the subjects; and (d) the process for data evaluation.

The Selection of the Measurement Tools

The two instruments that were used in assessing the dependent variables were the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and the California Psychological Inventory (CPI). The MSQ was chosen because it possessed a rationale that fit the purpose of the study and had been
used in previous assessments of teacher job satisfaction (3, 8, 13, 22, 23, 24, 25, 31, 32, 33, 34, 39, 40). The CPI was chosen because it "is a research tool favored by many investigators" (27, p. 227), and after examining several major instruments, it has been considered as one of the best personality assessment measures (1, p. 505; 2; 4; 5; 6; 7).

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Currently there are very few standardized measures of job satisfaction; in addition the MSQ was primarily designed for use in research (3, 8, 18, 21, 25, 28, 36, 37, 38), and it has been used in several educational studies, five of which were reviewed in the current study. The MSQ is considered by professional counselors as one of the better assessment tools in the field for measuring job satisfaction (4, pp. 1679-1680). It has been used in several studies regarding job satisfaction of music instructors; thus the results of the current study could be compared with the earlier studies.

There are a total of twenty scales in the test. Each scale consists of five likert-type questions evaluating the following areas

1. Ability utilization (AU): The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.
2. Achievement (Ach): The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.
3. Activity (Act): Being able to keep busy all the time.
5. Authority (Aut): The chance to tell other people what to do.
6. Company policies and practices (CCP): The way company policies are put into practice.
7. Compensation (Com): My pay and the amount of work I do.
8. Co-workers (CW): The way my co-workers get along with each other.
9. Creativity (Cre): The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.
10. Independence (Ind): The chance to work alone on the job.
11. Moral Values (MV): Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.
12. Recognition (Rec): The praise I get for doing a good job.
14. Security (Sec): The way my job provides for steady employment.
15. Social service (SSe): The chance to do things for other people.
16. Social status (SSSt): The chance to be "somebody" in the community.
17. Supervision-human relations (SHR): The way my boss handles his men.
19. Variety (Var): The chance to do different things from time to time.
20. Working conditions (WC): The working conditions (37, pp. 1-2).

There was also a General Satisfaction (Gen) scale that gave a total evaluation of the subject's job satisfaction. This sub-test was made up of twenty items, one question from each of the other twenty sub-tests (36, 37, 38). The reliability scores (see the Appendix, TABLE I) of the twenty sub-tests were all between .74 and .92. These
scores were all within excepted range for this type of test.

**California Psychological Inventory**

The *California Psychological Inventory* (CPI) was authored by Harrison Gough and was initially published in 1957 (9, 10, 12, 15, 19, 20, 27, 29, 30). The CPI has been used in counseling centers, clinics, schools and by correctional agencies (27, pp. 4-5). The CPI was developed for use with normal people, and has been used to identify people in conflict with society, the **MMPI** showed people in conflict with themselves (27, p. 251). The **MMPI** has items similar to the CPI, in fact 178 items, out of 480, are nearly identical (27, p. 5). The CPI had been called "the sane man's **MMPI**" (27, p. 5), and the CPI may be used to obtain the **MMPI** scales' results with about the same reliability as a test-retest (27, p. 94-95). Because of the manner in which the **MMPI** was constructed, low scores had little or no meaning (27, p. 251). With the CPI this was not the case. Each of the CPI scales had a means of fifty and a standard deviation of ten (27, p. 6), and any score that was two or more standard deviations above or below the mean was considered a significant deviation from the norm. The normative data was obtained from 15,294 individuals representing thirty-one different groups, worldwide (27, p. 4). The Woodworth study suggested that the **MMPI** and the
CPI would be the best personality tests for the current study (42). Reasons for not using the MMPI were discussed on pages 50-51. Anastasi says, "The CPI is one of the best personality inventories currently available" (1, p. 505).

The split-half reliability (see the Appendix, TABLE II) for 550 men and women of the CPI scales ranged from .86 for the Sense of Well-being scale to .62 for the Psychological-mindedness scale (27, p. 31). The Cm (Communality) and Py (Psychological-mindedness) scales were the only scales under .70, the Cm scale was .63 and the Py scale was .62 (27, p. 31). Gough stated

The Cm scale . . . is a 28-item scale with an extremely skewed distribution. The modal score in a test sample is usually 25 or 26, with values below 20 being almost never observed. This clustering of high scores means that a fluctuation in response to one or two items will markedly affect an individual's relative standing on Cm. The Py scale contains only 22 items and because of its shortness is susceptible to changes in one or two items (20, pp. 19-20).

The content validity of the scales was reported in the CPI Manual. One example of the cross-validation of the CPI can be seen with the Dominance (Do) scale. This was done by having fifteen high school principals name their school's student leaders. This produced a list of ninety males and eighty-nine females. The Do scale was administered to these students and over 7,500 unselected students. There was a significant difference between the selected and
unselected students at the .01 level for both males and females (20, p. 20).

The CPI scales are

1. Do (dominance) Assess factors of leadership ability, dominance, persistence, and social initiative.
2. Cs (capacity for status) Serves as an index of an individual's capacity for status (not his actual or achieved status). The scale measures the personal qualities and attributes which underlie and lead to status.
3. Sy (sociability) Identifies persons who are outgoing, sociable, participative temperament.
4. Sp (social presence) Assess factors such as poise, spontaneity, and self-confidence in personal and social interaction.
5. Sa (self-acceptance) Assess factors such as sense of personal worth, self-acceptance, and capacity for independent thinking and action.
6. Wb (sense of well-being) Identifies persons who minimize their worries and complaints, and who are relatively free from self-doubt and dis-illusionment.
7. Re (responsibility) Identify persons who are conscientious, responsible, and dependable disposition and temperament.
8. So (socialization) Indicates the degree of social maturity, integrity, and rectitude which the individual has attained.
10. To (tolerance) Identifies persons with permissive, accepting, and non-judgmental social beliefs and attitude.
11. Gi (good impression) identifies persons capable of creating a favorable impression, and who are concerned about how others react to them.
12. Cm (communality) Indicates the degree to which an individual's reactions and responses correspond to the Modal ("common") pattern established for the inventory.
13. Ac (achievement via conformance) Identifies those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where conformance is a positive behavior.
14. Ai (achievement via independence) Identifies those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where autonomy and independence are positive behaviors.
15. \( Ie \) (intellectual efficiency) Indicates the degree of personal and intellectual efficiency which the individual has attained.

16. \( Py \) (Psychological-mindedness) Measures the degree to which the individual is interested in, and responsive to, the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others.

17. \( Fx \) (flexibility) Indicates the degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior.

18. \( Fe \) (femininity) Assess the masculinity or femininity of interests. High scores indicate more feminine interests, low scores more masculine (20, pp. 10-11).

The Selection of the Subjects

The sample was drawn from the population of graduate music education majors attending North Texas State University from the Summer of 1983 to the Summer of 1985 who volunteered to participate in the study. The sample was composed of 107 music teachers, sixty-three men and forty-four women. There were forty-five band directors, twenty-five private lesson instructors, nineteen general music teachers, eleven choir directors, and five orchestra directors.

All the teachers in the current study were treated as a single group. Snapp has stated

It should perhaps be recognized at the outset that there are at the present no mutually exclusive specialist groups in the music profession. With the exception of public school teacher requirements, no external restrictions have been imposed on the types of musical endeavor in which an individual may engage. Many professional performers were formerly granted special certificates to teach in the public schools, and the practice still persists in some areas (34, pp. 56-57).
The researcher has taught music for several years and concurs with Snapp's observations. While the results may not apply to any other population, the population was chosen because it seemed to be a typical cross section of music teachers. For example there were teachers with various amounts of experience, some had taught for less than one year, while others had more than twenty-five years of experience and there were teachers in both large and small school districts.

Administration of the Measurement Tools

The MSQ and CPI were administered to graduate music education students at North Texas State University, in Denton, Texas, from the Summer of 1983 to the Summer of 1985. These tests were given to students in their regular classes, with the permission of the instructors. The tests were administered by a Licensed (by the State of Texas) Professional Counselor, with experience of having given over 10,000 tests. In each class a short discussion of the tests and their purposes was presented, then the instructions of both tests were read to the classes. In the case of the MSQ, the teachers were told to think of the questions in terms of the schools in which they worked. The subjects were given the CPI and instructed to take as much time as needed to complete it. Upon completing the test they received a copy of the MSQ. They were informed to take
as much time as needed on the second test. Most of the subjects were able to complete both tests in about one hour. The room conditions were comfortable and distractions did not occur during the test period.

The first research problem was to investigate the areas of job satisfaction among music teachers. Data about this were obtained by the use of the MSQ (21, 28, 36, 37, 38). The second research problem was to investigate the personality traits that were common among music teachers. The data were gathered by the use of the CPI (19, 20, 27). Data to resolve the third problem came from identifying relationships between the MSQ and the CPI (14, 16, 17, 25, 26, 35, 41, 42).

The CPI test books, scoring sheets, and answer keys were purchased from the test's publisher, Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. (19, 20, 27). Copies of the MSQ were purchased from its publisher, the University of Minnesota (36, 37, 38).

As Krueger stated: "Personality information is, by nature, an invasion of privacy. Therefore, the utmost caution was exercised in handling the data" (22, p. 180). Before the test was administered, meetings were held with the music teachers taking part in the study. The nature of the study was discussed, along with how the information gained would be used. The music teachers were also assured that their names and their individual scores would not be
given or reported. They were also assured that the scores would be treated as group scores. A code number was assigned to each music teacher to assure confidentiality. Only the writer had knowledge of each music teacher's test scores regarding the assessment of personality traits and job satisfactions. The answer sheets were hand scored by the writer.

Evaluating the Data

The statistical tests used to evaluate the data were rank order correlation, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, and Analysis of Variance. Although the Multiple Linear Regression approach would have had less chance for test error, the sample size was deemed too small for appropriate statistical testing. Thus the Multiple approach was not used (11, 14, 26, 27, 35, 41, 42).

The rank order correlation (26, 35) was used to determine if the MSQ results of the current study's subjects was like Bullock's subjects results (3). The analysis of variance (26, 35) was used to determine if the results of men and women were alike on both the MSQ and the CPI. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (26, 35) was used to determine if there was a significant relationship between the scores obtained by the subjects on the MSQ and the CPI (11, 14, 26, 27, 35, 41, 42). Megaree has stated that "a correlation coefficient is the best
measure of the relationship between a given pair of scales" (27, p. 105).
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Research Problem One

The first research problem was to investigate the areas of job satisfaction among music teachers, which in effect, asked the question, "what were the aspects of work which the music teachers liked, what were the aspects of work which the music teachers were neutral, and what were the aspects of work which the music teachers disliked?" To determine worker satisfaction the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (26) was administrated to 107 music teachers.

The MSQ consists of twenty scales and a General Satisfaction (Gen) scale. The twenty scales were Ability utilization (AU); Achievement (Ach); Activity (Act); Advancement (Adv); Authority (Aut); Company policies and practices (CCP); Compensation (Com); Co-workers (CW); Creativity (Cre); Independence (Ind); Moral Values (MV); Recognition (Rec); Responsibility (Res); Security (Sec); Social service (SSe); Social status (SSe); Supervision-human relations (SHR); Supervision-technical (ST); Variety (Var); and Working Conditions (WC) (26, p. 3).
The Analysis of Variance program from the Advanced Statistical Analysis software, developed by Radio Shack for the TRS-80 Model III microcomputer (catalog number 26-1705) was used to estimate the difference in the scores obtained by male and female teachers. The results of the ANOVA test indicated that the two groups of subjects possessed similar characteristics. Thus it seemed logical to study the subjects as a single group.

The Data

The mean scores of the MSQ scales (see Appendix, TABLE III) on which the music teachers indicated satisfaction (a score of 20.00 or higher) are reported in rank order Social Service (ability to do things for others) 21.62; Moral Values (do things that don't go against the teacher's conscience) 21.46; Activity (able to stay busy) 20.85; Achievement (feeling of accomplishment) 20.80; Creativity (chance for the teachers to try their own ideas and methods) 20.65; Ability Utilization (able to make use of their abilities) 20.18. These scales all had small standard deviations, often only about 2.00. This indicated that many of the teachers possessed similar views regarding their work.

On many of the MSQ scales the music teachers indicated they derived only a little satisfaction, or were neutral, these were (in rank order) Responsibility (freedom to use
their judgment) 19.82; Independence (work alone on their job) 19.48; Variety (do different things from time to time) 19.47; Co-workers (how well fellow workers get along together) 19.23; Recognition (praise worker gets for doing a good job) 18.86; Working Conditions 18.04; Authority (worker's own view of their own authority) 18.03; Social Status (standing in the community) 17.56; Security (job provides steady employment) 17.53; Supervision Human relations (the way the supervisor handles his workers) 17.36; Supervision technical (competence of the supervisor) 17.18; and General Satisfaction (an over-all view the job satisfaction of the worker) 75.11 (out of 100).

There were three areas of the MSQ on which the music teachers indicated very little satisfaction or even dissatisfaction, these were (in rank order) Company policies and practices (the way the schools policies are put into practice) 16.08; Advancement (chance for advancement) 15.59; and Compensation (pay for work done) 14.14.

From these scores it was determined that the areas which the music teachers indicated most job satisfaction were Social service; Moral values; Activity; Achievement; Creativity; and Ability utilization. On most of the factors of work measured by the MSQ the music teachers indicated some satisfaction or that they were neutral. There were three aspects of their employment which the music teachers
were not satisfied Company policies and practices; Advancement; and Compensation. A review of the literature (see pp. 31-38) pointed out that the General Satisfaction score (75.11) was within the range of scores reported (73.58 to 83.77) in other studies, but the results of the study were lower than all but one of the other studies with regards to general job satisfaction.

Bullock's 1974 (4) study group of junior high school music teachers in upstate New York (see pp. 42-43) had a mean score of 78.33 (see the Appendix, TABLE IV). It was found that there was a significant rank order correlation between Bullock's reported scores and the findings of the current study of 0.71.

It should also be noted that the finding of the current study regarding areas of teacher dissatisfaction were in agreement with the finding reported in other studies in the Review of Literature section (see pp. 37-44). For example Rhinehart's findings (see pp. 38-39) indicated teachers' dissatisfaction with salary, facilities, and with their administrators, with which the current study's findings are in agreement. The current study was also in agreement with the findings of Funk (see pp. 57-58) concerning music teachers' dissatisfaction with their school administrators.
Research Problem Two

The second research problem was to investigate the patterns of personality traits that were common among music teachers. This problem sought to determine, "what were the personality traits (or factors) which were common among these music teachers?" To investigate these personality trait patterns for music teachers the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) (7, 8, 23) was used. This instrument measured personality factors in eighteen areas. These scores are normally taken together to form an overall profile for a group of people. The CPI scales were Dominance (Do); Capacity for status (Cs); Sociability (Sy); Social presence (Sp); Self-acceptance (Sa); Sense of well-being (Wb); Responsibility (Re); Socialization (So); Self-control (Sc); Tolerance (To); Good impression (Gi); Communality (Cm); Achievement via conformance (Ac); Achievement via independence (Ai); Intellectual efficiency (Ie); Psychological-mindedness (Py); Flexibility (Fx); and Femininity (Fe) (7, 8, 23). Because there was no significant difference found between men and women's scores on the CPI, they were combined and treated as a single group. This was expected after reviewing the literature (1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18).
The Data

The mean scores of the music teachers on the eighteen CPI scales (see Appendix, TABLE V) were Dominance 59.55; Capacity for Status 55.67; Sociability 54.04; Social presence 55.04; Self-acceptance 61.35; Sense of well-being 46.70; Responsibility 47.47; Socialization 49.37; Self-control 45.66; Tolerance 47.93; Good impression 47.25; Communality 52.03; Achievement via conformance 54.75; Achievement via independence 55.29; Intellectual efficiency 49.16; Psychological-mindedness 53.45; Flexibility 50.54; and Femininity 52.33. It should be noted that these scores are reported in T scores (Mean=50.00). The large ranges and standard deviations indicated the subjects' scores were not similar.

Some examples of these large ranges and standard deviations are listed below. The Do scale had a range of forty-seven points, and the standard deviation was 9.98. The Cs scale had a range of thirty-nine points, the standard deviation was 9.57. The Sy scale had a range of forty-two points, and a standard deviation of 8.93. The Sp scale had a range of fifty-four points and the standard deviation was 10.72. The Sa scale had a range of thirty-seven points and the standard deviation was 8.20. Ac had a range of forty-seven points and the standard deviation was 10.15. The Ai scale had a range of scores of fifty points, with a standard deviation of 8.62. The Py
scale had a range of forty-seven points and the standard deviation was 9.86. The Wb scale had a range of sixty-three points and the standard deviation was 12.45. The Sc scale had a range of forty-two points and a standard deviation of 9.18.

One finding of interest was that the Femininity scale (which "assess the masculinity or femininity of interests. (High scores indicate more feminine interests, low scores more masculine" (8, p. 11).) was found to be within the normal range (52.33). It was reported in the review of literature section that many studies found that male teachers tend to obtain high scores on this type of scale, but they did not, as a group, in the current study. Perhaps this should be studied in the future.

These findings were not unexpected. DiAnn L'Roy, in her 1983 study at North Texas State University, stated "the undergraduate music education major did not appear to have one single reference group to which he looked for guidance in defining his beliefs, attitudes, values, and identity" (20, p. 162). The scores of school teachers in Kuhn's study indicated the same findings. She found that teachers had all the MBTI personality types (see pp. 32-33). This was also suggested for music teachers in the studies of Lutz, Foose, Slack, Anderson, Beaver, and Banks (see pp. 44-64). These findings indicate that there is no common personality for these music teachers.
Research Problem Three

The third research problem was to determine whether relationships existed between the areas in which music teachers showed job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and their personality profiles. The question which the third research problem asked was "were there any significant relationships between the ways music teachers liked or disliked their jobs, as measured by the MSQ and their personality patterns, as measured by the CPI?"

The correlation coefficient (22, 25) was used to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and personality traits. The MSQ had twenty-one scales and the CPI had eighteen scales. To determine if any relationship existed, all factors were compared from both tests. This lead to 378 correlation coefficient tests being performed. Some writers, Neter and Wasserman (6, 24), among them, have noted that this approach leads to a type I error (rejecting a null hypothesis when it is true). The Bonferroni formula has been recommended to correct this problem (24). Thus, it was used to compute the level of statistical probability for the current study. This was accomplished by dividing the level of probability (0.05) by the number of tests that were performed (378). The correct level of probability was 0.000132275, or about 0.0001. There were no relationships between the twenty-one MSQ scales and the eighteen CPI
scales which reached the 0.0001 probability of chance (see the Appendix, TABLE VI).

This finding does not agree with Bullock or Woodworth (see pp. 70-73), who found a number of relationships between personality traits and job satisfaction. However, Kuhn, Urban, Murphy, Barnes, Parkay, Hammer, and Forman did not find any relationships (see p. 68). If the 0.05 level of chance had been used in the current study, many relationships would, by chance alone, have been noted. These reported relationships, in other studies, might be due to chance factors.

Summary

The first research problem was to investigate areas of job satisfaction among music teachers. It was found that the music teachers in the current study were satisfied with the Social Service, Moral Values, Activity, Achievement, Creativity, and Ability Utilization aspects of their work, as measured by the MSQ. They were dissatisfied with the Company policies and practices, advancement, and Compensation aspects of their jobs.

The second research problem was to investigate the patterns of personality traits that were common among music teachers. It was found that there were no common personality traits among music teachers. These results are in agreement with the findings of other studies.
The third research problem was to determine whether relationships existed between the areas in which music teachers indicated job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and their personality profiles. It was determined that there were no relationships between job satisfaction and personality profiles in the current study which reached the .0001 level of chance.
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 CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Job satisfaction in music education has been researched by a number of people including Bodanske (2), Bullock (3), Rhinehart (17), Calder (4), White (23, 24), Snapp (19), and others. There have also been several studies that have examined the personality traits of music teachers; often these traits were associated with success in music teaching. This has included studies by Bullock (3), Fosse (6), Funk (7), Krueger (11), Lutz (13), Slack (18), and others. There has not been, however, a study that examined job satisfaction in music teachers and looked for a relationship between it and personality traits. Bullock studied both job satisfaction and personality traits, but did not establish a relation between them. This has been done in other fields, for example among research scientists; Woodworth (25) was able to establish relationships between job satisfaction and personality traits.
Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between personality traits and job satisfaction among music teachers.

Research Problems

The research problems were

1. to investigate the areas of job satisfaction among music teachers;
2. to investigate the patterns of personality traits that were common among music teachers;
3. to determine whether relationships existed between the areas in which music teachers showed job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and their personality profiles.

Methodology

The subjects were drawn from the population of graduate music education majors attending North Texas State University in Denton, Texas. These students all had experience teaching music. The subjects were tested between the summer of 1983 to the summer of 1985. There were a total of 107 music teachers whose scores were used. There were sixty-three men and forty-four women. There were: forty-five band directors, eleven choir teachers, nineteen general music teachers, twenty-five who were private lesson instructors, and five orchestra directors.
There was no evidence that there was a difference between the specialist groups in the music education profession (19, pp. 56-57). The current subjects were a designated sample, not a true random sample (which would have been drawn from the total population of music teachers). The results should not be applied to any group other than the designated population.

The MSQ (which gathered data on twenty-one job satisfaction traits) and CPI (which gathered data on eighteen personality factors) were administered to the study group. These tests were given to the music teachers in their regular classes at North Texas State University, with the permission of their instructors. The tests were administered by a Licensed Professional Counselor. In each class a short discussion of the tests and their purposes was presented, then the instructions of both tests were read to the classes. The subjects were instructed to take as much time as needed to complete both tests, first the CPI, followed by the MSQ.

Because of the personal nature of these inventories, the privacy of the participants was of utmost concern. They were informed about what information was being gained from these tests and how it would be used. They were assured their names were not to be used and individual scores would not be given or used. The scores were to be treated as groups scores.
The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used to gather information about the job satisfaction of the music teachers. The 1977 edition of the MSQ was used; it had 100 questions. There were twenty scales; each was composed of five questions, and a general satisfaction scale, which was composed of twenty questions, one from each of the twenty other scales. The following are the twenty sub-tests used in the current study and the general satisfaction scale.

Ability Utilization (AU)
Achievement (Ach)
Activity (Act)
Advancement (Adv)
Authority (Ach)
Company Policies and Practices (CCP)
Compensation (Com)
Co-Workers (CW)
Creativity (Cre)
Independence (Ind)
Moral Values (MV)
Recognition (Rec)
Responsibility (Res)
Security (Sec)
Social Service (SSE)
Social Status (SST)
Supervision-human relations (SHR)
Supervision-technical (ST)
Variety (Var)
Working Conditions (WC)
General Satisfaction (Gen) (21, 22)

Comparing these scales with research in the field, it was found that the MSQ scales covered the same work areas that were found to be important by the research studies (2, 3, 4, 17, 19, 23, 24).
The California Psychological Inventory (CPI) reported good reliability, good validity, was not an easy test to fake, and was shown, in the Woodworth (25) study, to be the most effective instrument in measuring personality traits in a study like the current one.

The CPI provided eighteen variables in the domain of personality traits. The following were the scales of the CPI:

- Dominance (Do)
- Capacity for status (Cs)
- Sociability (Sy)
- Social Presence (Sp)
- Self-acceptance (Sa)
- Sense of well-being (Wb)
- Responsibility (Re)
- Socialization (So)
- Self-Control (Sc)
- Tolerance (To)
- Good Impression (Gi)
- Community (Cm)
- Achievement via conformance (Ac)
- Achievement via independence (Ai)
- Intellectual Efficiency (Ie)
- Psychological-mindedness (Py)
- Flexibility (Fx)
- Femininity (Fe) (9, 10, 15)

For the analysis of data the Analysis of Variance and the correlation coefficient from the Advanced Statistical Analysis microcomputer software program were used. This was developed by Radio Shack for the TRS-80 Model III microcomputer (catalog number 26-1705). It was run on a Radio Shack TRS-80 Model III microcomputer. The rank order correlation (14, 20), and the Bonferroni formula (16) were also used.
The Results

The first research problem was to investigate the areas of job satisfaction among music teachers.

It was found that there was no difference between the score of men and women on the **MSQ** among the music teachers in the group studied. After this was determined all the scores of the music teachers were treated as a group.

The mean scores obtained by the subjects on each of the twenty sub-scales and the General Satisfaction scale were (in rank order) Social Service 21.62; Moral Values 21.46; Activity 20.85; Achievement 20.80; Creativity 20.65; Ability Utilization 20.18; Responsibility 19.82; Independence 19.48; Variety 19.47; Co-workers 19.23; Recognition 18.85; Working Conditions 18.04; Authority 18.03; Social Status 17.56; Security 17.53; Supervision Human relations 17.36; Supervision technical 17.18; Company policies and practices 16.08; Advancement 15.59; Compensation 14.14; and General Satisfaction 75.11.

The results of the mean scores of the twenty-one scales of the **MSQ** indicated the views of the music teachers about their job satisfaction (21, 22). The sub-tests on which the music teachers indicated their greatest (21, 22) job satisfaction were Social service; Moral values; Activity; Achievement; Creativity; and Ability Utilization. The scales on which the music teachers reported moderate satisfaction (21, 22) were Responsibility; Independence;
Variety; Co-workers; Recognition; Working Conditions; Authority; Social status; Security; Supervision human relations; Supervision technical; and General Satisfaction. The areas of their work on which the music teachers indicated little satisfaction or dissatisfaction (21, 22) were Company policies and practices; Advancement; and Compensation. In comparing these results with Bullock’s study, it was found that these two groups were similar, and their scores had a correlation of 0.71. The areas which the current study group indicated dissatisfaction were in agreement with findings reported in the review of literature section.

The second research problem was to investigate the patterns of personality traits that were common among music teachers. It was found that there was no statistical difference between the scores of men and women in this study on any of the eighteen CPI scales, and the rank-order correlation (20) indicated it to be significant beyond the 0.01 level. Because of this the scores of the women and the men were combined. It was found that the scores of these music teachers were not alike. The range of scores, the standard deviations, and review of the literature were used to determine this. It was concluded there was no pattern of personality traits common among these music teachers.

The mean scores of the music teachers on the eighteen CPI scales were Dominance 59.55; Capacity for Status 55.67;
Sociability 54.04; Social presence 55.04; Self-acceptance 61.35; Sense of well-being 45.70; Responsibility 47.47; Socialization 49.37; Self-control 45.66; Tolerance 47.93; Good impression 47.25; Communality 52.03; Achievement via conformance 54.75; Achievement via independence 55.29; Intellectual efficiency 49.16; Psychological-mindedness 53.45; Flexibility 50.54; and Femininity 52.33.

The third research problem was to determine whether there were relationships which existed between areas in which music teachers showed job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and their personality profiles.

Because of the large number of correlation coefficients performed (378), there was a risk of having the type I error (18); the Bonferroni formula (16) was used to correct for this error. This set the level of significance at about 0.0001. There were no significant relationships between the MSQ and the CPI at the .0001 level. It might be noted that if the Bonferroni formula had been used by Woodworth (25) or Bullock (3), perhaps none of their findings would have been significant.
Conclusions

From the first research problem it was concluded that there were certain aspects of the work environment, as measured by the MSQ, which the music teachers were satisfied or dissatisfied. These findings concurred with the results of the research of Bodanske (2), Bullock (3), Calder (4), Rhinehart (17), and Snapp (19).

From the second research problem it was concluded that (a) generally men and women, in the sample, had similar scores on personality traits (a correlation of 0.92), but (b) they, as a group, did not have a common personality profile. This finding had been suggested in the research of L' Roy (see page 106), and Fosse (5), Lütz (13), and Slack (18).

From the third research problem it was concluded that there would be no significant relationships between the factors of job satisfaction and the personality profiles of music teachers who were subjects in the current study at the .0001. This did not agree with the findings of Bullock (3), and Woodworth (25), who did report relationships between job satisfaction and personality traits. However, the current study's finding was conformed in studies of Kuhn, Urban, Murphy, Barnes, Parkay, Hammer and Forman (see page 68).
Recommendations

The replication of the present study which would investigate relationships between job satisfaction and personality traits should be done. An increase of the population, a random selection of teachers in the field or the use of other statistical instruments might yield different information. Also new norms need to be established for the MSQ, perhaps for music teachers as a group. Some questions which other studies might address could be

1. Why were these music teachers more dissatisfied than most of the classroom teachers?

2. What were the causes of the dissatisfaction of music teachers with their supervisors?

3. Why were music teachers dissatisfied with their relationships with their co-workers?

4. Why were music teachers dissatisfied with their job security?

5. Why did music teachers not have a common personality profile on the CPI?
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APPENDIX

TABLE I

The Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Hoyt Reliability Coefficients, of 191 Elementary School Teachers on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale**</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Hoyt*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>21.08</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aut</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cre</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>19.46</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHR</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>21.39</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var</td>
<td>20.88</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>82.14</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(37, p. 58)

**Hoyt**—Hoyt Reliability Coefficient (an Analysis of Variance method).

TABLE II

The Internal Consistency Coefficients and the Coefficients of Stability of the California Psychological Inventory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPI Scales</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Stability*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Status</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Presence</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Well-being</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Impression</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communality</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach. via Conformance</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach. via Independence</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Effic.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Mind.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(27, pp. 30-31)*

**"Consistency"—Split-half internal consistency coefficients for 550 men and women, "Stability"—Coefficients of Stability with one year between test and retest, based on the scores of 234 men and women."
TABLE III
The Rank Order Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of
107 Music Teachers on the Minnesota
Satisfaction Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSQ Scales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Values</td>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability Utilization</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Human relations</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision technical</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Policies &amp; Practices</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE IV

The Rank Order Comparison of the Mean Scores on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Between Twenty-Seven Junior High School Instrumental Music Teachers and 107 Music Teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSQ Scales*</th>
<th>Bullock's Mean</th>
<th>Bullock's Rank</th>
<th>Subjects Mean</th>
<th>Subject Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSe</td>
<td>18.41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cre</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aut</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHR</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res</td>
<td>21.11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach</td>
<td>22.37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>78.33</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>75.11</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4, p. 77)

**"AU"**—Ability utilization, **"Ach"**—Achievement, **"Act"**—Activity, **"Adv"**—Advancement, **"Aut"**—Authority, **"CCP"**—Company policies and practices, **"Com"**—Compensation, **"CW"**—Co-workers, **"Cre"**—Creativity, **"Ind"**—Independence, **"MV"**—Moral values, **"Rec"**—Recognition, **"Res"**—Responsibility, **"Sec"**—Security, **"SSe"**—Social service, **"SSt"**—Social status, **"SHR"**—Supervision-human relations, **"ST"**—Supervision-technical, **"Var"**—Variety, **"WC"**—Working conditions, **"Gen"**—General satisfaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPI Scales</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>59.55*</td>
<td>9.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for status</td>
<td>55.67</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>54.04</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social presence</td>
<td>55.04</td>
<td>10.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-acceptance</td>
<td>61.35</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of well-being</td>
<td>45.70</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>47.47</td>
<td>8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>49.37</td>
<td>8.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>45.66</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>9.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good impression</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communality</td>
<td>52.03</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement via conformance</td>
<td>54.75</td>
<td>10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement via independence</td>
<td>55.29</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual efficiency</td>
<td>49.16</td>
<td>10.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological-mindedness</td>
<td>53.45</td>
<td>9.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>50.54</td>
<td>10.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity</td>
<td>52.33</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reported in T scores (Mean=50.00)
### TABLE VI
The Relationships Between the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and the California Psychological Inventory, for 107 Music Teachers Using Correlation Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPI Scales</th>
<th>Gen*</th>
<th>SSE</th>
<th>Cre</th>
<th>MV</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Aut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do**</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cs</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sy</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wb</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gi</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>-.313</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai</td>
<td>-.296</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Py</td>
<td>-.218</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fx</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE VI—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPI Scales</th>
<th>CCP</th>
<th>SHR</th>
<th>Sec</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cs</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sy</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wb</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gi</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>-.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>-.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Py</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>-.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fx</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>-.254</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>-.300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE VI—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPI Scales</th>
<th>Rec</th>
<th>Ach</th>
<th>Act</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>SST</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>Res</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cs</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sy</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wb</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>-.225</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>-.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gi</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.276</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ie</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Py</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fx</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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