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The relationship between personality and performance has often been the focus of interest in the field of psychology (Binet, 1903; Busato, Prins, Elshout, & Hamaker, 2000; Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge & Bono, 2001; Noftle & Robins, 2007). Specifically, educational researchers have been interested in the effective prediction of academic performance whereas industrial researchers have been interested in how personality characteristics relate to personnel selection and job performance. Numerous research studies have been conducted over the years and have indicated a consistent relationship between personality and various outcomes such as school performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge & Bono, 2001; Noftle & Robins, 2007), career success (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999) and job satisfaction (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998), even when intelligence and cognitive ability are controlled for. Undoubtedly, personality traits play an important role in academic and work performance and this topic merits further investigation.

**Personality Correlates of Academic Performance**

Most universities’ admissions decisions are based on students’ high school academic performance, achievement test scores, and other factors such as letters of recommendation and personal statements. Even though research indicates that high school GPA, ACT or SAT scores are moderately predictive of college academic performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge & Bono, 2001; Noftle & Robins, 2007;
Martin, Montgomery, & Saphian, 2006), academic performance has also been related to
other cognitive processes, such as motivation and social orientation (Wolters 2004; Elliot
and Sheldon, 1997). More importantly, it is believed that academic performance is
strongly related to personality (Martin, Montgomery, & Saphian, 2006). Researchers
have attempted to establish links between college academic performance and personality
traits; the Big Five personality traits (McCrae & Costa, 1987) have been commonly used
to investigate the relationship between personality and academic performance
(Chamorro-Premuzic and Furnham, 2003, Noftle & Robins, 2007; Gellatly, 1996;
Paunonen and Ashton, 2001). These five personality factors are typically referred to as
conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, openness, and agreeableness (McCrae &
Costa, 1987). Among these five factors, conscientiousness has consistently shown a
positive relationship with test performance, grades, or GPA (Noftle & Robins, 2007;
conscientiousness is the strongest predictor of academic performance because
conscientious students are believed to be more organized, careful, precise, energetic, and
self-disciplined. Conscientiousness, also termed “the will to succeed,” expresses
intentional goal-driven behaviors (Digman & Takemoto-Chock, 1981). Individuals who
score low on conscientiousness tend to be less interested in achievement and working
toward success, and they are unable to meet their goals as a result of deficient self-
discipline (Eilam, Zeidner, & Aharon, 2009). This does not imply that such individuals
are lacking other qualities that might help in achieving goals. In contrast, individuals
who score high on conscientiousness tend to be more achievement oriented and differ from low-conscientious individuals in terms of performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

Martin, Montgomery, and Saphian (2006) state that the relationship between extraversion and academic performance is less clear. Some studies have shown a positive relationship between extraversion and academic performance (Chamorro-Premuzic and Furnham, 2003, Noftle & Robins, 2007; Gellatly, 1996), whereas others have shown negative (Goff & Ackerman, 1992) or non-significant (Paunonen & Nicol, 2001) relationship. Martin, Montgomery, and Saphian (2006) state that these inconsistent results may be due to the confusing construct of extraversion. The extraversion dimension includes a component of ambition, which includes a need for dominance and sociability. Individuals who score high on dominance or ambition may have greater motivation for achieving higher grades. On the other hand, students who score high on sociability may spend a greater amount of time and resources socializing rather than studying.

In terms of neuroticism, agreeableness, and openness to experience relating to academic performance, results have been unclear. Neuroticism was negatively related to performance in a few recent research studies (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003; Furnham & Mitchell, 1991; Heaven, Mak, Barry, & Ciarrochi, 2002), but most studies have reported nonsignificant results for this trait (Goff and Ackerman, 1992; Paunonen and Nicol, 2001; Rothstein, Paunonen, Rush, & King, 1994). Rothstein et al. (1994) also found that agreeableness was negatively related to academic performance; however, agreeableness has shown no significant effects in other studies (Dollinger and Orf, 1991;
Goff and Ackerman, 1992; Chamorro-Premuzic and Furnham, 2003). According to Martin, Montgomery, and Saphian (2006), the trait of openness shows a significant relationship to intelligence based on a previous study (Holland, Dollinger, Holland, & MacDonald, 1995); however, most empirical studies have found that openness is unrelated to performance in academia (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003 and Goff and Ackerman, 1992).

**Personality Correlates of Work Performance**

A great deal of research has investigated the relationship between personality and personnel selection. Most notably, the Big Five personality traits (McCrae & Costa, 1987) have consistently been used to investigate the relationship between personality and job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Digman, 1990; Gellatly, 1996). Conscientiousness has been shown to consistently predict work outcomes, including performance and training proficiency across occupational groups (Barrick & Mount, 1991). The trait of conscientiousness is expected to be related to job performance because it assesses personal characteristics such as being persistent, careful, responsible, and hardworking, which are significant attributes for accomplishing tasks in different jobs (Digman & Takemoto-Chock, 1981; Smith, 1967). Digman (1990) indicates that high conscientious individuals are dependable, reliable, and achievement oriented, whereas low scorers are careless and undependable. Barrick, Mount, and Straus (1993) suggest that highly conscientious salespeople are more likely to engage in goal setting than are those who score low on this personality dimension. A study by Gellatly (1996) extended this work further by examining the nature of the cognitive processes that are
involved in the relationship between conscientiousness and performance. Gellatly (1996) found that individuals who exhibited a strong sense of purpose, obligation, and persistence generally performed better than those who did not.

In terms of extraversion relating to job performance, the results have been mixed. A positive relationship between the trait of extraversion and job performance has been reported in sales success (Thoresen, Bradley, Bliese, & Thoresen 2004; Vinchur, Schippmann, Switzer, & Roth, 1998; Barrick, Stewart, and Piotrowski, 2002). Digman (1990) states that extraverts are more successful in the sales industry since they are characterized as gregarious, assertive, able to maintain positive emotion, active, and social, whereas individuals low in this trait tend to be detached, fearful, and socially withdrawn. Vinchur et al. (1998) also found extraversion to be a main predictor of both supervisory ratings of sales performance and actual sales volume. In addition, Barrick, Stewart, and Piotrowski (2002) found that extraverts were motivated to obtain status and interested in rewards at work and, because of these qualities, extraverts had increased sales totals compared to introverts. Nevertheless, the relationship between extraversion and prediction of performance across all jobs has not been supported in empirical research (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Barrick et al., 2001; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Mount & Barrick, 1995; Salgado, 1997). As Martin, Montgomery, and Saphian (2006) state, these inconsistent results may be due to the confusing construct of extraversion, as previously discussed.

The trait of neuroticism has been shown to be negatively related to job performance but the correlations were relatively low in most studies (Gellatly, 1996;
Barrick & Mount, 1991; Barrick, Mount, and Judge, 2001) and one study has shown a positive relationship between neuroticism and job performance (Thoresen, Bradley, Bliese, & Thoresen, 2004). Gellatly (1996) states that individuals exhibiting neurotic characteristics such as worry, nervousness, being temperamental, and showing tension will tend to be less successful than more emotionally stable individuals in all occupations because these traits tend to prevent rather than facilitate the accomplishment of work tasks. Barrick and Mount (1991) explain that low correlations between the trait of neuroticism and performance may be due to the nature of the participants. At the extreme, those individuals who are highly neurotic are unable to function effectively; as a result, those individuals are not likely to be in the labor force. Another explanation that Barrick and Mount (1991) propose is that there may not be a linear relationship between emotional stability and job performance; therefore, the predictive value of any differences is minimized. For example, Thoresen et al. (2004) conducted a study examining personality and sales performance in a group of pharmaceutical sales representatives and found a positive association between neuroticism and increased sales. Thoresen et al. (2004) propose that when people are confronted with stressful episodes, they take action, such as increasing the effort to eliminate the unpleasant emotions associated with stress. Therefore, some degree of neuroticism may actually be beneficial for performance under stressful conditions. Based on these overall results, Barrick and Mount (1991) suggest that researchers should interpret the relationship between neuroticism and job performance cautiously and further investigation is needed.
In terms of agreeableness and openness to experience relating to work performance, Thoresen et al. (2004) found a positive relationship between agreeableness and job performance. According to Thoresen et al (2004), agreeable individuals are more trustworthy and focused more on interpersonal interactions with customers, which is a critical quality when jobs require good customer service (Hogan & Holland, 2003; Mount, Barrick, & Stewart, 1998). In addition, Thoresen et al. (2004) found that openness to experience may be a key factor for job performance when employees are required to adapt to change, but is less important for steady state performance. However, the relationship between openness to experience and job performance has not been supported in other research (Gellatly, 1996; Barrick & Mount, 1991; Barrick, Mount, and Judge, 2001).

**Shortcomings of the Five Factor Model**

The Five-Factor personality model undoubtedly has been useful in helping researchers understand more about the relationship between personality and academic and job performance; however, the biggest problem with using the Five-Factor model of personality traits in explaining how personality is related to academic and job performance is inconsistency in its results. Even though conscientiousness has been repeatedly shown to be one of the predictors of academic success and job performance compared to the other four factors, the strength of the effect appeared to be different across studies (Paunonen, Jackson, Trzebinski, and Forsterling, 1992). Paunonen (1998) states that part of the reason might be due to the different facets of conscientiousness. Additionally, with regard to the other four factors of personality relating to academic and
job performance, results have been inconsistent or mixed. Gellatly (1996) states that the Five-Factor Model is too broad to explain how personality characteristics affect job performance and on-the-job behaviors. Lee, Sheldon, and Turban (2003) suggest that future research should use personality traits that include motivation and self-regulation components to examine academic and job performance. Lee, Sheldon, and Turban (2003) further state that a greater understanding of the motivational processes associated with personality characteristics would help school administrators and employers target these aspects of self-regulation for making policy changes. Rothstein et al (1994) state that other models should be considered and evaluated in order to gain a better understanding of the relationship between personality and academic and job performance. Therefore, a main focus of the current study is to gain a better understanding of the relationship between personality traits and academic and job performance by using a better model.

**Henry Murray’s Model**

Henry Murray (1893-1988) developed a theory of personality that was organized in terms of motives, presses, and needs (Murray, 1938). According to Murray (1938), a need is a drive that develops from within the individual and determines behavior; press is a drive that arises from environmental demands and determines behavior; thema is the interaction between needs and presses (Randolph & Wood, 1998). Murray’s (1938) theory of personality suggests that individuals’ behaviors are controlled by needs. Some needs are temporary and can change, whereas other needs are more deeply embedded. Murray (1938) believed that these needs function mostly on the unconscious level, but
play a major role in our personality and functioning. Murray (1938) also believed that each need is important in and of itself, but needs can be interrelated or support other needs and can conflict with other needs. In comparison to other personality psychologists, Murray (1938) focused much more on ability, need, and achievement and considered these components an important part of personality.

Murray’s (1938) identification of core psychological needs includes Abasement, Achievement, Affiliation, Aggression, Autonomy, Counteraction, Defendance, Deference, Dominance, Exhibition, Harmavoidance, Infavoidance, Nurturance, Order, Play, Rejection, Sentience, Sex, Succorance, and Understanding. These 20 traits or needs from Murray’s (1938)-theory of personality have made significant contributions to personality related research and have been the basis for a few widely used personality inventories. Some of these inventories are the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Edwards, 1970), the Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1967), and the Jackson Personality Inventory (Jackson, 1975a,b).

Numerous studies have been conducted based on Murray’s model of personality and his core psychological needs investigating the relationship between personality and academic and job performance (Bartels, Jackson, & Ryan 2010, Lamont & Lundstrom, 1977; Maudal, Butcher, & Mauger, 1974; Day & Silverman, 1989; Bretz, Ash, & Dreher, 1989; Steers 1975; Rothstein, Paunonen, Rush, & King, 1994). In personality and academic related research, the traits of achievement, harmavoidance, change, play, and impulsivity have been commonly used to investigate the relationship between personality and academic performance (Maudal, Butcher, and Mauger, 1974; Wong and
Csikszentmihalyi, 1991). Maudal, Butcher, and Mauger (1974) examined the role of personality in college attrition by using Murray's (1938) 20 personality traits. They examined personality differences among groups of persisters, transfers, and dropouts (only males were included in the study). A persister was defined as any student who was enrolled at Bethel College through the fourth semester. A dropout was any student who left Bethel College before the end of his second year and who had not enrolled at another school at the time the research was conducted. A transfer was any student who left Bethel College before the end of his second year and who enrolled at another school at the time the research was conducted. Maudal, Butcher, and Mauger (1974) found that persisters scored higher on the traits of achievement and harmavoidance and scored lower on the traits of change and impulsivity. They described persisters as able to strive to accomplish difficult tasks, able to work toward their academic goals, and not seeking out excitement or exciting activities in comparison to students who dropped out. In contrast, students who dropped out exhibited a greater enjoyment of new and different experiences and adapted more readily to changes in the environment. Maudal, Butcher, and Mauger (1974) also found that dropouts scored higher on the trait of impulsivity as compared to both persister and transfer groups. Maudal, Butcher, and Mauger (1974) proposed that transfer groups might be characterized as interested in seeking out new experiences in their lives but committed to academic goals, whereas persisters appeared to be in control and to have low needs for change.

Wong and Csikszentmihalyi (1991) investigated the relationship of personality, experience while studying, and academic performance. Wong and Csikszentmihalyi
(1991) believed that some personality traits such as achievement, endurance, order, play
(scored negatively), and impulsivity (scored negatively) together would facilitate efficient
and productive work and they termed people who exhibit this cluster as “work
orientation” in their study. Wong and Csikszentmihalyi (1991) also believed that
experience while studying has an indirect effect on academic outcomes because being
self-conscious appears to prevent individuals from focusing on task-relevant information
and problem-solving strategies. The authors found that, controlling for ability, work
orientation was a better predictor of grades than experience while studying for both
genders. Specifically, work orientation was positively correlated with percentage of time
that students used for studying and with GPA. Wong and Csikszentmihalyi (1991)
suggested that, controlling for ability, high work orientation students, who have a
tendency to aspire to accomplish difficult tasks and to maintain high standards (high on
achievement), a willingness to work hard (high on endurance), a need to be organized
(high on order), an ability to control impulses (low on impulsivity), and an ability to give
up immediate gratification (low on play) are likely to excel in school because these
students typically spend more time studying and tend to concentrate more when they
study.

Personality and work performance related research that is based on Murray’s
(1938) theory of personality has shown that personality traits are important components
of job performance beyond the contribution of cognitive ability (Day and Silverman,
1989; Steers, 1975; Lamont and Lundstrom, 1977). Day and Silverman (1989) found that
personality variables are significant predictors of job performance, and also that different
sets of variables will be relevant for distinct types of occupations. Day and Silverman (1989) investigated the relationship between personality and job performance in a group of accountants using the Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1984), an inventory that measures 20 manifest needs as defined by Murray (1938). The Personality Research Form consists of 7 scales with 20 traits; the scales were based on factor analyses by Jackson (1974). Day and Silverman (1989) found that three of the personality scales were significantly related to the job performance of accountants: the orientation toward work scale, which includes the traits of achievement, endurance, and play; the degree of ascendency scale, which includes the traits of dominance and abasement; and the degree and quality of interpersonal orientation scale, which includes the traits of affiliation, nurturance, exhibition, social recognition, aggression, and defendence. Specifically, Day and Silverman (1989) found that, even with the effects of cognitive ability taken into account, accountants who scored high on work orientation had good relationships with clients, demonstrated a positive attitude and professional manner in working with co-workers and clients, and met deadlines. They also found that individuals who scored high on work orientation tended to be willing to accomplish difficult tasks (high achievement) and to work long hours and to persevere in solving difficult problems (high endurance) yet maintained a passionate attitude toward work (low playfulness). In addition, Day and Silverman (1989) found that the ascendency scale was negatively correlated with ratings of potential for success and cooperation. Those scoring high in ascendency attempted to influence and control other people (high dominance), while not being very humble or self-critical (low abasement). With regard to the interpersonal
orientation scale, Day and Silverman (1989) found that it was positively related to client relations, which explained cooperation quality. High scorers on this scale tended to be friendly and sociable (high affiliation) in addition to being relatively low on aggression and defencence. Day and Silverman (1989) also found that the impulse expression scale, including the traits of impulse expression, change, control, order, harmavoidance and cognitive structure had a significant nonlinear relationship with ratings of timeliness of work and cooperation in curvilinear regression analyses. Day and Silverman (1989) explained that those individuals scoring high on the impulse expression scale tend to act or speak without deliberation (high impulsivity) and dislike routine (high change), and are less likely to be successful in performing their jobs. Individuals who were fearful and apprehensive (high harm avoidance), neat and systematic (high order), and rigid and exacting (high cognitive structure) were found to be not suitable for work involving a hectic and fast pace, especially during tax season. The authors concluded that personality measures can be beneficial for prediction, but their use in job performance related research and job selection should be used cautiously.

Steers (1975) studied the relationship between the need for achievement and job performance and work attitudes among a group of supervisors based on Murray’s (1938) theory. The measures of work related attitudes in the study were participants’ involvement and satisfaction in their job, whereas the job performance measure in this study was the supervisors’ ratings of participants. Steers (1975) believed that individuals who have a higher need for achievement place a higher value on the attainment of good job performance than do individuals who have a lower need for achievement. In
addition, individuals who have a higher need for achievement would likely devote more
time to their job, which in turn would lead them to perform better than individuals who
have a lower need for achievement. Then, when good job performance occurs, job
satisfaction will be experienced. Therefore, Steers (1975) believed that individuals with
higher need for achievement would show stronger involvement-performance-satisfaction
associations than would individuals with a lower need for achievement. He did find
significant involvement-performance-satisfaction associations for high need for
achievement subjects but not for low need for achievement subjects. He found that high
need for achievement subjects devoted significantly more time to their job than did low
need for achievement subjects. Steers (1975) also found that low need for achievement
individuals tended not to view good job performance as being a precursor of job
satisfaction; perhaps their satisfaction lever were related to other forms of behavior at
work, such as meeting new friends (high in need for affiliation). In conclusion, Steers
(1975) found that an employee’s need for achievement appeared to be an important
indicator of job performance and work attitude.

In addition, Lamont and Lundstrom (1977) examined the relationship between
personality traits and sales performance for industrial salesmen (only males were
included in this study) based on Murray’s (1938) psychological needs. Interviewing a
group of industrial salesmen, Lamont and Lundstrom (1977) found that the attributes of a
successful salesman were: (1) personal energy and initiative, (2) the ability to organize
and plan, with flexibility in thinking and work habits, (3) a moderate level of educational
achievement, (4) the ability to adapt to a variety of personalities and behaviors, (5)
concern with personal and professional development, and (6) a desire and need for recognition. These attributes correspond to some of Murray’s (1938) proposed personality traits, the traits of dominance, endurance, and social recognition. The trait of dominance characterizes individuals who attempt to control their environment and to influence or direct other people. A high scorer on dominance expresses opinions openly and enjoys the role of a leader. The trait of endurance measures an individual’s orientation toward work and play. A high scorer on endurance is willing to work long hours, is persevering even in the face of great challenge, and is patient and unrelenting in work habits. In terms of the trait of social recognition, individuals who score high on this trait desire to be held in high esteem by acquaintances and are concerned about what other people think of them. Lamont and Lundstrom (1977) found that successful salesmen, as rated by their district managers, were individuals who scored high on the trait of endurance. Lamont and Lundstrom (1977) state that the trait of endurance indicates a salesman’s willingness to devote effort to enhance his selling skills and to spend time and effort building relationships between his customers and the company. Individuals who scored high on this trait were found to have good work habits, were perseverant, and were willing to work long hours as compared to those who scored low. Lamont and Lundstrom (1977) also found that salesmen having a high need for social recognition tended to be more motivated to develop relationships with prospective customers since they enjoyed recognition from others for selling accomplishments as compared to those who scored low on social recognition.
Summary

Academic performance and job performance related research based on Henry Murray’s (1938) theory of personality using his psychological needs as objective personality traits has shown common findings. Nevertheless, the utility of these findings was weak because the methodology had several limitations (Batels, Jackson, & Ryan 2010, Lamont & Lundstrom, 1977; Maudal, Butcher, & Mauger, 1974; Day & Silverman, 1989; Bretz, Ash, & Dreher, 1989; Steers 1975; Rothstein, Paunonen, Rush, & King, 1994). One of the limitations dealing with the relationship between personality and academic performance is that prior research provides no clear or consistent evidence on how the combination of personality traits relates to academic performance. Wong and Csikszentmihaly (1991) state that how personality traits relate to performance still remains unclear. For instance, a person who is high on need for achievement but low on impulse control and endurance is unlikely to succeed in school. Therefore, Wong and Csikszentmihaly (1991) suggest that considering a combination of personality traits can provide new insight into how personality traits are related to performance. Another problem is that in most of the previous personality and academic performance related research, researchers use student report of GPA or their report of SAT scores as outcome measures. These may not be objective and reliable measures. Similarly, in most personality and work performance related research, actual performance, behavioral observation, or job satisfaction scales are commonly used as the outcome variables; however, these data are not always available or appropriate for research studies since actual performance data might not be available for every participant. Additionally,
previous studies related to personality and job performance are occupation-specific; as a result, the findings of these studies lack generality. Furthermore, most research relating to personality and performance has been conducted on either academic performance or job performance. Since there has been little research examining both variables together, the combination merits further investigation.

**The Present Study**

The present study reflected many aspects of previous personality and academic and job performance related studies (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge & Bono, 2001; Noftle & Robins, 2007; Martin, Montgomery, & Saphian, 2006, Digman, 1990; Gellatly, 1996). The present study differed from these previous studies, however, in that it examined the relationship between personality and attitudes toward school and work by using a better model and methodology than previous researchers have used, as well as overcoming previous limitations they have encountered. Instead of using the Five-Factor personality model (McCrae & Costa, 1987), the present study used Henry Murray’s (1938) model of personality. Previous research on personality and academic and job performance-related studies lacked consistency of results. Even though conscientiousness has repeatedly been shown to be one of the predictors of academic success and job performance as compared to the other four factors in the Five-Factor personality model (McCrae & Costa, 1987), the strength of the effect appeared to be different across studies. As a result, it is difficult to understand how personality characteristics affect academic and job performance. This is possibly due to the fact that the Five-Factor Model is too broad in explaining how personality characteristics affect
academic and job performance. Murray’s model was applied in an attempt to use personality traits that include motivation and self-regulation components to examine academic and job performance. Murray (1938) identified 20 traits or needs and has made significant contributions to personality related research. In the present study, 14 of these traits were included based on their theoretical and empirical relationships to academic and job performance (Batels, Jackson, & Ryan 2010, Lamont & Lundstrom, 1977; Maudal, Butcher, & Mauger, 1974; Day & Silverman, 1989; Bretz, Ash, & Dreher, 1989; Steers 1975; Rothstein, Paunonen, Rush, & King, 1994). These 14 traits are Abasement, Achievement, Affiliation, Aggression, Change, Defendence, Dominance, Endurance, Exhibition, Harmavoidance, Impulsivity, Nurturance, Play, and Social Recognition. To date, there is a notable lack of research examining how a combination of personality traits relates to attitudes toward school and work. The present study aimed to use principal components analysis to explore how a combination of the aforementioned personality traits relates to attitudes toward school and work.

In addition to exploring a combination of the aforementioned personality traits, the present study also examined the relationship between personality and attitudes toward school and work. For personality and academic performance related studies, previous studies have almost exclusively used students’ reported GPA or reported SAT scores as outcome measures; however, these may not be objective and reliable measures. For personality and job performance related studies, supervisors’ ratings have been commonly used as the outcome measure; however, these data are not always available for every participant. Additionally, previous studies have focused almost exclusively on
either academic or job performance. The current study was designed in an attempt to
develop a more reliable and valid outcome measure which used participants’ attitudes
toward school and work instead of reported GPA or work observations that previous
studies usually used while exploring these two variables together. A greater
understanding of the motivational processes associated with personality characteristics
would help school administrators and employers target these aspects of self-regulation
when making policy changes; the current study aimed to further knowledge in these
areas. Based on previous research, it was expected that traits of achievement and
endurance would be positively related to positive attitudes toward school and work,
whereas play, change, and impulsivity was expected to correlate negatively with positive
attitudes toward school and work. However, no specific hypotheses were specified since
the current study was fundamentally exploratory in nature. Canonical correlation was
used to analyze and examine the relationship between personality and attitudes toward
school and work.
Chapter 2

METHOD

Participants

Participants in this study were 317 California State University, Sacramento students who volunteered to participate in order to fulfill research assignments for their undergraduate psychology courses. Participants received one half hour of research credit for their participation in this study. There were no specific criteria for inclusion or exclusion except that students could not participate in the study more than once.

Materials

Demographic Sheet

The demographic questionnaire included questions about subjects’ age, sex, ethnic background, academic major, academic goal, year in college, and working status (Appendix A).

Personality Research Form E

The Personality Research Form E (PRF, Form E) (Jackson, 1984) was used to assess participants’ personalities. The PRF, Form E is a true/false self-report inventory, consists of 22 scales, and is comprised of 352 items that measure manifest needs as defined by Murray’s (1938) theory of personality. The PRF, Form E is designed to yield a set of scores for personality traits broadly relevant to the normal functioning of individuals. In the current study, 14 traits were included based on their theoretical and empirical relationships to academic and job performance. These 14 traits are Abasement,
Achievement, Affiliation, Aggression, Change, Defendence, Dominance, Endurance, Exhibition, Harmavoidance, Impulsivity, Nurturance, Play, and Social Recognition. The Abasement scale measures an individual’s humility and willingness to accept an inferior position. The Achievement scale examines an individual’s belief in his or her ability to accomplish difficult tasks and willingness to work toward distant goals. The Affiliation scale measures an individual’s efforts to maintain associations with people. The Aggression scale measures the degree to which an individual is aggressive and argumentative. The Change scale measures an individual’s ability to adapt in different circumstances. The Defendence scale measures an individual’s level of self-defense and self-protection. The Dominance scale measures the degree to which an individual is confident and assertive. The Endurance scale measures an individual’s persistence, determination, and willingness to work long hours. The Exhibition scale measures the degree to which an individual enjoys being the center of attention. The Harmavoidance scale measures an individual’s level of seeking out exciting activities. The Impulsivity scale measures an individual’s tendency to act on the “spur of the moment.” The Nurturance scale measures an individual’s ability to empathize and sympathize with others and to care for others whenever possible. The Play scale measures an individual’s easy-going attitude toward life. The Social Recognition scale measures an individual’s desire to be held in high esteem by acquaintances. These 14 traits consist of 224 items; each trait is assessed by 16 items. Anastasi (1988) stated that “The PRF has excellent psychometric properties” (p. 548) and is the fourth most highly cited personality inventory in the psychological research literature (Mitchell, 1983). Paunonen and
Jackson (1979) conducted a validity study asking participants to complete the PRF-E to describe themselves and their roommate. Paunonen and Jackson’s study (1979) revealed supportive evidence for the convergent validity of PRF-E scales with correlations between self-ratings and roommate ratings of .48 for Abasement, .63 for Achievement, .57 for Affiliation, .36 for Aggression, .48 for Change, .34 for Defendence, .50 for Dominance, .51 for Endurance, .62 Exhibition, .45 for Hamavoidance, .56 for Impulsivity, .61 for Nurturance, .74 for Play, and .38 for Social recognition. PRF, Form E has been shown to be psychometrically adequate with internal consistency .70 for Abasement, .57 for Achievement, .86 for Affiliation, .63 for Aggression, .65 for Change, .66 for Defendence, .67 for Dominance, .75 for Endurance, .85 for Exhibition, .91 for Harmavoidance, .85 for Impulsivity, .65 for Nurturance, .50 for Play, and .73 for Social Recognition (Jackson, 1999). However, caution should be exercised when interpreting any scale with a reliability below the middle .6s.

**Goal Orientation Scales**

The 18-item Goal Orientation Scales (GOS) (Midgley et al., 1998) was used to assess participants’ attitudes toward school. The Goal Orientation Scales consist of three subscales and each subscale consists of six items. The three subscales are Task Goal Orientation, Ability-Approach Goal Orientation, and Ability-Avoid Goal Orientation. Task Goal Orientation measures an individual’s desire to develop ability and skills (e.g., “An important reason why I do my school work is because I like to learn new things”). Ability-Approach Goal Orientation measures an individual’s belief in demonstrating ability (e.g., “I’d like to show my teachers that I’m smarter than the other students in my
classes”). Ability-Avoid Goal Orientation measures an individual’s goal to avoid demonstrating lack of ability (e.g., “The reason I do my school work is so my teachers don’t think I know less than others”). Responses to each item are made on a 5-point likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Strong internal consistency has been shown for the Goal Orientation Scales; as described by Cronbach’s alpha. Task Goal Orientation was greater than .70 and was often greater than .80 and the alpha coefficient for the scale of Ability-Approach Goal Orientation was .84 and for the scale of Ability-Avoid Goal Orientation was .79 (Roeser, Midgley, & Urdan, 1996). A study conducted by Middleton & Midgley (1997) had similar results; the internal consistency for each of the three scales (task, ability-approach, and ability-avoid goals) was also .84. Midgley et al. (1998) discussed the construct validity of the Goal Orientation Scales. The Goal Orientation Scales have been associated with academic efficacy (cognition), reported use of adaptive and maladaptive learning strategies (behavior), and affect at school (affect). The Task Goal Orientation and Ability-Approach Goal Orientation scales were positively correlated with academic efficacy, though the relationship was stronger for the Task Goal Orientation scale ($r = .38$) than for the Ability-Approach Goal Orientation scale ($r = .33$). The Ability-Avoid Goal Orientation scale was negatively correlated with academic efficacy ($r = -.33$) (Anderman & Young, 1994; Anderman & Midgley, 1997; Kaplan & Midgley, in press; Midgley & Urdan, 1995; Roeser et al., 1996; Darnon, Butera, Mugny, Quiamzade, & Hulleman, 2009). In addition, Midgley, Anderman, and Hicks (1995) found that Task Goal Orientation has been associated positively with the reported use of adaptive learning strategies ($r = .53$). Kaplan and
Midgley (1995) found similar results; Task Goal Orientation was positively related to adaptive learning strategies \( (r = .52) \) and negatively related to maladaptive learning strategies \( (r = -.29) \). Seifert (1995) included measures of both negative emotions (‘‘When I am in school, I usually feel frustrated’) and positive emotions (‘‘When I am in school, I usually feel proud’’) in a study of the relation between academic goals and emotions. Positive emotions were more strongly correlated with a mastery orientation (Task Goal Orientation) \( (r = .42) \) than with a performance orientation (Ability-Approach Orientation) \( (r = .32) \). Negative emotions were negatively related to mastery goals (Task Goal Orientation) \( (r = -.29) \), negatively related to perception of ability (Ability-Avoid Goal Orientation) \( (r = -.46) \), and unrelated to performance goals (Ability-Approach) \( (r = -.03) \).

**The Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile**

The multidimensional work ethic profile (MWEP) (Miller, Woehr, & Hudspeth, 2002) was used to measure participants’ attitudes toward work. The MWEP is a 65-item inventory that measures seven conceptually and empirically distinct facets of the work ethic construct. Self-Reliance, Morality/Ethics, Leisure, Hard Work, and Centrality of Work are each measured by 10 items, and Wasted Time and Delay of Gratification are measured by 8 and 7 items, respectively. Responses to each item are made on a 5-point likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The Self-Reliance scale measures the degree to which an individual strives to work independently in his or her daily tasks. The Morality/Ethics scale measures an individual’s belief in a just and moral existence. The Leisure scale measures an individual’s pro-leisure attitudes and beliefs in
the importance of non-work activities. The Hard Work scale measures an individual’s belief in the virtues of hard work. The Centrality of Work scale measures an individual’s belief in the importance of work. The Wasted Time scale measures an individual’s attitudes and beliefs as they reflect active and productive use of time (e.g., “Most people spend too much time in unprofitable amusements”). The Delay of Gratification scale measures an individual’s attitudes toward the future and the postponement of rewards.

As reported by Miller, Woehr, and Hudspeth (2002), the MWEP has a strong internal consistency of .75 for Wasted Time, .77 for Morality/Ethics, .79 for Delay of Gratification, .84 for Centrality of Work, .85 for Hard Work, .87 for Leisure, and .89 for Self-Reliance. In addition, the MWEP has demonstrated criterion-related validity as a predictor of work performance; the results of a regression analysis indicated a significant overall relation between the MWEP dimensions and an overall performance rating ($r = .37, p < .05$) (Miller, Woehr, and Hudspeth, 2002).

**Procedure**

All measures were administered in a questionnaire packet. The researcher explained to participants that they were participating in a study that would examine attitudes toward school and work and they might withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty except for not receiving research credit. The researcher then provided the participants with an informed consent form (Appendix B) to sign and date. After participants signed and dated the informed consent form, the researcher gathered all of the consent forms and placed them into a manila envelope to ensure that they could not be traced back to specific participants. Participants then received a manila envelope
which included all of the materials they would need for the study and they were instructed by the researcher to not place their name or any other identifying marks on their materials. The packet included a demographics sheet and three questionnaires, the Goal Orientation Scales, the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile, and the Personality Research Form, Form E. The order of measures was randomized within each packet. When participants finished answering the questionnaires, they were asked to place all materials back into the manila envelope and hand the envelope to the researcher who then debriefed them. The researcher answered any questions they may have had at that time and handed out the debriefing page (Appendix C) for the participants to keep. The debriefing explained the purpose of the study and gave directions regarding how to learn about the results of the study if participants were interested.
Chapter 3

RESULTS

Invalid Packet Exclusion

Ten of the 327 participants’ data packets were omitted from inclusion in the study. Of these 10 omitted packets, 3 were excluded from the study because participants did not respond to the 65 item MWEP and 7 of the 10 packets were removed from the study because of participants’ failing to complete enough questions of PRF-Form E to be scored.

Preliminary Data Analysis

After the removal of 10 invalid data packets, the sample consisted of 317 participants (82 male and 235 female, mean age = 21.38, SD = 0.26). Of the participants, 19.6% were freshmen, 26.8% were sophomores, 37.5% were juniors, 15.8% were seniors, and 0.3% were graduate-students. Also, the study participants were ethnically diverse, with most being Caucasian, Asian or Pacific Islander, and Latino/Hispanic. Table 1 illustrates this ethnic diversity.
Table 1

Ethnicity of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than two ethnicities</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 317.

Descriptive Statistics

Means, standard deviations, 95% confidence intervals, and reliability data for the attitudes toward school, attitudes toward work, and performance on the personality scales are presented in Table 2. As the information in Table 2 indicates, the reliabilities were good for the GOS scales, ranging in the .80s; they were similar to Midgley et al. (1998) who reported .84 for each of the three scales. The reliabilities were also good for the MWEP scales (i.e., with a range of .74 to .89) and were consistent with Miller et al. (2002) who reported internal consistency estimates ranging from .75 to .89 across the seven dimensions. The reliabilities for the PRF-E in this study were similar to those
reported by Jackson (1999) even though the coefficients for a few of the subscales were lower than those reported for college students by Jackson (1999). In particular, reliabilities for the scales of Abasement, Affiliation, Endurance, Harmavoidance, and Impulsivity were relatively low in comparison to what Jackson (1999) reported. Caution should be exercised when interpreting any scale with a reliability below the middle .6s.
Table 2

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOS-Task Goal Orientation</td>
<td>22.99</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>22.51-23.48</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS-Ability-Approach</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>20.33-21.44</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS -Ability-Avoid Goal</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>18.60-19.31</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWEP- Self Reliance</td>
<td>37.57</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>36.82-38.25</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWEP -Morality/Ethics</td>
<td>44.38</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>43.89-44.88</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWEP- Leisure</td>
<td>33.05</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>32.29-33.78</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWEP- Hard Work</td>
<td>42.02</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>41.37-42.68</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWEP -Centrality of Work</td>
<td>38.47</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>37.80-39.14</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWEP- Wasted Time</td>
<td>30.39</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>29.79-30.83</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWEP -Delay of Gratification</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>25.90-27.00</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF- Abasement (Ab)</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>6.61-7.18</td>
<td>.53 (.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF- Achievement (Ac)</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>10.16-10.76</td>
<td>.58 (.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF- Affiliation (Af)</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>8.95-9.69</td>
<td>.74 (.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF- Aggression (Ag)</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>7.09-7.73</td>
<td>.61 (.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF- Change (Ch)</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>8.74-9.38</td>
<td>.60 (.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF- Defendence (De)</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>6.69-7.34</td>
<td>.63 (.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF- Dominance (Do)</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>8.48-9.32</td>
<td>.79 (.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF –Endurance (En)</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>9.83-10.44</td>
<td>.63 (.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF- Exhibition (Ex)</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>6.78-7.63</td>
<td>.80 (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF –Harmavoidance (Ha)</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>8.61-9.43</td>
<td>.78 (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF- Impulsivity (Im)</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>5.45-6.12</td>
<td>.68 (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF –Nurturance (Nu)</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>11.02-11.66</td>
<td>.67 (.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF- Play (Pl)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.64-9.30</td>
<td>.66 (.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF- Social Recognition (Sr)</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>7.43-8.13</td>
<td>.71 (.73)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PRF Form E (Jackson 1999) reliabilities are in parentheses
**Correlation Analysis**

Tables 3, 4, and 5 show the degree of association for the Goal Orientation scales (GOS), the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile (MWEP), and the Personality Research Form E (PRF-E), respectively. As can be seen in Table 3, participants who had higher levels of Ability-Approach goal orientation also had higher levels of Ability-Avoid goal orientation.

**Table 3**

*Correlation Matrix for Goal Orientation Scales (GOS)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ability-Approach goal orientation</th>
<th>Ability-Avoid goal orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Goal Orientation</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability-Approach goal</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 4 shows the degree of association among Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile (MWEP) scales. It indicates that individuals who had higher levels of Self Reliance also had higher levels of Morality/Ethics, Leisure, Hard Work, Centrality of Work, Wasted Time, and Delay of Gratification. Individuals who more strongly endorsed Morality/Ethics also more strongly endorsed Hard Work, Centrality of Work, Wasted Time, and Delay of Gratification but endorsed Leisure to a lesser extent. In addition, participants who had higher levels of Leisure also had higher levels of Centrality of Work.
Table 4

Correlation Matrix for Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile Scales (MWEP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morality/Ethics</th>
<th>Leisure</th>
<th>Hard Work</th>
<th>Centrality of Work</th>
<th>Wasted Time</th>
<th>Delay of Gratification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Reliance</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality/Ethics</td>
<td>- .13*</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td>- .34**</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>- .06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasted Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.45**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05. ** p < .01

Table 5 shows the degree of association for 14 traits of the Personality Research Form E (PRF-E). Some of the correlation patterns that can be seen in Table 5 are as follows: Participants with higher levels of Abasement (Ab) had lower levels of Aggression (Ag), Defendence (De), Dominance (Do), Exhibition (Ex), and Harmavoidance (Ha). Participants with higher levels of Achievement (Ac) also had higher levels of Dominance (Do), Endurance (En), and Nurturance but had lower levels of Impulsivity (Im) and Play (Pl). Those with higher levels of Affiliation also had higher levels of Change (Ch), Exhibition (Ex), Nurturance (Nu), and Play (Pl). Finally, participants with higher levels of Aggression (Ag) also had higher levels of Defendence (De), Dominance (Do), Exhibition (Ex), Impulsivity (Im), and Social Recognition (Sr); however, they had lower levels of Nurturance (Nu).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation Matrix for Personality Research Form E Scales (PPF-E)

Table 5
Principal Components Analysis

In preparation for the canonical correlation analysis, principal components analyses (PCAs) were performed to consolidate the subscales assessed by two of the inventories (the 7 subscales of the MWEP and the 14 subscales of PRF), as some of the scales within these inventories were relatively highly correlated.

The PCA yielded two components with eigenvalues greater than 1.00 for the MWEP and five components with eigenvalues greater than 1.00 for the PRF. Examination of the scree plot suggested two strong factors for the MWEP and five strong factors for the PRF, each of which resulted in the most interpretable solution for the respective inventory.

For the MWEP, the 2 factor solution accounted for 60.2 of the variance. Table 6 illustrates the amount of variance accounted for by each of the two components for the MWEP and Table 7 shows the structure coefficients of the MWEP subscales from the promax rotation. Component 1 of the MWEP consists of five subscales and was labeled Work Ethic. Work Ethic is characterized by an emphasis on the need for each individual to follow his or her own instincts and ideas (Self Reliance), a belief in the moral benefit of work (Morality/Ethics), perseverance in carrying out tasks (Hard Work), good use of time while at work (Wasted Time), and the ability to put off reward in order to gain a better reward later (Delay of Gratification). Component 2 consists of the two subscales of Leisure and Centrality of Work, and was labeled Anti-Play. Anti-Play is characterized by a less positive approach to time away from work (Leisure) and the importance of working (Centrality of Work). Leisure was negatively loaded while Centrality of Work
was positively loaded in the PCA; therefore, a recode of the subscale of Leisure prior to the canonical correlation analysis was conducted.

Table 6

*Variance Accounted for by the Two Factors Yielded by Principle Components Analysis of the Seven Subscales from the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile (MWEP) Scales with a Promax Rotation.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percentage of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.72</td>
<td>42.72</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>60.18</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Structure Coefficients: 2-Factor Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile (MWEP)

Scales/Promax Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard Work</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasted Time</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Reliance</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay of Gratification</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality/Ethics</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality of Work</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For the PRF, the 5 factor solution accounted for 66.62% of the variance. Table 8 illustrates the amount of variance accounted for by each of the five components for the PRF and Table 9 shows the structure coefficients of the PRF subscales from the promax rotation. Component 1 of the PRF consists of three subscales and was labeled Sociable. Sociable is characterized by the emphasis on the need to maintain associations with people (Affiliation), enjoying being the center of attention (Exhibition), and an easy going attitude toward life (Play). Component 2 consists of three subscales and was labeled Drive. Drive is characterized by a willingness to work toward goals (Achievement), being patient and unrelenting in work habits (Endurance), and enjoying the role of leader and being in control of the environment (Dominance). Component 3
consists of 3 subscales and was labeled Self-Protection. Self-Protection is characterized by an emphasis on the ability to defend oneself with criticism (Defendence), enjoying combat and a willingness to hurt people to get one’s own way (Aggression), and concern about reputation and what other people think (Social Recognition). Component 4 consists of 2 subscales and was labeled Excitement. Excitement is characterized by a less positive approach to avoiding risk (Harmavoidance) and by the tendency to act on the “spur of the moment” (Impulsivity). Component 5 consists of 2 subscales and was labeled Caring. Caring is characterized by an interest in providing sympathy and comfort to others when possible (Nurturance) and showing a high degree of humility and accepting criticism even when it is not deserved (Abasement).

A recode of the subscale of Harmavoidance prior to the canonical correlation analysis was conducted in a similar way as MEWP’s recoding procedure. Further, the subscale of Change (Ch) was found to be not significantly associated with any other subscales; therefore, the scale of Change (Ch) was excluded in any of these 5 components to make most interpretable the solution for the respective inventory.
Table 8

Variance Accounted for by the Five Factors Yielded by Principle Components Analysis of the Fourteen Subscales from the Personality Research Form, Form E (PRF, Form E) Scales with a Promax Rotation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percentage of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>50.82</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>59.62</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>66.62</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Structure Coefficients: 5-Factor Personality Research Form, Form E (PRF, Form E)

Scales/Promax Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Recognition</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defendence</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmavoidance</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsivity</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abasement</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturance</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canonical Correlation Analysis

A canonical correlation analysis was used to explore the relationships between personality variables and attitudes toward school and work. The dependent variables used to assess attitudes toward school were Task Goal Orientation, Ability-Approach Goal Orientation, and Ability-Avoid Goal Orientation as measured by the Goal Orientation Scales (Midgley et al., 1998). The dependent variables used to assess attitudes toward work were Work Ethic and Anti-Play as defined by the principal components analysis, and were measured by the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile (Miller et al., 2002). The predictor variables were Sociable, Drive, Self-Protection, Excitement, and Caring as defined by the principal components analysis; they were measured by the Personality Research Form E (PRF, Form E) (Jackson, 1984).

With 317 cases in the analysis, the relationship between the sets of variables was statistically significant, Wilks’ Lambda = .57, $R_c^2 = .43$, approximate $F(25, 1141.96) = 7.58$, $p < .001$.

The dimension reduction analysis indicated that only the first two of the five functions were statistically significant; therefore, only those first two functions were extracted and interpreted. These two functions combined accounted for approximately 92% of the explained variance. Eigenvalues, percentages of variance explained, and the squared canonical correlations for each function are shown in Table 10.

The first function accounted for approximately 58% of the explained variance, and the second function added 34% to that. Based on the Cramer–Nicewander (1979)
index, it appears that approximately 10% of the variance of the dependent variates was explained by the predictor variates.

Table 10

_Eigenvalues, Cumulative Percentage of Explained Variance, and Squared Canonical Correlations for the Two Canonical Functions_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Percent Variance</th>
<th>Squared Canonical Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>58.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>34.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structure coefficients for the first two functions for the predictor and dependent variables are shown in Tables 11 and 12. The first predictor function is associated with lower levels of Drive (Achievement, Endurance, and Dominance) and Caring (Nurturance and Abasement) and higher levels of Self-Protection (Defendence, Aggression, and Social Recognition). This function appears to represent uncaring defensiveness matched with poor work habits. The first dependent function is associated with lower levels of Anti-Play (a less positive approach to time away from work (Leisure) and the importance of working (Centrality of Work) and Task Goal (an individual’s desire to develop ability and skills) and higher levels of Ability Avoid (an individual’s goal to avoid the demonstration of lack of ability). This function appears to represent the importance of work and looking competent but having little interest in
developing one’s ability. Taken together, the first function appears to indicate that being
defensive and lazy is predictive of presenting a positive appearance while remaining
stagnant.

The second predictor function is associated with lower levels of Drive and Self-
Protection. This function appears to represent lack of motivation matched with poor
work habits. The second dependent function is associated with lower levels of Anti-Play
(Leisure and Centrality of Work), Ability Approach, and Work Ethic. This function
appears to represent the importance of work and demonstrating ability but having a bad
work ethic. Taken together, the second function appears to indicate that lack of
motivation and being apathetic is predictive of being unproductive.

Table 11

*Structure Coefficients for Predictor Canonical Variates for the Two Functions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Function 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>-.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Protection</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

Structure Coefficients for the Dependent Canonical Variates for the Two Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Function 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Goal Orientation</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability-Approach</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability-Avoid</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Ethic</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Play</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

The primary goal of this study was to gain a better understanding of the relationship between personality traits and attitudes toward school and work. Participants’ attitudes toward school and work were thought to be predictable based on their scores on the PRF, Form E (Jackson, 1974) and the relationship was explored by a canonical correlation analysis using the Goal Orientation Scale (Midgley et al., 1998) and the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile (MWEP) (Miller et al., 2002) as the dependent variables and the personality traits measured by the PRF, Form E (Jackson, 1974) as the predictor variables. Two functions were found to be statistically significant.

The first finding yielded by the canonical correlation analysis suggested that participants who were less willing to work toward goals and had less patience were highly concerned about their reputation, desired to look competent, and had little interest in developing their ability. The second finding in the current study indicated that participants who lacked motivation and were apathetic did not value the importance of work or being productive. The results of the current study demonstrated an individual’s goal to avoid showing lack of ability in the academic and work place. Specifically, individuals who were less motivated and highly concerned about their reputation had a higher level of desire to avoid demonstrating lack of ability in comparison with others.

The results of current study indicated that significant numbers of participants’ attitudes toward school and work were related to avoiding showing lack of ability in
school and in the workplace rather than developing their ability. These findings are congruent with research showing the importance of motivation for academic and job performance. Mastery goals (Task Goal Orientation) have been positively linked to academic and job performance and adaptive outcomes, such as task persistence after failure (Diener & Dweck, 1980), intrinsic motivation (Rawsthorne & Elliot, 1999), low reports of disruptive behaviors (Kaplan, Gheen, & Midgley, 2002) and efficient ways of solving conflict (Damon & Butera, 2007; Damon, Muller, Schrager, Pannuzzo, & Butera, 2006). On the other hand, research has shown links between Performance-Avoidance goals (Ability-Avoid Goal Orientation) and many maladaptive outcomes, including poor academic performance and poor job success (Church, Elliot, & Gable, 2001; Elliot & Church, 1997; Elliot, McGregor, & Gable, 1999; Sideridis, 2005). This link was even associated with long-term measures of academic performance (Harackiewicz, Barron, Tauer, Carter, & Elliot, 2000). Based on previous research findings, it would be reasonable to expect that participants in the current study who aimed to avoid showing lack of ability in the academic setting and in the workplace rather than developing their own ability would show poor academic and job performance. This interesting finding of the current study was not expected and merits further investigation.

There were limitations in the current study that posed potential confounds. First, the five components of the Personality Research Form, Form E yielded by the principal components analysis in this study were a little different from Jackson’s (1974). In addition, the subscale of change (Ch) was excluded in any of these five components in the current study because it was found not to be significantly associated with any other
subscales, which also differed from Jackson’s (1974) findings. The difference in groupings between the current study and Jackson’s (1974) limits the comparison of the current study’s findings to previous studies that used the Personality Research Form, Form E (Jackson, 1974) as one of the measures. Moreover, even though the 14 personality traits that were chosen in this current study were based on their theoretical and empirical relationships to previous personality, academic, and job performance related studies, it would be beneficial to include the other remaining personality traits in the Personality Research Form, Form E (Jackson, 1967) in future studies.

A second limitation of the current study was that actual performance measurements were not included. As mentioned before, students’ reported GPA might not be a reliable measure; however, if there were a way to access students’ actual exam results, class grades, or an actual job performance observation and use these in conjunction with attitude measures in future personality, attitudes, and performance related studies, this would help provide better evidence toward the relationship between personality, attitudes toward school and work, and actual performance.

A third limitation that must be considered in the current study is the issue of fatigue among participants. Although the majority of participants were able to complete the packet of questions in less than 30 minutes, each participant's packet consisted of 25 pages of material including 307 multiple choice items and demographic information. It would be reasonable to suspect that a number of participants experienced significant fatigue, which may have affected their responses. It may be better for future studies to consider lessening the amount of data collected.
The current study demonstrated an individual’s goal to avoid demonstrating lack of ability in the academic and work place; this topic has not been fully explored in the majority of previous academic and job related studies. Despite limitations, the current study provides valuable information for future studies interested in exploring the relationship between personality traits and attitudes toward school and work. Given that school and work play an important role in most individuals’ lives, gaining a better understanding of these variables will be beneficial. The current study provides important information relating to attitudes toward school and work and can be utilized for further explorations; however, much work remains to be done.
APPENDIX A

Demographic Sheet

Please do not write your name on this form. It will be stored separately from any other information that you complete during this study and will not be linked with your responses in any way.

For the following items, please select the one response that is most descriptive of you or fill in the blank as appropriate.

Age: _________________________ Gender: _________________________

Ethnicity:
- [ ] Asian or Pacific Islander American
- [ ] Indian
- [ ] African
- [ ] Caucasian
- [ ] Native American
- [ ] Latino/Hispanic
- [ ] Puerto Rican
- [ ] More than one race (specify): _________________________

Major (s): _________________________ Minor (s): _________________________

Year in college:
- [ ] First-year
- [ ] Sophomore
- [ ] Junior
- [ ] Senior
- [ ] Graduate

Enrollment Status:
- [ ] Full-time (12 or more units)
- [ ] Part-time (less than 12 units)

Educational Goal:
- [ ] AA/AS
- [ ] BA/BS
- [ ] MA/MS
- [ ] Doctorate
- [ ] Undecided

Do you work (paid work/unpaid work/volunteer work/internship)? Yes ______ No _______

If you work, how many hours per week: ____________ Hours
I hereby agree to participate in research that will be conducted by Fu Yiu, a student in The Psychology Graduate Program at California State University, Sacramento. The study will investigate factors that relate to academic and career success among college students.

I understand I will be asked to complete several questionnaires about my academic attitudes, work attitudes, and personal traits and values, and some demographic questions. The questionnaires may require up to a half hour of my time and will be administered in one of the research rooms on the third floor of Amador Hall.

I understand that I will receive one half hour of credit toward satisfying the Psychology Department’s research participation requirement by participating in this study.

Some of the questionnaires may seem personal and they might create a mild discomfort or mild unpleasant feelings. However, I may gain insight into factors that affect success in college and workplace, or I may not personally benefit from participating in this research.

I understand that my anonymity will be maintained and my data will be kept confidential. My name on this consent form cannot be connected to the answers I provide to the questionnaires. In addition, the results will be reported at the group and not the individual level. I understand that I may discontinue my participation at any time without any penalty other than loss of research credit, and that the investigator may discontinue my participation at any time. If any aspect of my participation has caused me distress or has made me anxious, I understand that I can contact Counseling and Psychological Services at 278-6416 to speak with a counselor about my feelings and/or thoughts.

This information was explained to me by Fu Yiu. I understand that she will answer any questions I may have now or later about this research. Fu Yiu can be reached at voyo0730@aol.com. My participation in this research is entirely voluntary. My signature below indicates that I have read this page and agree to participate in the research.

____________________ _______________
Signature of Participant                     Date
APPENDIX C

Debriefing

Purpose
The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between personality traits and attitudes toward school and work. Specifically, I am investigating which personality traits are closely associated with academic success and job performance, and the results of this study may help school administrators increase students’ academic success and help employers increase work performance.

Hypotheses and Supporting Research
Research has indicated a consistent relationship between personality and various outcomes such as school performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge & Bono, 2001), career success (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999) and job satisfaction (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998). Day and Silverman (1989), showed that even with the effects of cognitive ability taken into account, some personality traits such as affiliation, nurturance, exhibition, social recognition, aggression, and defendence were significantly related to job performance. In terms of academic performance, the trait of achievement motivation is the most widely studied personality characteristic and has been consistently shown to be related to academic performance (Wong and Csikszentmihaly, 1991). However, Wong and Csikszentmihaly (1991) state that how achievement motivation relates to performance still remains unclear and it is important to consider several personality characteristics together since a combination of personality traits can provide new insight into how personality traits are related to behavior and performance in school and work.

I hypothesized that some personality traits are closely related to attitudes toward school and work while some are not. Specifically, I expected that an individual who scores high on the trait of achievement motivation will enjoy school more and will be more likely to be successful in school. I expected to find similar results, in which an individual who scores high on the trait of achievement motivation will enjoy his or her work more and will be more likely to perform better at his or her work. Moreover, I hypothesized that an individual who scores high in affiliation and social recognition will perform better in work as compared to those who score low in these personality traits.

Contact Information
The results of this study will be available by summer 2012. If you would like further information about the study or have questions regarding the experiment, please contact Fu Yiu at yoyo0730@aol.com at your convenience.

Psychological Services
If this study evoked any painful memories or negative emotional responses that are troubling you, please contact Counseling and Psychological Services at 916-278-6416. The counselors there will be happy to provide assistance to you.

Closing
Do you have any questions?
Thank you for participating!
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