

PERSONALITY, JOB PERFORMANCE, AND JOB SATISFACTION IN NON-
PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

A thesis presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of Western Carolina
University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
in Psychology.

By

Whittney Breanne Campbell-Bridges

Director: Dr. David McCord
Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department

Committee Members: Dr. Christopher Cooper, Political Science and Public Affairs
Dr. Winford A. Gordon, Psychology

April 2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my mother for her continued support throughout this process. Thank you for always being my biggest fan and number one supporter.

I would also like to thank my committee members for their support and direction.

Specifically, I would like to thank Dr. David McCord whose attention to detail and constructive criticism produced something I will always be proud of. Thank you for everything; I will always be grateful for your guidance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	iv
Abstract	v
Introduction.....	7
Literature Review.....	10
The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	10
History of the FFM	12
Factor Definitions	15
Evidence for the FFM	16
FFM and Job Satisfaction	19
FFM and Job Performance	21
Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, Personality in Public Administration.....	25
Personality and the Non-Profit Sector	27
Statement of the problem.....	28
Hypotheses	29
Method	31
Participants.....	30
Measures	30
M5-50.....	30
Neocleous MBTI proxy	31
Job satisfaction scale.....	31
OCB-O and OCB-I	31
Procedures.....	31
Results.....	32
Discussion	37
References	39
Appendices.....	43
Appendix A: M5-50 Questionnaire	43
Appendix B: Neocleous Proxy for the MBTI.....	46
Appendix C: Job Satisfaction Survey	50
Appendix D: M5-50 Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scales	51

LIST OF TABLES

	Table Page
1. Scale Means	32
2. Regression Analyses for Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Organization	33
3. Regression Analyses for Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Individual	33
4. Regression Analyses for Job Satisfaction.....	34
5. Bivariate Correlations with Predictor and Outcome Variables	35
6. Scale Cronbach's Alphas	36

ABSTRACT

PERSONALITY, JOB PERFORMANCE, AND JOB SATISFACTION IN NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Whittney Breanne Campbell-Bridges

Western Carolina University (April 2013)

Director: Dr. David McCord

Formal assessment of personality characteristics is common in many organizational settings, for reasons such as personnel selection, personnel training, determining leadership styles and team building. This study documents the use of personality assessment in non-profit organizations and examines the associations between personality and job outcomes among directors of non-profit organizations. Personality traits are associated with many job-related variables, including job satisfaction and job performance. Clearly, the relevance of personality traits to these job-related characteristics is highly dependent on the type of job and type of organization.

This paper will also discuss the limitations and problems with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). Even though the MBTI is popular in many organizational settings, it is a flawed instrument for measuring personality. Modern personality psychologists agree that the instrument relies on an outdated theory of personality. A better conceptual schema is the five-factor model of personality (FFM), an empirically verified, theoretically sound framework that is in concordance among personality psychologists as the best measure of personality.

The public sector has favored the MBTI (Coe, 1992), but the recent paper by Cooper, Knotts, Johnson, and McCord (in press) argues for the effectiveness of the FFM

in this domain. Virtually no literature exists at present with regard to the use of personality assessment within the domain of non-profit and volunteer organizations. The purpose of the current project is to examine the usefulness of FFM-based personality measurement to predict job performance and job satisfaction in the non-profit sector and to compare the FFM to the MBTI in this regard.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Formal assessment of personality characteristics is common in many organizational settings, for reasons such as personnel selection, personnel training, determining leadership styles and team building. For example, approximately 80 percent of Fortune 500 companies use some form of personality testing to assess their employees (Dattener, 2008). Personality traits are associated with many job-related variables, including job satisfaction and job performance. Clearly, the relevance of personality traits to these job-related characteristics is highly dependent on the type of job and type of organization.

A considerable literature exists regarding personality and job performance, and satisfaction in the corporate world (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991, 2001). Researchers dealing with management issues in the public service sector focus on specific characteristics in this setting, as distinct from the corporate environment. A significant literature exists regarding the concept of “public service motivation,” which deals with this distinction. Data suggest that people who enter public service share common characteristics that make them different than those that have jobs with government entities or profit making firms (Benz, 2005). Some literature suggests that people who enter non-profit fields also differ in terms of job satisfaction (Benz, 2005). Thus, personality traits as predictors of job satisfaction and job performance are seen as relevant, but with different patterns, in the public sector as compared to the private sector, and a recent study (Cooper, Knotts, Johnson, & McCord, in press) describes initial work in this area.

Another major organizational setting to consider is the vast and growing world of non-profit and volunteer organizations, and virtually no research exists regarding the associations among core personality traits and job performance and satisfaction among executive directors of such organizations. Non-profits, like the Red Cross, United Way, children's welfare organizations, and veteran's support groups tend to address a specific socially valued "cause" and to derive income from donations to that cause. We might speculate that staff members and directors of such organizations have different motivations, and different personality profiles from their counterparts in both for profit and public employment. The present study represents an initial foray into this population.

Within the public sector research, and many business organizations, the most popular specific personality assessment instrument is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI; Myers & McCaulley, 1985), selling approximately 2.5 million tests a year (Shuit, 2003). Even though the MBTI is popular in many organizational settings, it is a flawed instrument for measuring personality. Modern personality psychologists agree that the instrument relies on an outdated theory of personality. The instrument also has serious measurement issues that forces people into one category or another (McRae & Costa, 1989).

We propose that the five factor model of personality (FFM) provides a better theoretical framework for assessing personality. Psychologists agree that trait structure is best represented by the FFM (McCrae & Costa, 1997). Personality psychologists have largely given up the idea of formulating new theories of personality since the development of the FFM (McCrae, 2011). The FFM is an empirically verified, sound model of personality that has great promise for directors of non-profit organizations. A

considerable body of research exists regarding the use of the FFM in typical organizational settings such as businesses, corporations, and industry. The public sector has favored the MBTI, but the recent paper by Cooper et al. (in press) argues for the effectiveness of the FFM in this domain. As noted, virtually no literature exists at present with regard to the use of personality assessment within the domain of non-profit and volunteer organizations. The purpose of the current project is to examine the usefulness of FFM-based personality measurement to predict job performance and job satisfaction in the non-profit sector, and to compare the FFM to the MBTI in this regard.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will first review a brief history and literature on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Next, a history of the five-factor model and analysis of the literature on the FFM will be presented. The paper will also discuss the relationship between the FFM and job satisfaction and job performance: job satisfaction and organizational citizenship. Following this we describe our data and methods. Next, the paper will demonstrate how dimensions of the FFM can better predict two important outcome measures among directors of non-profit organizations. The paper will conclude by discussing how the FFM is a better predictor of job satisfaction and organizational citizenship.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

Personality psychologists generally agree that the MBTI lacks promise and are skeptical of the instrument's ability to accurately assess personalities (McCrae & Costa, 1989). The instrument's roots are found in Carl Jung's *Psychological Types* (1923). Even though Jung's book assisted in paving the road for individual differences, it also created obstacles to the development of inventory for assessing types (McCrae & Costa, 1989). Many of the descriptions of attitudes seem to overlap and it also includes traits that do not empirically covary (McCrae & Costa, 1989). Jung theorized that differences in human behavior are the product of differences in personality (1923). Jung's theory assumes that an individual is born with a predisposition to 4 of 8 functions: extraversion/introversion, sensing/intuiting, thinking/feeling, and judging/perceiving (this type was later added by Myers and Briggs). The judging/perceiving scale was not originally in Jung's theory and actually contradicts his personality theory (Coe, 1992). Jung's central distinction was between extraverted and introverted individuals (McCrae & Costa, 1989). Jung also made

a distinction between the way that individuals relate to the world through the rational (or judging) functions of thinking and feeling, and the irrational (or perceiving) function of sensing and intuiting (McCrae & Costa, 1989). Extraverts are more inclined to talk rather than think, while introverts are more likely to think rather than talk. Sensors are more likely to take in information through their five senses and intuitors through their intuition. Thinkers base their decision off of logic while feelers base their decisions by emotion. Lastly, judgers are more likely to find closure and decision quickly, while perceivers wait for more information (Coe, 1992).

Based on these ideals Isabella Myers and Katherine Briggs, with no formal psychological training, developed the Myers-Briggs Type indicator. The MBTI classifies test takers as 1 of 16 types. The instrument uses a dichotomized scale that gives a 4-letter type classification and a numeric score that indicates the strength of the classification (Coe, 1992).

Among many criticisms, the MBTI gives no indication of one's values or motives, does not measure pathology, and does not measure how well preferred functions are performed (Coe, 1992). The descriptions provided by the MBTI are based on Jung's ideals that involves the unconscious life of individuals which is difficult to assess by self-report measures (McCrae & Costa, 1989). McCrae and Costa found no support for typological theory. Personality dimensions do not interact to form distinct types of persons (McCrae & Costa, 1989). Psychometricians do not agree with type theory and find that MBTI only measures quasi-normally distributed personality traits (McCrae & Costa, 1989). McCrae and Costa (1989) also found that the Jungian prediction that opposing functions developed later on in life were not confirmed by the MBTI. They

found that preferences do not form true dichotomies, 16 types did not appear to be qualitatively distinct (McCrae & Costa, 1989). Correlates of individual scales were consistent with individual scales but these would not have been predicted Jung's theory (McCrae & Costa, 1989). The use of dichotomous scales misclassifies many individuals that are at the cutting point and fails to note the large differences that may be found within the type; most individuals accept whatever description is provided for them according to their type (McCrae & Costa, 1989).

In fact, proponents of Jungian theory should avoid the MBTI because it does not appear to be a promising instrument for measuring Jung's types (McCrae & Costa, 1989). Conversely, those who use the MBTI to assess individual differences should stop using it and some of the associated language (McCrae & Costa, 1989). The MBTI does not give comprehensive information on its four scales because all four scales give only a broad, global picture and lacks traits that lie within each of the scales (McCrae & Costa, 1989).

History of the FFM

The five-factor model of personality is a hierarchical organization of personality traits that are organized into five basic dimensions: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience. It is of some interest to note that Louis Thurstone, in his presidential address to the APA in 1934 indicated that he had found five independent common factors in his factor analysis of 60 adjectives used by subjects to describe well known acquaintances (Digman, 1995). Even though Thurstone's temperament scales did not correspond exactly to the current five-factor model, his method of factor analysis was used by many, including Raymond B. Cattell (Goldberg, 1993).

Raymond B. Cattell began investigating personality traits in the mid 1940's based on the trait terms developed by Allport and Odbert (1936). Lexicon is made up of thousands of terms describing personality and can be useful when deciphering recurrent traits. Cattell began his research with a trait list of 4,500 descriptive terms and developed a set of 35 complex bipolar variables, in other words, a composite set of opposite adjectives (Goldberg, 1993). The variables were then factored and he asserted that he had found 16 personality factors (Goldberg, 1993). Cattell compiled the results of three studies and developed his 16-PF questionnaire (Digman, 1995). Later, when Cattell's results were further factor analyzed, researchers concluded that only five factors were replicable. Although Cattell criticized the current five-factor model, he is considered by most personality psychologists to be the primary contributor to its developments.

Substantial credit also goes to Tupes and Christal, two U.S Air Force researchers. In a 1961 series of Air Force studies on the effect of length of acquaintance on the accuracy of peer ratings, Tupes and Christal found three different response formats and seminal comparisons of factor structures across diverse samples (Goldberg, 1993). Tupes and Christal used a set of 30 scales borrowed from Cattell's list and found five factors (Digman, 1995). They also found evidence of the factors in other studies that were stable across replications of the works of Cattell and Fisk (Digman, 1995). Tupes and Christal conducted what can be seen as a meta-analysis because they related their own results to results derived by analyzing the correlations of other investigators and comparing the five factors across other studies (Digman, 1995).

Despite their efforts, the "big five" did not fully resurface until the 1980s, due to a movement toward behaviorism. The assimilation of the current model can be credited to

two separate systems, the questionnaire approach and the lexical approach. The most important of the two separate systems is the questionnaire, developed by McRae and Costa in their NEO personality inventory, which is a 3-factor personality model that included neuroticism, extraversion, and openness to experience. The NEO-PI was developed by incorporating a variety of questionnaires including those developed by Eysenck, Jackson, and Wiggins, as well as questionnaires such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Goldberg, 1993). McRae and Costa identified that neuroticism, extraversion, and openness to experience were major components of psychological tests.

The FFM also has roots in studies using the lexical hypothesis, which is a rationale that uses dictionary lexicon to recognize personality descriptive terms and note how many share aspects of their meanings (Goldberg, 1993). The English language contains thousands of words used to describe personality and analysis can be used to find similar factors. Using the lexical hypothesis approach Lewis Goldberg concluded that there were indeed five personality factor markers. The FFM finally came together when Goldberg presented his research to McRae and Costa in 1983 where his “efforts to convince them that five orthogonal factors were necessary to account for phenotypic personality differences fell on receptive ears” (Goldberg, 1993). It was at this point that the lexical approach and questionnaire approach merged. McRae and Costa were persuaded to add conscientiousness and agreeableness to their model and the structure had now been formed for the present FFM.

Factor Definitions

The factor names are not just a matter of convention but in fact the labels reflect conceptualizations of the factors (McCrae & John, 1992). This would explain why there is some dispute among proponents of the FFM. There is little dispute about the extraversion domain (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Extraversion and agreeableness define the interpersonal circumplex. Goldberg (1999) argues that extraversion is most closely associated with dominance, while McCrae and Costa (1989) argue that the factor is midway between dominance and warmth. Extraversion is distinguished by its breadth of content such as venturesome, energy, ambition and on the opposite end, shy, silent, and withdrawn (McCrae & John, 1992). Goldberg (1999) identified facets such as friendliness, gregariousness, activity level, cheerfulness, and assertiveness as parts of the extraversion domain.

An interpretation of Agreeableness is dependent upon one's interpretation of extraversion (McCrae & John, 1992). It is a domain of human morality. The factor is comprised of characteristics such as altruism, caring, emotional support, and nurturance as well as self-centeredness, spitefulness, and jealousy (McCrae & John, 1992). Goldberg (1999) defined lower level facets such as altruism, cooperation, sympathy, trust, and modesty.

Conscientiousness encompasses characteristics such as thoroughness, neat, organization, diligent, and achievement orientation (McCrae & John, 1992). Some view Conscientiousness as a dimension that holds impulsive behavior in check while others see it as dimension that organizes and direct behaviors (McCrae & John, 1992). The general consensus is that Conscientiousness combines both aspects because it can mean either

governed by conscience or thought (McCrae & John, 1992). The lower level facets identified by Goldberg (1999) are self-efficacy, dutifulness, self-discipline, orderliness, and cautiousness.

Neuroticism is the least disputed and most agree that the factor represents individual differences in the experience of distress (McCrae & John, 1992). Those who have high N scores are more likely to report depression, anxiety, anger, embarrassment, and more likely to have psychiatric disorders (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Those with low N scores are more likely to be calm and stable. Goldberg (1999) identified lower-level facets that include anxiety, depression, anger, self-consciousness, and vulnerability.

The factor most debated is Openness to Experience. Researchers claim that the factor represents intelligence while others see a broader dimension that includes intellect as well as creativity, differentiated emotions, aesthetic sensitivity, need for variety, and unconventional values (McCrae & John, 1992). The differences in these two views can be accounted for by the questionnaire approach to the FFM and the lexical approach to the FFM.

Evidence for the FFM

The factors are shown to be stable across time based on cross observer validity of the five factors (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Buss (1991) also reports that personality will typically be consistent over time although, individual differences are embodied in the FFM. Facets such as friendliness appear to generalize across target persons varying in sex and familiarity (Buss, 1991). Costa and McCrae define traits as “enduring dispositions that can be inferred from patterns of behavior” that can be assessed by longitudinal studies. Finn (1986) reported that Neuroticism and Extraversion remained relatively

stable in 78 middle age men retested after 30 years. All five factors have also been validated in longitudinal studies (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Norman and Goldberg (1966) reported the stability of the factors between peer and spouse ratings as well as McCrae and Costa (1987). Surprisingly, life experiences such as divorce, raising children, illness, and retirement have shown to have little impact on personality profiles (McCrae, 2011).

The factors are not just stable across time but each dimension of the five factors has evidence for universality (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The five factors are found in both sexes, all races, different age groups, and across cultures (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The FFM structure has been replicated in over 50 cultures (McCrae, 2011). The factors have been found in teachers' ratings of children, in college students, and in adults (Costa & McCrae, 1992). In a sample of approximately 1500 individuals tested in research study on job performance, using the NEO-PI, found similar factors for white and non-white subjects (Costa et Al., 1991). Ostendorf (1990) found an almost perfect replication of the FFM structure after analyzing a German lexicon. Also, Chinese trait adjectives have been analyzed and researchers have reported five factors, not identical, but similar to the standard five (Costa & McCrae, 1992). McCrae and Costa (1997) also found that a similar structure of personality can be found in at least six distinct language families that include the native languages of most of the earth's inhabitants.

Since the five factors are found across many cultures, it can be expected that they are basic features of human nature. There are many studies that have shown that Neuroticism and Extraversion have genetic influences (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Plomin and McClearn (1990) found that 41 percent of the variance on the Openness to Experience scale could be credited to genetic influence. Eysenck has published many

studies that suggest Agreeableness and Conscientiousness have genetic influences (Costa & McCrae, 1992). It is important to note that Eysenck studies are on psychoticism, this can be interpreted from the FFM as a combination of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. Studies have also shown that identical twins raised in different households showed similar personality profiles in adulthood, but adopted children reared in the same households and school had different personality profiles (McCrae, 2011). Some evidence suggests that the Openness to Experience factor has the strongest genetic influence (McCrae, 2000). There is also a neurological basis for the five factors; Tooby and Cosmides (1990) claim that neurophysiological systems may account for the covariation of specific traits among into broad factors.

With its many supporters and replicable studies the FFM does not come without criticisms. Block (1995) claimed that the method of factor analysis does not provide accurate factors that are incisive and that using the lexical approach uses methodological assumptions that are inaccurate. Block argued that the use of factor analysis in the FFM and common variance did not reflect personality factors that are found in the real world (Block, 1995). He also criticized the FFM for having a set number of factors and that there is not a set method to determine an exact number of personality factors and that a set of variables may be prestructured leading to a predetermined outcome (Block, 1995).

Despite these criticisms the FFM has proven to be a useful model for many, especially in applied settings. Since the development of the FFM, personality psychologists now know more about personality than ever before (McCrae, 2011). The FFM has made it easier to study trait development and heritability sex differences (McCrae, 2011). The factors can be predictors of life satisfaction, academic achievement,

vocational interest, and job performance (McCrae, 2011) (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001).

FFM and Job Satisfaction

Psychology has often attempted to discover why individuals vary in their motivation to work as well as how organizational factors influence job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is defined as “the extent to which people are satisfied with their work” (Furnham, Eraculeous, Chamorro-Premuzic, 2009). It is difficult to discuss the concept of job satisfaction without discussing motivation because “it is arguable the extent to which an individual is satisfied at work is dictated by the presence of factors that motivates him or her” (Furnham, et al., 2009). Since the consensus is that the FFM can be used to describe most salient aspects of personality, then it is useful in organizational settings and employee satisfaction (Judge & Mount, 2002). The rationale behind contemporary theories of motivation and job satisfaction is to increase employee enthusiasm in their roles through a framework where organizations can better influence their employees’ drive to work (Furnham et al., 2009). Most job satisfaction literature ignores individual differences and focuses on organization predictors such as pay and supervision (Furnham et al., 2009). On the other hand, O’Reilly et al. (1980) found that individuals significantly differ in the way they perceive their jobs, even if the roles they had to perform remained constant, which suggests that some individual differences affect work attitudes (Furnham et al., 2009). A longitudinal study by Staw and Ross (1985) found that employees’ attitudes, which include job satisfaction, were stable across five years, even with occupation and employer changes (Furnham et al., 2009). Prior attitudes were a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than pay or promotions (Furnham et al., 2009).

Many researchers have begun to give considerable amount of attention to the effect of genetic influences on job satisfaction. Avery et al., (1989) documented that with environmental influences, genetic influences account for 30 percent of the variance in job satisfaction. This is in accordance with the fact that most studies that involve researching the heritability of personality only report an average of .5 percent; it is reasonable to assume that personality accounts for part of this (Furnham et al., 2009).

Some researchers argue that individual dispositional traits that increase or decrease job satisfaction have a profound influence on how the working world is perceived (Furnham et al., 2009). It has also been hypothesized that extroverts may be highly motivated by intrinsic factors such as positive feedback and rewards, since people who score high in extraversion are more sociable in nature (Furnham et al., 2009). It is also hypothesized that individuals with higher openness to experience scores will be more likely to be satisfied with jobs that involve innovation and learning new skills (Furnham et al., 2009). Many studies have confirmed that conscientiousness is a predictor of job satisfaction; “individuals are likely to higher intrinsic and extrinsic rewards due to their efficient nature, thus consequently increasing job satisfaction” (Furnham et al., 2009). Factor scores, in a study to find the associations between personality and work values, demonstrated that responses can categorized according to intrinsic and extrinsic, which also supports cross cultural evidence (Furnham et al., 2009).

In a study designed to investigate the extent to which personality and demographic factors explain variance in motivation and job satisfaction, Furnham et al. (2009) found that personality and demographic variables were significantly related to job satisfaction. Conscientiousness, in particular was found to be a significant predictor of

job satisfaction, as well as of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. In a meta-analysis review, using the FFM as a basis for examining the dispositional source of job satisfaction, Judge and Mount (2002) found that extraversion, conscientiousness, and extraversion were moderately correlated with job satisfaction. They also found that neuroticism emerged as the greatest predictor of job satisfaction, which supports the idea that individuals with lower neuroticism scores experience more emotional stability and tend to be more happier in life, as well as their jobs (Judge & Mount, 2002).

FFM and Job Performance

The relationship between personality and job performance can be categorized into two distinct phases (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001). The first phase includes research conducted from the early 1900s through the mid 1980s (Barrick et al., 2001). The use of personality testing for employee selection was frowned upon by personnel selection specialists (Hurtz & Donovan, 2000). The general conclusion was that personality tests did not “demonstrate adequate, predictive variability to qualify their use in personnel selection” (Hurtz & Donovan, 2000). In recent years, there has been more enthusiasm regarding the use of personality testing in employee selection. Researchers have concluded that the lack of validity in personality testing in employee selection was obscured due to the lack of a common personality framework for organizing the traits being used as predictors (Hurtz & Donovan, 2000). There was also no classification system to reduce the thousands of personality traits into a small manageable number (Barrick et al., 2001).

The second phase of personality and job performance covers the mid 1980s to the present time (Barrick et al., 2001). The research on personality and job performance is

now dominated by the FFM. Most studies since the early 1990s have used instruments that utilize the big FFM as their framework, or used the FFM to classify individual scales from personality inventories (Barrick et al., 2001). It is also important to note that second phase of research is characterized by the use of meta-analytic methods to summarize results, which shows promising results for the utilizing the FFM in job performance research (Barrick et al., 2001).

Research conducted by Barrick and Mount (1991) found that conscientiousness was the only trait to display correlations with job performance across different occupational groups and criterion types (Barrick et al., 2001). On the other hand, Tett, Rothstein and Jackson (1991) found that agreeableness and openness to experience displayed higher correlations with job performance than conscientiousness (Barrick et al., 2001). There have also been a few more recent studies that have found correlations between job performance and conscientiousness as well as, meta-analysis that have reported with as much variance as the findings noted above (Barrick et al., 2001). These correlations demonstrate that the differences across primary studies are usually due to small sample sizes rather the meaningful differences among the traits and job performance (Barrick et al., 2001).

The FFM has provided researchers with a framework that enables them to develop specific hypotheses about the predictive validity of personality constructs (Barrick et al., 2001). The FFM has been useful in almost all occupations but some traits are more useful for certain occupations. For example, high scores in agreeableness are predictive of job satisfaction in the service industry, while extraversion and openness to experience are useful for occupations with training and proficiency (Barrick et al., 2001). Most research

has shown that conscientiousness is more related to job performance among the five traits (Barrick et al., 2001). This is not surprising because it would be rare to find a job where laziness and irresponsibility were tolerated.

A study in a government training institution in China Jiang, Wang and Zhou (2009) investigated the relationship between job performance and agreeableness and conscientiousness. They found that conscientiousness was predictive of task and contextual performance among government employees in China (Jiang et al., 2009). Unexpectedly, they also found that agreeableness showed a negative predictive relationship with task performance (Jiang et al., 2009). These results suggests that a “negative relationship may be more common in China where paternalistic leadership is though to be prevalent...”(Jiang et al., 2009). In summary, their results confirm the generalizability of the effects of conscientiousness on task performance in China.

More recently, the term “work role” has been used to refer to the performance responsibilities an individual has at work (Neal, Yeo, Koy & Xiao, 2012). Neal et al. (2012) identify nine dimensions of work role performance by cross-classifying three forms of behavior (proficiency, adaptivity, and proactivity) with three levels of behavior that contribute to effectiveness (individual, team, and organizational). These work forms have been redefined because as work systems become more complex and uncertain, work roles then become more flexible (Neal et al., 2012). As a result, it is more important for organizations and employers to easily identify those that have the ability to adapt to and initiate change in the work place (Neal et al., 2012). This leads to an interest in identifying personality traits that predict these characteristics.

These characteristics are different forms of behavior that are required in different situations. Proficiency is the extent to which an individual meets the requirements of their role (Neal et al., 2012). Adaptivity is the extent to which an individual adapts to changes, and proactivity is the extent to which an individual takes self-directed action to anticipate or imitate change (Neal et al., 2012). Most work roles require a mixture of these three. Neal et al. (2012) hypothesized that these behaviors can be predicted in terms of the Five Factor Model.

Neal et al. (2012) found a differential pattern of relationships among the five personality traits and nine dimensions of work role performance. They found that openness to experience was positively related to proactivity at the individual and organizational levels (Neal et al., 2012). These results suggest that individuals who are creative and curious also engage in self-directed behaviors that initiate change in an individual's own role or the organization (Neal et al., 2012). Surprisingly, they found that openness to experience was negatively related to team and organizational proficiency (Neal et al., 2012). This could suggest that openness to experience inhibits cooperative behaviors (Neal et al., 2012). Agreeableness was negatively related to individual proactivity, which could suggest that cooperative characteristics inhibit behaviors that challenge existing role definitions (Neal et al., 2012). This finding is consistent with the view of the passive nature of agreeableness (Neal et al., 2012).

Neal et al. (2012) also found that extraversion was negatively related to individual task proficiency. They hypothesized that extraversion in administrative settings might be inhibited or viewed negatively by those in upper management. As expected, Neal et al., (2012) found that conscientiousness and neuroticism predicted all dimensions of work

role performance; conscientiousness was the strongest predictor of individual task performance.

Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, Personality in Public Administration

Even though the FFM has emerged as the most theoretically sound frameworks regarding personality measurement, it is practically absent in the public administration sector. In a study using a survey of public administrators in three states, Cooper et al. (in press) demonstrated the usefulness of all five domains of the FFM in predicting job satisfaction and job performance.

To measure job outcomes Cooper et al. (in press) selected organizational citizenship as well as job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is an important variable to measure in public administration because it is associated with employee retention and organizational productivity (Cooper et al., in press). The study also measures organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB). Organ (1988) defines these as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Cooper et al., in press). These behaviors are important to an organization because they are linked to job performance, assessing OCB can assist organizations in employee selections. It is important to note that there is a distinction between organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward an individual (OCBI) and organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward organizations (OCBO) (Cooper et al., in press). Literature on OCB suggest that citizenship behaviors can vary person to person and that personality, a stable trait, can predict OCBI and OCBO scores (Cooper et al., in press).

Cooper et al. (in press) first identified a sample of 862 public managers through a query of members through North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia government management associations. Most members of these associations are city, town, or county managers but budget analysts, planners, and other public officials are also members (Cooper et al., in press).

Cooper et al. (in press) then emailed a five-section questionnaire that assessed awareness and opinions of personality assessment in public management, organizational citizenship behaviors, job satisfaction, FFM, and finally demographic questions. Respondents were encouraged to answer the survey with a web based program that calculated the participants' personality profile (Cooper et al., in press). Approximately 30 percent of the participants responded to the survey (Cooper et al., in press).

This study made several contributions to research on personality and job outcomes in public administration. Cooper et al. (in press) found that 60 percent of respondents consider personality assessment useful and rely on personality measurements in their job. This demonstrates the importance of sound, reliable, validated personality assessment in organizational settings. Unfortunately, organizations that use personality assessments are not using theoretically sound measurements; they are typically use instruments such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. As noted earlier, there are many problems with the MBTI including its theoretical framework, dichotomized scales, and its inability to assess how well preferred functions are formed. Alternatively, the FFM is an empirically validated and theoretically sound framework for personality assessments and there is a general consensus among scholars that the FFM provides the best tools for assessing personality.

Cooper et al. (in press) demonstrated that all five factors of personality can explain employee behaviors. Conscientiousness was the only trait that was a significant predictor in all contexts (Cooper et al., in press). The study also found relationship between conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism and OCBI, as well as, a relationship between conscientiousness and openness to experience with OCBO (Cooper et al., in press). Surprisingly, neuroticism showed a positive correlation with OCBI (Cooper et al., in press). They suggest that this might be due to how people who score higher on neuroticism think and perform their jobs; they are unlikely to be satisfied but work hard to contribute to the organization and individuals within the organization (Cooper et al., in press).

Cooper et al. (in press) suggests that employers should pay close attention to conscientiousness when selecting employees for satisfaction and organizational citizenship. They openly admit that their study was limited to three states and one region and they cannot be sure if these results could be generalizable to other populations (Cooper et al., in press). Other criticisms are that participants may have given socially desirable answers in self-report measures (Cooper et al., in press). Despite the criticisms, Cooper et al. (in press) feel that the FFM can predict job outcomes such as job satisfaction and organizational citizenship.

Personality and the Non-Profit Sector

Goulet and Frank (2002) noted that there is indeed a difference between profit, public, and non-profit sectors especially the motivation and behaviors of employees in the non-profit sector. Goulet and Frank (2002) found that organizational commitment was highest among for profit employees, followed by non-profit, and organizational

commitment was lowest among public sector employees. Organizational commitment is similar to organizational citizenship behaviors. These findings support the idea that the non-profit sector is unique. Unfortunately there is a lack of research on non-profit organizations; it is neglected in literature of organizational commitment, personality, and job performance.

Statement of the problem

Personality assessments are useful for many types of organizational settings. They can be used for employee selection, employee placement, assessing leadership styles, and team building. A review of the literature on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator shows that instrument came from unorthodox beginnings and that the instrument lacks empirical validation. Even though scholars agree that the instrument should not used to assess individual differences, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is one of the most widely used personality assessments, especially in organizational settings. Conversely, the five-factor model provides personality instruments with a theoretically sound framework that is supported by empirical research. It shows that across age and culture that personality is innate, stable trait. The FFM has yet to enter the organizational realm broadly, even though it is the most widely accepted personality instrument among scholars.

Job satisfaction and job performance are also important in organizational settings. Many of the studies on the relationship between FFM traits and job satisfaction show varying results, with conscientiousness being the most common predictor of both job satisfaction and job performance. A more recent study chose to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship (job performance)

and the FFM in public administration (Cooper et al., in press). They found that all five traits can be useful in predicting job satisfaction and organizational citizenship.

A sector closely related to public administration is the non-profit sector. The non-profit sector is virtually absent in literature documenting the use of personality assessment, although it can be assumed that the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is the most popular instrument in this type of setting. This study would like to introduce the FFM into the non-profit sector by demonstrating its usefulness in predicting job outcomes, such as job satisfaction and job performance. The study will compare a public-domain proxy of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the M5-50 (an instrument to assess the five traits) in predicting job outcomes, using organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction as variables

Hypotheses

1. The FFM will provide a better framework for predicting job performance.
Specifically using multiple regression, with organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as the criterion variable, the five factors of the FFM will produce a higher R^2 than the four personality scales of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.
2. The FFM will provide a better framework for predicting job satisfaction.
Specifically, using multiple regression, with job satisfaction as the criterion variable, the five factors of the FFM will produce a higher R^2 than the four personality scales of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

CHAPTER 3: METHOD

Participants

Careful consideration was given to selecting what non-profit sample would be used in this study. It was important to make sure to select a homogenous sample that displayed a general commitment to public welfare. United Way was chosen because of its history with superior public service and a beyond reproach commitment to serve the general public.

To test these hypotheses, a sample of directors of United Way was identified. After considering a number of possibilities, with permission from the Executive Director of United Way of North Carolina, emails were obtained from United Way websites from 12 states. States were selected at random, and United Way offices from counties within the states were identified and 963 emails were obtained from the websites within the counties. A total of 133 surveys were completed. Cases with five or more missing items were excluded and a total of 128 surveys were used in the data analyses.

Measures

M5-50. The M5-50 represents our measure of the five-factor model of personality. It is a 50-item questionnaire derived from Goldberg's International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) that measures the five broad domains of the NEO-PI-R. The IPIP allows free access to reliable and valid personality instruments for anyone interested in personality research (Socha, Cooper, & McCord, 2010). The M5-50 is a freely available, with a specific ordering of the items, questionnaire (Socha, 2010). The questionnaire asks participants to rate on a 5-point scale how accurately each statement describes them. Socha et al. (2010) provided additional reliability and construct validity

data for the instrument in their study using a web based questionnaire and 760 participants. As an incentive to take to the surveys the questionnaires were programmed to give respondents their personality profile.

Neocleous MBTI Proxy. The Neocleus public domain proxy represents our measure for the MBTI. The public domain proxy is a 36-item scale developed from www.personalitytest.net, originally a 68-item scale developed by Nick Neocleus (see attached) that yields scores similar to the constructs measured by the MBTI. This instrument was developed in a preliminary study using 100 volunteers recruited from the human subjects pool at Western Carolina University. Participants completed both the MBTI and the proxy in a counter balanced order. Results showed that the proxy had high correlations with the MBTI (Bridges & McCord, 2012).

Job satisfaction scale. The JIG is a global job satisfaction instrument and is part of the Job Descriptive index. The JIG has 18 items and is reliable and valid instrument for assessing job satisfaction (Saane et al., 2003)

OCB-O and OCB-I. I used two organizational citizenship scales developed by Lee and Allen (2002). The scales measure two types of citizenship behaviors; behaviors that are intended to help an organization and behaviors that are intended to help an individual. Participants were asked to rate how often they engage in citizenship behaviors on a 7-point scale (1=never, 7=always).

Procedures

Surveys were assembled and distributed through Qualtrics. After one week a reminder was sent to those who had not completed the survey, asking them to complete the survey with the link attached. The survey was closed one week after the reminder.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The means for the five factors of the M5-50, the four factors of the Neocleous MBTI proxy, as well as the means for OCB-O, OCB-I, and job satisfaction are shown in the chart below.

Table 1: *Scale Means*

Scales	Means
Extraversion	3.76
Agreeableness	4.16
Conscientiousness	4.07
Neuroticism	2.09
Openness	3.92
Sensing/Intuiting	1.48
Judging/Perceiving	1.29
Extraversion/Introversion	1.41
Thinking/Feeling	1.55
OCB-O	6.32
OCB-I	5.75
Job Satisfaction	2.74

Multiple regression analyses were conducted to compare the five factors of the M5-50 to the four factors of the Neocleous MBTI proxy in predicting three separate outcome criteria, OCB-O, OCB-I, and job satisfaction. Bivariate correlations were also computed in order to provide additional perspectives on the data.

With regard to OCB-O, the multiple regression model for the M5-50 predictors produced Adjusted $R^2 = .099$, $F(5, 119) = 3.718$, $p < .004$. Significant beta weights were produced by Conscientiousness and Extraversion. The multiple regression model for the MBTI proxy produced Adjusted $R^2 = .099$, $F(4, 120) = 4.418$, $p < .002$. Significant beta weights were produced by scales Extraversion-Introversion and Thinking-Feeling. See Table 1 for additional details from the multiple regression analyses.

Table 2: *Regression Analyses for Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Organization*

	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	Sig.
M5-50	.368	.135	.099	3.718	.004
MBTI Proxy	.358	.128	.099	4.418	.002

With regard to OCB-I, the multiple regression model for the M5-50 predictors produced Adjusted $R^2 = .066$, $F(5, 120) = 2.758$, $p < .021$. Significant beta weights were produced by Agreeableness. The multiple regression model for the MBTI proxy produced Adjusted $R^2 = .066$, $F(4, 121) = 3.223$, $p < .015$. Significant beta weights were produced by scale Sensing-Intuiting. See Table 2 for additional details from the multiple regression analyses.

Table 3: *Regression Analyses for Organizational Citizenship Behavior- Individual*

	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	Sig.
M5-50	.321	.103	.066	2.758	.021
MBTI Proxy	.310	.096	.066	3.223	.015

With regard to job satisfaction, the multiple regression model for the M5-50 predictors produced Adjusted $R^2=.074$, $F(5, 121)= 3.022$, $p <.013$. Significant beta weights were produced by scales Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism. The multiple regression model for the MBTI proxy produced Adjusted $R^2=.021$, $F(4, 122)= 1.691$, $p<.156$. Significant beta weights were not produced by any scales. See Table 3 for additional details from the multiple regression analyses.

Table 4: *Regression Analyses for Job Satisfaction*

	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	Sig.
M5-50	.333	.111	.074	3.022	.013
MBTI Proxy	.229	.053	.021	1.691	.156

Finally, bivariate correlations were calculated between each predictor variable and each outcome variable. Table 4 and table 5 presents these results, along with Cronbach's alphas for each scale. Among the FFM predictors, significant correlations with one or more outcome variables were found for Extraversion (with OCB-O), Agreeableness (with OCB-I), and Conscientiousness (with all three outcome variables). Among the MBTI proxy predictors, significant correlations with one or more outcome variables were found for sensing/intuiting (with OCB-I), and judging/perceiving (with OCB-I), and extraversion/introversion (with OCB-O).

Table 5: *Bivariate Correlations with Predictor and Outcome Variables*

		OCBO	OCBI	Job Satisfaction
Extraversion	Pearson Correlation	.272 ^{**}	.097	.045
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.281	.612
Agreeableness	Pearson Correlation	.033	.260 ^{**}	-.090
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.711	.003	.312
Conscientiousness	Pearson Correlation	.281 ^{**}	.199 [*]	.177 [*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.025	.046
Neuroticism	Pearson Correlation	-.113	-.108	-.154
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.211	.231	.084
Openness to Experience	Pearson Correlation	.077	-.081	-.162
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.395	.366	.068
Sensing/ Intuiting	Pearson Correlation	.092	-.237 ^{**}	-.096
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.309	.007	.282
Judging/ Perceiving	Pearson Correlation	.026	-.223 [*]	-.166
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.774	.012	.062
Extraversion/Introversion	Pearson Correlation	-.241 ^{**}	-.045	-.126
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.615	.157
Thinking/Feeling	Pearson Correlation	-.222 [*]	.056	-.111
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	.536	.212

****.** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*****. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 6: *Scale Cronbach's Alphas*

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
Extraversion	.755
Agreeableness	.788
Conscientiousness	.779
Neuroticism	.791
Openness to Experience	.735
Sensing/Intuiting	.567
Judging/Perceiving	.712
Extroversion/Introversion	.730
Thinking/Feeling	.586

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

As mentioned early, formal assessment of personality characteristics is common in many organizational settings, for reasons such as personnel selection, personnel training, determining leadership styles and team building. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is the most commonly used personality questionnaire in assessing common personality characteristics, but with its popularity comes many flaws. The five-factor model on the other hand provides a better empirically based theoretical framework for assessing personality. This study compared the two theoretical frameworks in predicting job performance and job satisfaction, using a proxy for the MBTI and the M5-50 for the FFM, in a sample of directors of United Way. The hypotheses were:

1. The FFM will provide a better framework for predicting job performance. Specifically using multiple regression, with organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as the criterion variable, the five factors of the FFM will produce a higher R^2 than the four personality scales of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.
2. The FFM will provide a better framework for predicting job satisfaction. Specifically, using multiple regression, with job satisfaction as the criterion variable, the five factors of the FFM will produce a higher R^2 than the four personality scales of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

The results indicated that the FFM did not provide a better framework for predicting job performance when using multiple regression, with organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as the criterion variable. This could be due to a lack of variability in the scores of organizational citizenship behavior. The lack of variability in OCB scores could also be due to a small sample size. It could be speculated that

the respondents that completed the survey are more likely to engage in altruistic organizational behaviors, which is why they are more likely to complete the survey.

The results also indicated that the FFM did provide a better framework for predicting job satisfaction when using multiple regression, with job satisfaction as the criterion variable. The FFM can help predict job satisfaction in organizational settings, which has many benefits to the employer and employee. Being aware of one's own personality and knowing one's weaknesses and strengths can help organizations find personnel that is best suited for the organization, and those that would be happiest in the organization. Being able to predict who will be happiest in the organization can also reduce turnover rates within the organization.

The implications and findings of this study help support that the FFM is a better framework for assessing personality . Not only does the FFM provide an empirically based theoretical framework, but it also provides free assessment tools, such as the M5-50. Free assessment tools allow any organization on any budget to utilize personality assessment.

REFERENCES

- Barrick, M., Mount, M., Judge, T. (2001). Personality and Performance at the Beginning of the New Millennium: What Do We Know and Where Do We Go Next? *Personality and Performance*, 9(1): 9-30.
- Benz, Matthias. (2005). Not for the Profit, but for the Satisfaction?-Evidence on Worker Well-Being in Non-Profit Firms. *Kyklos*, 58(2): 155-176.
- Block, J. (1995). A contrarian view of the five-factor approach to personality description. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(2): 187-215.
- Bridges, W. B., & McCord, D. M. (February, 2012). *Development of a public domain proxy for the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Buss, M D. (1991). Evolutionary Personality Psychology. *Annual Review Psychology*. 42(1)459-491
- Coe, C., K. (1992). The MBTI: Potential uses and misuses in personnel administration. *Public Personnel Management*, 21(4), 511-522.
- Cooper, C. A., Knotts, H. G., Johnson, A. J., & McCord, D. M. (in press). Taking personality seriously: The Five Factor Model and public management. *American Review of Public Administration*.
- Costa, T. P., McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13(6) 653-665.

- Dattener, Ben. (2008). The Use and Misuse of Personality tests for Coaching and Development. Credit and Blame at Work. Retrieved from:
<http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/minds-work/200806/the-use-and-misuse-personality-tests-coaching-and-development>
- Digman, J. M. (1996). The curious history of the five-factor model. In J. Wiggins (Ed.), *The Five-Factor Model of Personality*, (pp.1-20). New York: Guilford.
- Furnham, A., Eracleous, A., Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2009) Personality, motivation and job satisfaction: Hertzberg meets the Big Five. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(8) 765 - 779
- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The Structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26-34.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. Defruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality Psychology in Europe*, Vol. 7 (pp. 7-28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
- Goulet, L., Frank, M. (2002). Organizational commitment across three sectors: public, non-profit, and for profit. *Public Personnel Management*, 31(2) 201-210.
- Hurtz, G. M. and J. J. Donovan. (2000). Personality and job performance: The big five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 869-879.

- Jiang, C., D. Wang, and F. Zhou. (2009). Personality traits and job performance in local government organizations in china. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 37(4), 451-457.
- Judge, T. A., D. Heller, M.K. Mount. (2002). Five factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 530-541.
- Jung, C. G. (1923). *Psychological types*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- McCrae, R. R., (2000). Nature Over Nurture: Temperment, Personality, and Life Span Development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 78(1), 173-186.
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P.T., Jr. (1987). Validation of the Five-Factor Model of Personality Across Instruments and Observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1) 81-90
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Jr. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52, 509-516.
- McCrae, R. R., (2011). Personality Theories for the 21st Century. *Teaching of Psychology* ,38(3) 209-214.
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Jr. (1989). Reinterpreting the Myers-Briggs type indicator from the perspective of the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Personality*, 57(1), 17-40.
- McCrae, R. R., and John, O., (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality* 60(2), 175-215.

Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, Consulting Psychologists Press.

Neal, A., Yeo, G., Koy, A., Xiao, T. (2012). Predicting the form and direction of work role performance from the Big 5 model of personality traits. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(2), 175-192.

Saane, N., Sluiter, J.K., Verbeek, H. A. M., Frings-Dresen, M. H. W. (2003). Reliability and validity of instruments measuring job satisfaction-a systematic review. *Occupational Review*, 53(3), 191-200.

Socha, A., C. A. Cooper, and D. M. McCord. (2010). Confirmatory factor analysis of the M5-50: An implementation of the international item pool item set. *Psychological Assessment*, 22(1), 43-49.

Shuit, Douglas. (2003). At 60, Myers-Briggs Still Sorting out and Identifying People's Types. Retrieved from:
<http://www.workforce.com/article/20031126/NEWS02/311269976>

APPENDICES

Appendix A: M5-50 Questionnaire

M5-50 Questionnaire

David M. McCord, Ph.D., Western Carolina University

Optional Fields

Phone: _____ Email: _____ Ethnic identity: _____

This is a personality questionnaire, which should take about 10 minutes. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions; you simply respond with the choice that describes you best. Please rate how accurately each statement describes you by marking inaccurate, moderately inaccurate, neither, moderately accurate, or accurate.

If you feel that you cannot see the questions appropriately because of sight difficulties, cannot use a pencil well because of hand-motor problems, or know of any other physical, emotional, or environmental issues which would affect your performance on this test, please notify the testing administrator now.

If you feel extremely nervous about this testing process and feel that your nervousness will affect your performance, please notify the testing administrator so that they can answer any questions about this process and alleviate any fears. Please recognize that a degree of nervousness is normal for most testing.

The *M5 Questionnaire* is used primarily for research purposes, though in certain cases individual results may be shared with the test-taker through a professional consultation. In general, results are treated anonymously and are combined with other data in order to develop norms, establish psychometric properties of these scales and items, and to study various theoretical and practical issues within the field of personality psychology.

By proceeding with the process and responding to these questionnaire items, you are expressing your understanding of these terms and your consent for your data to be used for research purposes. You are also agreeing to release and forever discharge *Western Carolina University* and *David M. McCord, Ph.D.*, from any and all claims of any kind or nature whatsoever arising from the assessment process.

M5-50 Questionnaire	
1	Have a vivid imagination
2	Believe in the importance of art
3	Seldom feel blue
4	Have a sharp tongue
5	Am not interested in abstract ideas
6	Find it difficult to get down to work
7	Panic easily
8	Tend to vote for liberal political candidates
9	Am not easily bothered by things
10	Make friends easily
11	Often feel blue
12	Get chores done right away
13	Suspect hidden motives in others
14	Rarely get irritated
15	Do not like art
16	Dislike myself
17	Keep in the background
18	Do just enough work to get by
19	Am always prepared
20	Tend to vote for conservative political candidates
21	Feel comfortable with myself
22	Avoid philosophical discussions
23	Waste my time
24	Believe that others have good intentions
25	Am very pleased with myself
26	Have little to say

27	Feel comfortable around other people
28	Am often down in the dumps
29	Do not enjoy going to art museums
30	Have frequent mood swings
31	Don't like to draw attention to myself
32	Insult people
33	Have a good word for everyone
34	Get back at others
35	Carry out my plans
36	Would describe my experiences as somewhat dull
37	Carry the conversation to a higher level
38	Don't see things through
39	Am skilled in handling social situations
40	Respect others
41	Pay attention to details
42	Am the life of the party
43	Enjoy hearing new ideas
44	Accept people as they are
45	Don't talk a lot
46	Cut others to pieces
47	Make plans and stick to them
48	Know how to captivate people
49	Make people feel at ease
50	Shirk my duties

Appendix B

Neocleous Proxy for the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

Personality Type Indicator

Instructions: Please choose one answer from the following

1. Where would you prefer to spend most of your time if you were on a holiday

- Meeting people
- Reading and taking lonely walks

2. Do you admire people who

- Can get things done
- Are warm and kind

3. Do you tend to

- Plan your actions in advance
- Let things happen naturally

4. Do you admire people who are

- Stable and successful
- Profound

5. Do you find it

- Difficult to talk about your feelings
- Easy to talk about your feelings

6. You know how to make good use of your time

- All of the time
- Sometimes

7. Are you more interested in

- Putting things in order
- Anticipating opportunities for a change

8. Do you more often prefer to

- Classify
- Brainstorm

9. Are you more likely to trust

- Reason
- Feelings

10. In social situations you

- Find it easy to communicate
- Are more of a listener than a speaker

11. Are you more interested in

- What is real
- What is meaningful

12. Do you value in yourself more that you are

- Just and impartial
- Merciful and forgiving

13. Do you more often prefer to

- Know what you are getting yourself into
- Adapt to new situations

14. Do you tend to

- Take deadlines seriously
- See deadlines as elastic

15. Do you tend to

- Expect something in return when you help someone
- Readily help people while asking nothing in return

16. Are you more comfortable

- Checking off a "to do" list
- Ignoring a "to do" list even if you made one

17. Would you say that you are more in need of

- Social interactions
- Peace and privacy

18. When watching TV dramas do you feel

- Personally uninvolved with the characters
- Personally involved with the characters

19. Would you say that you

- Sometimes talk without thinking
 - Usually think without talking
20. Would you say that you
- Know many people
 - Know few people, but deeply
21. Your desk or workbench at your workplace is
- Usually neat and orderly
 - Untidy and messy
22. When working with others do you tend to
- See their flaws and question their findings
 - Show your appreciation in order to please them
23. Do you usually
- Work first and play later
 - Play first and work later
24. Which of the following describes you better
- “What you see is what you get”
 - “Still waters run deep”
25. Do you tend to be more
- Deliberate
 - Impulsive
26. Are you more satisfied
- With a public role
 - Working “behind the scenes”
27. Which do you tend to notice more
- The facts, details and realities of the world around you
 - The meaning of the facts and relationships between them
28. Would you say that you
- Make decisions easily
 - Find difficulty making decisions
29. Do you tend to

- Tolerate noise and crowds
 - Avoid crowds and seek quiet
30. Are you the kind of person who
- Feels rules and regulations are essential
 - Dislikes rules and regulations
31. Are you the kind of person who
- Communicates with enthusiasm
 - Keeps enthusiasm to yourself
32. Which do you admire more
- Practical solutions
 - Creative ideas
33. Are you more likely to be motivated by
- Achievement
 - Appreciation
34. Do you prefer to
- Read step-by-step instructions
 - Figure things out for yourself
35. In most situations you rely more on
- Careful planning
 - Improvisation
36. Would you say that you
- Like to be at the center of attention
 - Are content being on the sidelines

Appendix C

Job Satisfaction Survey

Please select “yes” if this describes your job and “no” if it doesn’t

1. Pleasant
2. Bad
3. Great
4. Waste of time
5. Good
6. Undesirable
7. Worthwhile
8. Worst than most
9. Acceptable
10. Superior
11. Better than most
12. Disagreeable
13. Makes me content
14. Inadequate
15. Excellent
16. Rotten
17. Enjoyable
18. Poor

Appendix D

Organizational Citizenship Scales (Adapted from Lee and Allen 2002)

OCBI (Individual)

1. Help others who have been absent.
2. Willingly give your time to help others who have work-related problems.
3. Adjust your work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time off.
4. Go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group.
5. Show genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even under the most trying business or personal situations.
6. Give up time to help others who have work or nonwork problems.
7. Assist others with their duties.
8. Share personal property with others to help their work.

OCBO (Organizational)

9. Attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image.
10. Keep up with developments in the organization.
11. Defend the organization when other employees criticize it.
12. Show pride when representing the organization in public.
13. Offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization.
14. Express loyalty toward the organization.
15. Take action to protect the organization from potential problems.
16. Demonstrate concern about the image of the organization.

- Respondents were asked to indicate their answers to the above questions on a 1-7 scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (always)