

COMMUNICATION FACTORS WHICH PROMOTE EMPLOYEE'S JOB  
SATISFACTION IN TAIWAN HIGH-TECH INDUSTRY: A PERSONALITY TRAITS  
STUDY

A Thesis

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty of The University of Akron

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

Hsing Yu Tseng

August, 2006

COMMUNICATION FACTORS WHICH PROMOTE EMPLOYEE'S JOB  
SATISFACTION IN TAIWAN HIGH-TECH INDUSTRY: A PERSONALITY TRAITS  
STUDY

Hsing Yu Tseng

Thesis

Approved:

Accepted:

---

Advisor  
Dr. Heather L. Walter

---

Director of the School  
Dr. Dudley B. Turner

---

Committee Member  
Dr. Carolyn M. Anderson

---

Interim Dean of the College  
Dr. James M. Lynn

---

Committee Member  
Dr. Dudley B. Turner

---

Dean of the Graduate School  
Dr. George R. Newkome

---

Date

## ABSTRACT

Effective communication in the work place contributes significantly towards the performance of employees and gives rise to enhanced job satisfaction. This paper investigates the communication factors that have a significant influence on job satisfaction as well as the variation in job satisfaction explained by differences in workers' characteristics in terms of the big five personality traits among Taiwan high-tech industry employees. Three translated version of instruments including the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ), the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) were used in a web-based survey to collect the self-report data. The findings showed that employees' communication satisfaction and job satisfaction can be successfully predicted by the Big Five personality traits of Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness, except Neuroticism in a Taiwanese sample. Future study in this area should also focus on determining other variations in communication satisfaction and job satisfaction, such as organizational culture differences.

## DEDICATION

This graduate school experience would have been impossible without the love and encouragement provided by my mother, father and my fiancé. I also dedicate this thesis to the memory of my professor Wen-Ming Chou.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I complete my thesis, there are many people I want to thank for their encouragement. I am positive the network of support I had gave me the love and strength to complete the process. Respectfully, I would like to honor my family, fiancé, faculty, and friends.

I must first thank my family and my fiancé. They have supported me throughout my life and their encouragement has assisted me through this journey. I realized they are truly my big fans and I will always be grateful to them for all that they have provided.

Additionally, this thesis would not have been completed without the support of my remarkable committee, Dr. Heather L. Walter, Dr. Carolyn M. Anderson, and Dr. Dudley B. Turner. Their continuous advice and patience has allowed me to discover more about communication and satisfaction that I ever dreamed possible. I have to express gratitude to them for helping me through this process.

Lastly, the support system of my professors, especially Dr. Kathleen D. Clark and Dr. Patricia S. Hill, and close friends has made completing my thesis so much easier. They have been there to listen and provide support that was needed even without my asking. I am certain they have helped me to get this far.

I am thankful to all of these people as well as everyone else that I have assisted me in any way possible during this incredible and challenging process.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	5
Communication Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction . . . . .	5
The Five-Factor Model and Job Satisfaction . . . . .	7
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	12
Participants . . . . .	12
Procedures . . . . .	13
Instruments . . . . .	13
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	17
V. DISCUSSION . . . . .	24

Limitations . . . . .	28
Further Implements . . . . .	29
REFERENCES . . . . .	31
APPENDICES . . . . .	38
APPENDIX A CONSENT FORM . . . . .	39
APPENDIX B SURVEY QUESTIONS . . . . .	41

## LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
1 The Main Characteristic of the Sample . . . . .	12
2 Pearson's Correlation Test . . . . .	17
3 Means and Standard Deviations for JDI scale . . . . .	18
4 Friedman Test . . . . .	19
5 Means and Standard Deviations for the NEO-FFI Scale . . . . .	19
6 Multiple Regression Analysis . . . . .	20
7 One-Way ANOVA Analysis (Education) . . . . .	21
8 One-Way ANOVA Analysis (Gender) . . . . .	22
9 One-Way ANOVA Analysis (Age) . . . . .	22
10 One-Way ANOVA Analysis (Length of server) . . . . .	23

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In Taiwan, the government has been playing a pivotal role in guiding technological development. Public research centers, service bureaus, and science parks have been deliberately founded by the government to nurture the vitality of high technology. This strategy is an attempt to use public institutional innovations to diffuse the technological capabilities of privately owned, market-driven companies. With this governmental research-private marketing policy, Taiwan has successfully cultivated high technology clusters, manufacturing a variety of computers, IT products, and integrated circuits (Mathews, 1997).

As known, high-tech industry has begun to take the front seat in Taiwan is drive for development. However, the growth of the high-tech industry has aroused concerns among practitioners and scholars about human resource management. For example, it is considered that the high-tech industry is a technology-and-people oriented business; to survive in such a competitive market, job satisfaction is an important attitude which organizations desire of their employees.

Job satisfaction has been linked to many different issues when considering employees. Studies have been performed to see what the predictor of job satisfaction is. Some of the studies conducted include looking at employee attitudes towards change

(Vielhaber, 1983), and the quality of friendships at work (Winstead, Derlega, Montgomery & Pilkington, 1995) communication intervention with information regarding job and company (Hunt & Ebeling, 1983).

The relationship between communication and job satisfaction has been investigated by many communication scholars (Faicione, McCroskey & Daly, 1977; Pincus, 1986). It seems organizations are always stating in job descriptions that good communication is essential. Communication is critical in organizations for connecting employees and permitting organizations to function (Downs, 1988; Hargie *et al.*, 1999). Several researchers noted that internal organizational communication is important for improving employee productivity and performance and for positive organizational outcomes (Argenti, 1998; Clampitt & Downs, 1993). For example, how employees perceive supervisory communication style and content as well as the organization's communication system influences the level of job satisfaction (Pettit, Goris & Vaught, 1997).

Moreover, there has been recognition of individual differences in job satisfaction for as long as the topic of job satisfaction has been studied. Fisher and Hanna (1931) concluded that job dissatisfaction could be traced to emotional maladjustment. Hoppock (1935) determined that questions assessing emotional adjustment clearly separated satisfied and dissatisfied employees. Locke (1976) suggested the possible usefulness of looking at dispositional factors, but at that time few such studies had been carried out. It is only since the mid 1980s that the dispositional source of job satisfaction has been the focus of more than sporadic research attention. Greenberg and Baron (1993), for example, noted that "... many different personality variables have been associated

with job satisfaction” (p. 170). Further, Landy (1989) reported renewed interest in a “trait-based approach” in the industrial-organizational literature on job satisfaction. Although a few of the early studies were criticisms of the approach (Cropanzano & James, 1990; Gerhart, 1987; Gutek & Winter, 1992), their criticisms appear to have subsided and few argue with the basic conclusion that a significant part of job satisfaction is rooted in individuals’ personalities.

Though prior research on the dispositional source of job satisfaction, the Big Five (Goldberg, 1990) framework, alternatively referred as the five-factor model of personality, provides a comprehensive taxonomy to organize traits relevant to job satisfaction (Judge, Heller & Mount, 2002). The five-factor model comprises the dimensions of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Judge, *et al.*, (2002) used the five-factor model to cumulate the results of previous studies that investigated relationships between personality trait and job satisfaction by means of meta-analysis. They found that four of the Big Five traits were related to job satisfaction. After classing 335 correlations between personality traits and job satisfaction reported in 135 research projects into categories corresponding to the Big Five traits, they computed true-score correlations between each of the Big Five traits and job satisfaction. Though the Big Five traits vary in their relevance to job satisfaction (with Openness being the least relevant), Judge *et al.*, (2002) concluded that organizing personality traits according to the five-factor model leads to substantial support for the dispositional source of job satisfaction.

## Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this thesis is twofold. First it will use the translated version of instruments including the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ), the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the NEO Five-factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) to investigate the relationship between communication satisfaction, job satisfaction and Big Five personality traits, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Additionally, it is important to determine whether the constructs and relationships that apply in the west also hold in a non-west context. The research question is posed:

*RQ: Are personality traits mediating factors between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction in a non-west context?*

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter consists of the following sections. First, it includes a description of the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. Second it introduces the Big Five personality traits and explicates individual relationship with job satisfaction.

#### Communication Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction

The evaluation of employee communication satisfaction has been an important component of organizational communication audits to assess communication effectiveness. Hecht (1978) described communication satisfaction as a socioemotional outcome resulting from communication interactions. Although communication that provides information and clarifies work tasks roles may contribute to employee communication satisfaction, Anderson and Martin (1995) found that employees seek communication interactions with coworkers and supervisor to satisfy interpersonal needs of pleasure and inclusion. According to Rubin (1993), when employee needs are met through satisfying communication, employees are more likely to build effective work relationships. Moreover, there is a high positive correlation between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction (Pettit, Goris & Vaught, 1997). Thus, employee

communication satisfaction is important because it highlights a key issue for employees who play a central role in determining organizational effectiveness.

The relationship of communication and job satisfaction has been researched extensively. Communication has consistently been found to be related to job satisfaction. Some of the occupational settings for which a relationship between communication and job satisfaction have been found include utility employees (Burke & Wilcox, 1969; Muchinsky, 1977), university administrators (Appelbaum & Anatol, 1979; Wheelless & Howard, 1984), supervisors and subordinates (Hatfield & Huseman, 1982), and teachers (Richmond & McCroskey, 1980). Those researchers have all concluded that communication is related to job satisfaction. Researchers hope to find a link between communication and job satisfaction in order that job satisfaction may ultimately be influenced by altering the appropriate items of communication.

Communication has been observed to be related to variables other than job satisfaction. Researchers have noted a relationship between communication and performance (Hunt & Ebeling, 1983; Pincus, 1986), turnover (Rings, Stinson & Johnson, 1979), and the sex of the respondent (Penley & Hawkins, 1980). None of those prior researchers examined the possibility that employees may view communication to be inseparable from job satisfaction. Thus, the hypothesis that looks at communication satisfaction and job satisfaction is proposed.

*H1: There will be a direct relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction.*

## The five-factor model and job satisfaction

A good deal of the personality and job satisfaction literature has focused on the personality variables of negative affectivity (or neuroticism) and positive affectivity (the core of extraversion). For example, Cropanzano, James, and Konovsky (1993) found that both lower negative affectivity and higher positive affectivity predicted global job satisfaction among 198 employees at a pathology laboratory. Decker and Borgen (1993) and Necowitz and Roznowski (1994) both found that negative affectivity predicted low job satisfaction. Alpass, Long, Chamberlain, and MacDonald (1997) reported that negative affectivity predicted unique variance in job satisfaction for a long sample of mostly-male military personnel in New Zealand but not for an ex-military sample (zero-order correlations were not reported). Meir, Melamed, and Dinur (1995) found that Israeli professionals' job satisfaction linked negatively to negative affectivity and positively to self-esteem.

Longitudinally, Spector and O'Connell (1994) found pre-job negative affectivity to predict 109 employees' job satisfaction approximately one year later. However, Watson and Slack (1993) did find Time 1 negative and positive affectivity both to predict several dimensions of job satisfaction approximately two years later. The combination of Time 1 negative and positive affectivity significantly predicted two of six job satisfaction measures at Time 2, even after controlling for blocks of occupational quality and job change variables.

Despite the often-found links between negative affectivity and described job satisfaction, others have questioned the meaning of this association. For example, Brief, Butcher, and Roberson (1995) found the same relation but also found that reposts of

greater job satisfaction, relative to controls, resulted from a positive-mood-inducing experimental manipulation. Interestingly, they also found an interaction, such that the positive mood induction had less effect on high-negative affectivity workers than on low-negative affectivity employees. These findings raised a great many questions about the nature of negative affectivity and of job satisfaction and about the affect-satisfaction link. Judge (1993) departed from standard operationalization of affective disposition in an effort to elicit more trait-like (than state-like) affectivity, modifying Weitz's (1952) "gripe index," which assesses people's tendency to express dissatisfaction about a variety of stimuli. Although not a focus of this study, she found that 234 employees' job satisfaction were positively related to a more positive affective disposition.

Several authors have investigated possible mechanisms for the negative affectivity-satisfaction link. Taking a closer look at the nature of "affective disposition," Judge and Hulin (1993) demonstrated support for the argument that affective disposition (again operationalized with self and other reports on the modified Weitz (1952) scale) was related to job satisfaction only indirectly, via its effect on subjective well-being. Judge and Hulin (1993) found that current mood was not responsible for the relation of well-being to satisfaction. Extending Judge and Hulin's (1993) model, Judge and Locke (1993) again found affective disposition (Weitz, 1952) to predict job satisfaction through its effect on subjective well-being.

Other Big-Five dimensions have received less emphasis. In a sample of 395 employed adults, Tokar *et al.*, (1995) found that a combination of Big-Five personality variables predicted a small amount of variance in job satisfaction. Lower neuroticism/negative affectivity and higher extraversion/positive affectivity were unique

contributors to higher satisfaction. Day and Bedeian (1995) examined job satisfaction in relation to personality (extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness) similarity to African American nursing personnel to coworkers. Agreeableness similarity was not related to satisfaction; extraversion- and conscientiousness-similarity were both weakly correlated with increased satisfaction, though these relations did not hold in a structural equation model. The hypotheses that expected relationships between big five personality traits are discussed below.

*Neuroticism.* Because of their essentially negative nature, neurotic individuals experience more negative life events than other individuals (Magnus *et al.*, 1993) in part, because they select themselves into situations that foster negative affect (Emmons, Diener, & Larsen, 1985). To the extent that such situations occur on or with respect to the job, they would lead to diminished levels of job satisfaction. Neuroticism has been described as the primary source of negative affectivity (NA), and the link between NA and job satisfaction was documented in Connolly and Viswesvaran's (2000) meta-analysis.

*H2a: There will be a negative relationship between neuroticism and job satisfaction.*

*Extraversion.* Whereas Neuroticism is related to the experience of negative life events, extraverts are predisposed to experience positive emotions (Costa & McCrae, 1992), and positive emotionality likely generalizes to job satisfaction, as demonstrated by Connolly and Viswesvaran's (2000) meta-analysis of positive affectivity (PA)-job satisfaction relationships. Evidence also indicated that extraverts have more friends and spend more time in social situations than do introverts and, because of their social

facility, are likely to find interpersonal interactions more rewarding (Watson & Clark, 1997).

*H2b: There will be a positive relationship between extraversion and job satisfaction.*

*Openness to Experience.* Openness to Experience is related to scientific and artistic creativity (Feist, 1998), divergent thinking, low religiosity, and political liberalism (McCrae, 1996). None of these psychological states seem to be closely related to job satisfaction. Moreover, DeNeve and Cooper (1998) noted that “Openness to Experience is a ‘double-edged sword’ that predisposes individuals to feel both the good and the bad more deeply” (p. 199), rendering its directional influence on affective reactions like subjective well-being or job satisfaction unclear.

*H2c: There will be no relationship between openness to experience and job satisfaction.*

*Agreeableness.* McCrae and Costa (1997) argued that Agreeableness should be related to happiness because agreeable individuals have greater motivation to achieve interpersonal intimacy, which should lead to greater levels of well-being. Indeed, they found that Agreeableness was positively related to life satisfaction, although at a relatively low level (mean  $r = .16$ ). Assuming these same communal motivations exist on the job, then the same process should operate with respect to job satisfaction. Organ and Lingl (1995) apparently agreed, commenting that Agreeableness “involves getting along with others in pleasant, satisfying relationships” (p. 340).

*H2d: There will be a positive relationship between agreeableness and job satisfaction.*

*Conscientiousness.* Organ and Lingl (1995) argued that Conscientiousness should be related to job satisfaction because it represents a general work-involvement tendency and thus leads to a greater likelihood of obtaining satisfying work rewards, both formal (e.g., pay, promotions) and informal (e.g., recognition, respect, feelings of personal accomplishment). Indirectly, the subjective well-being literature also suggested a positive relationship between Conscientiousness and job satisfaction (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998).

*H2e: There will be a positive relationship between conscientiousness and job satisfaction.*

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

This chapter consists of the following sections. First, it explains the subjects of study. Second it describes the procedure of study. Finally, it explains the instruments of study.

#### Participants

The participants of this study consisted of 146 full-time employees that work in the Taiwan high-tech industry. Participation was voluntary in this study. The sample was made up of 94 males and 52 females. Table 1 shows the main characteristics of the sample. The age range of the participants was 19 to 52 years old with the median age being 34 years. The length of service is 1 to 11 years. The majority of the participants (n = 103) are in the undergraduate degree level.

Table 1  
The Main Characteristic of the Sample

Characteristic	Frequency	Per cent
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	94	64.4
Female	52	35.6
<i>Age (years)</i>		
< 20	3	2.1
20 – 30	90	61.6
30 – 40	50	34.2
> 40	3	2.1
<i>Length of service (years)</i>		
< 1	22	15.1
1 – 3	48	32.9
3 – 5	36	24.7
> 5	40	27.4
<i>Education Level</i>		
High school	12	8.2
Undergraduate	103	70.5
Graduate	31	21.2
Note: n = 146		

## Procedures

Employees were invited to a web page event by the email. This event was announced by the HR department of their organizations. The employees were approached by the web advisor and asked if they would fill out questionnaires regarding how they feel about their job and communication at their workplace. Participants who agreed to be part of the study then were provided with a written explanation of their rights as a participant within the study and by completing the questionnaires they were consenting to the study. After reading over the written explanation the participants were asked to complete the questionnaires. At the end of the questionnaires each participant was given a written debriefing page that provided an explanation of the study purpose.

## Instruments

The present study measured the correlation among personal factors, job satisfaction and communication satisfaction using modified forms of the NEO PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1985), the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969), and the communication satisfaction questionnaire (CSQ) (Downs & Hazen, 1977).

*The NEO Five-factor Inventory.* The NEO-FFI is an instrument that contains 60 NEO PI- R questions measuring five dimensions of the normal personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Each of the five traits in the NEO-FFI are measured by asking respondents to indicate their agreement with 12 statements (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Example statements include, “I rarely feel lonely or blue” (Neuroticism), “My life is fast-paced” (Extraversion), “I have a lot of intellectual curiosity” (Openness), “I would rather cooperate with others than compete with them” (Agreeableness), and “I try to perform all the tasks assigned to me conscientiously” (Conscientiousness).

This abbreviated instrument is somewhat limited compared to the long version in that does not provide facet information. Reliability indexes range between .68 and .86 in the American sample. Rolland, Parker, and Stumpf (1998) obtained reliability indexes oscillating between .62 and .84, and between .50 and .84 in both university student and military French samples, respectively. Later, Borkenau and Ostendorf (1993), and Schmitz *et al.*, (2001) analyzed the psychometric properties of the German version of the NEO-FFI. They found that reliability indexes between .71 and .85, and between .66 and .84, respectively. A study conducted on a British sample, Egan, Deary, and Austin (2000) obtained reliability indexes between .72 and .87. Similarly results were obtained for a NEO-FFI version in Poland, the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic (Hrebickova *et al.*, 2002).

The Chinese instrument is a direct translation of the NEO-FFI maintaining the same number of items and scoring procedures as the original. Scale scores were obtained by summing the 12 items of each dimension, after appropriate items were reversed (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Overall alpha reliability for the revised scale in the present study was .72.

*The Job Descriptive Index (JDI)*. The scale measures five facets of job satisfaction. These facets include: work, pay, promotion, supervisor, and coworkers. The reliability of the scale is acceptable as well as with previous research finding it to range from 0.73 to 0.92 (Wheless *et al.*, 1984). The original version of the Job Descriptive Index contained 72 total items with either 9 or 18 items included in each section. According to Spector (1997), the items consisted of: evaluative adjective or short phrase that is descriptive of the job. Responses are “Yes” “Uncertain,” or “No.” For each facet

scale, a brief explanation is provided, followed by the items concerning that facet. Both favorable or positively worded, and unfavorable or negatively worded items are provided.

For this study, the modified Chinese version of the JDI scale (Smith, *et al.*, 1969) includes the 30 items which are evaluative adjective or short phrase of the job descriptive. The modified Chinese version has a Likert-type scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree) with a 5-point response format instead of the 3-point response format like the original form. Overall alpha reliability for the revised scale in this study was .61.

*The Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ)*. The CSQ (Downs & Hazen, 1977), a 40-item instrument with a reported overall reliability of .94 (Greenbaum *et al.*, 1988), was used to rate satisfaction with aspects of communication in the workplace on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = very dissatisfied to 7 = very satisfied. Research conducted by Downs and Hazen (1977) into communication satisfaction identified eight factors and several studies have confirmed the factor structure (Crino & White, 1981; Downs, 1988, Varona, 1996). The factors identified by Downs (1988) are as follows:

- *Horizontal communication*. The extent to which informal communication is accurate and free flowing, and includes perceptions of the grapevine.
- *Subordinate communication*. Upward and downward communication with subordinates. Only workers in supervisory positions responded to these items, which included subordinate responsiveness to downward communication and the extent to which subordinates initiate upward communication.

- *Media quality.* The extent to which meetings are well organized and written directives are short and clear.
- *Organizational perspective.* Information about the organization as a whole, which includes notifications about changes, overall policies, and goals of the organization.
- *Organizational integration.* The degree to which individuals receive information about their immediate work environment.
- *Communication climate.* The extent to which communication in an organization motivates and stimulates workers to meet organizational goals.
- *Personal feedback.* Information concerning how workers are being judged and how their performance is being appraised.
- *Supervisory communication.* The upward and downward aspects of communication with supervisors.

The CSQ scale was modified to have 40 items on a 5-point Likert-type response format to have consistency through out the questionnaire being used for this study. Overall alpha reliability for the CSQ scale was .94, M = 134.07, and SD = 17.65.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

Of the 200 questionnaires distributed, 146 were returned, a response rate of 73 %. First, Pearson's correlation test was used to test the relationships among communication satisfaction, job satisfaction, and five personality traits in terms of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. Table 2 shows the results of the Pearson's correlation test.

**Table 2**  
**Pearson's Correlation Test**

	Neuroticism	Extraversion	Openness	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Communication satisfaction	Job satisfaction - work	Job satisfaction - pay	Job satisfaction - promotion	Job satisfaction - supervisor	Job satisfaction - coworker	Job satisfaction - in general
Neuroticism	1 .146											
Extraversion	.327* .000 .146	1 .146										
Openness	.304* .000 .146	.395* .000 .146	1 .146									
Agreeableness	.336* .000 .146	.397* .000 .146	.409* .000 .146	1 .146								
Conscientiousness	.156 .061 .146	.416* .000 .146	.400* .000 .146	.336* .000 .146	1 .146							
Communication satisfaction	-.131 .115 .146	.167* .044 .146	.128 .124 .146	-.009 .915 .146	.432* .000 .146	1 .146						
Job satisfaction - work	-.155 .062 .146	.086 .300 .146	.011 .900 .146	-.079 .346 .146	.238* .004 .146	.535* .000 .146	1 .146					
Job satisfaction - pay	.106 .203 .146	.094 .260 .146	.143 .085 .146	-.017 .842 .146	.194* .019 .146	.230* .005 .146	.205* .013 .146	1 .146				
Job satisfaction - promotion	.053 .523 .146	.077 .354 .146	.071 .395 .146	.018 .831 .146	.140 .092 .146	.195* .018 .146	.245* .003 .146	.188* .023 .146	1 .146			
Job satisfaction - supervisor	-.108 .196 .146	.078 .347 .146	.108 .194 .146	-.047 .574 .146	.191* .021 .146	.468* .000 .146	.365* .000 .146	.133 .109 .146	.248* .003 .146	1 .146		
Job satisfaction - coworker	.096 .249 .146	.081 .332 .146	.251* .002 .146	.165* .046 .146	.142 .087 .146	.055 .508 .146	.020 .808 .146	.234* .004 .146	-.028 .735 .146	.149 .073 .146	1 .146	
Job satisfaction - in general	.141 .089 .146	.233* .005 .146	.160 .054 .146	.093 .264 .146	.246* .003 .146	.250* .002 .146	.432* .000 .146	.303* .000 .146	.205* .013 .146	.243* .003 .146	.113 .174 .146	1 .146

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

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

The results indicate that there is a positive relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction with work ( $r = 0.54, p < .01$ ), job satisfaction with pay ( $r = .23, p < .01$ ), job satisfaction with promotion ( $r = .20, p < .05$ ), job satisfaction with supervisor ( $r = .47, p < .01$ ) and job satisfaction in general ( $r = .25, p < .01$ ). Hence, H1 was supported. There is a direct relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction.

Table 3  
Means and Standard Deviations for JDI scale

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job satisfaction - coworker	146	11	22	15.26	1.95
Job satisfaction - in general	146	10	25	15.95	2.13
Job satisfaction - pay	146	5	24	14.49	2.14
Job satisfaction - promotion	146	9	25	15.23	2.21
Job satisfaction - supervisor	146	9	25	17.38	2.75
Job satisfaction - work	146	5	25	16.85	3.44
Valid N (listwise)	146				

Moreover, Table 3 shows the result that respondents were most satisfied with supervisor ( $M = 17.38$ ), with work itself ( $M = 16.85$ ), with coworkers ( $M = 15.26$ ), and with promotion ( $M = 15.23$ ), but less satisfied with pay ( $M = 14.49$ ). The data were also subjected to a non-parametric Friedman test (see Table 4). The mean ranks for each facet were supervisor,  $MR = 4.72$ , work  $MR = 4.13$ , promotion  $MR = 3.09$ , coworkers  $MR = 3.08$ , and pay  $MR = 2.34$ . The significance ( $p < .0001$ ) suggests the satisfaction was not independent in the individual job facets (Table 4).

Table 4  
Friedman Test

	Mean Rank
Job satisfaction - pay	2.34
Job satisfaction - coworker	3.08
Job satisfaction - promotion	3.09
Job satisfaction - supervisor	4.72
Job satisfaction - in general	3.65
Job satisfaction - work	4.13

N	146
Chi-Square	169.385
df	5
Asymp. Sig.	.000

The first research question asked if personality traits would play a mediating role between communication and job satisfaction in a non-west context. Table 5 presents mean and standard deviations for the 5 facets of the scale.

Table 5  
Means and Standard Deviations for the NEO-FFI Scale

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Conscientiousness	146	33	49	40.95	3.41
Extraversion	146	32	49	38.68	3.41
Openness	146	26	49	37.28	3.65
Neuroticism	146	24	48	35.10	3.91
Agreeableness	146	25	49	37.86	4.31
Valid N (listwise)	146				

Multiple regression analysis was used with communication satisfaction serving as the criterion variable. The five personality trait variables were entered into the model as a block and then followed by job satisfaction. The regression model (Table 6) was significant,  $F = 11.09$ ,  $R^2 = 0.24$ ,  $p < 0.01$ . Conscientiousness had a  $\beta = .32$ ,  $t = 4.17$ ,  $p$

< .001. Job satisfaction in work had a  $\beta = .34$ ,  $t = 4.48$ ,  $p < .001$ . Job satisfaction in supervisor had a  $\beta = .28$ ,  $t = 4.03$ ,  $p < .001$ .

In addition, the results also reveal that there is a positive relationship between Extraversion trait and job satisfaction in general ( $r = .23$ ,  $p < .01$ ); there is a positive relationship between Openness trait and job satisfaction with coworkers ( $r = .25$ ,  $p < .01$ ); there is a positive relationship between Agreeableness trait and job satisfaction with coworkers ( $r = .17$ ,  $p < .05$ ); and there are positive relationships between Conscientiousness trait and job satisfaction in terms of work ( $r = .24$ ,  $p < .01$ ), pay ( $r = .19$ ,  $p < .05$ ), supervisor ( $r = .19$ ,  $p < .05$ ), and in general ( $r = .25$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Hence, H2b, H2d, and H2e were supported.

Table 6  
Multiple Regression Analysis

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	21523.471	11	1956.679	11.091	.000
	Residual	23639.844	134	176.417		
	Total	45163.315	145			

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	23.615	19.199		1.230	.221
	Conscientiousness	1.632	.391	.315	4.169	.000
	Neuroticism	-.388	.324	-.086	-1.198	.233
	Agreeableness	-.345	.307	-.084	-1.126	.262
	Extraversion	.252	.391	.049	.644	.521
	Openness	.077	.367	.016	.211	.833
	Job satisfaction - work	1.761	.393	.343	4.477	.000
	Job satisfaction - supervisor	1.812	.450	.282	4.027	.000
	Job satisfaction - pay	.751	.569	.091	1.319	.189
	Job satisfaction - in general	-.501	.615	-.061	-.814	.417
	Job satisfaction - coworker	-.354	.610	-.039	-.580	.563
	Job satisfaction - promotion	-.064	.535	-.008	-.119	.905

As far as the relationship among communication, job satisfaction and socio-demographic characteristics; the results of one-way ANOVA indicate that only the education level is significantly related to job satisfaction with work itself ( $p < .001$ ) and

communication ( $p < .001$ ) (see Table 7). There is no gender (Table 8), age (Table 9), or length of service (Table 10) differences in terms of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction among Taiwan high-tech industry employees.

Table 7  
One-Way ANOVA Analysis (Education)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Communication satisfaction	Between Groups	4910.476	2	2455.238	8.722	.000
	Within Groups	40252.839	143	281.488		
	Total	45163.315	145			
Job satisfaction - work	Between Groups	173.893	2	86.947	8.049	.000
	Within Groups	1544.792	143	10.803		
	Total	1718.685	145			
Job satisfaction - supervisor	Between Groups	54.047	2	27.023	3.707	.027
	Within Groups	1042.474	143	7.290		
	Total	1096.521	145			
Job satisfaction - promotion	Between Groups	30.689	2	15.345	3.251	.042
	Within Groups	674.852	143	4.719		
	Total	705.541	145			
Job satisfaction - coworker	Between Groups	5.025	2	2.512	.659	.519
	Within Groups	545.085	143	3.812		
	Total	550.110	145			
Job satisfaction - pay	Between Groups	5.564	2	2.782	.604	.548
	Within Groups	658.909	143	4.608		
	Total	664.473	145			
Job satisfaction - in general	Between Groups	2.102	2	1.051	.229	.796
	Within Groups	657.460	143	4.598		
	Total	659.562	145			

**Table 8**  
**One-Way ANOVA Analysis (Gender)**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Communication satisfaction	Between Groups	963.050	1	963.050	3.138	.079
	Within Groups	44200.265	144	306.946		
	Total	45163.315	145			
Job satisfaction - supervisor	Between Groups	8.577	1	8.577	1.135	.288
	Within Groups	1087.944	144	7.555		
	Total	1096.521	145			
Job satisfaction - pay	Between Groups	4.827	1	4.827	1.054	.306
	Within Groups	659.646	144	4.581		
	Total	664.473	145			
Job satisfaction - work	Between Groups	10.970	1	10.970	.925	.338
	Within Groups	1707.715	144	11.859		
	Total	1718.685	145			
Job satisfaction - in general	Between Groups	4.194	1	4.194	.921	.339
	Within Groups	655.368	144	4.551		
	Total	659.562	145			
Job satisfaction - coworker	Between Groups	.596	1	.596	.156	.693
	Within Groups	549.514	144	3.816		
	Total	550.110	145			
Job satisfaction - promotion	Between Groups	.539	1	.539	.110	.741
	Within Groups	705.002	144	4.896		
	Total	705.541	145			

**Table 9**  
**One-Way ANOVA Analysis (Age)**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Job satisfaction - work	Between Groups	101.438	3	33.813	2.969	.034
	Within Groups	1617.247	142	11.389		
	Total	1718.685	145			
Job satisfaction - supervisor	Between Groups	64.145	3	21.382	2.941	.035
	Within Groups	1032.376	142	7.270		
	Total	1096.521	145			
Job satisfaction - pay	Between Groups	38.186	3	12.729	2.886	.038
	Within Groups	626.287	142	4.410		
	Total	664.473	145			
Communication satisfaction	Between Groups	1780.513	3	593.504	1.943	.125
	Within Groups	43382.802	142	305.513		
	Total	45163.315	145			
Job satisfaction - promotion	Between Groups	13.094	3	4.365	.895	.445
	Within Groups	692.447	142	4.876		
	Total	705.541	145			
Job satisfaction - coworker	Between Groups	3.563	3	1.188	.309	.819
	Within Groups	546.547	142	3.849		
	Total	550.110	145			
Job satisfaction - in general	Between Groups	3.586	3	1.195	.259	.855
	Within Groups	655.976	142	4.620		
	Total	659.562	145			

**Table 10**  
**One-Way ANOVA Analysis (Length of server)**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Job satisfaction - in general	Between Groups	42.610	3	14.203	3.269	.023
	Within Groups	616.952	142	4.345		
	Total	659.562	145			
Job satisfaction - work	Between Groups	103.149	3	34.383	3.022	.032
	Within Groups	1615.536	142	11.377		
	Total	1718.685	145			
Communication satisfaction	Between Groups	1258.560	3	419.520	1.357	.259
	Within Groups	43904.755	142	309.188		
	Total	45163.315	145			
Job satisfaction - supervisor	Between Groups	22.472	3	7.491	.990	.399
	Within Groups	1074.048	142	7.564		
	Total	1096.521	145			
Job satisfaction - coworker	Between Groups	3.857	3	1.286	.334	.801
	Within Groups	546.253	142	3.847		
	Total	550.110	145			
Job satisfaction - promotion	Between Groups	2.237	3	.746	.151	.929
	Within Groups	703.305	142	4.953		
	Total	705.541	145			
Job satisfaction - pay	Between Groups	.814	3	.271	.058	.982
	Within Groups	663.659	142	4.674		
	Total	664.473	145	42.610		

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this thesis was to investigate how the Big Five personality traits of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness play a role in communication satisfaction and job satisfaction in a non-west context. One research question and five hypotheses were asked to investigate the relationship between the variables mentioned.

RQ: Are personality traits mediating factors between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction in a non-west context?

Results from Pearson correlation analysis strongly agreed the proposition that communication satisfaction and job satisfaction are correlated with employees' personalities as described by the five-factor model in a Taiwanese sample. These results also are consistent with suggestions of Tranberg *et al.*, (1993) regarding the importance of personality in predicting job satisfaction. In particular, the trait of Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness displayed correlations with job satisfaction. However, Neuroticism, that has been studied most often in relation to job satisfaction, emerged as no correlate of job satisfaction in this sample.

H1: There will be a direct relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction.

The understanding of satisfaction was extended by this study when comparing Downs and Hazen's (1977) Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire and Job Description Index. A positive significant relationship was found between these variables and it illustrates the connection between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. This finding demonstrates the importance of effective communication in the workplace in relation to being a more satisfied employee. Utilizing the finding from this thesis, organizations can work towards having greater communication satisfaction amongst employees. Considering how the CSQ eight dimensions of satisfaction that measured an individual's satisfaction with information flow and relationship variables influences communication satisfaction can lead to the greater overall job satisfaction.

H2e: There will be a positive relationship between conscientiousness and job satisfaction.

In regard to the magnitude of the effect of personality traits on communication satisfaction and job satisfaction, the results indicated that Conscientiousness seems to have a powerful enough association with these two variables in order for its effects to be highly consistent and replicable. Conscientiousness was a moderately strong predictor of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. It appears, at least within the confines of this sample, that the dutiful, rule-bound, and reliable natures of conscientious employees were more satisfied with their jobs. Conscientiousness was also a consistent positive predictor of global actual job satisfaction, a result that echoes findings from Judge *et al.*, (1999). Salgado (1997) noted that nearly all meta-analyses aggregating over different samples in different countries with different outcome criteria show that Consciousness is probably the best trait predictor of work-related behavior. It is worth pointing out that, in

this sample, Conscientiousness was positively associated with communication satisfaction and job satisfaction in terms of work itself, pay, supervisor, and in general.

H2b: There will be a positive relationship between extraversion and job satisfaction.

Of the Big Five traits, Extraversion displayed the second strongest correlation with job satisfaction. One would expect that factors that cause emotionally stable and extraverted individuals to be happy in life would also lead them to be happy in their job. As Tokar, Fischer and Subich (1998) noted in their qualitative review, greater job satisfaction is related to lower neuroticism and its variants, as well as to higher extraversion and related traits (p. 144).

H2c & H2d: There will be an indirect relationship between openness to experience and job satisfaction as well as a positive relationship between agreeableness and job satisfaction.

The other two traits – Agreeableness and Openness to Experience –also displayed relatively significant positive correlations with job satisfaction. The result does not support the proposition that there will be an indirect relationship between openness to experience and job satisfaction. However, in general, the results are quite similar to DeNeve and Cooper's (1998) meta-analysis, suggesting that cognitive, affective, and behavioral factors may lead to personality-job satisfaction relations. Agreeableness one, being likeable, cooperative, and good-natured is more satisfied in their job. Similarly, the greater intellectual curiosity and sensitivity to inner feelings of more open individuals are more satisfied in their job.

H2a: There will be a negative relationship between neuroticism and job satisfaction.

It is interesting to note that, with the exception of Neuroticism, all of the other personality traits predicted the subscale scores of actual job satisfaction. Thus, in contrast with the hypothesis and previous findings in the literature (e.g., Connolly & Viswesvaran's, 2000; Tokar, Fischer & Subich, 1998) Neuroticism did not predict levels of job satisfaction in the Taiwanese sample. It appears that being calm, secure, well-adjusted, and low in anxiety has no impact on job satisfaction. As has been suggested elsewhere (Furnham, 1994), it is quite possible that the predictive validity of personality traits will vary depending on the composition of the various samples. It is not clear why Neuroticism was not related to job satisfaction. Perhaps one reason is that neurotic individuals, although impulsive, are more realistic in evaluating contingencies and consequences of their actions (Alloy & Abramson, 1979). Thus, because of their tendencies to worry about negative outcomes, neurotic employees may be more attuned to the potentially negative consequences of job satisfaction.

Considering the links between job satisfaction, communication satisfaction and demographic characteristics on a Taiwanese sample, there was only one predictor of job satisfaction and communication satisfaction - education level. The more high educated employees consistently reported higher levels of job satisfaction. With respect to the link between education and job satisfaction the findings in the previous research are equivocal. Thus, various relationships have been reported including positive and negative overeducation on job satisfaction (Glenn & Weaver, 1982; Rumberger, 1981). In the present study, the results clearly indicated that higher educated employees were more

satisfied with their jobs, but given the size and composition of the sample (majority participants (70.5%) were undergraduate level) this finding should be interpreted with caution.

The findings from this thesis are quite consistent with previous studies that have been conducted (Day & Bedeian, 1995; Down & Hazen, 1977; Hecht, 1978; Judge & Locke, 1993). This thesis enriched the job satisfaction literature because it provides more evidence for the connection between the Big Five personality traits and the degree of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction the employees have in Taiwan high-tech industry.

In sum, findings from this paper suggest that the five-factor model is a fruitful basis from which to examine the dispositional basis of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction in the Taiwan high-tech industry. In particular, results indicated that more high educated and conscientious employees are more likely satisfied with their job. The considerable stability, and probable genetic origins of these traits (Bergeman, Chipuer, Plomin, & Pedersen, 1993), make it unlikely that organizations can increase satisfaction by changing these traits. However, selecting relatively more conscientious and extroverted employees could be a beneficial strategy to raise satisfaction.

#### Limitations

Like all studies, this is not a study without limitations. The first limitation is inherent in the nature of the data concerns the modeling of the heritable effects on job satisfaction. We assumed that the genotypic influences on the Big Five traits are distinct from one another. Conceptually, the Big Five factors are considered orthogonal (Costa & McCrae, 1992), and at least with respect to Neuroticism and Extraversion, there is

empirical evidence that these traits reflect individual differences in the functioning of distinct neurobiological system (Matthews & Gilliland, 1999).

Second, personality traits, job satisfaction and communication satisfaction were measured by self-report. This has been done in many studies on the job characteristics model, but may cause common method variance.

#### Further Implements

Although the results linking the Big Five traits to job satisfaction are impressive, other frameworks could explain the dispositional source of job satisfaction. For example, Connolly and Viswesvaran's (2000) results indicated that positive affectivity (PA) and negative affectivity (NA) display moderately strong correlations with job satisfaction. Indeed, the correlations involving PA are stronger than those reported in this study. However, two factors argued in favor of the five-factor model. First, researchers have suggested that PA represents Extraversion and NA Neuroticism in the five-factor model (e.g., Watson & Clark, 1997). Because the five-factor model contains an additional trait that is relevant to job satisfaction (Conscientiousness), the PA-NA would need to be supplemented with Conscientiousness if the maximum prediction of job satisfaction is to be obtained. Second, PA and NA are quasi-dispositional in that they are assessments of mood or "affective traits" (Watson, 2000, p. 15), are less stable than other dispositional measures (Judge & Bretz, 1993), and may to some degree be confounded with job satisfaction (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998). Nevertheless, given the empirical validity of both frameworks future integrative research is needed.

In addition, looking at different factors that could potentially play a role in communication satisfaction and job satisfaction would be beneficial to researching what

is truly important to both employees and employers. Understanding the factors that are involved in satisfaction is imperative when considering the volatility of the job market. The major downfall with examining the factors involved with satisfaction is each individual will have their own interpretation of their satisfaction. So, continuing to examine the factors that are involved with satisfaction is imperative since it is such an evolving phenomena due to the changing society in which people work. Also, looking at different aspects other than personality traits would be beneficial because there are many other factors that organizations are trying to figure out and improve upon. Examples of these factors would be included: turnover, job performance, stress levels, burnout or organizational commitment.

Finally, the research in Taiwan on organizational culture and job satisfaction is limited. In a case study of the China Steel Company, Chap (1990) discussed the Confucian tradition and ethos and their implications for management and worker performance in Asian societies and found that management philosophy and corporate culture were rooted in and guided by Confucianism in the Chinese character and approach to work. While the culture may provide a framework within which the influence of the job satisfaction, it would be useful to know how the organizational culture plays a role in the level of job satisfaction.

## REFERENCES

- Alloy, L. B., & Abramson, L. Y. (1979). Judgment of contingency in depressed and nondepressed students: Sadder but wiser? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *108*, 441-485.
- Anderson, C., & Martin, M. (1995). Why employees speak to coworkers and bosses: Motives, gender, and organizational satisfaction. *The Journal of Business Communication*, *32*(3), 249-266.
- Alpass, F., Long, N., Chamberlain, K., & MacDonald, C. (1997). Job satisfaction differences between military and ex-military personnel: The role of demographic and organizational variables. *Military Psychology*, *9*, 227-249.
- Argenti, P. A. (1998). Strategic employee communications. *Human Resource Management*, *37*, 199-206.
- Bergeman, C. S., Chipuer, H. M., Plomin, R., & Pedersen, N. L. (1993). Genetic and environmental effects on openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness: An adoption/twin study. *Journal of Personality*, *61*, 159-179.
- Brief, A. P., Butcher, A. H., & Roberson, L. (1995). Cookies, disposition, and job attitudes: The effects of positive mood-inducing events and negative affectivity on job satisfaction in a field experiment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *62*, 55-62.
- Borkenau, P., & Ostendorf, F. (1993). *NEO-Five-Factor Inventory according to Costa and McCrae*. Gottingen, Germany: Hogrefe.
- Burke, R. J., & Wilcox, D. S. (1969). Effects of different patterns and degrees of openness in superior-subordinate communication on subordinate job satisfaction. *Academic of Management Journal*, *12*, 319-326.
- Cho, Y. T. (1990). Culture and work organizations: The Chinese case. *International Journal of Psychology*, *25*, 583-92.
- Clampitt, P. G., & Downs, C. W. (1993). Employee perceptions of the relationship between communication and productivity: A field study. *Journal of Business Communication*, *30*, 5-28.

- Connolly, J. J., & Viswesvaran, C. (2000). The role of affectivity in job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29*, 265-281.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory Manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Crino, M. D., & White, M. C. (1981). Satisfaction in communication: An examination of the Downs-Hazen measure. *Psychological Reports, 49*, 831-838.
- Cropanzano, R., James, K. (1990). Some methodological considerations for the behavior genetic analysis of work attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 433-439.
- Cropanzano, R., James, K., & Konovsky, M. A. (1993). Dispositional affectivity as a predictor of work attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*, 595-606.
- Day, D. V., & Bedeian, A. G. (1995). Personality similarity and work-related outcomes among African-American nursing personnel: A test of the supplementary model of person-environment congruence. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 46*, 55-70.
- Decker, P. J., & Borgen, F. H. (1993). Dimensions of work appraisal: stress, strain, coping, job satisfaction, and negative affectivity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40*, 470-478.
- DeNeve, K. M., & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: A meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*, 197-229.
- Downs, C. W. (1988). *Communication Audits*. Scott Foresman, IL: Glenview.
- Downs, C. W., & Hazen, D. (1977). A factor analytic study of communication satisfaction. *The Journal of Business Communication, 14*, 63-73.
- Egan, V., Deary, I., & Austin, E. (2000). The NEO-FFI: Emerging British norms and an item-level analysis suggest N, A and C are more reliable than O and E. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29*, 907-920.
- Emmons, R. A., Diener, E., & Larsen, R. J. (1985). Choice of situations and congruence models of interactionism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 6*, 693-702.

- Faicione, R. L., McCroskey, J. C., & Daly, J. A. (1977). Job satisfaction as a function of employee's communication apprehension, self-esteem, and perceptions of the immediate supervisors. *Communication Yearbook, 1*, 363-375.
- Feist, G. J. (1998). A meta-analysis of personality in scientific and artistic creativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 2*, 290-309.
- Fisher, V. E., & Hanna, J. V. (1931). *The dissatisfaction worker*. New York: Macmillan.
- Furnham, A. (1994). *Personality at work*. London: Routledge.
- Gerhart, B. (1987). How important are dispositional factors as determinants of job satisfaction?: Implications for job design and other personnel programs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*, 366-373.
- Glenn, N., & Weaver, C. N. (1982). Further evidence on education and job satisfaction. *Social Forces, 61*, 46-55.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The Big Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 1216-1229.
- Greengerg, J., & Baron, R. A. (1993). *Behavior in organization* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gutek, B. A., & Winter, S. J. (1992). Consistency of job satisfaction across situations: Fact or framing artifact? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 41*, 61-78.
- Hargie, O., Dickson, D., & Tourish, D. (1999). *Communication in Management*. Gower, Aldershot.
- Hatfield, J. D., & Huseman, R. C. (1982). Perceptual congruence about communication as related to satisfaction: Moderating effects of individual characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal, 25*, 349-358.
- Hecht, M. L. (1978). The conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication satisfaction. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 253-264.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*, New York: Harper.
- Hrebickova, M., Urbanek, T., Cermak, I., Szarota, P., Fickova, E., & Orlicka, L. (2002). The NEO Five-Factor Inventory in Czech, Polish, and Slovak contexts. In R. R. McCrae & J. Allik (Eds.), *The Five-Factor Model of personality across cultures* (pp. 53-78). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Hunt, G. T., & Ebeling, R. E. (1983). The impact of a communication intervention on work-unit productivity and employee satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 11*, 57-68.
- Judge, T. A. (1993). Does affective disposition moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and voluntary turnover? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 395-401.
- Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1993). Report on an alternative measure of affective disposition. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53*, 1095-1104.
- Judge, T. A., Higgins, C., Thoresen, C., & Barrick, M. (1999). The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology, 52*, 621-652.
- Judge, T. A., & Hulin, C. L. (1993). Job satisfaction as a reflection of disposition: A multiple source causal analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 56*, 388-421.
- Judge, T. A., & Locke, E. A. (1993). Effect of dysfunctional thought processes on subjective well-being and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 475-490.
- Judge, T. A., & Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 17-34.
- Landy, F. J. (1989). *Psychology of work behavior* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Locke, E. (1976). The nature and cause of job satisfaction. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp.1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Magnus, K., Diener, E., Fujita, F., & Pavot, W. (1993). Extraversion and neuroticism as predictors of objective life events: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 1046-1053.
- Mathews, J. (1997). A silicon valley of the East: Creating Taiwan's semiconductor industry. *California Management Review, 39*, 26-54.
- Matthews, G., & Gilliland, K. (1999). The personality theories of H. J. Eysenck and J. A. Gray: A comparative review. *Personality and Individual Difference, 26*, 583-626.
- McCrae, R. R. (1996). Social consequences of experiential openness. *Psychological Bulletin, 120*, 323-337.

- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist, 52*, 509-516.
- Meir, E. I., Melamed, S., & Dinur, C. (1995). The benefits of congruence. *Career Development Quarterly, 43*, 257-266.
- Muchinsky, P. M. (1977). Organizational communication: Relationship to organizational climate and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal, 20*, 592-607.
- Necowitz, L. B., & Roznowski, M. (1994). Negative affectivity and job satisfaction: cognitive processes underlying the relationship and effects on employee behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 45*, 270-294.
- Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135*, 339-350.
- Penley, L. E., & Hawkins, B. L. (1980). Organizational communication, performance, and job satisfaction as a function of ethnicity and sex. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16*, 368-384.
- Pettit, J. D., Goris, J. R., & Vaught, B. C. (1997). An examination of organizational communication as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication, 34*, 81-98.
- Pincus, J. D. (1986). Communication satisfaction, job satisfaction and job performance. *Human Communication Research, 12*, 395-419.
- Raz, J., & Aviad, E. R. (1996). America meets Japan: A Journey for real between two imaginaries. *Theory, Culture and Society, 13*, 157-182.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1980). Management communication style, tolerance for disagreement and innovativeness as predictors of employee satisfaction: A comparison of single-factor, two-factor, and multiple factor approaches. *Communication Yearbook, 3*, 359-373.
- Rings, R. L., Stinson, J. E., & Johnson, T. W. (1979). Communication behaviors associated with role stress and satisfaction variables. *The Journal of Applied Communication Research, 7*, 15-22.
- Rolland, J. P., Parker, W. D., & Stumpf, H. (1998). A psychometric examination of the French translations of the NEO-PI-R and NEO-FFI. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 71*, 269-291.

- Rubin, A. M. (1993). The effects of locus of control on communication motives, anxiety, and satisfaction. *Communication Quarterly*, 41, 162-171.
- Rumberger, R. W. (1981). *Overeducation in the U.S. labor market*. New York: Praeger.
- Salgado, J. F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the European Community. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 30-43.
- Schmitz, N., Hartamp, N., Baldini, C., Rollnik, J., & Tress, W. (2001). Psychometric properties of the German version of the NEO-FFI in psychosomatic outpatients. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31, 713-722.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand-McNally & Co.
- Spector, P. E., & O'Connell, B. J. (1994). The contribution of personality traits, negative affectivity, locus of control and type of A to the subsequent reports of job stressors and job strains. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 1-12.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tokar, D. M., Fischer, A. R., & Subich, L. M. (1998). Personality and vocational behavior: A selected review of literature, 1993-1997. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 53, 115-153.
- Tokar, D. M., Vaux, A., & Swanson, J. L. (1995). Dimensions relating Holland's vocational personality typology and the five-factor model. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 3, 57-74.
- Tranberg, M., Slane, S., & Ekeberg, S. E. (1993). The relation between interest congruence and satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42, 253-264.
- Varona, F. (1996). Relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational communication in three Guatemalan organizations. *Journal of Business Communication*, 33, 111-140.
- Vielhaber, M. E. (1983). Communication and attitudes toward work-related change. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 11, 1-16.
- Watson, D. (2000). *Mood and temperament*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Watson, D., & Slack, A. K. (1993). General factors of affective temperament and their relation to job satisfaction over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 182-202.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1997). Extraversion and its positive emotional core. In R. Hogan, J. A. Johnson, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 767-793). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Weitz, J. (1952). A neglected concept in the study of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 5, 201-205.
- Wheless, L. R., Wheless, V. E., & Howard, R. D. (1984). The relationships of communication with supervisor and decision-participation to employee job satisfaction. *Communication Quarterly*, 32, 222-232.
- Winstead, B. A., Derlega, V. J., Montgomery, M. J., & Pilkington, C. (1995). The quality of friendships at work and job satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 12, 199-215.
- Wheless, V. E., Wheless, L. R., & Howard, R. D. (1983). An analysis of the contribution of participative decision making and communication with supervisor as predictors of job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 18, 145-160.

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A  
CONSENT FORM

Dear participant:

I am a graduate student in the School of Communication at The University of Akron. I am conducting a research study for my graduate thesis to examine the communication factors that have a significant influence on job satisfaction as well as the variation in job satisfaction explained by differences in workers' characteristics in terms of the big five personality traits.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. It is not part of your job and will have no effect on your job or any employment evaluations. I appreciate your taking time to complete the questionnaire. It should take you 20 to 30 minutes.

Through this study, your answers are completely confidential so be as frank as you wish. There is not a test – your opinion is the only right answer. Do not put your name; we do not wish to know who you are. The answers will be combined into groups for reporting purpose.

There are no foreseeable risks to you stemming from this study. You will receive no monetary compensation for your participation.

The Human Subjects Review Board at The University of Akron has approved the study. For questions about this study, please contact me ([ht5@uakron.edu](mailto:ht5@uakron.edu)), or my advisor, Dr. Heather L. Walter, Professor, School of Communication, at ([hlwalter@uakron.edu](mailto:hlwalter@uakron.edu)).

Submit of the questionnaire will be considered your consent to participate. Thank you!

Sincerely

Hsing Yu Tseng

APPENDIX B  
SURVEY QUESTIONS

Direction: The statements below relate to your personality. Describe yourself honestly and state your opinions as accurately as possible. There would be no right or wrong answers. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by placing the appropriate number (according to the scale below) in the space provide.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral 4 – Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I am not a worrier.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I like to have a lot of people around me.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I don't like to waste my time daydreaming.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I try to courteous to everyone I meet.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I keep my belongings neat and clean.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I often feel inferior to other.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I laugh easily.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Once I find the right way to do something I stick to it.                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. I often get into arguments with my family and co-worker.                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. I'm pretty good about pacing myself so as to get things done on time.                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. When I'm under a great deal of stress, sometimes I feel like I'm going to pieces.         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. I don't consider myself especially "light-hearted."                                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. I am intrigued by the patterns I find in art and nature.                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Some people think I'm selfish and egotistical.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. I am not a very methodical person.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. I rarely feel lonely or blue.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. I really enjoy talking to people.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. I would rather cooperate with others than compete with them.                              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. I try to perform all the tasks assigned to me conscientiously.                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. I often feel tense and jittery.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. I like to be where the action is.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. Poetry has little or no effect on me.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. I tend to be cynical and skeptical of others' intentions.                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. I have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion.                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. Sometimes I feel completely worthless.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. I usually prefer to do things alone.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. I often try new and foreign foods.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29 I believe that most people will take advantage of you if you let them.                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

30. I waste a lot of time before setting down to work.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I rarely feel fearful or anxious.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I often feel as if I'm bursting with energy.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Most people I know like me.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I work hard to accomplish my goals.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I often got angry at the way people treat me.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I am a cheerful, high-spirited person..	1	2	3	4	5
38. I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Some people think of me as cold and calculating.	1	2	3	4	5
40. When I make a commitment, I can always be counted on to follow through.	1	2	3	4	5
41. Too often, when things go wrong, I get discouraged and feel like giving up.	1	2	3	4	5
42. I am not a cheerful optimist.	1	2	3	4	5
43. Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement.	1	2	3	4	5
44. I'm hard-headed and tough-minded in my attitudes.	1	2	3	4	5
45. Sometimes I'm not as dependable or reliable as I should be.	1	2	3	4	5
46. I am seldom sad or depressed.	1	2	3	4	5
47. My life is fast-paced.	1	2	3	4	5
48. I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human consider.	1	2	3	4	5
49. I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate.	1	2	3	4	5
50. I am a productive person who always gets the job done.	1	2	3	4	5
51. I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems.	1	2	3	4	5
52. I prefer jobs that let me work alone without being bothered by other people.	1	2	3	4	5
53. I have a lot of intellectual curiosity.	1	2	3	4	5
54. If I don't like people, I let them know it.	1	2	3	4	5
55. I never seem to be able to get organized.	1	2	3	4	5
56. At times I have been so ashamed I just wanted to hide.	1	2	3	4	5
57. I would rather go my own way than be a leader of others.	1	2	3	4	5
58. I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
59. If necessary, I am willing to manipulate people to get what I want.	1	2	3	4	5
60. I strive for excellence in everything I do.	1	2	3	4	5

Direction: Below are a set of questions concerning communicating at work. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by placing the appropriate number (according to the scale below) in the space provide.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral 4 – Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

1. Information about my progress at my firm.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Personal news	1	2	3	4	5
3. Information about organizational policies and goals.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Information about how my job compares with others.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Information about how I am being judged.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Recognition of my effort.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Information about departmental policies and goals.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Information about the requirements of my job.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Information about government action affecting my organization.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Information about changes in our organization.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Reports on how problems in my job are being handled.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Information about benefits and pay.	1	2	3	4	5

13. Information about our organization's financial standing.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Information about accomplishments and/or failures of the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Extent to which my supervisors know and understand the problems faced by subordinates.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Extent to which the organization's communication motivates and stimulates an enthusiasm for meeting its goals.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Extent to which my supervisor listens and pays attention to me.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Extent to which the people in my organization have great ability as communicators.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Extent to which my supervisor offers guidance for solving job related problems.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Extent to which the organization's communication makes me identify with it or feel a vital part of it.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Extent to which the organization's communications are interesting and helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Extent to which my supervisor trusts me.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Extent to which I receive in time the information needed to do my job.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Extent to which conflicts are handled appropriately through proper communication channels.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Extent to which the grapevine is active in our organization.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Extent to which my supervisor is open to ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Extent to which horizontal communication with other organizational members is accurate and free flowing.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Extent to which communication practices are adaptable to emergencies.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Extent to which my work group is compatible.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Extent to which our meetings are well organized.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Extent to which the amount of supervision given me is about right.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Extent to which written directives and reports are clear and concise.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Extent to which the attitudes toward communication in the organization are basically healthy.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Extent to which informal communication is active and accurate.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Extent to which the amount of communication in the organization is about right.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Extent to which my subordinates are responsive to downward directive communication.	1	2	3	4	5
37. Extent to which my subordinates anticipate my needs for information.	1	2	3	4	5
38. Extent to which I do not have a communication overload.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Extent to which my subordinates are receptive to evaluation, suggestions, and criticisms.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Extent to which my subordinates feel responsible for initiating accurate upward communication.	1	2	3	4	5

Direction: Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words describe your work? Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by placing the appropriate number (according to the scale below) in the space provide.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral 4 – Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

1. Satisfying.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Can see results.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Challenging	1	2	3	4	5
4. Gives sense of accomplishment.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Use my abilities.	1	2	3	4	5

Direction: Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words describe your pay? Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by placing the appropriate number (according to the scale below) in the space provide.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral 4 – Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Income adequate for normal expenses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Less than I deserve                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Income provides luxuries            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Fair                                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Insecure                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Direction: Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words describe your opportunities for promotion? Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by placing the appropriate number (according to the scale below) in the space provide.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral 4 – Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

- |                                      |   |   |   |   |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Good opportunities for promotion. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Promotion on ability.             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Unfair promotion policy.          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Infrequent promotion.             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Opportunities somewhat limited.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Direction: Think of your supervisor and the kind of supervisor that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words describe your supervisor? Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by placing the appropriate number (according to the scale below) in the space provide.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral 4 – Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

- |                      |   |   |   |   |   |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Ask my advice.    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Praise good work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Know job well     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Has favorites.    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Intelligent.      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Direction: Think of the majority of the people that you work with now or the people that you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words describe these people? Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by placing the appropriate number (according to the scale below) in the space provide.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral 4 – Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

- |                          |   |   |   |   |   |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Easy to make enemies. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Narrow interests.     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- |                 |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Lazy         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Responsible. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Intelligent  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Direction: Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of time? Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by placing the appropriate number (according to the scale below) in the space provide.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral 4 – Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

- |                      |   |   |   |   |   |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Make me content.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Worthwhile.       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Waste of time.    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Acceptable.       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Better than most. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Basic personal information

1. My age : \_\_\_\_\_
2. My gender : \_\_\_\_\_
3. My service year : \_\_\_\_\_
4. My education level : \_\_\_\_\_

Adapted and reproduced by special permission of the Publisher, Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., 16204 North Florida Avenue, Lutz, Florida 33549, from the NEO Five-Factor Inventory by Paul T. Costa, Jr. and Robert R. McCrae, Copyright 1978, 1985, 1989 by PAR, Inc. and Department of Psychology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio 443403, from the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General scale, Copyright 1975, 1985, 1997 by Bowling Green State University. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission from PAR, Inc. and Bowling Green State University.