



12-14-2017

Judgements of Managerial Personality Affecting Employee Job Satisfaction

Makenzi Astore

Follow this and additional works at: http://vc.bridgew.edu/honors_proj



Part of the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Astore, Makenzi. (2017). Judgements of Managerial Personality Affecting Employee Job Satisfaction. In *BSU Honors Program Theses and Projects*. Item 244. Available at: http://vc.bridgew.edu/honors_proj/244
Copyright © 2017 Makenzi Astore

Judgements of Managerial Personality Affecting Employee Job Satisfaction

Makenzi Astore

Submitted in Partial Completion of the
Requirements for Commonwealth Honors in Management

Bridgewater State University

December 14, 2017

Dr. Todd Harris, Thesis Director
Dr. Jakari Griffith, Committee Member
Dr. Peter Sietins, Committee Member

Judgements of Managerial Personality Affecting Employee Job Satisfaction

Makenzi L. Astore

Bridgewater State University

Table of Contents

Abstract4

Acknowledgements5

Introduction6

 1. What is personality?6

 2. What is job satisfaction?6

 3. Why use the Big Five?8

 4. Why use personality assessment within organizations?10

 a. Effective for use in selecting candidates10

 b. Recruitment based on decisions from both applicants and recruiters10

 c. Executives are often in the “spot-light”11

 d. Helps understand where the company is now12

 e. Helps conflict management12

 f. Helps predict ability to be dynamic and work in teams12

Preliminary Research and Literature Review13

Research Question and Hypothesis14

Methodology15

 1. Participants15

 2. Survey15

 3. Independent Variables16

 a. The Big Five personality traits16

 4. Dependent Variables16

 a. Categories of satisfaction16

 5. Analysis17

Results18

 1. Openness to Experiences18

 a. Overall results18

 b. By gender19

 2. Conscientiousness20

 a. Overall results20

 b. By gender20

 3. Extroversion21

 a. Overall results21

 b. By gender21

 4. Agreeableness22

 a. Overall results22

 b. By gender22

 5. Emotional Stability23

 a. Overall results23

 b. By gender24

Discussion24

Limitations and Future Research27

References29

Appendix A.....32

 1. Survey given to participants.....32

 2. Reference for survey39

Appendix B40

 1. IRB Approval.....40

Abstract

Personality is the configuration of thought, emotions and behaviors (Funder, 2013). Locke argues that job satisfaction is a positive state that derives from appraisal of a job experience (as cited in Ilies & Judge, 2004, p. 367). Job satisfaction has consistently been shown to affect productivity. The purpose of this study was to determine if employee judgements of managerial personality characteristics contribute to the overall satisfaction of the employee. I surveyed 79 individuals from the Bridgewater State University community and beyond, each being at least 18 years of age and employed to some capacity. The survey measured the level of employee job satisfaction overall, as well as 12 specific aspects of job satisfaction. Additionally, questions were posed to determine personality characteristics of managers based on the Big Five personality traits. Results from the study showed that judgments of managerial personality do influence employee job satisfaction. Perceived managerial openness to experiences, conscientiousness, and emotional stability have several relationships with different areas of employee satisfaction. Knowing that these specific characteristics can alter job satisfaction, organizations can hire appropriate candidates to adjust specific areas of employee satisfaction. This would allow employees to be more productive in the work place and feel more accomplished.

Acknowledgements

Several factors and individuals played into the success of this thesis. Foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Todd Harris for his support, knowledge, and guidance throughout this entire process. An incredible amount of his time was allotted for my success in this research, which I will never be able to repay him. Even before this the process of the thesis began, Todd provided so much knowledge applicable to life and success that I am forever grateful for.

I would also like to acknowledge Bridgewater State University and the BSU Honors Program for providing me with the opportunities and support to be able to pursue the thesis writing process. BSU has allowed me to learn so much through the four years at this institution and writing a thesis felt like a culmination of these experiences.

I would also like to thank my mother and sister for their unfading support throughout this entire process. Thank you to everyone who took my survey and provided their input. Thank you to everyone who provided me with advice for improvements or posed questions for me to think deeper into my research.

Introduction

What is personality?

One's personality is a conglomerate of their thoughts, emotions, and behaviors that tend to remain generally consistent over time, forming "patterns" (Funder, 2013, p. 140). "These patterns include many kinds of variables, including motives, intentions, goals, strategies, and subjective representations" (Funder, 2013, p.140). The variables within personality indicate the degree to which many aspects about the individual are displayed (Funder, 2013).

While many theorists have varying definitions, personality psychology focuses on comprehending oneself or another regardless of the specific situation they are in (Hogan, 2011b). Personality psychology can be confused easily with social psychology, which is the study of how people act in certain situations. However, the important distinction between these two arrives with the separation of a controlled environment, attributing to social psychology (Hogan, 2011b).

In personality assessment, some areas are not, and may never be, completely encompassed in research when regarding leadership theory and organizational roles. "The model of leadership effectiveness drawn from implicit leadership theory is empirically well supported, but represents a view of leadership from the outside" (Hogan, 2011a, p. 2). Additionally, leadership itself cannot fully be understood without deciphering the relationship between followers and leaders, supervisors and supervisees (Hogan, 2011b). Other instances, such as childhood trauma may play a significant role in the way someone acts (Hogan, 2011a).

What is job satisfaction?

Locke proposes that "job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from an appraisal on one's job or job experiences" (as cited in Ilies & Judge, 2004, p. 367). Job

satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are not antonyms, but are rather two different measurements with their own scales. To feel opposite of satisfied with a situation would be considered feeling no satisfaction. Similarly, the opposite of dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 2003). It is important to remember this when discussing how an individual feels about a given situation. Generally speaking, levels of job satisfaction derive from motivators throughout the organization, while levels of job dissatisfaction stem from levels of hygienic factors throughout the organization (Herzberg, 2003). Additionally, a study found that levels of job satisfaction as well as variability in this satisfaction may be affected by the mood of the individual (Ilies & Judge, 2002). Although the present study did not calculate mood into the overall satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the workers, this notion is still an important distinguishing factor that may influence the variation and severity, or lack thereof, in responses.

Current levels of job satisfaction have varied over the past few years as examined through Gallup. According to the company, in 2017, 52% of individuals reported being completely satisfied with their job (Gallup, n.d.). This percentage is down from 54% of individuals that reported being completely satisfied in 2016, but otherwise higher than any year in the last decade (Gallup, n.d.). Satisfaction from relations with co-workers (76% completely satisfied), physical safety conditions (79% completely satisfied), and health insurance (40% completely satisfied) are higher than the previous year in 2017 (Gallup, n.d.).

Satisfaction for one's immediate supervisor (60% completely satisfied) dropped one percent from 2016 to 2017 (Gallup, n.d.). However, several other categories saw more drastic decreases in percentage of completely satisfied participants from 2016 to 2017 including satisfaction with the recognition received (48% from 55%), the amount of money earned (30%

from 41%), on-the-job stress (25% from 34%), and job security (60% from 65%) (Gallup, n.d.).

This information ensures the variability that is produced within job satisfaction.

Why use the Big Five?

The Big 5, Big Five, or Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality is a widely accepted model for addressing and arranging distinctive traits of an individual. “A growing body of research has pointed to the five-factor model as a recurrent and more or less comprehensive taxonomy of personality traits” (McCrae and Costa, 1987, p. 86). Funder (2001) describes the use of the Big Five personality break down to be “ubiquitous” and mentions that the traits “have been correlated with many other personality traits and some behavioral and social outcomes” (p. 200). Beyond, Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, and Barrick (1999) also conclude that the acceptance of use of the Big Five is practically universal. Thus, the use of this framework is well received and appropriate for the scope of this study.

Barrick and Mount (1991) explain that the use of the FFM helps describe personality with five independent factors, which allows for the study of individual differences. The Big Five personality model discusses personality with the attempt to encompass any variation of personality within five different dimensions. These divisions consist of Openness to Experiences, Conscientiousness, Extroversion, Agreeableness, and Emotional Stability (sometimes referred to as Neuroticism).

While some researchers may use similar terms to describe somewhat different personalities, others use varying terms with essentially equivalent meanings. The following definitions were used in this research. High levels of openness to experience correlate with high levels of curiosity and imagination. Individuals who are highly open to experiences enjoy diversity in life and look to try new things (Boundless Management, n.d.). The second trait,

conscientiousness, describes an individual's tendency to plan and stay organized. Highly conscientious people tend to show high levels of discipline and reach for success (Boundless Management, n.d.). Extroversion is the trait that likely is the most common. An Extrovert is talkative, social, and active. Extroverted people tend to seek stimulation through the company of others (Boundless Management, n.d.). Agreeableness describes an individual's level of being cooperative and sympathetic (Boundless Management, n.d.). Lastly, Emotional Stability looks at one's ability to control their own emotions and resist spontaneous urges (Boundless Management, n.d.).

Each of the five traits can further be broken into more specific traits. However, this first-level break down allows the analysis to encompass the necessary scope of personality without dissecting the definitions of each and potentially creating more confusion. When terms describing personality become too complex, the entire study follows in complexity. McCrae and Costa (1987) argue that the use of the FFM can ultimately provide an outline for studying each of these traits. By keeping the surface-level traits in the forefront of this study, we are capitalizing on the highest trait description on the hierarchy (McCrae & John, 1992).

However, even with much research on the Big Five and masses of reliability placed upon them, some issues must be addressed. The first point confronts the notion that these five traits may not be independent of each other (Funder, 2001). However, by only incorporating the main five personality traits, and no other sub-traits, it must be assumed that the traits are independent, due to the way they were created (Funder, 2001). Nonetheless, it truly can be difficult to separate personality. Secondly, the Big Five cannot truly be assumed as all encompassing (Funder, 2001). Nonetheless, it should not be assumed that if individuals were to have the same score in each

category would they actually have the same personality. The variation within each of the five super-categories makes this assumption not only impracticable but also impossible.

Why use personality assessment within organizations?

Effective for use in selecting candidates. A common criticism of personality psychology as well as personality assessments is its effectiveness, or lack thereof, in predicting certain levels of organizational performance. Many believe that such tests should not be used as a pre-employment screening, as it lacks face validity and may easily allow participants to adjust answers in hopes it may provide a more “normal” result (Hogan, Hogan, & Roberts, 1996, p. 475). What we do know is that the increase in attention in this field has allowed research to provide evidence for the effectiveness of these screenings. “[D]ata are reasonably clear that well-constructed personality measures are valid predictors of job performance, and they can enhance fairness in the employment process” (Hogan et al., 1996, p. 469). Many notions that make someone good for the organization can usually be traced back to the individual's personality. For example, the level to which someone takes initiative or is team-oriented can be assessed using personality measures (Hogan et al., 1996, p. 471). Research shows that about one quarter of job performance can be accredited to the employee's personality (Harris, 2008, p. 45). Additionally, proper behavior is undoubtedly an important aspect to sufficient job performance. However, after a certain point in the selection process, it is vital to determine how an applicant completes the task versus simply which tasks he or she is able to complete (Hogan et al., 1996). Although these assessments may seem overly simplified, using a personality template can at least help facilitate decisions and provide consistency for the organization.

Recruitment based on decisions from both applicants and recruiters. Another reason that pre-hire personality observations have proven important when firms are seeking to hire

applicants is that recruitment processes run differently from many of its post-hire counterparts. This process can be very competitive and it is one of few onboarding processes that is influenced by both the decisions of the recruiters as well as the decisions of the applicants (Johnson, Winter, Reio, Thompson & Petrosko 2008).

Research by Johnson et al. (2008) found the following:

It is this dual decision-making feature of recruitment that makes it imperative organizations perform all recruitment activities (e.g. position advertisements, recruitment interviews, job offers) with a high degree of proficiency if they are to be successful in attracting qualified management talent in an increasingly competitive managerial labor market. (p. 632)

Personality of each applicant may ultimately determine his or her inclination to apply for the position (Johnson et al., 2008). This can particularly be important when attempting to determine the appropriate candidate for the position. Johnson et al. (2008) argued that human resource departments can adapt recruitment material to attract applicants with specific personalities to respond.

Executives are often in the “spot-light”. Beyond recruitment, the heightened views of leaders within the company also make the study of personality important (Harris, 2008). Mainly with executives, these characters rarely avoid public attention regarding their actions in a range of situations, through various topics. Well-developed tests can help predict performance across cultures, companies, age, gender, and race, meaning these assessments can be adjusted to fit the needs of various organizations (Harris, 2008, p. 45). This is good news, because research has found that employers are currently less interested in determining if personality can predict job

performance and more interested in deciding how well different assessments work within their specific industry, company, or job (Hogan et al., 1996).

Helps understand where the company is now. Companies are incorporating personality into assessment at many different levels of an employee's career including leadership evaluations and 360-degree reviews (Krell, 2005). Several areas of the human resources including appropriate hiring by taking into consideration not only fit but also diversity, are areas that professionals are implementing personality assessment into (Krell, 2005). Companies are gathering a "baseline" personality profile, something they refer to as "bench strength" in order to understand exactly where the company lies (Krell, 2005, para. 5). From there, it can fully understand its strengths and weaknesses to then seek out what its needs in future hiring endeavors (Krell, 2005).

Helps conflict management. Additionally, research has found that, when everyone understands their own personality and others', it significantly decreases turnover and improves conflict management (Krell, 2005). When there is an issue between employees, they may be able to work through it more objectively when looking at their personality types and discovering where there may be room for disagreements. Similarly, if an employee is feeling attacked by another, they are more likely to blame this on the personality, rather than the person (Krell, 2005).

Helps predict ability to be dynamic and work in teams. Personality studied at the corporate level also seems to have important effects on the organization. Miller and Toulouse (1986) found that the relationship between personality and characteristics of the organization were very strong in smaller firms and in dynamic environments. Additionally, although social skills and teamwork knowledge are undoubtedly important aspects of working successfully on a

team, it was also found that high levels of agreeableness, conscientiousness, and extroversion predict contextual performance for success in working with teams (Morgeson, Reider, & Champion, 2005). Similarly, Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, and Mount (1998) found that “[w]ork teams with higher mean levels of extraversion and emotional stability received higher ratings of team viability” (p. 384). Teamwork has grown increasingly important within organizations regardless if that involves a team of employees, a team of manager, or a team with an array of workers at various levels of the organization. However, there is still little information regarding the usefulness and composition of teams in the workplace (Barrick, et al., 1998).

Preliminary Research and Literature Review

This survey was created to test if specific perceived personality traits found in managers are indicators of employee job satisfaction levels. The survey measured the influences that managers have on job satisfaction in attempt to discover which managerial characteristics are associated with the most satisfied employees. This is done with intentions to assist with people being happier overall with their life and work environment. Many people complain that they are unsatisfied with their careers and point the blame on how the company is run or on specific individuals they interact with. However, certain management characteristics may ultimately hinder job satisfaction and thus performance and productivity.

There have been specific findings that some aspects affect the level of job satisfaction. For example, conflict management methods likely affect job satisfaction (Choi, 2013) as well as how involved employees feel that they are with decision-making processes (Kim, 2002). Additionally, it has been proposed that different aspects of culture environment satisfy workers of different geographical locations (Neuman, 2014). Lastly, Ilies and Judge (2002) believe substantial progress has been made in the research surrounding the causes of job satisfaction and

dissatisfaction. However, little research has examined the affect that personality and characteristics of managers have on the satisfaction level of their employees. If able to determine which perceived personality traits lead to more satisfied employees, it would be easier and more cost-efficient to predict successful managers and train others to be successful. Additionally, this will be helpful in understanding why employees may blame their dissatisfaction on their supervisors.

Further, it should be noted that involvement and empowerment of the employee help increase commitment and urges employees to act less resistant to change, as they feel valued (Dobre, 2013). This study will combine the fields of personality assessment with general management, with the goal of determining how to make our business lives as satisfied as possible, so that our overall happiness can increase, while simultaneously creating a more productive workforce. Further research in this area could potentially provide insight on actual versus perceived managerial characteristics that lead to a more satisfied group of employees. From this, managers with these characteristics can be sought after and trained to increase job satisfaction, leading to more productivity and greater job performance.

Research Question and Hypothesis

We can conclude that information regarding personality in the workplace is incredibly important to the effectiveness of the organization. However, much of research currently regarding this area looks at employee and executive personality traits and how they individually affect corporate goals. There is little to no research observing the personalities of managers with the effects on employee satisfaction. Thus, the following question has been proposed: Are specific perceived personality traits found in managers indicators of employee job satisfaction levels?

After contemplating this question, I hypothesize that employee judgements of managerial personality will indeed have some degree of relation to employee job satisfaction.

Methodology

Participants

Candidates of the study had to meet two major criteria to be qualified to complete the survey. The first criterium regarded the capacity of which someone worked; the second criterium regarded the age of the participant. Participants needed to be employed to some capacity, as the survey observed perceptions between personalities of managers and employee satisfaction in the workplace. Truly, this cannot be monitored if one is not employed. Secondly, due to minor restrictions, candidates needed to be aged 18 or above.

79 participants ultimately agreed to have their data submitted for survey analysis. Of these participants, 49 identified as female/woman, 29 identified as male/man, and one was unsure of their gender identity. Additionally, 43 participants reported falling between the ages of 18 and 24. 14 participants reported being between the ages of 25 and 34. Eight, four, eight, and two participants reported being 35 to 44, 45 to 54, 55 to 64, and 65 or over, respectively. 42 respondents have a collegiate degree, whether it be associate, bachelor's, master's, or doctoral. 28 participants have completed some college and 9 have either not finished high school or solely have a high school degree. Each regression may have varied slightly in the number of observations as blank answers were eliminated from specific analyses.

Survey

I administered a survey for two and a half months to individuals across many different fields. Bridgewater State University Institutional Review Board approved the survey on March 17, 2017. Within the advertisement email for the survey, it was noted that the entire email may

be forwarded to others that may be willing to participate. The survey was set to automatically cease to collect responses once 200 participants had submitted responses or on May 31, 2017, whichever occurred first. This distribution method provided representative data, as it included those working full-time and part-time, as well as those employed long-term at companies or in temporary positions. Although this survey was optional and there were no personal benefits received from completing it, it was hoped that explaining the implications of the research would encourage participants.

Independent Variables

The Big Five personality traits. Participants were asked to rate the degree to which their supervisor displayed each of the Big Five personality traits. A scale of one through five was used; five being the highest level someone could display the trait and one being the lowest level someone could display the trait. An abbreviated description of each trait was provided for reference when responding.

Dependent Variables

Categories of satisfaction. Participants were provided the opportunity to rank their degree of satisfaction on 12 different categories of job satisfaction, ranging from job security to autonomy to decipher between different types of satisfaction that may arise in the workplace. Participants were also given the opportunity to report their overall job satisfaction. All 13 types of satisfaction were proposed by providing a 5-point Likert Scale for responses, ranging from “Extremely satisfied” to “Extremely dissatisfied”.

It is important to note that nowhere within the survey did it ask for a relationship between the employee and supervisor (either emotional or hierarchical) nor was it asked to identify actual, measured personality of the supervisor. It was simply encouraged that participants base their

answers around the individual they consider to be their direct supervisor. This decision helps hold the purpose of the survey true: compare the relationship between perceived personality of a direct supervisor and the effect on job satisfaction. Hofstede (1994) argued that personality of an individual can be determined by the average discernment of others (as cited in Hogan, Hogan, & Roberts, 1996). In only asking for perceived personality, the traits of the supervisor can be specific to that individual. Since the participant answered about their own job satisfaction levels, it is important to compare these levels with how he or she feels their supervisor acts. Other key factors that were asked in the survey were questions regarding identified gender, age, education level, and field of profession. These questions were asked to test if there is any correlation between satisfaction and demographics. After compiling all this data, the aspects driving employee satisfaction appeared.

Analysis

After gathering the results via Qualtrics, the data was exported and coded. Responses containing solely alphabet syntax were coded to represent numerics using Vlookup in Excel. For example, participants were asked to rate satisfaction levels ranging from extremely satisfied to extremely dissatisfied. “Extremely satisfied” responses were transformed into “5” while “extremely dissatisfied” responses were transformed into a “1”. This gives the regression analysis the proper form of data necessary. Respondents that did not agree to have their responses submitted in the survey, or those who left responses blank for the specific variables that were being examined, were eliminate from analysis.

Since we were examining whether perceived personality type affects job satisfaction, when conducting the regression analysis, the Y-values included the data points that reflected levels of jobs satisfaction. Conversely, the X-values related to the level of perceived Big Five

personality types from the workers' perspective. The regression was first set to determine if a relationship was present between overall satisfaction of the employee and each of the Big Five personality traits. Beyond this, the regression then extended to include the 12 different areas of satisfaction. Once these calculations were concluded, the demographic breakdown was examined. Due to the number of survey participants, gender identity was the only categorizing factor that yielded a large enough quatum. The same process was completed for each type of satisfaction when separated by gender. Results were then reviewed and discussed.

Results

Overall, the data concluded that judgements of managerial personality have some significant impact on employee job satisfaction. 85 of 195 relationships have statistical significance per the calculations (31 with $p < .05$, 54 with $p < .01$). 51.28%, 58.97%, and 56.41% of tested relationships between perceived levels of openness to experiences, conscientiousness, and emotional stability, respectively, of a manager and satisfaction levels are statistically significant. Only 15.38% and 35.90% of the same statistic regarding extroversion and agreeableness, respectively, are significant.

As evident from examining the tables, employees who perceive their managers as open to experiences, conscientious, and emotionally stable have a higher likelihood of being satisfied in several of the areas examined in the analysis. When looking at personality traits, it is uncommon to see correlation above .30 (T. Harris, personal communication, June 16, 2017). Thus, in this analysis, we consider a relationship of .20 or above as noteworthy.

Openness to Experiences

Overall results. Statistically shown, several aspects of job satisfaction are significantly affected by managerial openness to experiences. The areas of satisfaction most statistically

significant, without separating by gender, are satisfaction derived from conflict management styles (24.12%, $p < .01$), satisfaction derived from level of appreciation (22.41%, $p < .01$), and satisfaction derived from level of job security (20.45%, $p < .01$).

No significant relationship was found between satisfaction from daily tasks, level of difficulty in work, pay, or working conditions and managerial levels of openness to experiences whether including or excluding gender. In total, seven of the 13 components were statically significant with $p < .01$ and another two of 13 components were statistically significant with $p < .05$.

By gender. Males had high correlation with levels of satisfaction stemming from the culture of the workplace (20.3%, $p < .05$) and conflict management styles (20.02%, $p < .05$). Of the 13 categories of satisfaction, three of the relationships were statistically significant with $p < .05$ for males. Females tended to have high correlation with levels of satisfaction from levels of job security (37.11%, $p < .01$), appreciation (29.42%, $p < .01$), and conflict management styles (25.62%, $p < .01$). Of the 13 tested relationships, both $p < .01$ and $p < .05$ had four statistically significant relationships.

	Openness to Experiences	Male	Female
Overall	0.12652**	0.18729*	0.09486*
Culture	0.10891**	0.20308*	
Co-Workers	0.06711*		0.09961*
Daily Tasks			
Level of Difficulty			
Salary/Hourly Pay			
Level of Autonomy	0.14567**		0.14863**
Level of Personal Safety	0.07725*		0.12917*
Level of Appreciation	0.22411**		0.29419**
Conflict Management	0.24121**	0.2002*	0.25601**
Working Conditions			
Level of Communication	0.13025**		0.14237*
Level of Job Security	0.20446**		0.3711**

* = *p-values below .05*; ** = *p-values below .01*

Conscientiousness

Overall results. Two areas proved to be notably significant. Satisfaction from levels of communication had a 23.12% correlation with managerial conscientiousness ($p < .01$).

Satisfaction with working conditions correlated with managerial conscientiousness approximately 22.76% ($p < .01$).

Such as with openness to experiences, judgements of managerial conscientiousness had no correlation with satisfaction with daily tasks, satisfaction from the level of difficulty, and satisfaction from pay. Managerial conscientiousness also had no relationship with the satisfaction from level of autonomy of the work. Eight of the 13 relationships tested found significant correlations with $p < .01$. Only one of the 13 components was statically significant with $p < .05$.

By gender. Overall job satisfaction with males had a 34.78% relationship with judgements of managerial conscientiousness. Males had a 31.75% correlation with satisfaction from levels of appreciation and managerial conscientiousness ($p < .01$). Male satisfaction from working conditions correlated 32.09% ($p < .01$), satisfaction from conflict management correlated 25.66% ($p < .01$), and satisfaction from the level of communication correlated 20.68% ($p < .05$) with managerial conscientiousness. Four of the 13 tested relationships in males had significance with $p < .01$ and one had significance with $p < .05$. Levels of communication and job security proved statistically significant for females with 24.99% and 23.94%, respectively ($p < .01$ for both). Females also had a high level of correlation between the working conditions and managerial conscientiousness, with 20.29% correlation ($p < .01$). For females, four of the tested relationships were statistically significant with $p < .01$ and another five relationships with statistically significant with $p < .05$.

	Conscientiousness	Male	Female
Overall	0.12302**	0.34783**	
Culture	0.11893**		0.11993*
Co-Workers	0.07421*		0.09507*
Daily Tasks			
Level of Difficulty			
Salary/Hourly Pay			0.19672*
Level of Autonomy			
Level of Personal Safety	0.11826**		0.19246**
Level of Appreciation	0.17399**	0.31747**	0.13532*
Conflict Management	0.12337**	0.25658**	0.10022*
Working Conditions	0.2276**	0.32092**	0.20292**
Level of Communication	0.23119**	0.2068*	0.24991**
Level of Job Security	0.15228**		0.23935**

* = *p-values below .05*; ** = *p-values below .01*

Extroversion

Overall results. Although some relationships were found to have significant association, no tested relationship between an area of job satisfaction and judged levels of managerial extroversion yielded results greater than .20. The most significant relationship overall showed 11.2% correlation between managerial extroversion and satisfaction from co-workers ($p < .01$). Only one of the 13 relationships yielded results with $p < .01$ and two of the 13 tested relationships yielded results with $p < .05$.

By gender. When analyzing results from males and females separately, similar results occurred as with overall correlations. No tested relationship produced results over .20. The strongest relationship was found among males with 19.92% correlation between managerial extroversion and satisfaction with the culture of the workplace ($p < .05$). Of the 13 male relationships, two had significant relationships with $p < .05$. For females, one relationship had a statistically significant correlation with $p < .05$.

	Extroversion	Male	Female
Overall			
Culture		0.19924*	
Co-Workers	0.11195**		
Daily Tasks			
Level of Difficulty			
Salary/Hourly Pay			
Level of Autonomy			
Level of Personal Safety			
Level of Appreciation			
Conflict Management			
Working Conditions	0.07478*	0.18877*	
Level of Communication	0.06385*		0.09473*
Level of Job Security			

* = *p-values below .05*; ** = *p-values below .01*

Agreeableness

Overall results. No tested area of satisfaction had relationships with managerial agreeableness greater than .20 when looking at all respondents together. The strongest relationship was found between managerial agreeableness and level of appreciation at work, with 19.91% correlation ($p < .01$). No relation was present in managerial agreeableness with satisfaction with the culture, co-workers, daily tasks, level of difficulty, pay, or level of autonomy. Four of the 13 tested relationships generated results with $p < .01$. Two of the tested relationships resulted with $p < .05$.

By gender. When separated by gender, males had a very high connection with managerial agreeableness and their satisfaction with the level of appreciation, the conflict management, and level of job security with 45.26%, 44.91%, and 33.31% connection, respectively ($p < .01$ for all). Males also showed a relationship with managerial agreeableness and satisfaction with working conditions at 21.98% ($p < .01$). Of the 13 tested relationships in males,

three had relationships with $p < .01$ and two had relationships with $p < .05$. Females had no categories where the relationship was over 20% significant. One category had a relationship with $p < .01$ and two had relationships with $p < .05$.

	Agreeableness	Male	Female
Overall		0.19575*	
Culture			
Co-Workers			
Daily Tasks			
Level of Difficulty			
Salary/Hourly Pay			
Level of Autonomy			
Level of Personal Safety	0.13874**		0.16097**
Level of Appreciation	0.19915**	0.4526**	
Conflict Management	0.16865**	0.44911**	0.09512*
Working Conditions	0.08575*	0.21978*	
Level of Communication	0.07865*		
Level of Job Security	0.17603**	0.3331**	0.11464*

* = *p-values below .05*; ** = *p-values below .01*

Emotional Stability

Overall results. The majority of job satisfaction areas had some connection with judgements of managerial emotional stability. However, many of these relationships did not yield connections beyond .20. When looking at all the data combined, the largest relationship with managerial emotional stability came from satisfaction from level of appreciation with 28.03% connection ($p < .01$).

Similar to other personality types tested, no substantial relationship was found between emotional stability and daily tasks, level of difficulty, or pay. Nine of the 13 tested relationships yielded results with $p < .01$. One relationship of those tested had a correlation with $p < .05$.

By gender. Male satisfaction with working conditions had a 25.96% correlation with managerial emotional stability ($p < .01$). Of the 13 male relationships tested, one had a significance with $p < .01$ and two had significance with $p < .05$. A rather strong connection was found between female satisfaction with the level of appreciation and managerial emotional stability (44.1%, $p < .01$). Additionally, satisfaction with level of autonomy, co-workers, conflict management, and level of communication each yielded a statistically significant relationship for females (31.38%, 27.35%, 23.72%, and 21.31%, respectively, $p < .01$ for all). Of the 13 relationships among females, eight had significance with $p < .01$ and one had significance with $p < .05$.

	Emotional Stability	Male	Female
Overall	0.17564**	0.19395*	0.16272**
Culture	0.10093**		0.14196*
Co-Workers	0.15513**		0.27353**
Daily Tasks			
Level of Difficulty			
Salary/Hourly Pay			
Level of Autonomy	0.19098**		0.31181**
Level of Personal Safety	0.10093**		
Level of Appreciation	0.2803**		0.44103**
Conflict Management	0.18851**		0.23722**
Working Conditions	0.1978**	0.25964**	0.15429**
Level of Communication	0.19391**	0.1678*	0.21313**
Level of Job Security	0.06146*		0.15863**

* = *p-values below .05*; ** = *p-values below .01*

Discussion

Results from this survey showed very promising implications. Most importantly, it can be said with relative confidence that some managerial traits do effect employee job satisfaction in many different aspects of business. This is an important conclusion, because it proves that

employee satisfaction is influenced by external aspects as well as internal aspects. There are specific characteristics that come from those supervising individuals that affect their satisfaction and thus, productivity. One of the largest reasons for conducting this study was to determine how to make employees more satisfied overall with their work, as most Americans need to work to survive. From the findings, there are many different areas that can be examined and potentially improved upon by taking these results into consideration.

One of the most obvious ways that this research can be used to improve business functionality, performance, and satisfaction is to look at the areas of satisfaction that employees feel when specific personality traits are present. From here, managers who are aware of the specific traits they possess and display will have precise areas to seek improvement. This can be done either by attempting to display higher levels of a certain trait or by monitoring the environment and implementing other aspects into the work setting to “make-up” for these areas.

Additionally, with the interpretation from these results, one may be able to understand why employees are not being as productive as they thought possible. As we know, productivity and job performance are affected by how satisfied the individual feels in the workplace. Managers will be able to reflect on themselves and potentially determine areas that are causing the employee to lack in productivity. Once this is identified, it can be corrected.

This research can also be used during human resource processes in many different aspects. First, when attempting to recruit a new managerial candidate, specific personality can be sought after, depending on what types of satisfaction seems to be lacking currently in the workplace. This not only will help improve satisfaction of the employees, but may also help the employees feel like their needs are being taken into consideration when determining where they are truly satisfied and where they are not. The same process and results are true if a firm is

looking to a consultant to improve business function. Also, when hiring new candidates in entry-level positions, these traits can be examined and potentially taken into consideration if the company ultimately seeks to hire from within. If a firm can hire an individual already displaying certain preferred traits, it makes fostering these traits down the line less time-consuming and less-costly to the firm, as a solid background is already established.

Secondly, if an organization is looking to increase satisfaction in one or more areas, training and development can occur to provide ways of displaying desired traits more effectively. For example, we know that conflict management satisfaction has a large correlation with managerial openness to experiences. If employees provide feedback that conflict management is not being handled appropriately, human resources can provide methods and experiences that can help increase the management level of openness to experiences. If this is done in correlation with other conflict management improvement practices, it is likely that the notion will hold better in the organization once training is completed.

Another area that can be discussed with this research includes extending beyond personality types. From the data, we could see that none of the Big Five had a strong correlation with satisfaction from daily tasks, difficulty of work, or salary or hourly pay. Thus, managers know that if these are the areas which satisfaction is lacking, they need not focus on improving perceived personality, but can look elsewhere for the answer. Similarly, if the area of satisfaction has correlation with each trait, yet an employee still is not satisfied, one needs to look elsewhere for the answer. Other internal and external factors can be examined in attempting to determine influences that alter the satisfaction level of an individual. This research can provide a starting point if managers are lacking a direction to head when attempting to grow satisfaction within their workers.

Limitations and Future Research

This research does contain some limiting factors. The major limitation came from the minimal number of respondents willing to participate. Although less than 100 individuals participated in the survey, results seem promising and may have the potential to be extended across larger samples. This may have been a result of a second limitation of the study. The distribution method of the survey may have also been limiting. Not having access to many email addresses and relying on individuals to forward the message along at their will may have disrupted the potential flow of the survey and limited the number of individuals it could have reached.

Another limitation stemmed from the demographics of respondents. Many respondents reflected similar demographics as the researcher, as many are in undergraduate studies. Future research may be able to avoid this by purchasing respondents and expanding beyond peers for participates.

Additional research is also possible in this area. One of the most prevalent areas of improvement would be increasing the sample size. Although the majority of the regressions had 40-90 observations, when separated by gender, male population size ranged from 20-30. Additionally, I was not able to run regressions with samples divided by any other demographic other than gender (e.g. age, industry, education level) due to the fact that any other division yielded insignificant sample sizes. I believe that having other methods for recruiting candidates and having the survey available for a longer period of time would minimize this outcome and likely create a larger sample of respondents to work with, ultimately increasing validity of the results.

Other areas of improvement include providing deeper meaning of the Big Five personality traits for analysis and potentially analyzing the same satisfaction versus other models of personality such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. There is potential that the brief descriptions I chose may have altered participant responses. These hyphenated definitions were provided in the survey to ensure brevity, but may be looked at in the future to determine if each was the “best” definition to use for its respective personality trait. Inclusion of other personality indicators may ultimately help determine which is best used within the workforce and may provide more specific results for each level of satisfaction.

This research specifically avoided taking measured managerial personality into consideration and only observed perceived personality. However, firms may benefit from also determining how large this discretion is and where the discretion lays. If one is perceived very different from how he or she believes to be acting, there may be room for training and development to remedy that situation.

If one is incredibly fascinated with these findings, this study can also be extended to include more in-depth analysis of specific areas of satisfaction. In this study, it was attempted to discover if specific perceived personality types of managers affected employee job satisfaction. However, no where did this survey look at why these personality types affected satisfaction. After determining the areas of satisfaction that are largely affected by a perceived type of personality, extending this research to include detailed accounts of how the trait changes satisfaction would be beneficial. Managers would have an even-more specific way of determining how to ultimately guarantee that their employees are satisfied. They could then incorporate these actions into every day processes the organization has.

References

- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(1), 1-26.
- Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., Neubert, M. J., & Mount, M. K. (1998). Relating member ability and personality to work-team processes and team effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(3), 377-391.
- Boundless Management. (n.d.). *Personality*. Retrieved from <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/boundless-management/chapter/personality/>
- Choi, Y. (2013). The influence of conflict management culture on job satisfaction. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal, 41*(4), 687-692.
doi:10.2224/sbp.2013.41.4.687
- Dobre, O. I. (2013). Employee motivation and organizational performance. *Journal of Management and Socio-Economic, 1*(1).
- Funder, D. C. (2001). Personality. *Annual Review Psychology, 52*(1), 197-421.
- Funder, D. C. (2013). *The personality puzzle*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Gallup. (n.d.). *Work and workplace*. Retrieved from <http://news.gallup.com/poll/1720/work-work-place.aspx>
- Harris, T. (2008). Using personality data to identify and develop high-potential leaders. *Talent Management, 44*-47.
- Herzberg, F. (2003). One more time: How do you motivate employees?. *Harvard Business Review, 81*(1), 87-96.
- Hogan, R. (2011a). The ambiguities of effectiveness. *Tulsa, USA: Hogan Assessment Systems*.

- Hogan, R. (2011b). Why Freud matters. *Hogan Assessment Systems*. Retrieved from <http://info.hoganassessments.com/blog/bid/109248/Why-Freud-Matters>
- Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Roberts, B. W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions: Questions and answers. *American Psychologist*, *51*(5), 469.
- Ilies, R., & Judge, T. A. (2002). Understanding the dynamic relationships among personality, mood, and job satisfaction: A field experience sampling study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *89*(2), 1119-1139.
- Ilies, R., & Judge, T. A. (2004). An experience-sampling measure of job satisfaction and its relationships with affectivity, mood at work, job beliefs, and general job satisfaction. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *13*(3), 367-389.
- Johnson, A., Winter, P. A., Reio Jr, T. G., Thompson, H. L., & Petrosko, J. M. (2008). Managerial recruitment: the influence of personality and ideal candidate characteristics. *Journal of Management Development*, *27*(6), 631-648.
- Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J., & Barrick, M. R. (1999). The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology*, *52*(3), 621-652.
- Kim, S. (2002). Participative management and job satisfaction: lessons for management leadership. *Public Administration Review*, *62*(2), 231+
- Krell, E. (2005, November 1). Personality counts. *HR Magazine*, *50*(11), 4.
- 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., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality, 60*(2), 175-215.
- Miller, D., & Toulouse, J. M. (1986). Chief executive personality and corporate strategy and structure in small firms. *Management Science, 32*(11), 1389-1409.
- Morgeson, F. P., Reider, M. H., & Campion, M. A. (2005). Selecting individuals in team settings: The importance of social skills, personality characteristics, and teamwork knowledge. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(3), 583-611.
- Neuman, K. D. (2014). The effect of job characteristics on job satisfaction in the United States and China. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research, 15*(2), 121-142.
- Thomas, A. J. P. A. W. Managerial recruitment: the influence of personality and ideal candidate characteristics Alonzo Johnson Paul A. Winter Thomas G. Reio Jr Henry L. Thompson Joseph M. Petrosko. *Management, 27*(6), 631-648.

Appendix A
Survey Given to Participants

Perceived Personality Types

Q1 You are invited to participate in a research study to determine the degree of correlation between perceived personality types of direct supervisors and employee job satisfaction. Demographic questions will be included in the survey. You will be asked to complete the survey to the best of your ability. Your participation in the study should last no more than 10 minutes, is completely voluntary, and you may discontinue your participation in the survey at any time without incurring any penalty. You are also free to decline to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable. There are no foreseeable risks associated with your participation in the survey and your identity will not be tied to the results in any way. Identifiable information will not be included on the questionnaire, the written work, or any materials used in this study. You may feel pressured to complete this survey due to your relationship with with investigator(s), but please be assured that under no circumstances are you required to participate or complete the survey. If the data should be published, your identity will not be revealed. Individually, you may not benefit personally by participating in this study. The Department of Psychology, the University Institutional Review Board, Assistant Professor Todd Harris (617-290-5686), or Investigator Makenzi Astore (413-822-1857) may inspect your records. Absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, but will be upheld to the extent permitted by law. If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to call the investigators listed below. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may call the University Institutional Review Board office (508-531-1242) and will be given an opportunity to discuss any questions in confidence, with a member of the committee. This is an independent committee composed of faculty and staff of Bridgewater State University and its affiliates, as well as lay members of the community not connected with the institution. The committee has reviewed this study. The survey will cease to collect information once 200 responses are collected. Note: You must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this survey and be employed to some degree. If you agree to participate, and are of age, please choose the option below that will allow you to continue to the survey. You will have the option to refuse to answer individual questions and may change your mind and leave the study at any time without penalty. Investigators:

Makenzi Astore

Dr. Todd Harris

M1astore@student.bridgew.edu
1857

T3harris@bridgew.edu 413-822-
617-290-5686

- I have read the Consent Letter, meet the requirements, and agree to complete this survey (1)
- I do not agree to complete this survey (2)

Display This Question:

If You are invited to participate in a research study designed to gather information in attempt to determine the degree of correlation between perceived personality types of direct supervisors end emp... I do not agree to complete this survey Is Selected

Q5 Thank you. You may close the webpage.

Condition: Thank you. You may close th... Is Displayed. Skip To: End of Survey.

Q6 Demographic Information:

Q2 My age is:

- 18-24 (1)
- 25-34 (2)
- 35-44 (3)
- 45-54 (4)
- 55-64 (5)
- 65 or over (6)

Q3 What is your gender identity? Gender identity refers to a deeply held sense of being a man, woman, both, neither, or a combination therein. Gender identity is different from sexual orientation and may or may not be the same as the sex you were assigned at birth.

- Agender (1)
- Female/woman, not transgender (2)
- Genderqueer or gender fluid (3)
- Male/man, not transgender (4)
- Questioning or unsure (5)
- Trans man (6)
- Trans woman (7)
- A gender category/identity not listed (9)
- Prefer not to disclose (8)

Q30 If you chose, "A gender category/identity not listed," please specify:

Q4 What is the highest level of education completed?

- No High School Degree (1)
- High School Degree (2)
- Some College (3)
- Associate's Degree (4)
- Bachelor's Degree (5)
- Master's Degree (6)
- Doctorate Degree (7)

Q29 If you have multiple jobs, please answer the rest of the survey questions based on the job where you spend the most time.

Q27 What industry do you work in?

- Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting (1)
- Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction (2)
- Construction (3)
- Manufacturing (4)
- Wholesale and retail trade (5)
- Transportation and utilities (6)
- Information (7)
- Financial activities (8)
- Professional and business services (9)
- Education and health services (10)
- Leisure and hospitality (11)
- Other services (12)
- Public Administration (13)
- Do not know (14)

Q7 How long have you been in your current employment position?

- Less than 1 year (1)
- 1-3 years (2)
- 4-6 years (3)
- 7-10 years (4)
- More than 10 years (5)

Q12 Job satisfaction:

Q8 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you overall with your employment?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Q9 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with the culture at your place of employment?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Q10 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with your co-workers at your place of employment?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Q16 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with your daily tasks at your place of employment?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Q11 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with the level of difficulty of your work at your place of employment?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Q13 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with your salary/hourly pay in correlation to your job's tasks at your place of employment?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Q14 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you of the level of autonomy you have at your place of employment?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Q17 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you of the level of personal safety you have at your place of employment?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Q18 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with the level of appreciation you receive from your supervisor at your place of employment?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Q31 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with the conflict management displayed at your place of employment?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Q19 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with the working conditions at your place of employment?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Q15 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with the level of communication at your place of employment?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Q28 Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with the level of job security you have at your place of employment?

- Extremely satisfied (1)
- Somewhat satisfied (2)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)
- Somewhat dissatisfied (4)
- Extremely dissatisfied (5)

Q21 For each of the following personality traits, please rate on a scale of 1-5 the level to which your supervisor displays each trait. Higher scores indicate more of the trait; lower scores indicate less of the trait.

Q22 Openness to Experiences describes an individual's level of curiosity, creativity, and urge for variety. On a scale of 1-5, how open to experiences is your supervisor?

_____ Openness (1)

Q23 Conscientiousness describes an individual's tendency to aim for high achievements, show self-discipline, and utilize planning and organization. On a scale of 1-5, how conscientious is your supervisor?

_____ Conscientiousness (1)

Q24 Extroversion describes an individual's tendency to seek stimulation from others. Extroverts tend to be assertive and talkative. On a scale of 1-5, how extroverted is your supervisor?

_____ Extroversion (1)

Q25 Agreeableness describes an individual's tendency to be cooperative and trusting of others. On a scale of 1-5, how agreeable is your supervisor?

_____ Agreeableness (1)

Q26 Emotional Stability describes an individual's tendency to experience pleasant emotions and control impulses. On a scale of 1-5, how emotionally stable is your supervisor?

_____ Emotional Stability (1)

References for Survey

Boundless Management. (n.d.). *Personality*. Retrieved from

<https://courses.lumenlearning.com/boundless-management/chapter/personality/>

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2017). *Household data: Employed persons by detailed industry and*

age [Data file]. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat18b.htm>

Gender Identity Question wording provided by BSU staff Lisa Forest, Director, GLBTA Pride Center

Appendix B
IRB Approval

3/15/17

Todd Harris
Management Dept.
Harrington Hall, Room 101A
Re: IRB Application – 2017113

Dear Dr. Harris:

This letter is to inform you that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has approved (*expedited*) the research project titled, *Perceived Managerial Characteristics Affecting Job Satisfaction*.

The approval for your study is active for a period of one (1) year from the date of this letter. You are expected to adhere to the procedures as outlined in your proposal. Any changes in procedures, protocol, or the consent form will require the approval of the Institutional Review Board. You are also expected to notify the IRB immediately in the event of injury to or any problem with the subject participating in the study.

As the principal investigator, you have primary responsibility for protecting the rights and welfare of human research subjects and for complying with the provisions of the Institutional Review Board.

Best wishes on the completion of your research project. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

Dr. Orlando Olivares
Interim Chair, Institutional Review Board

OO/mz

cc: Makenzi Astore