

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LIFE  
SATISFACTION AND SELF-CONCEPT, LOCUS OF  
CONTROL, SATISFACTION WITH PRIMARY  
RELATIONSHIPS, AND WORK SATISFACTION

A Dissertation for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

MARTHA RAE ANDERSON

1977

24189434



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LIFE  
SATISFACTION AND SELF-CONCEPT, LOCUS OF  
CONTROL, SATISFACTION WITH PRIMARY  
RELATIONSHIPS, AND WORK SATISFACTION

presented by

Martha Rae Anderson

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Education

*William W. Farguhar*  
Major professor

Date 2-22-77

# REMOTE STORAGE *RSF*

**PLACE IN RETURN BOX** to remove this checkout from your record.

**TO AVOID FINES** return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
		<i>11/18/90</i>

## ABSTRACT

### A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LIFE SATISFACTION AND SELF-CONCEPT, LOCUS OF CONTROL, SATISFACTION WITH PRIMARY RELATIONSHIPS, AND WORK SATISFACTION

By

Martha Rae Anderson

The study investigated the relationship between life satisfaction and five variables--locus of control, self-concept, work satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, and discrepancy between "have" and "want." Subjects were 228 graduate students and teachers, all of whom were employed. The sample was relatively young (mean age = 30), well educated (all subjects had at least a bachelor's degree), and reported modest family incomes (mean = \$13,500). Three-fifths of the subjects were married, and about one-third had children.

The subjects volunteered to complete a questionnaire consisting of instruments designed to measure general satisfaction, work satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, and the discrepancy scale (all of which were constructed by the writer) along with Fitt's Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and Rotter's Locus of Control Scale.



The hypotheses for the study and the results of the hypothesis tests were:

1. There will be a positive correlation between the Total Positive scores (self-esteem) on the Tennessee Self-Concept scale and the scores on the General Satisfaction scale. The correlation found was .615 (p less than .001).

2. There will be a positive correlation between scores on the General Satisfaction scale and scores on the Work Satisfaction scale. The correlation found was .550 (p less than .001).

3. There will be a positive correlation between scores on the General Satisfaction scale and scores on the Relationship Satisfaction scale. The correlation found was .332 (p less than .001).

4. There will be a negative correlation between scores on Rotter's Locus of Control scale scored in an external direction and scores on the General Satisfaction scale. The correlation found was  $-.355$  (p less than .001).

5. There will be a negative correlation between the scores on the General Satisfaction scale and scores on the Discrepancy scale. A correlation of  $-.532$  (p less than .001) was found.

Regression analysis of the data revealed a strong multiple correlation of .75 between General Satisfaction and the best linear combination of predictor variables (work satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, locus of control, total discrepancy, and self-esteem).

Self-esteem was the best predictor of general satisfaction (beta = .4392). The beta coefficients for other explanatory variables were: work satisfaction (beta = .3055), relationship satisfaction (beta = .0532), locus of control (beta =  $-.1138$ ), and total discrepancy (beta =  $-.2427$ ).

A discriminant function analysis was performed to identify the variables which best differentiated people who scored either high or low on the General Satisfaction scale. The variable with the highest discriminant weight was work satisfaction (.901) followed by total positive (self-esteem) which had a discriminant weight of .582.

The aspects of life most important to the subjects' satisfaction with life were: good health, a satisfying relationship, and love. Subjects found the least satisfaction with the amount of money they made and the amount of education they had attained. Subjects were most satisfied with the amount of time for their friends and social life and the amount of physical attractiveness they experienced.

Few significant relationships were established between demographic characteristics and other variables used. However, married persons and those "cohabiting on a long-term basis" expressed more life satisfaction than single or divorced subjects. Neither level of education nor income was found to be related to the degree of professed life satisfaction.

Work satisfaction was found to be more highly related to demographic characteristics than any of the other variables used in the study. Presence of children in the home was associated with higher levels of work satisfaction, and subjects employed by the university (usually graduate assistants) were more satisfied with their jobs than were teachers.

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LIFE  
SATISFACTION AND SELF-CONCEPT, LOCUS OF  
CONTROL, SATISFACTION WITH PRIMARY  
RELATIONSHIPS, AND WORK SATISFACTION

By

Martha Rae Anderson

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Counseling, Personnel Services, and  
Educational Psychology

1977

To Ray and Bernice Anderson

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the members of my guidance committee, Sam Plyler, Tom Parmeter, Don Grummon, and my chairman, Bill Farquhar, for the distinct part each has played in my graduate education.

Members of the Department of Surgery, especially Dan English and Bill Nicholas, have been generous in providing time, moral support, and funds for the analysis of the data.

Carol Anne Shipley graciously contributed her very special talent for clarity of thought and expression.

Steve Downing assisted with editing the items, and has encouraged me to think more clearly about measurement issues.

To faculty members in the College of Education who allowed me to use their class time for the collection of data, and the students who patiently answered all my questions, I am most grateful.

Finally, David West helped analyze and interpret the data for the study, and has made a unique contribution to my satisfaction with life.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Need for the Study . . . . .	2
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	3
Research Hypotheses . . . . .	3
Theoretical Considerations and	
Expectations . . . . .	4
Life Satisfaction . . . . .	5
Job Satisfaction . . . . .	6
Primary Relationship Satisfaction . . . . .	8
Self-Esteem . . . . .	9
Locus of Control . . . . .	13
Overview of the Dissertation . . . . .	18
II. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	20
Introduction . . . . .	20
Studies of Life Satisfaction . . . . .	22
Job Satisfaction and Life	
Satisfaction . . . . .	31
Satisfaction With Primary	
Relationships and Life Satisfaction . . . . .	32
Locus of Control and Life Satisfaction . . . . .	37
Self-Esteem and Life Satisfaction . . . . .	38
Interrelationship of Predictor Variables . . . . .	38
Locus of Control and Self-Esteem . . . . .	38
Self-Concept and Marital Satisfaction . . . . .	40
Work Satisfaction and Marital Adjustment . . . . .	41
Locus of Control and Work Satisfaction . . . . .	42
Studies of Happiness . . . . .	43
Quality of Life . . . . .	45
Gerontological Perspective of Life	
Satisfaction . . . . .	47
Summary . . . . .	48
Qualifying Demographic Variables . . . . .	48
Predictor or Explanatory Variables	
Used in the Study . . . . .	49
Intercorrelation of Predictor Variables . . . . .	50

Chapter	Page
III. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY . . . . .	51
The Sample . . . . .	51
Instrumentation of the Study . . . . .	56
Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) . . . . .	57
Locus of Control Scale . . . . .	61
Scales Developed for This Study . . . . .	63
General Life Satisfaction . . . . .	66
Work Satisfaction . . . . .	67
Relationship Satisfaction . . . . .	68
Child Satisfaction . . . . .	71
Importance and Discrepancy Scales . . . . .	71
Plan of the Study . . . . .	74
Testable Hypotheses . . . . .	74
Procedures for Data Analysis . . . . .	75
Summary . . . . .	79
IV. RESULTS OF THE DATA ANALYSIS . . . . .	81
Correlational Hypotheses . . . . .	81
Hypothesis 1 . . . . .	84
Hypothesis 2 . . . . .	84
Hypothesis 3 . . . . .	84
Hypothesis 4 . . . . .	84
Hypothesis 5 . . . . .	85
Regression Analysis . . . . .	85
Discriminant Function Analysis . . . . .	91
Further Analysis of the Data . . . . .	95
Importance and Discrepancy Scales . . . . .	95
Factor Analysis of Items Constructed for the Study . . . . .	99
Intercorrelation of All Scales . . . . .	109
Demographic Characteristics . . . . .	113
Summary . . . . .	118
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	123
Summary of Findings . . . . .	123
Conclusions . . . . .	127
Discussion . . . . .	129
Implications for Future Research . . . . .	136
APPENDICES . . . . .	140
A. QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THE STUDY . . . . .	141
B. ORIGINAL ITEM POOL GENERATED FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SCALE . . . . .	155

Chapter	Page
C. COMPLETE ITEM STATISTICS FOR GENERAL SATISFACTION, RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION, WORK SATISFACTION, AND CHILD SATISFACTION SCALES AND ORIGIN OF ITEM . . . . .	177
D. COMPLETE FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR PRINCIPAL FACTORS SOLUTION . . . . .	190
E. COMPLETE FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR VARIMAX ROTATION . . . . .	194
F. CORRELATION MATRIX FOR ALL VARIABLES USED IN THE STUDY . . . . .	198
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	200



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Factors in Best and Worst Possible Life . . .	24
2.2 Distribution of Scores on Overall Satisfaction . . . . .	26
2.3 Dissatisfaction in Marriage x Overall Happiness . . . . .	35
2.4 Dissatisfaction With Job x Dissatisfaction With Marriage . . . . .	36
3.1 Educational Level of the Sample . . . . .	53
3.2 Income Level of Respondents . . . . .	54
3.3 Relationship Status of the Respondents . . . .	55
3.4 Number of Respondents With Children . . . . .	56
3.5 Means for Tennessee Self-Concept Scales, Norm Group and Present Sample . . . . .	60
3.6 Statistics for Each Scale Developed for the Study . . . . .	65
3.7 Item-Scale Correlations for General Satisfaction . . . . .	67
3.8 Item-Scale Correlations for the Work Satisfaction Scale . . . . .	69
3.9 Item-Scale Correlations for the Relationship Satisfaction Scale . . . . .	70
3.10 Means and Standard Deviations of Importance and Discrepancy Scales . . . . .	72
4.1 Correlation Matrix for Predictor and Criterion Variables . . . . .	82
4.2 First Hierarchical Regression Analysis of the Data . . . . .	86

Table	Page
4.3 Standardized Regression Coefficients (Beta Weights) for Regression on General Satisfaction . . . . .	88
4.4 Results of the Quasi-Stepwise Regression Analysis of the Data . . . . .	90
4.5 Means and Standard Deviations of the Discriminating Variables for the Discriminant Function Analysis . . . . .	92
4.6 Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients . . . . .	93
4.7 Results of the Classification Analysis . . . . .	94
4.8 Rank Order of the Importance Scale Items . . . . .	96
4.9 Differences in Means Between "Have" and "Want" Scales . . . . .	97
4.10 Items Loading on Factor 1, Principal Factors Solution . . . . .	100
4.11 Items Loading on Factor 2, Principal Factors Solution . . . . .	102
4.12 Items Loading on Factor 3, Principal Factors Solution . . . . .	103
4.13 Items Loading on Factor 1, Varimax Rotation . . . . .	105
4.14 Items Loading on Factor 2, Varimax Rotation . . . . .	106
4.15 Items Loading on Factor 3, Varimax Rotation . . . . .	106
4.16 Items Loading on Factor 4, Varimax Rotation . . . . .	107
4.17 Items Loading on Factor 5, Varimax Rotation . . . . .	108
4.18 Items Loading on Factor 6, Varimax Rotation . . . . .	108
4.19 Correlation Matrix: Major Variables and TSCS Subscales . . . . .	111
4.20 Results of Analysis of Variance for Demographic Variables . . . . .	117

Table	Page
D1. Principal-Factor Factor Analysis Loading . . .	191
E1. Varimax Rotation--Factor Analysis Loading . .	195
F1. Correlation Matrix for All Variables Used in the Study . . . . .	199

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

"No human quest may claim a larger following than happiness or satisfaction with life."<sup>1</sup> These seemingly elusive qualities have long been the province of scholars of many disciplines within the social sciences. Satisfaction in life has been viewed by some observers as a theological issue, with various prescriptions for finding a "blessed existence." Satisfaction in living has also been treated as an economic question. Economists and social philosophers such as Karl Marx, Adam Smith, and John Maynard Keynes have advocated a myriad of "systems" to promote well-being. Politicians and political scientists posit various programs to improve the life quality of people. Presumably, the "war on poverty" was motivated by the assumption that it was possible to assure a better life for poor people.

Satisfaction with life has been equated with psychological or social adjustment. Pundits suggest hundreds of ways to change one's life, eliminate depression, improve sexual relations, be liberated, or win

---

<sup>1</sup>Watson, G., Happiness among adult students of education. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1930, 21, 1.

(with or without intimidation). "States" such as self-actualization<sup>2</sup> have become desired modes of being. Most of these psychological techniques and theories, however, have not generated a body of empirical knowledge sufficient to clarify any definition of the components of life satisfaction or the personality traits, attitudes, or behaviors associated with life satisfaction.

### Need for the Study

Consequently, there is a need for research investigating the relationship of personality variables and life satisfaction. Studies which examine the major role-related components of an individual's life and the personality variables that interact with them ought to begin to clarify the complex nature of life satisfaction.

Previous research in life satisfaction has been dominated by a sociological perspective relating life satisfaction to demographic characteristics such as socioeconomic status, sex, marital status, and educational level. Most of the studies have not dealt with the probable psychological underpinnings of life satisfaction.

Psychologists are just beginning to view the normal personality as a legitimate area of research,

---

<sup>2</sup>Maslow, A., Toward a psychology of being. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1962.

and only recently have researchers begun to look at the development of the post-adolescent personality. This paucity of research in the psychology of the normal adult personality underscores the need for further studies in this area.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to apply an empirical psychological perspective to the study of life satisfaction. The study is designed to ask people about their satisfaction with life and to investigate the relationship of selected psychological variables to life satisfaction. The focus of the study is a group of adults who are currently employed and therefore should have adequate food and shelter. The sample does not include elderly people. Consequently poor health and the other problems of aging should not be identified as major detractors to satisfaction with life. Because all respondents in the study have completed at least a bachelor's degree, lack of education should not be a deterrent to these people in reaching their life goals.

#### Research Hypotheses

The objective of this study is to test the following research hypotheses:

1. There is a positive relationship between self-esteem and overall satisfaction with life.

2. A positive relationship exists between job satisfaction and general satisfaction with life.
3. A positive relationship exists between satisfaction with primary relationships and general life satisfaction.
4. There is a negative relationship between external locus of control and general life satisfaction.
5. A negative relationship exists between satisfaction with life and the discrepancy between what a person wants and what he actually experiences in his job, spare time, and other areas of life.

#### Theoretical Considerations and Expectations

Included in the study are four independent or "explanatory" variables: self-esteem, job satisfaction, satisfaction with primary relationships, and locus of control. The relationship between these explanatory variables and satisfaction with life will be studied. Since there is no accepted "theory" of life satisfaction, the definition of this construct becomes the strategy for the development of items to measure these variables.

The following sections contain a discussion of each independent variable and its hypothesized or theoretical relationship to some general measure of life satisfaction. A rationale is also developed for the choice of the variables in the study.

### Life Satisfaction

For purposes of this research, life satisfaction is defined as "feelings of contentment with one's life style." Robinson and Shaver<sup>3</sup> have advanced this definition as a way of "accounting for" types of questionnaire responses examined in prior research. Satisfaction with life implies fulfillment of wants and needs which are likely to be determined, at least in part, by individual values. These values provide the standard against which one's life is evaluated. Examples of these values are success, comfort, having fun, excitement, adventure, happiness, or anything else a person may value. A global assessment of life satisfaction requires an assessment of "where one is" with respect to all these values, needs, and desires. Satisfaction with life implies one spends time in ways that are satisfying including time at work and leisure. It would seem to involve a sense of optimism, the belief that one has an opportunity to do what one wants and needs to do to achieve valued goals. Being satisfied can also include finding direction and meaning in life experiences, tasks, feelings, or relationships. Previous research<sup>4</sup> suggests that feeling

---

<sup>3</sup>Robinson, John P., & Shaver, Phillip R., Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor: The Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1973, p. 11.

<sup>4</sup>Converse, P., & Robinson, John P., The use of time: Activities of urban and suburban populations in twelve countries. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton, 1972.



healthy, zestful, or energetic is important to the quality of an individual's life.

One possible operational measure of satisfaction with life is the discrepancy between what a person wants and what a person actually has. For example, if a person desires more time with family, yet works 12 hours per day, then a discrepancy exists between the amount of time the person wants to spend with his/her family and the amount of time this person actually has available to spend with family. If individuals recognize many such discrepancies between desires and reality, they are likely to report less satisfaction with life.

### Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as feelings of satisfaction or contentment with one's job. The term job satisfaction has been extended to include the individual's feelings about the environment of the job, including the relationships with co-workers or supervisor, in addition to the actual task.

Other important aspects of job satisfaction include receiving appropriate recognition for contributions at work, enjoying the tasks one performs, feeling competent in those tasks, and experiencing a sense of commitment and meaning. (The sample of this study contains people with high levels of education; consequently

the definition of job satisfaction has a professional orientation, which might not be appropriate if the range of occupations being sampled were broader.)

Work has traditionally been a major factor in the life styles of Americans. Work has played a principal role in the organization of men's lives, and is becoming a major role in women's lives. "It seems safe to assume that a role occupying so much of an individual's time will have some effect on well-being."<sup>5</sup>

A job, particularly a white-collar job, not only provides a means to earn a living, but is also instrumental in a person's life in other ways. Work gives people a feeling of being tied into society, of having something to do, of having a purpose in life. According to Morse and Weiss,<sup>6</sup> work keeps people occupied, "healthy," and serves as a means of warding off loneliness and isolation. It is an input into the emotional economies of individuals because it serves to anchor the individual into the society.

Given that work plays such an instrumental role in life, satisfaction or dissatisfaction with a job

---

<sup>5</sup>Bradburn, Norman M., The structure of psychological well-being. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969, p. 180.

<sup>6</sup>Morse, Nancy C., & Weiss, Robert S. The function and meaning of work and the job. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 192.

should be a large contributor to or distractor from life satisfaction. If much of our identity involves a job, with feelings of competence and enjoyment derived from work, work should play an integral role in satisfaction with life. Consequently, it is posited that job satisfaction will be positively related to life satisfaction.

#### Primary Relationship Satisfaction

Another major role-related component of this study is satisfaction with primary relationships. Primary relationships are defined to include relationships with a spouse or with a significant other. In some segments of society (particularly within the university group sampled for this study) attitudes have changed rather dramatically and many people simply live together without being married. Therefore the term "spouse" may not be inclusive enough to take into account all pair-bonded individuals.

The definition of the concept of relationship satisfaction includes many of the functions that a relationship performs in assisting the individual in a good life. These include providing companionship, intimacy, shared responsibility, and security. The definition of satisfaction must also include some aspects of how pair-bonded individuals relate to one

another. Examples include: a partner's respect for one's opinions, thoughts, and ideas; resolving differences between the partners; feelings of affection or love between the partners; and satisfaction with sexual experiences.

The literature has shown that married people are happier and more satisfied than people who never married, or who are divorced or widowed. It is the purpose of this study to discover the degree to which satisfaction with a primary relationship contributes to overall life satisfaction.

### Self-Esteem

Psychological opinion has been divided on the question of the psychological construct of the self-concept. Some psychologists, such as Allport,<sup>7</sup> believe the construct can be dispensed with completely. Other behavioral scientists believe the construct of the self-concept is not only useful but necessary (e.g. James, Cooley, Mead, Lecky, Sullivan, Hilgard, Snygg & Combs, and Rogers). Phenomenologists consider the self-concept to be the most central construct in all of psychology, as it provides (at least for them) the only perspective from which an individual's behavior can be

---

<sup>7</sup>Allport, G., Becoming. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.

understood. Self-concept, more specifically self-esteem, was considered to be an important construct in developing this research.

Wylie<sup>8</sup> suggests that self-esteem has been related to almost every possible variable at one time or another. However, in spite of the popularity of the construct of self-esteem, no standard or operational definition exists. For purposes of this study, self-esteem is defined as "liking and respect for oneself."<sup>9</sup> "People high in self-esteem tend to like themselves, feel they are persons of value and worth, have confidence in themselves, and act accordingly. People with low self-esteem are doubtful of their worth, see themselves as undesirable, often feel anxious, depressed, and unhappy, and have little faith or confidence in themselves."<sup>10</sup>

Crandall<sup>11</sup> proposes that self-esteem is related to assertiveness and risk-taking behavior. Heaton and

---

<sup>8</sup>Wylie, R., The self-concept. Lincoln, Nebraska: The University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

<sup>9</sup>Crandall, R., The measurement of self-esteem and related constructs. In J. P. Robinson & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor: The Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1973, p. 45.

<sup>10</sup>Fitts, William H., Manual for the Tennessee Self-Concept scale. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

<sup>11</sup>Crandall, op. cit., p. 46.

Duerfeldt<sup>12</sup> describe self-esteem as an "internal mediating process . . . capable of motivating and directing behavior." Ziller et al.<sup>13</sup> contend that "self-esteem is a component of the self-system which regulates the extent to which the self-system is maintained under conditions of strain, such as during the processing of new information concerning the self." Evaluations of either a positive or negative nature do not evoke immediate action by an individual with high self-esteem. New information is examined on the basis of its relevance and meaning for the self-system and is disregarded if its meaning is tangential. Thus, a person with high self-esteem is not completely subject to momentary environmental contingencies.

On the other hand, persons of low self-esteem do not possess an environmental buffer. In Witkin's<sup>14</sup> research the person with low self-esteem was found to

---

<sup>12</sup>Heaton, Ronald C., & Duerfeldt, Pryse H., The relationship between self-esteem, self-reinforcement, and the internal-external personality dimension. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1973, 123, 3.

<sup>13</sup>Ziller, R. C., Hagey, J., Smith, M. C., & Long, B. H., Self-esteem: A self-social construct. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 84.

<sup>14</sup>Witkin, H. A., Dyk, R. B., Folerson, H. F., Goodenough, D. R., & Karp, S. A., Psychological differentiation. New York: Wiley, 1962.

be field dependent, passively conforming to the influence of the prevailing field or environment.

Fitts,<sup>15</sup> in summarizing research done with the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, suggests that high self-esteem is associated with: "effective functioning," "behavioral competence," "personality integration," and "full utilization of one's potentialities." According to Fitts, other studies employing the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale have shown that high self-esteem individuals are generally warm and open in their interpersonal interactions, show intellectual efficiency, and have adaptive and efficient cognitive, perceptual, and physiological functioning. Warren Thompson<sup>16</sup> reports that a "substantial linear relationship between self-concept and anxiety has been found in a number of studies with a variety of samples, and across several measures of anxiety."

A feeling of self-confidence and assertiveness, and a feeling that one can meet one's needs should be salient factors in life satisfaction. The person who

---

<sup>15</sup>Fitts, William H., Adams, Jennie K., Radford, G., Richard, Wayne C., Thomas, Barbara K., Thomas, Murphy M., & Thompson, W., The self-concept and self-actualization. Research Monograph III. Nashville, Tennessee: Dede Wallace Center, 1971, p. 111.

<sup>16</sup>Thompson, W., Correlates of the self-concept. Research Monograph VI. Nashville, Tennessee: Dede Wallace Center, 1972, p. 80.

is high in self-esteem should be more able to find the life style most suited to him/her. The "high esteem" person should be more deliberate in choosing a partner or job most helpful in creating the life he/she wants.

If high self-esteem is instrumental in maintaining the self in times of stress, then it seems logical that high self-esteem would be valuable in maintaining satisfaction with life. A person high in self-esteem should be able to adapt to more situations and to adjust more easily when things in life do not go as planned. Thus, it is suggested that self-esteem is positively related to general satisfaction with life.

#### Locus of Control

Locus of control, derived originally from Rotter's<sup>17</sup> social learning theory as later modified,<sup>18</sup> has been the focus of considerable interest in recent years. The dichotomy that is made in locus of control theory is between internal and external control, that is, the degree of control one perceives with regard to the consequences of behavior. Rotter<sup>19</sup> defines locus

---

<sup>17</sup>Rotter, Julian B., Social learning and clinical psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

<sup>18</sup>Rotter, Julian B., Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1, Whole No. 609).

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 1.



of control as "the degree to which an individual perceives that the reward follows from, or is contingent upon, individual behavior or attributes versus the degree to which a person feels the reward is controlled by forces from outside and may occur independently of his/her action."

Behavioral scientists have given a vast amount of attention to locus of control, and the number of studies using the construct is phenomenal. A large part of this literature has demonstrated (in varying degrees) the relationship of the construct to many personality dimensions. "Internals" have been characterized as: more skill oriented and capable, more accepting of personal responsibility,<sup>20</sup> less dogmatic,<sup>21</sup> less neurotic,<sup>22</sup> less blaming,<sup>23</sup> more likely to attribute

---

<sup>20</sup>Rotter, Julian B., Chance, June E., & Phares, E. J., Applications of a social learning theory of personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.

<sup>21</sup>Clauser, R. A., & Hjelle, L. A., Relationship between locus of control and dogmatism. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26, 1006.

<sup>22</sup>Platt, Jerome J., Pomeranz, D., & Eisenman, A. A validation of the Eysnck personality inventory by the MMPI and the internal-external locus of control scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1971, 27, 104-105.

<sup>23</sup>Phares, E. J., Wilson, K. G., & Klyver, N. W. Internal-external control and the attribution of blame under neutral and distractive conditions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 27, 104-105.

success to ability than to motivation, and more tolerant.<sup>24</sup>

"Externals" were found to be: low in self-esteem,<sup>25</sup> high in neuroticism and maladjustment and likely to ruminate about failures, which helps maintain the self-perception as an inactive pawn of fate.<sup>26</sup> Lefcourt<sup>27</sup> cites a series of studies which conclude that externals are higher in conformity, more susceptible to verbal conditioning, and exhibit less resistance to influence across a number of experimental tasks than internals. Seeman and Evans<sup>28</sup> and Seeman<sup>29</sup> have reported that internals possess more information relevant to their personal conditions than do externals. Rotter, Chance, and Phares<sup>30</sup> suggest that internals are

---

<sup>24</sup>Hersch, P. D., & Schiebe, K. E. On the reliability and validity of internal-external control as a personality dimension. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1967, 31, 609-614.

<sup>25</sup>Clauser and Hjelle, loc. cit.

<sup>26</sup>Hersch and Schiebe, loc. cit.

<sup>27</sup>Lefcourt, Herbert M., Recent developments in the study of locus of control. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research (Vol. 6). New York: Academic Press, 1972.

<sup>28</sup>Seeman, M., & Evans, J. W. Alienation and learning in a hospital setting. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 772-783.

<sup>29</sup>Seeman, M., Alienation and social learning in a reformatory. American Journal of Sociology, 1965, 69, 270-284.

<sup>30</sup>Rotter, Chance, & Phares, loc. cit.

more alert to those aspects of the environment which provide useful information for future behavior.

Relationships have also been found between achievement behavior and locus of control. These studies have generally found that an internal locus of control accompanies various aspects of children's successful academic achievement. A sense of personal control characterized successful students regardless of the socioeconomic status of the home.<sup>31</sup> Lessing<sup>32</sup> found that a sense of person control predicted grade-point level of students even when IQ was partialled out. One of the most publicized studies which included questions dealing with achievement and locus of control has been the Coleman Report.<sup>33</sup> Coleman's findings also follow the previously described pattern.

---

<sup>31</sup>Harrison, F. T., Relationship between home background, school success, and adolescent attitudes, Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1968, 14, 331-344.

<sup>32</sup>Lessing, E. E., Racial differences in indices of ego functioning relevant to academic achievement. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1969, 115, 153-167.

<sup>33</sup>Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. G., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfield, F. D., & York, R. L., Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966. (Report from the Office of Education.)

MacDonald<sup>34</sup> states that:

All research points to the same conclusion. People are handicapped by an external locus of control orientation. The prevailing belief is that it is desirable to change people, especially those who are not doing well in our society, in the direction of internality. Internals and Externals occupy different positions on the instrumental-expressive behavior dimension. Internals engage in more instrumental goal-directed activity, whereas Externals more often manifest emotional, non-goal-directed responses.

After reading MacDonald's strong statement concerning the rather tenuous position of the External in American society, doubt may exist whether there is a need to prove an empirical relationship between locus of control and life satisfaction. In spite of all the evidence presented, this may be a hasty conclusion. However, it does seem that low achievement, high anxiety, being easily persuaded, being alienated, neurotic, and caught up in failure does doom an individual to a rather gloomy existence. The finding that Internals are attuned to information relevant to their personal conduct and are more goal directed would suggest that an Internal structures his/her life to facilitate meeting needs. The final assumption of this study is that a

---

<sup>34</sup>MacDonald, A. P., Internal-external locus of control. In J. P. Robinson & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), Measures of social-psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1973, pp. 170-171.

negative relationship exists between external locus of control and life satisfaction.

### Overview of the Dissertation

The previous discussion has developed the notion that research in life satisfaction has been largely ignored by psychologists, and that it is consequently necessary to begin to develop psychological models for the study of life satisfaction. These models must direct attention to both major role-related components of life satisfaction and to personality variables which may influence a person's contentment with his/her life style.

Chapter II provides a review of previous research. First, major findings in the area of life satisfaction will be outlined. In the second part of the literature review, research will be discussed which pertains to the hypotheses of this study.

The contents of Chapter III include: a description of the measures used to assess each of the variables chosen for the study, a description of the sample, the design of the study, the data-analysis strategy employed, and the research hypotheses defined in testable form.

The results of the data analysis are addressed in Chapter IV. Findings are presented in tabular form

and summarized and discussed in terms of the hypotheses and procedures.

Chapter V is devoted to integrating the results of the research, drawing conclusions, and discussing the implications of the findings.

## CHAPTER II

### A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The objectives of this review were: (1) to describe the findings of major studies that have examined life satisfaction, and (2) to describe previous research that relates to the hypotheses of the present study.

#### Introduction

There have been a number of attempts to develop measures which provide subjective indicators of well-being (cf. Levy & Guttman<sup>35</sup> and Rodgers & Converse<sup>36</sup>). The first of these conceptualizes well-being as a cognitive experience in which the individual compares the present situation to one to which the subject has aspired or felt he/she deserves. The discrepancy between the current perception of life and the "idealized" perception of life which the subject holds is expressed as a measure of satisfaction-dissatisfaction. Obviously, greater satisfaction can indicate well-being.

---

<sup>35</sup>Levy, S., & Guttman, U., On the multivariate structure of well-being. Social Indicators Research, 1975, 2, 361-388.

<sup>36</sup>Rodgers, Willard L., & Converse, Phillip E., Measures of the perceived overall quality of life. Social Indicators Research, 1975, 2, 1-23.

During the early 1960's Cantril<sup>37</sup> developed the self-anchoring scale and studied aspirations and satisfactions of different nations. (Results from Cantril's American sample will be discussed later in the review.)

The second approach to large-scale studies of well-being has emphasized the affective aspects of experience. The most prominent of the studies in this area are those done by Norman Bradburn, who first investigated avowed happiness<sup>38</sup> and then developed the "affect balance" scale.<sup>39</sup> The concept of "happiness" is certainly attractive, coming from early Greek identification of happiness with the good life and having as it does almost universal currency as a recognized, if not uniquely important, component of the quality of life experience.<sup>40</sup>

Finally, there have been a number of attempts to assess the experiences of large populations by procedures derived from psychiatric practice. Among the better known of the early studies are the Yorkville

---

<sup>37</sup>Cantril, H., The pattern of human concerns. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1965.

<sup>38</sup>Bradburn, Norman M., & Caplovitz, D. Reports on happiness. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.

<sup>39</sup>Bradburn, 1969, op. cit.

<sup>40</sup>Campbell, A., Subjective measures of well-being. American Psychologist, 1976, 31, 117-124.



community mental health study<sup>41</sup> and the Stirling County studies.<sup>42</sup> The first national study was the Gurin, Veroff, and Feld<sup>43</sup> project carried out for the Joint Commission on Mental Health.

Since the current study deals primarily with life satisfaction, studies of the cognitive aspects of well-being and satisfaction will be addressed. However, some of the earlier studies which developed measures of happiness will also be reviewed.

#### Studies of Life Satisfaction

The overall results of life satisfaction studies show that most Americans are overwhelmingly satisfied with their lives. A single question on satisfaction with life was included in a 1965 nationwide study of use of time by Americans.<sup>44</sup> The sample consisted of 1,244 adults living in homes where at least one member of the household had a regular job in a nonfarm

---

<sup>41</sup>Rennie, T. A. C., The Yorkville community mental health research study. Paper presented to the annual conference of the Milbank Memorial Fund. New York City, November, 1952.

<sup>42</sup>MacMillan, A. M., The health opinion survey: Techniques for estimating prevalence of psychoneurotic and related types of disorders in communities. Psychological Reports, 1957, 3, 325-339.

<sup>43</sup>Gurin, G., Veroff, J., & Feld, S. Americans view their mental health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

<sup>44</sup>Converse & Robinson, op. cit.

occupation. Subjects were all under the age of 65 and were interviewed between 1965 and 1966. The survey was restricted to people living in or near cities of 50,000 population, systematically eliminating attitudes of individuals living in rural areas. The question asked was: "In general, how satisfying do you find the way you're spending your life these days? Would you call it completely satisfying, pretty satisfying, or not very satisfying?" Twenty-four percent of the respondents said they were completely satisfied; 65% were pretty satisfied, and only 11% claimed they were not very satisfied.

The question was repeated in the 1968 Survey Research Center post-election study of political behavior. The sample of 1,315 respondents provided full representation of the entire population and was, moreover, supplemented with a special sample of black citizens. Twenty-four percent of the people interviewed stated they were completely satisfied; 66% of the respondents stated they were pretty satisfied, and 10% said they were not very satisfied.

Cantril<sup>45</sup> devised the standard self-anchoring scale and employed it in a 13-nation study which interviewed nearly 20,000 people. In the modified probability sample drawn from the United States, 1,549 people were

---

<sup>45</sup>Cantril, op. cit.

interviewed in 1959. The instrument has an 11-point scale; the lower end point (0) refers to the respondent's description of the "worst possible life" and the highest end point (10) to his/her description of the "best possible life." The average score on the U.S. sample for this question was 6.6 (slightly above the midpoint between the two poles).

Cantril also asked his subjects to indicate factors in the best possible life and the worst possible life. The results of Cantril's question are presented in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Factors in Best and Worst Possible Life<sup>46</sup>  
(N = 1,549)

	Factors in	
	Best Life	Worst Life
Economic	65%	46%
Health	48	56
Family	47	25
Personal values	20	3
Status quo	11	--
Job or work situation	10	5
Social values	5	3
Political	2	5
Nothing mentioned	5	12

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

Almost two-thirds of Cantril's sample mentioned economic factors in describing the best possible life, with just under one-half mentioning family life or good health. In describing the worst possible life, poor health was mentioned more often than undesirable economic circumstances and unhappy family considerations ranked even lower.

In a 1971 survey using a nationwide probability sample, Rodgers and Converse<sup>47</sup> questioned over 2,000 "informants" concerning their "satisfaction with life as a whole." Respondents were asked to place themselves on a 7-point scale, which ranged from "completely dissatisfied" to "completely satisfied." The middle point was labeled "neutral" or "just as satisfied as dissatisfied." Results from the Rodgers and Converse study are presented in Table 2.2. The mean for the Rodgers and Converse scale was 5.5. Only 7% of the subjects chose ratings below the midpoint, while 22% placed themselves at the "completely satisfied" end of the scale.

The most recent study concerning life satisfaction was undertaken by Lowenthal and associates.<sup>48</sup> They studied two groups of men and women facing "incremental" transitions--leaving home and starting a family--and

---

<sup>47</sup>Rodgers & Converse, op. cit., p. 131.

<sup>48</sup>Lowenthal, M. F., Thurnher, M., & Chiriboga, D., Four stages of life. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

two "decremental" groups--those having an "empty nest" when the last child leaves home and retiring. Their research presents a systematic analysis of the socio-psychological dilemmas confronting common transitions of adult life. Subjects were 216 white lower- and middle-class urban residents. However, the respondents were not part of a systematic random or probability sample.

Table 2.2: Distribution of Scores on Overall Satisfaction<sup>49</sup> (N = 2,000)

Scale	% Marking
1. Completely dissatisfied	1%
2.	2
3.	4
4. Neutral	11
5.	21
6.	39
7. Completely satisfied	22

The members of the sample were rated on the Life Satisfaction Index (LSI), which included the Bradburn<sup>50</sup> Affect Balance Scale, a measure of satisfaction with the present year, and self-ratings of past, present, and

<sup>49</sup>Rodgers & Converse, loc. cit.

<sup>50</sup>Bradburn, op. cit.

projected lives. The results of this rating indicate that the least satisfied group were high school seniors, followed by middle-age parents. Those in the pre-retirement stage were very satisfied--as much so as newlyweds. No sex differences were found across all age groups for scores on the LSI.<sup>51</sup> The two lowest groups on the LSI were high school boys and middle-aged women. The researchers conclude that "there are peaks and valleys in satisfaction throughout the course of adult life."<sup>52</sup>

Among the younger subjects, the most satisfied were those high in family role participation and those who had a broad scope of social activities.

As with life satisfaction, most persons claim they are at least "pretty happy." Typically, 85% to 90% of those surveyed put themselves in a category such as "very happy" or "pretty happy"--presenting a picture of Americans who are either reasonably happy or at least unwilling to confess to much unhappiness. Both Gurin<sup>53</sup> and Bradburn<sup>54,55</sup> have studied well-being in

---

<sup>51</sup>Lowenthal, Thurnher, & Chiriboga, op. cit., p. 88.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 86.

<sup>53</sup>Gurin, Veroff, & Feld, op. cit.

<sup>54</sup>Bradburn, op. cit.

<sup>55</sup>Bradburn & Caplovitz, op. cit.

Americans. These two authors agree that about 30% of the people say they are "very happy," between 50% and 55% of the people claim to be "pretty happy," and about 15% of the people are "not too happy."

People who are married proclaim most happiness, with single, divorced, or widowed persons claiming less.<sup>56,57</sup> Few differences emerge when looking at the sex of the "happiness" respondents. However, combining these two demographic variables (sex and marital status) shows that single men and divorced women fare "worst" in the happiness race<sup>58,59</sup> and persons with no children express more happiness than parents.<sup>60</sup>

It is also possible to demonstrate a linear relationship between happiness and socioeconomic status--with reports of happiness becoming more positive as the SES of the respondent increases.<sup>61</sup> This is true no matter what SES indicator is used--educational level,

---

<sup>56</sup>Gurin, Veroff, & Feld, op. cit.

<sup>57</sup>Bradburn & Caplovitz, op. cit.

<sup>58</sup>Gurin, Veroff, & Feld, op. cit.

<sup>59</sup>Knopfer, G., & Clark, R., The mental health of the unmarried. The American Journal of Psychiatry, 1966, 122, 841-851.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid.

<sup>61</sup>Campbell, A., Converse, Phillip E., & Rodgers, W., The quality of American life; Perceptions, evaluations, and satisfactions. New York: Russell-Sage Foundation, 1976.

income, or job status. Young people report more happiness than older people.<sup>62,63,64</sup>

Angus Campbell<sup>65</sup> has pointed out a recent trend in the "happiness data." He concludes that there is a "gradual but consistent trend, which may have accelerated in the years 1971-1972, for fewer Americans to report they are very happy."

Most of the relationships mentioned above (i.e., the relationships with marital status and SES) are also characteristic of life satisfaction data. However, there are two exceptions to these trends. Life satisfaction tends to follow a linear relationship with age, with more satisfaction proclaimed at older age levels. Younger people tend to report more happiness than life satisfaction.<sup>66</sup>

Life satisfaction measures have not shown the decline in very satisfied responses that marked the happiness question.<sup>67</sup> Satisfaction has been marked by consistent reports over time.

---

<sup>62</sup>Gurin, Veroff, & Feld, op. cit.

<sup>63</sup>Bradburn, op. cit.

<sup>64</sup>Bradburn & Caplovitz, op. cit.

<sup>65</sup>Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, op. cit., p. 26.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid.



Campbell also suggests that the correlation between general life satisfaction and happiness is about .5. There is a tendency for people who place themselves at the "very happy" end of the scale to relate that they are very satisfied, and that there is considerable overlap at the unhappy or dissatisfied end of the scale. It appears that the two constructs tap "somewhat the same state of mind, but at least moderately different facets of this state."<sup>68</sup>

After exploring global measures of life satisfaction and happiness and clarifying what is generally known about these concepts--how they behave in particular instances, and their relationship to each other--it is necessary to turn to research on how each of the predictor variables in this study has been found to relate to life satisfaction.

Studies dealing with happiness are included in this section because the two global concepts have been found to be related and because most of the relationships with one variable also hold for the other. Few data could be found that dealt with the explanatory variables and life satisfaction.

---

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., p. 35.

### Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction

One hypothesis of this study is that job satisfaction is positively related to life satisfaction. This intuitively rather obvious notion is generally confirmed by the literature.

A study undertaken for the National Opinion Research Center by Bradburn<sup>69</sup> found statistically significant correlations between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. Gamma values<sup>70</sup> of .43 and .41 for men and .28 and .44 for women were found in the two respective waves of interviews which were carried out among cross-sectional panels of employed people in the mid-1960's (N = 2,428 and N = 1,925). Instruments for measuring these variables were developed by Bradburn and Caplovitz<sup>71</sup> and consisted of a three-item work satisfaction and personal happiness index which were part of a longer personal interview schedule.

An article relating to the job satisfaction hypothesis was published by Seashore and Faber.<sup>72</sup> This

---

<sup>69</sup>Bradburn, op. cit.

<sup>70</sup>Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H., Manual for the statistical package for the social sciences (2nd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975, p. 228.

<sup>71</sup>Bradburn & Caplovitz, op. cit.

<sup>72</sup>Seashore, Stanley E., & Faber, Thomas B., Job satisfaction indicators and their correlates. American Behavioral Scientist, 1975, 18, 323-327.



review article cited the following findings from two investigations of the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction:

1. Andrews and Withey<sup>73</sup> report from a nationwide sample of adults that job satisfaction has a significant role in overall life satisfaction.

2. Quinn and Mangione<sup>74</sup> reported that job dissatisfaction was "significantly" correlated with life dissatisfaction. Quinn and Mangione also reported that there was a "significant relationship" between life dissatisfaction and self-esteem. (Unfortunately, there was no evidence provided to clarify the nature of this relationship, or on what basis it was found.)

Satisfaction With Primary  
Relationships and Life  
Satisfaction

It is hypothesized that there is a positive relationship between satisfaction with primary relationships and life satisfaction. Again, the literature

---

<sup>73</sup> Andrews, Frank M., & Withey, Stephen B., Developing measures of perceived life quality; Results from several national surveys. Social Indicators Research, 1974, 1, 1-26.

<sup>74</sup> Quinn, R. B., & Mangione, T. W., The 1969-1970 survey of working conditions: Chronicles of an unfinished enterprise. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1972.

supports this hypothesis. Orden and Bradburn<sup>75</sup> illustrate this point. Although in this case the authors considered happiness in marriage and a global measure of happiness, rather than satisfaction, they found a very strong relationship between general happiness and an indicator of marriage happiness for both men and women at all levels of SES. Among those subjects who reported "not very happy" marriages, no one reported being "very happy" on the overall ratings. Although the relationship was quite strong for both men and women, it was stronger for women (gamma = .78 and .86) than for men (gamma = .72 and .68). Orden and Bradburn conclude that most women were equating happiness in a marriage with overall happiness.

Glenn's<sup>76</sup> 1975 study of the contribution of marriage to the psychological well-being of males and females concluded that "the data strongly suggest marriage is conducive to happiness for both sexes, and the effect is as great for females as for males." The data corroborate evidence indicating that married persons as

---

<sup>75</sup>Orden, Susan R., & Bradburn, Norman M., Dimensions of marriage happiness. The American Journal of Sociology, 1968, 73, 715-731.

<sup>76</sup>Glenn, N. D., The contribution of marriage to the psychological well-being of males and females. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1975, 57, 71.

an aggregate report substantially greater global happiness than any category of unmarried people.

Glenn's study was prompted by Bernard's<sup>77</sup> assertion that marriage in the United States is distinctly beneficial to most husbands, but not beneficial at all to most wives. The hypothesis that males will report greater marital happiness than females was not supported, since the percentage of male and female respondents reported "very happy" were virtually equal (70.2% for males and 69.8% for females of all ages). The evidence does lend support to the hypotheses of the present study. It is necessary to keep in mind, however, the study dealt with happiness in marriage and life, not satisfaction.

Another investigator (Renne)<sup>78</sup> approached the question of marital satisfaction by defining the correlates of dissatisfaction in marriage. In her study Renne drew a probability sample of 5,163 households in Alameda County, California. These respondents were currently married and living with spouse.

Renne states that "marital satisfaction is an integral part of emotional or psychic well-being.

---

<sup>77</sup>Bernard, J., The future of marriage. New York: Bantam Books, 1972.

<sup>78</sup>Renne, Karen S., Correlates of dissatisfaction in marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 54-67.

Marital satisfaction was closely associated with general morale or happiness, a positive view of one's health, and satisfaction with a job."<sup>79</sup> These findings are displayed in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3: Dissatisfaction in Marriage x Overall Happiness<sup>80</sup> (N = 5,163)

Overall Happiness	Percent Dissatisfied With Marriage			
	White		Black	
	Husbands	Wives	Husbands	Wives
Not too happy	52%	71%	72%	73%
Pretty happy	18	22	31	44
Very happy	2	4	13	14

Overall, black husbands and wives were much less "happy" than white husbands or wives, but in both black and white people the percentage dissatisfied with marriage was much lower for people who are "very happy."

The interaction of marital satisfaction and job satisfaction was also studied. People who were satisfied with their jobs were also likely to be satisfied with their marriages. These findings are displayed in Table 2.4.

---

<sup>79</sup>Ibid., p. 66.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., p. 65.

Table 2.4: Dissatisfaction With Job x Dissatisfaction With Marriage<sup>81</sup> (N = 5,163)

Satisfaction With Job	Percent Dissatisfied With Marriage			
	White		Black	
	Husbands	Wives	Husbands	Wives
Not satisfied	24%	25%	44%	55%
Somewhat satisfied	19	27	38	52
Very satisfied	14	20	22	28

Blacks tend to feel more dissatisfaction than whites in their jobs, as would be expected, since many blacks are "underemployed." The lowest percentage of people dissatisfied with their marriages appear in the category of persons who claim to be "very satisfied" with their jobs.

Following is a summary of other factors from Renne's study which were associated with dissatisfaction in marriage.

1. Black people and others with low incomes or little education were more apt to be dissatisfied with their marriages than were white people or people with adequate income or education.

2. People currently raising children were more likely to be dissatisfied with their marriages than

---

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., p. 64.



people who had never had children or whose children had left home, regardless of age, race, or income level.

3. Persons who suffered from chronic conditions or physical symptoms were more likely than others to be dissatisfied with their marriages.

#### Locus of Control and Life Satisfaction

No studies were found testing hypotheses about the relationship between life satisfaction and an individual's orientation toward internal or external locus of control. Campbell,<sup>82</sup> however, describes a scale called the Index of Personal Competence. The Index of Personal Competence is defined as "the extent to which people feel in control of their lives rather than subject to control by external forces like society, the government, superiors, or even sheer fate or luck." The definition is remarkably similar to the definition of internal locus of control defined in Chapter I. Campbell et al. have found this index "rather strongly related" to most measures of well-being. These data were obtained in a study of the quality of American life through interviews of a probability sample of 2,164 persons, 18 years of age or older, living in the United States.

---

<sup>82</sup>Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, op. cit.

### Self-Esteem and Life Satisfaction

No studies were found relating self-concept to life satisfaction.

### Interrelationship of Predictor Variables

The following group of studies considered the interrelationship of various predictor variables.

### Locus of Control and Self-Esteem

Although none of the studies to be reviewed has used the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale as a measure of self-concept or self-esteem, all self-esteem measures used in these studies appear to be at least conceptually related to the self-esteem score (Total Positive) from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. In all other studies reported, the Rotter Locus of Control Scale was employed as the measure of locus of control.

Platt et al.,<sup>83</sup> Fish et al.,<sup>84</sup> and Ryckman et al.<sup>85</sup> studied the relationship between locus of

---

<sup>83</sup>Platt, Jerome J., Eisenman, R., & Darbes, A., Self-esteem and internal-external locus of control: A validation study. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26, 162.

<sup>84</sup>Fish, B., & Karabenick, S., Relationship between self-esteem and locus of control. Psychological Reports, 1971, 29, 784.

<sup>85</sup>Ryckman, R., & Sherman, M., Relationship between self-esteem and internal-external control for men and women. Psychological Reports, 1973, 32, 1106.

control and self-esteem. Two of these studies (Fish and Ryckman) used the Janis-Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale.<sup>86</sup> These two studies (subjects were college undergraduates) report low, but significant, correlations between the two variables. Ryckman et al. reported an  $r$  of  $-.25$  ( $p$  less than  $.001$ ) for a combined sample of men and women ( $N = 382$ ). Fish et al. found a correlation of  $-.28$  ( $p$  less than  $.001$ ) for a sample of males. These data indicate that both men and women with higher self-esteem tend to be somewhat more internally oriented.

Platt et al., however, found no relationship between the Ziller Self-Esteem measure<sup>87</sup> and the Locus of Control Scale. In the two male samples, correlations of  $-.17$  ( $N = 24$ ) and  $.17$  ( $N = 36$ ) were found. For women the correlation found in the sample was  $-.20$  ( $N = 31$ ). None of these correlations differed significantly from zero. Finding no relationship between the variables in the Platt study may be a result of methodological problems. The use of small numbers ( $N = 24, 36$ ) may not have afforded sufficient power to find a statistically

---

<sup>86</sup>Hovland, C., & Janis, I. (Eds.), Personality and persuasibility. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1959.

<sup>87</sup>Ziller, R. C., Hagey, J., Smith, M. C., & Long, B. H., Self-esteem: A self-social construct. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 35, 84-95.

significant relationship. Since self-esteem measures vary it may be that the constructs measured were actually different, and that the locus of control has no relationship with self-esteem as measured by the Ziller et al. scale.

#### Self-Concept and Marital Satisfaction

McCahan<sup>88</sup> investigated the relationship between marital satisfaction and self-esteem. The sample of 331 respondents of similar ethnic and socio-cultural background presented a wide range of levels of marital satisfaction. Marital satisfaction was operationally defined as the total score on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test.<sup>89</sup> Self-concept was operationalized as the total P score on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. The results support the hypothesis that a relationship exists between marital satisfaction and self-concept ( $r = .47$ ,  $p$  less than .01). The relationship was found to be linear at high levels of marital satisfaction and curvilinear at low levels of marital satisfaction.

---

<sup>88</sup>McCahan, George R., The relationship between self-concept and marital satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1975.

<sup>89</sup>Locke, H., & Wallace, Karl M., Short marital adjustment prediction tests: The reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 1959, 21, 251-255.

In a study with 100 married student couples, Aller<sup>90</sup> found that "self-concept played a significant role in marital adjustment." The Aller study used the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test and the California Psychological Inventory<sup>91</sup> to measure self-concept and marital adjustment.

#### Work Satisfaction and Marital Adjustment

A study by Ridley<sup>92</sup> explored the relationship between job satisfaction and marital adjustment. The Bullock Scale of Job Satisfaction<sup>93</sup> and the Nye-MacDougall Marital Adjustment Inventory<sup>94</sup> were the measures used. The sample was drawn from public school teachers and included married teachers and their husbands (N for females = 210, N for males = 109). No

---

<sup>90</sup>Aller, F., Role of the self-concept in student marital adjustment. Family Life Coordinator, 1962, 11, 45.

<sup>91</sup>Gough, Harrison G., The California Psychological Inventory test booklet. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1956.

<sup>92</sup>Ridley, Carl A., Exploring the impact of work satisfaction and involvement on marital interaction when both partners are employed. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 35, 308-315.

<sup>93</sup>Bullock, Robert P., Social factors related to job satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1952.

<sup>94</sup>Nye, T. I., & MacDougall, E., The dependent variable in marital research. Pacific Sociological Review, 1959, 2, 67-70.

relationship was found between job satisfaction and marital adjustment for female teachers (Somers'<sup>95</sup>  $D_{yx} = .069$ ). Knowledge of the female teachers' job satisfaction reduced the error in predicting their marital adjustment by only 7%. However, analysis of the data for husbands in the sample showed the relationship of marital adjustment and job satisfaction is positive and significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. Knowledge of the husband's job satisfaction resulted in a 24% reduction in error in predicting his marital adjustment score (Somers'  $D_{yx} = .237$ ,  $p$  less than .01).

#### Locus of Control and Work Satisfaction

A study by Organ and Greene<sup>96</sup> of the relationship between work satisfaction and locus of control found scores on Rotter's Locus of Control Scale (scored in the negative direction for external control) correlated negatively with work satisfaction ( $r = -.36$ ,  $p$  less than .01). The sample included 94 senior research scientists and engineers employed in the research,

---

<sup>95</sup>Somers, R., A new asymmetric measure of association for ordinal variables. American Sociological Review, 1969, 27, 799-811.

<sup>96</sup>Organ, Dennis W., & Greene, Charles N. Role ambiguity, locus of control, and work satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 101-102.

development, and engineering divisions of a large manufacturer of electronics equipment.

### Studies of Happiness

Studies dealing with happiness have been included in this review since (1) happiness and life satisfaction have been found to be related, and (2) in many of the studies with happiness as the dependent variable, the predictor variables employed were the same as those used in this study.

In 1967, Warner Wilson<sup>97</sup> reviewed the literature concerning happiness and its correlates. From this review the happy person emerges as "young, healthy, well-educated, well-paid, extroverted, optimistic, worry-free, religious, a married person with high self-esteem, high job morale, of modest aspirations, of either sex and of a wide range of intelligence."

Wilson also cited the work of Wessman and Ricks.<sup>98</sup> Their investigations revealed the following to be related to avowed happiness: being married, getting along with one's family, and being satisfied with one's job. They concluded that: (1) family, social,

---

<sup>97</sup>Wilson, W., Correlates of avowed happiness. Psychological Bulletin, 1967, 67, 294.

<sup>98</sup>Wessman, Alden E., & Ricks, David F. Mood and personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1966.

and job adjustments are variables of major importance; (2) persons who are satisfied with two or three areas seem happier than those satisfied with only one area; and (3) family relationships seem to be the most important, with job satisfaction next, and social adjustment third.

Veroff et al.<sup>99</sup> studied 255 employed fathers and 542 married women. Marital adjustment, happiness, problems with children, and anxiety indices were administered to these subjects. It was found that marital happiness correlated more highly with general avowed happiness ( $r = .38$ ,  $p$  less than .001) than did any one of the several other indices of subjective adjustment.

An early study conducted by Watson<sup>100</sup> engaged a sample of 338 graduate students in education. Watson's findings indicate that good health, high job satisfaction, a happy home, and good relationships with other people (including a spouse) were conducive to happiness. He also noted that "graduate students of education are, on the whole, fairly satisfied with life." Since this study was concluded over 40 years ago, its currency for

---

<sup>99</sup>Veroff, J., Feld, S., & Gurin, G. Dimensions of subjective adjustment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 192-245.

<sup>100</sup>Watson, op. cit., p. 109.



the people sampled in the present study must be viewed with some reservations.

### Quality of Life

John Flanagan<sup>101</sup> conducted a major study which investigated quality of life and its components. He followed 1,000 students who were originally interviewed for Project TALENT in 1960, and interviewed them again in 1975. These "students" were 30 years old and were asked to relate incidents critical to their quality of life and to rate the importance of 15 various factors important to the quality of their life. Both men and women in this sample indicated the most important component for the quality of their life was health. More than 98% said that "physical and mental health" was either important or very important to the quality of their life. The second most important dimension for both groups was "close relationship with spouse, boyfriend, or girlfriend." Over 90% (91.4% males, 94.4% females) indicated a close relationship as "important" or "very important." The third most important dimension for males was their job, with 91% indicating it was important or very important to them. The women's responses showed that 88% found "work in the home or on a job" as

---

<sup>101</sup>Flanagan, John C., Education's contribution to the quality of life of a national sample of 30 year olds. Educational Researcher, 1975, 4, 13-16.

being important. The third most important dimension of quality of life for women was "being a parent and having and raising children." This aspect of their lives was rated as "important" or "very important" by 92% of the women and 82% of the men.

The next most important aspect important to both men and women was "maturity and personal understanding" (89.5% very important or important). "Developing and using one's mind through learning" was said to be important or very important by 86% of the men interviewed and 84% of the women interviewed.

The following items from the Flanagan study are here ranked in order of importance by both men and women: (1) material comforts; (2) relationships with parents, brothers and sisters, and other relatives; (3) close friends; (4) participation in activities which help or encourage other adults or children; (5) reading, listening to music, or observing sporting events or other entertainment; (6) participation in active recreation such as sports or travel; (7) expressing oneself in a creative manner in music, art, etc.; (8) socializing; and (9) participation in local or national government and public affairs.

Gerontological Perspective of  
Life Satisfaction

Another area in which studies of life satisfaction have been prominent is gerontology. Neugarten et al.<sup>102</sup> developed two life satisfaction scales for use in studying the elderly in the Kansas City Study of Adult Life. In order to develop these scales, two groups of people aged 60 to 90 were interviewed (N = 177 for the two groups). The two groups were obtained through quota and modified probability sampling. The individual interviews were then rated for five components. These were: Zest vs. Apathy, including enthusiasm of response, ego involvement; Resolution and Fortitude, and acceptance of personal responsibility for life; Congruence between desired and achieved goals; Positive Self-Concept; and Mood Tone, happy optimistic attitudes and mood. Each of the components was rated on a five-point scale. Validity of the life satisfaction rating was obtained by the re-interview of 80 members of the sample by a clinical psychologist. His ratings correlated .64 with ratings from the original interviews.

The results of the life satisfaction scale yielded no correlation between life satisfaction and age. There was a positive but not marked (.39) relationship

---

<sup>102</sup>Neugarten, Bernice L., Havighurst, Robert J., & Tobin, Sheldon S. The measurement of life satisfaction. Journal of Gerontology, 1961, 16, 134-143.

between life satisfaction (as measured by the Neugarten scale) and socioeconomic status. There was no significant sex difference in life satisfaction scores. The nonmarried (single, divorced or separated, and widowed) individuals had significantly lower life satisfaction scores.

### Summary

A review of the literature reveals that Americans on the whole report satisfying and happy lives. The studies show that only about 15% of the people are "not very happy" or "not very satisfied." However, endorsement of the "very happy" category in these studies has been shown to be declining in recent years.

### Qualifying Demographic Variables

Age--Older people tend to be more satisfied with their lives, yet less happy. Younger people report less satisfaction and more avowed happiness.

Sex--Sex differences alone in either happiness or life satisfaction were not found in any of the studies reviewed. However, the Lowenthal study did point out what is essentially a sex by age interaction with high school boys and middle aged women reporting the lowest levels of life satisfaction.

Marital status--Marital status is typically found to be the strongest predictor of both life satisfaction

and happiness. Married respondents consistently reported higher levels of both satisfaction and happiness than did single, widowed, or divorced people. Single males were found to report the lowest ratings of happiness and satisfaction, with only slightly higher levels reported by divorced women.

Presence of children--Persons with children living at home are typically less satisfied and less happy than either parents of grown children or childless couples.

Socioeconomic status--Both life satisfaction and happiness are directly related to SES. This relationship holds for educational level, income, and job status.

#### Predictor or Explanatory Variables Used in the Study

Work satisfaction--Work satisfaction was found to play a significant role in both overall life satisfaction and happiness. Bradburn and Caplovitz found correlations on the order of .4 for both men and women relating work satisfaction and personal happiness.

Primary relationships--Bradburn found strong relationships between marital happiness and overall happiness, with gamma averaging in the low .70's for men and low .80's for women--indicating a stronger relationship for these variables in women. Renne also

found that marital satisfaction was closely associated with general morale or "happiness."

Locus of control--Campbell found a relationship of .35 between scores on an Index of Well-Being and scores on the Index of Personal Competence (which seems to be very similar to locus of control as defined by Rotter).

Self-esteem--No research was found which reported investigating a relationship between self-concept and life satisfaction.

#### Intercorrelation of Predictor Variables

Low but significant correlations were found between self-esteem and locus of control ( $-.25, -.28$ ). A moderate relationship ( $r = .47$ ) was found between marital satisfaction and self-concept. A weak but statistically significant relationship was found for men, between job satisfaction and marital adjustment. A negative relationship ( $r = -.36$ ) was found between work satisfaction and external locus of control.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This research attempted to investigate the relationship of two personality variables, self-concept and locus of control, and several component areas of life satisfaction (work satisfaction and relationship satisfaction) to overall life satisfaction. A significant aspect of the study was the investigation of these relationships in a group of people who have presumably met basic life needs, such as adequate food, clothing, and shelter.

Included in Chapter III are: a description of the sample, the operational measures employed, the design of the study, a restatement of research hypotheses in testable form, and the procedures for the analysis of the data.

#### The Sample

This study sampled 228 people,<sup>103</sup> most of whom were graduate students in the College of Education at Michigan State University. They were selected for

---

<sup>103</sup>The number of respondents reported for each table varies since all subjects did not answer every question.

several reasons. First, they represent a group who should not be exposed to some of the barriers to life satisfaction. All have sufficient education to make choices concerning careers. Secondly, all are employed, so that psychological and economic consequences of unemployment are not detractors from life satisfaction. Third, this group is fairly young; therefore old age or ill health should not be major factors in detracting from life satisfaction. The use of this sample was an attempt to limit some possible causes of life dissatisfaction so as not to obscure the hypothesized relationships. Finally, this group afforded the researcher subjects who were fairly accessible, fit the criteria for the study, and who could be reached without a great deal of added expense.

Forty-seven percent of the subjects were teachers in Michigan public schools. The teachers were primarily from the southern half of Michigan's lower peninsula. Subjects resided in Detroit, Royal Oak, Bloomfield Hills, Dowagiac, Niles, Kalamazoo, Grand Rapids, Lansing, and East Lansing, and taught in grades K through 12. No attempt was made in the study to control for size of town, size of school system, or the grades or subject matter taught by the respondent. The other 53% of the sample were "full-time" university graduate students--i.e., they identified themselves as students and were enrolled



in a wide range of educational programs which included Educational Psychology, Curriculum, Counseling, and Higher Education and Administration. Most of these students held graduate assistantships within the university.

The mean age of the total sample was 30.2 years; subjects ranged in age from 22 to 58. The modal age was 25. Forty-two percent of the sample were males and 58% were females. The biographical portion of the questionnaire did not inquire about the subject's race.

All of the subjects in the study had obtained at least a bachelor's degree. A breakdown of the educational level of the subjects is shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Educational Level of the Sample (N = 227)

Degree	Percentage	Frequency
Bachelor's degree	7.4%	( 17)
Some graduate school	46.5	(107)
Master's degree	42.2	( 97)
Ph.D. or professional degree	2.6	( 6)

*One* of the objectives of the study was to look at people *for* whom lack of education would not restrict options *in* attaining happiness or satisfaction. As can be seen *from* Table 3.1, the modal educational level was "some

graduate school" (46.5% of the sample), while 42.2% of the sample had earned Master's degrees.

The level of total family income of the respondents ranged from zero to over \$50,000 per year. The mean reported salary (before taxes) was approximately \$13,000. Table 3.2 displays the income range of respondents.

Table 3.2: Income Level of Respondents (N = 226)

Income	Percentage of Sample	Frequency
\$ 0-\$ 6,999	16.4%	37
\$ 7,000-\$ 9,999	7.1	16
\$10,000-\$12,999	20.8	47
\$13,000-\$15,999	10.6	24
\$16,000-\$19,999	11.9	27
\$20,000-\$24,999	12.4	28
\$25,000-\$49,999	19.5	44
Over \$50,000	1.3	3

As can be seen from the data displayed in Table 3.3, over one-half (56.5%) of the subjects were married for the first time, while approximately 15% (14.8%) described themselves as single. Ten percent of the respondents reported that they were divorced or separated.

Table 3.3: Relationship Status of the Respondents  
(N = 228)

Relationship Status	Percentage of Respondents	Frequency
Single	14.8%	34
Married, first time	56.5	130
Married, more than once	3.5	8
Divorced or separated	10.0	23
Widowed	.4	1
Cohabiting on a long-term basis	4.8	11
Dating someone on a long-term basis	7.8	17
Casual dating	2.2	4

As shown in Table 3.4, 35.2% of the sample have no children but plan to have at least one child, while 31% have one or more children. Of the respondents with no children, 22% said they planned not to have any.

Data were acquired for the study from responses to a questionnaire containing a life satisfaction scale, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, and the Rotter Locus of Control Scale. The questionnaires were distributed through graduate classes offered by the College of Education at Michigan State University. (These classes were either being taught in various Michigan communities or were regular on-campus graduate courses.) Students in these classes were not randomly selected from some larger

population but rather volunteered to fill out the questionnaires. Forty-six percent of the questionnaires distributed were returned.

Table 3.4: Number of Respondents With Children (N = 216)

Number of Children	Percentage of Sample	Frequency
None, do not plan to have any	21.8%	47
None, plan to have one or more	35.2	76
None, cannot have any for medical reasons	1.9	4
One	10.2	22
Two	19.9	43
Three	4.6	10
Four or five	2.8	6
Six or more	3.7	8

### Instrumentation of the Study<sup>104</sup>

The variables in the study included general satisfaction with life, satisfaction with work, satisfaction with relationships, discrepancy between "have" and "want," self-concept, and locus of control. The following section includes a description of the operational measures of these variables. The first two which

---

<sup>104</sup>A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

will be considered are the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale<sup>105</sup> and the Locus of Control Scale.<sup>106</sup> Following the description of these two scales, the scales which were constructed especially for this study will be described and discussed.

#### Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS)

The TSCS was developed by William Fitts in 1965 and has been used extensively as a research instrument. In this study the computer-scored Clinical and Research form of the scale was used. The scale consists of 100 self-descriptive statements which the respondents use to form their own picture of themselves.

The Tennessee was chosen as an operational measure of self-concept for several reasons. The TSCS: (1) is a widely known and used scale, so data from other groups of subjects were available (including both validation and cross-validation studies);<sup>107</sup> (2) contains a scale which measures self-esteem (i.e., the Total Positive Scale which will be discussed in a succeeding section; (3) also contains several subscales measuring various "portions" of the self-concept which could possibly provide additional information for the study;

---

<sup>105</sup>Fitts, op. cit.

<sup>106</sup>Rotter, 1966, op. cit.

<sup>107</sup>Fitts, op. cit., p. 2.

and (4) provides two validity scales, a lie scale designed to measure defensiveness, and a scale which purports to measure acquiescence response set. Knowledge about the validity of respondents' answers is crucial if data are to be properly interpreted.

Following are descriptions of the subscales from the Tennessee which were included as one of the measures in this study.

Total Positive: This scale reflects the overall level of self-esteem and is a summation of the component scores of self-concept.

Self-Criticism: This scale is composed of 10 items taken from the L scale of the MMPI. These are all mildly derogatory statements that most people admit as being true of them. Individuals who deny most of these statements could be exhibiting defensiveness and are likely to be making a deliberate attempt to present a favorable picture of themselves.

True/False Ratio (T/F Ratio): This is a measure of response set or response bias, i.e., an indication of whether a subject's approach to the task involves any *strong* tendency to agree or disagree regardless of item *content*.

Identity: These are "what am I" items. Here *individuals* describe basic identity--how they see themselves.

Self-Satisfaction: This score is derived from those items where respondents describe how they feel about the perceived self.

Physical Self: The Physical Self Scale is a reflection of body image, state of health, physical appearance, skills, and sexuality.

Moral-Ethical Self: This score describes the self from a moral-ethical frame of reference--moral worth, relationship to God, feeling of being a "good" or "bad" person, and satisfaction with one's religion or lack thereof.

Family Self: Family self reflects one's feelings of adequacy, worth, and value as a family member. It refers to the individual's perception of self in reference to the closest and most immediate circle of associates.

Social Self: "Self in relation to others," but more general than "family self."

Psychometric data for the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Since this scale was computer-scored by the publishers of the test,<sup>108</sup> who provided no reliability estimates, the reliability of the instrument for this sample cannot be reported. The manual for the TSCS does not

---

<sup>108</sup>Counselor Recordings and Tests, Dede Wallace Research Center, Nashville, Tennessee.

report internal consistency estimates of reliability for the scale. The test-retest reliability of the Total Positive score over 2 weeks (sample, 60 college students) was .92, with test-retest reliability for various subscores ranging between .70 and .90.<sup>109</sup>

Mean scale scores for the TSCS. The means for both the norm group of the TSCS and for this sample are presented in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5: Means for Tennessee Self-Concept Scales, Norm Group and Present Sample

Scale Name	Mean Raw Score Orig. Norm Group (N = 626)	Mean Raw Score Present Sample (N = 228)
Self-Criticism	35.54	36.37
True-False Ratio	1.03	1.04
Total Positive	345.57	355.89
Identity	127.10	126.69
Self-Satisfaction	103.67	113.58
Behavior	115.01	115.63
Physical Self	71.78	69.80
Moral-Ethical Self	70.33	73.46
Personal Self	64.55	68.92
Family Self	70.83	73.07
Social Self	68.14	70.64

<sup>109</sup>Robinson & Shaver, op. cit., p. 68.



The sample used in this study does not appear to differ greatly from the group used to norm the scale, a broad sample of 626 people from various parts of the country, ages 12 to 68. There was an equal number of males and females, and it represented all social, economic, intellectual, and educational levels.<sup>110</sup>

The largest differences between the norm group and the sample of this study occurred in the Total Positive and Self-Satisfaction scores. These are both 10 points higher for the sample of this study. However, this sample appears to be no more defensive or no more acquiescent than the norm group. Therefore, for all practical purposes, it appears that the sample of this study did not differ from Fitts' original norm group.

#### Locus of Control Scale

The Locus of Control Scale was developed by Julian Rotter and was used as the operational measure for classifying subjects as internally or externally controlled. This personality inventory consists of 23 items (i.e., question pairs with one "internal" and one "external" statement from which to choose) plus six *filler* items. One point is scored for each external *statement* which the respondent endorses. Scores can *range* from 0 (most internal) to 23 (most external).

---

<sup>110</sup>Fitts, op. cit., p. 12.

The Rotter scale was chosen for use in this study because of its wide usage in measuring locus of control. Lefcourt,<sup>111</sup> Minton,<sup>112</sup> and Rotter<sup>113</sup> all report validity studies indicating "there are individual differences in perception about one's control over one's destiny and the Rotter scale is sensitive to these differences."<sup>114</sup>

Reliability: Rotter<sup>115</sup> reports an internal consistency coefficient of .70 obtained from a sample of 400 college students. The reliability (internal consistency) estimate for this sample was .791 (Coefficient Alpha).<sup>116</sup>

Scale Means: Robinson and Shaver<sup>117</sup> have reported a mean of 8.2 and a standard deviation of 4.0 for a sample of 4,443 subjects. The mean for the sample of this study was 9.62 with a standard deviation of 4.5. A comparison of these figures indicates that this sample

---

<sup>111</sup>Lefcourt, op. cit.

<sup>112</sup>Minton, H. L., Power as a personality construct. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research (Vol. 4). New York: Academic Press, 1967.

<sup>113</sup>Rotter, 1966, op. cit.

<sup>114</sup>Robinson & Shaver, op. cit., p. 228.

<sup>115</sup>Rotter, 1966, op. cit.

<sup>116</sup>Cronbach, Lee J., Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 1951, 16, 297-334.

<sup>117</sup>Robinson & Shaver, loc. cit.

is slightly more externally oriented and exhibits slightly more variability than the norm group.

#### Scales Developed for This Study

In order to test the hypotheses of this study, scales were developed to operationalize the concepts of general life satisfaction, work satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, and the discrepancy between "want" and "have." Items were generated via a logical development procedure<sup>118</sup> by developing items that ask about aspects of life which should be related to life satisfaction. In addition, previous research was consulted in the area delimited by the research hypotheses, and the findings from this research were used in item construction. Finally, items which had been used in previous research were also included in the subscales when they appropriately matched the relevant constructs. Since most of these previously used items were designed for use in interviews, they were modified for questionnaire use.

One hundred fifty-four items were initially developed for use in the study<sup>119</sup> and were given

---

<sup>118</sup>Mehrens, William A., & Lehmann, Irvin J., Measurement and evaluation in education and psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973, p. 529.

<sup>119</sup>These items are listed in Appendix B.

initially to 15 graduate students and faculty members at Michigan State University. The initial screening process was used to select items most suited for each scale and to assist in improving the clarity of items. From this pool, items were drawn for each of the scales and additional items were constructed to complete each scale.

It is necessary to be concerned with the validity of the item-development procedure. This study did not involve the empirical or derived validity of the scales (although this is certainly important for later research). The major consideration was the "direct validity" of the scale. Direct validity essentially means establishing definitions for the concept to be studied.<sup>120</sup> Since there was no "theory of life satisfaction," the definitions for these rather abstract concepts had to be developed from clues in previous research, personality theories, and some "gut reaction" to the construct.

The following section contains both scale statistics and item statistics for the scales developed for this research. The mean, standard deviation, kurtosis, skewness, and reliability for each scale are presented in Table 3.6. Reliabilities were calculated

---

<sup>120</sup>Ebel, Robert L. Essentials of educational measurement. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Table 3.6: Statistics for Each Scale Developed for the Study (N = 228)

Variable Name	Mean	Variance	S.D.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Reliability
General Satisfaction	50.890	35.446	5.954	-.632	.061	.8361
Work Satisfaction	36.693	29.377	5.420	-.809	.236	.8095
Relationship Satisfaction	49.812	47.692	6.906	-1.976	4.648	.8949
Weighted Total Discrepancy	-48.381	862.445	29.367	a	a	.8416

<sup>a</sup>Skewness and kurtosis were not computed for the Discrepancy Scale.

by using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha,<sup>121</sup> which estimates the degree of internal consistency of nondichotomously scored items.

General Life Satisfaction. The reliability estimate of the General Satisfaction Scale scores for this sample was .836. The mean for the scale was 50.89 out of a possible 64 points. The standard deviation of the scale was 5.954; skewness was -.632; kurtosis was .061. This analysis demonstrates that the scale was highly reliable, and moderately skewed in a negative direction, meaning that most of the responses to this scale were positive. That is, subjects chose responses that reflect the more "satisfied" end of the scale.

The item-scale correlations (the correlation of each item with the total General Satisfaction Scale scores) ranged from .35 for the item "How much energy do you have compared to other people of your age?" to .64 for the item "How satisfying do you find the way you are spending your life?" Note that the highest item-scale correlation was for the item which directly explored the subject's level of life satisfaction. There were no items which had negative item-scale correlations and no extremely low or extremely high correlations were found.

---

<sup>121</sup>Cronbach, op. cit.

Items with the highest and lowest item-scale correlations are listed in Table 3.7.

Table 3.7: Item-Scale Correlations for General Satisfaction (N = 228)

Item	Item-Scale Correlation <sup>a</sup>
<u>Items With High Item-Scale Correlations</u>	
How optimistic or pessimistic about your life would you say you are?	.62
How often do you feel you have an opportunity to do what you want to do?	.61
How often do you feel depressed?	.53
How successful have you been in achieving the goals and aims in your life?	.52
I feel my life has meaning and direction.	.50
<u>Items With Low Item-Scale Correlations</u>	
How much of the time are you bored?	.37
How would you rate your physical health?	.37
How much energy do you have compared to others of your age?	.35

<sup>a</sup>All item statistics for each of the scales used in the study are presented in Appendix C.

Work Satisfaction. The mean for the Work Satisfaction Scale was 36.09 out of a possible 46 points. The variance of this scale was 29.38; the standard deviation was 5.42; the skewness was -.809. The kurtosis

was .236. The reliability for the scale was .809 for this sample.

The Work Satisfaction Scale had item-scale correlations which ranged from .13 for the item, "Some people feel they are not doing as well at work as they would like to. How true is this for you?" to .79 for the item, "How satisfying do you find your job to be?" As in the General Satisfaction Scale, the item with the highest item-scale correlation asked a direct question about level of satisfaction. None of the items exhibited a negative item-scale correlation. In Table 3.8 item-scale correlations for the Work Satisfaction Scale are exhibited.

Relationship Satisfaction. The reliability of the Relationship Satisfaction Scale was .895. The mean of the scale was 49.812 out of a possible 58 points. The standard deviation was 6.906. The Relationship Satisfaction Scale was highly negatively skewed (skewness = -1.976), indicating that most people scored at the high end of the scale. The kurtosis was 4.64.

The extreme skewness of this scale would make it a questionable choice for use in regression analysis as the multiple regression model assumes a multivariate normal distribution. However, the major consequence of violating this assumption is that the sample estimate



of the degree of relationship among scores on the Relationship Satisfaction Scale and scores on the other variables will be attenuated.

Table 3.8: Item-Scale Correlations for the Work Satisfaction Scale (N = 228)

Item	Item-Scale Correlation
<u>Items With High Item-Scale Correlations</u>	
How meaningful do you find your work to be?	.77
How enjoyable do you find your work to be?	.74
How committed are you to your work?	.62
Do you feel that your present job is the right job for you?	.58
<u>Items With Low Item-Scale Correlations</u>	
How well do you get along with your co-workers?	.21
How well do you get along with your supervisor?	.31
Do you feel you receive appropriate recognition for your contributions at work?	.42
If you suddenly inherited a large fortune would you continue in your present job?	.49

The Relationship Satisfaction Scale differs from the previous scales in that the scale is more homogeneous. All but two of the item-scale correlations were above .6. These two items concern the "argument behavior" of couples. The items were: "About how much of the time do you and your partner argue?" ( $r = .29$ ) and "When you and your partner argue do you resolve your differences?" ( $r = .57$ ).

Unlike the previous scales, the Relationship Satisfaction Scale's highest item-scale correlation is not with the item which directly inquires about the subject's perception of his/her satisfaction with a relationship. Instead, the largest item-scale correlation is found for the item, "To what degree do you feel you and your partner are compatible?" ( $r = .77$ ). Other strong item-scale correlations are listed in Table 3.9.

Table 3.9: Item-Scale Correlations for the Relationship Satisfaction Scale (N = 228)

Item	Item-Scale Correlation
How close do you feel to your spouse or partner?	.75
How exciting is your relationship with your spouse or partner?	.75
How close do you think your spouse or partner feels to you?	.73
Are you now in love with your partner?	.73

It would not be surprising to discover that this scale was particularly affected by social desirability--given its high reliability, its negative skewness, and the high item-scale correlations.

Child Satisfaction. Also included in the scale were three items relating to children, which inquired about the degree of satisfaction derived from the subject's relationship with his/her children. These three items were not included in further analysis (except the factor analysis of the scales) because there were only three items and few of the people (31%) in the sample were parents. Even though the scale contained only three items, its reliability was .70.

Importance and Discrepancy Scales. In order to ascertain the value of a certain aspect of life, the subject was asked to rate the importance of that aspect of life on the following four-point scale:

1. Not at all important
2. Slightly important
3. Moderately important
4. Very important

The items used in this scale are the same as those used in the Discrepancy scale. These items are listed in Table 3.10.

The "have" portion of the Discrepancy Scale asked the subject to state how much of each of the aspects of life he/she experienced. The "want" portion of the

Table 3.10: Means and Standard Deviations of Importance and Discrepancy Scales  
(N = 228)

Variable Name	Scales					
	Importance		Have		Want	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
1. Sufficient education	3.63	.62	2.60	.74	3.68	.53
2. Physical attractiveness	2.90	.70	2.91	.58	3.37	.61
3. Sex	3.21	.68	2.85	.74	3.39	.52
4. Love	3.78	.51	3.23	.71	3.79	.46
5. Leisure time	3.44	.63	2.47	.74	3.34	.53
6. Achievement of goals	3.74	.49	2.82	.55	3.73	.47
7. Success	3.34	.71	2.91	.52	3.54	.57
8. Serenity	3.34	.71	2.63	.63	3.41	.63
9. Opportunity to do what I want	3.67	.52	2.73	.65	3.57	.52
10. Good health	3.81	.49	3.30	.61	3.82	.49
11. Satisfying relationship with partner	3.80	.53	2.98	.79	3.80	.45
12. Friends and social life	3.20	.69	2.84	.66	3.22	.57
13. Control over my life	3.67	.56	2.96	.62	3.71	.48
14. Happiness	3.68	.55	3.01	.61	3.73	.48
15. Meaning in my life	3.76	.50	3.04	.67	3.74	.51
16. Exercise or physical activity	3.03	.79	2.56	.81	3.26	.66
17. Time with my children	3.27	.99	2.75	.90	3.37	.88
18. Money	2.96	.65	2.51	.77	3.56	.58
19. Satisfaction with job	3.61	.56	2.87	.60	3.70	.49
20. Enjoyment of hobby	3.17	.73	2.61	.72	3.24	.66

scale requested the subject to state how much of each aspect of life he/she wanted. The scale values for each of these scales were:

Have

1. I never have a sufficient amount of this.
2. I seldom have a sufficient amount of this.
3. I have a sufficient amount of this most of the time.
4. I have a sufficient amount of this all of the time.

Want

1. I never want this.
2. I rarely want this.
3. I sometimes want this.
4. I almost always want this.

To arrive at a discrepancy for each item, the "want" score was subtracted from the "have" score. Further, the discrepancy score was weighted by the Importance score for each item. These weighted discrepancies were summed across the items to form the weighted total discrepancy score. The means and standard deviations of the Importance and Discrepancy Scales appear in Table 3.10. The means of the Importance Scale seem very similar to the means of the want scale, and it may be that the subjects in this sample responded to the Importance Scale as if wanting something was the same thing as judging its importance to satisfaction with life. The reliability of the weighted Discrepancy Scale was .8416.

### Plan of the Study

The nature of this research is correlational and predictive. That is, the objective was to find relationships (if they exist) among the variables selected for study, to assess the strength of these relationships, and discover which variables best predicted satisfaction with life.

In order to assess these relationships, the instruments described in the previous section were assembled as a questionnaire. This questionnaire was then administered to the sample described earlier in this chapter.

### Testable Hypotheses

The testable hypotheses for this dissertation were:

1. There is a positive correlation between the Total P scores on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the scores on the General Satisfaction Scale.
2. There is a positive correlation between the scores on the Job Satisfaction Scale and the scores on the General Satisfaction Scale.
3. There is a positive correlation between scores on the Relationship Satisfaction Scale and the scores on the General Satisfaction Scale.
4. There is a negative correlation between scores on Rotter's Locus of Control Scale scored in an external direction and scores on the General Satisfaction Scale.

5. There is a negative correlation between the scores on the General Satisfaction Scale and the scores on the Discrepancy Scale.

### Procedures for Data Analysis

This section of Chapter III describes the statistical analyses used to test the hypotheses of the study. Supplemental statistical procedures which were used to further inspect the data are also described.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were used to test the strength of the relationship between two variables. The assumptions for the Pearson correlation coefficient are:

1. Bivariate normal distribution
2. Homoscedasticity (i.e., equality of conditional variances)
3. Independence of observations

Further analysis of the data was undertaken using multiple regression procedures. Regression analysis provides a means to find the independent variables which best predict scores on the criterion variable. Multiple correlation coefficients ( $R$ ) provide a measure of the magnitude of the relationship between a criterion and the best linear combination of the predictors. The significance of  $R$  was tested using the F test. Assumptions for using the F test in this situation are:<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup>Kerlinger, Fred N., & Pedhauzer, Elzar J., Multiple regression in behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1975.

1. Multivariate normal distribution
2. Equality of conditional variances (homoscedasticity)
3. Independence of observations

According to Kerlinger and Pedhauzer, the F test is quite robust with respect to violation of these assumptions, and "both analysis of variance and multiple regression analysis can be used without worrying too much about assumptions."<sup>123</sup>

Another statistical technique used to explore the data and clarify relationships among the variables was the discriminant function analysis. The function of this technique is to weight the variables in such a way that the weighted linear combination would maximally differentiate among members of various groups. (In this case, the discriminant function is appropriate in attempting to describe high and low satisfaction groups, consisting of the lowest and highest third of scores on the General Satisfaction Scale.) In analysis of variance terms, this is precisely the same as weighting the variables so as to maximize the  $SS_B$  (in univariate ANOVA) or the  $SS_{\text{hypothesis}}$  (in multivariate ANOVA). In fact, the results of a discriminant function analysis are the same as a one-way multivariate analysis of variance

---

<sup>123</sup>Ibid., p. 48.



(MANOVA) between the groups in question.<sup>124</sup> The weights assigned to variables are called canonical or discriminant weights and can be interpreted in roughly the same way as a standardized regression coefficient or beta weight. That is, the size of the weight is proportional to the importance of predictive value of that variable when the influence of the other variables has been partialled out.<sup>125</sup>

Wilks' Lambda provides the test statistic for the multivariate test of the equality of the means of the discriminating variables. If Wilks' Lambda is significant, then the multivariate null hypothesis can be rejected and it can be concluded that the means on the linear combination of the discriminating variables differ between groups. Wilks' lambda equals  $1 - R^2$  when group membership is coded as a dummy variable and the values of the several discriminating variables are regressed on the dummy variable.<sup>126,127</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup>Ibid.

<sup>125</sup>Klecka, W., Discriminant analysis. In N. H. Nie, C. H. Hull, J. H. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner, & D. H. Bent., Statistical package for the social sciences manual (2nd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

<sup>126</sup>Cohen, J., & Cohen, P., Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum Associates, 1975.

<sup>127</sup>Kerlinger & Pedhauzer, op. cit.

An important part of this study is the construction of items that operationally measure the hypothesized constructs. Factor analysis is the traditional method of identifying specifically how responses to items relate to each other. A principal factors analysis was performed first. Typically, one general factor will emerge from this analysis along with three or four other factors which account for smaller proportions of common variance.

Following the principal factors analysis, a varimax rotation was executed. This procedure maximizes the within factor loading for any one item. If the logically constructed scales have "factorial validity," the items on a particular scale should load on the same factor. That is, items measuring work satisfaction should load solely (or most heavily) on a factor made up of the items from the Work Satisfaction Scale.

Finally, analysis of variance was used to examine the role which several demographic variables may play in life satisfaction. Previous research found that indices of relationship status, sex, age, and occupation often revealed significant results in studies of life satisfaction. ANOVA was used to compare mean scores of "attached" vs. "unattached" subjects, subjects with children vs. those who have no children, and people who are employed by the university vs. public school teachers on the

General Satisfaction Scale, the Work Satisfaction Scale, Relationship Satisfaction Scale, Locus of Control Scale, and the Self-Concept Scale.

### Summary

In order to test the hypotheses about the relationship between general life satisfaction and satisfaction with one's work and one's relationships with a partner, locus of control and self-concept, graduate students in education were contacted. A total of 228 volunteers completed a specifically constructed General Satisfaction Scale, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, and the Rotter Locus of Control Scale. The reliability of the Locus of Control Scale in this sample was .79.

The General Life Satisfaction Scale was developed to operationalize the concepts of general life satisfaction, work satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, and the discrepancy between what one "has" and what one "wants."

Items were generated by a logical development process for each of the concepts. Furthermore, pertinent items from previous studies were edited for use in the scale. General life satisfaction was elaborated to include concepts such as optimism or pessimism in life, meaning in life, control over one's life, satisfaction with leisure time, and health of the subject. The Work

Satisfaction Scale consisted of items measuring not only feelings about the tasks performed at work, but relationships with co-workers and supervisor, recognition received for work, enjoyment of work, and commitment to the job. Relationship satisfaction was postulated to measure feelings of closeness to partner, compatibility, companionship, excitement in the relationship, respect, security, and satisfaction with sexual experiences.

The Discrepancy Scale consisted of a list of 20 "values" such as sex, money, education, control over life, being with one's children, and relationships with a partner and friends. Subjects were asked to rate the importance of each of these to their satisfaction with life, and then define the amount of each desired, and the amount possessed. A score was obtained by subtracting the weighting of "want" from "have" and summing across all items.

The estimated internal consistency reliabilities of the Life Satisfaction Scales were high (range: .83 to .89). A factor analysis of the items (described in Chapter IV) revealed that items on the same scales, for the most part, loaded on the same factors, thus implying that the items were probably measuring the same construct.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS OF THE DATA ANALYSIS

In Chapter IV, results of the tests of each of the hypotheses of the study are discussed. The first section displays the results of the tests of the correlational hypotheses. The second section includes the results of the regression, discriminant function, and factor analysis of the data. The third section is devoted to further explanatory analysis of the data and interpreting the results.

#### Correlational Hypotheses

The variables in this study include general life satisfaction (the "criterion" variable) and "explanatory" or "predictor" variables: self-esteem, locus of control, work satisfaction, and relationship satisfaction. The correlations among the principal variables are summarized in Table 4.1.

Before discussing the results of the hypothesis tests, it is necessary to clarify the use of the terms describing the magnitude of the correlation coefficients.

Squaring Pearson's  $r$  gives the proportion of variance in one variable which can be accounted for by

Table 4.1: Correlation Matrix for Predictor and Criterion Variables (N = 228)<sup>a</sup>

	Gen. Sat.	Work Sat.	Rel. Sat.	Locus of Control	Total Positive
General Satisfaction					
Work Satisfaction	.5585 (.001)				
Relationship Satisfaction	.3316 (.001)	.1936 (.011)			
Locus of Control	-.3534 (.001)	-.1833 (.009)	-.1844 (.023)		
Total Positive	.6147 (.001)	.3852 (.001)	.3966 (.001)	-.3246 (.001)	
Total Discrepancy	-.5325 (.001)	-.3694 (.001)	-.2557 (.001)	.2571 (.001)	-.3923 (.001)

<sup>a</sup>Values in parentheses are the probability of Type I error.

scores on the other variable. For example, a correlation of .3 squared yields an  $r^2$  of .09. Thus, only 9% of the variance in one variable can be accounted for by scores on the other variable. On this basis, it is appropriate to conclude that a correlation of .3 indicates a relatively weak relationship even though the correlation may be statistically significant. As in the case of the hypothesis test of the difference between sample means, it is possible to obtain statistically significant relationships by employing large sample sizes. Therefore the finding of statistical significance is not always sufficient to describe the strength of a relationship.

In the following analysis only correlations of above .3 are considered to be meaningfully significant since any  $r$  of less than .3 will account for less than 9% of the variance in the dependent variable under consideration.

### Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 states that there will be a positive correlation between the Total Positive scores on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the scores on the General Life Satisfaction Scale. The product-moment correlation between Total Positive (self-esteem) and general satisfaction was .615 ( $p$  less than .001). The size of this correlation indicates that the relationship between

self-esteem and overall life satisfaction is meaningfully as well as statistically significant.

### Hypothesis 2

This hypothesis posits a positive correlation between the scores on the Job Satisfaction Scale and scores on the General Satisfaction Scale. The product-moment correlation between the Job Satisfaction and General Satisfaction Scales was .550 ( $p$  less than .001). Consequently, the relationship between job satisfaction and overall life satisfaction is meaningfully as well as statistically significant.

### Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 suggests a positive correlation between scores on the Relationship Satisfaction Scale and the scores on the General Satisfaction Scale. The correlation between these variables was found to be .332 ( $p$  less than .001), which although statistically significant is less meaningfully significant than the previous two correlations.

### Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 posits a negative correlation between scores on Rotter's Locus of Control Scale scored in an "external" direction and scores on the General Life Satisfaction Scale. Analysis of the data from



these subjects revealed a correlation of  $-.355$  ( $p$  less than  $.001$ ) between these two measures. Again, the correlation was found to be statistically significant but does not indicate a particularly strong relationship between the two variables.

#### Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 states that there will be a negative correlation between the scores on the General Life Satisfaction Scale and the scores on the Discrepancy Scale. The product-moment correlation between the scores ( $-.532$ ,  $p$  less than  $.001$ ) demonstrates a meaningful as well as statistically significant relationship between the variables.

#### Regression Analysis

In order to estimate the degree of the relationship between scores on the Total Positive Scale, Relationship Satisfaction Scale, Work Satisfaction Scale, Locus of Control Scale, and the General Satisfaction Scale, a multiple regression analysis was performed. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4.2.

As reported in Table 4.2, the multiple correlation ( $R$ ) between General Satisfaction and Total Positive, Work Satisfaction, Relationship Satisfaction, and Total Discrepancy was  $.754$  ( $p$  less than  $.001$ ). The multiple correlation squared ( $R^2$ ) of  $.569$  indicates that

approximately 57% of the variance in General Satisfaction can be accounted for by a linear combination of the predictor variables. The  $R^2$  Change in Table 4.2 indicates the additional variance accounted for by the variable added on that step of the regression analysis when the variance in General Satisfaction attributable to variables entered in previous steps has been controlled.

Table 4.2: First Hierarchical Regression Analysis of the Data (N = 228)

Step	Variable	R	$R^2$	$R^2$ Change	F	Sig.
1	Total Positive	.6147	.3778	.3778	91.08	.001
2	Rel. Satisfaction	.6221	.3870	.0092	2.23	.138
3	Work Satisfaction	.7111	.5056	.1187	35.52	.001
4	Locus of Control	.7238	.5239	.0118	5.65	.019
5	Total Discrep.	.7542	.5687	.0448	15.18	.001
6	Wt. Total Discr.	.7554	.5706	.0019	0.64	.424

It can be seen from  $R^2$  change of Table 4.2 that the Total Positive variable accounts for approximately 38% of the variance in General Satisfaction; Relationship Satisfaction accounts for 1% of the variance after Total Positive has been controlled (i.e., statistically partialled); Work Satisfaction accounts for an additional 12% of the variance, Locus of Control 2%, Total

Discrepancy an additional 4% of the variance after removing the variance attributable to the predictor variables which were entered in earlier steps of the regression. Finally the weighted total discrepancy accounted for only one-half of 1% of additional variance.

The standardized regression or "beta weight" is the predicted change (in the number of standard deviations) in the dependent variable, General Satisfaction, when the value of the independent variable is increased by one standard deviation and the values of the other predictor or independent variables are held constant. Because all of the variables have been standardized to have the same mean and variance (and are expressed in Z score units), the size of the beta weight of a variable gives a good indication of the "influence" of a variable when the other variables in the equation are statistically controlled and when the intercorrelations among the predictor variables are not high.<sup>128</sup>

Because the intercorrelation of the predictor variables (multicollinearity) can influence the magnitude of the regression weights, it is important to explore this phenomenon in order to properly interpret the results of the research. By referring to the correlation matrix of the major variables in the study (Table 4.1),

---

<sup>128</sup>Ibid.

the extent of the multicollinearity in the study can be demonstrated.

Although many of these correlations are statistically significant at the .001 level, all range between .18 and .39. The Total Positive Scale correlates most highly with the other predictor variables. It is reasonable to assume this scale may have had some effect on the results of the regression because it shares the greatest amount of "common variance" with the other variables. However, the effect of this shared variance cannot be uniquely determined.

The beta weights for each of the major variables of the study are displayed in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Standardized Regression Coefficients (Beta Weights) for Regression on General Satisfaction (N = 228)

Variable	Beta	F	Sig.
Total Positive	.4392	26.87	.001
Relationship Satisfaction	.0532	0.80	.374
Work Satisfaction	.3055	25.10	.001
Locus of Control	-.1138	3.82	.053
Total Discrepancy	-.2417	15.18	.001

From the magnitude of the beta weights, it can be seen that the Total Positive Scale (Self-Esteem Scale) was the predictor variable which is most highly related to the General Satisfaction score (Beta = .439,  $p$  less than .001).

The variable offering the next most important contribution to General Satisfaction is Work Satisfaction (Beta = .305,  $p$  less than .001). Total Discrepancy makes the third most significant contribution to General Satisfaction (Beta = -.242,  $p$  less than .001). The variables offering the least contribution to variance in General Satisfaction are Locus of Control (Beta = -.114,  $p$  less than .053) and Relationship Satisfaction (Beta = .053,  $p$  less than .374).

The "quasi" stepwise regression analysis (the results of which are displayed in Table 4.4) utilized essentially the same procedure as previously discussed in the hierarchical regression. However, two modifications in the analysis were made: In order to assess the contributions of response set and defensiveness, the T/F Ratio and Self-Criticism Scales from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale were entered into the regression first. After these two scales had been entered, the predictor variables were added in a slightly different order to see if their contributions to the total variance in General Satisfaction would measurably change. Total

Positive and Locus of Control were assigned the highest inclusion level; Work Satisfaction and Relationship Satisfaction the next highest; and the two discrepancy scores the lowest inclusion level. It is necessary to examine the  $R^2$  Change column in Table 4.4 to determine if the scales used to measure the variables in the study were still contributing significantly to the total variance.

Table 4.4: Results of the Quasi-Stepwise Regression Analysis of the Data (N = 228)

Step	Variable	R	$R^2$	$R^2$ Change	F	Sig.
1	Self-Criticism (Defensiveness)					
	T/F Ratio (Response Set)	.1868	.0349	.0036	2.69	.071
2	Total Positive	.6261	.3902	.3571	86.93	.001
3	Locus of Control	.6479	.4198	.0278	7.04	.009
4	Work Satisfaction	.7276	.5293	.1095	33.98	.000
5	Rel. Satisfaction	.7299	.5328	.0035	1.08	.301
6	Wt. Total Discrep.	.7604	.5781	.0453	15.48	.001
7	Total Discrep.	.7604	.5782	.0001	0.02	.887

From Table 4.4 it can be seen that the Total Positive Scale, the Locus of Control Scale, the Work Satisfaction Scale, and the Weighted Total Discrepancy contribute more to the variance in General Satisfaction than do the two validity scales. The simple correlation between General Satisfaction and Self-Criticism (the lie scale) was only  $-.1771$  ( $p$  less than  $.580$ ) with General Satisfaction.

#### Discriminant Function Analysis

The discriminant function analysis outlined in Chapter III was performed on the data. An attempt was made to split the subjects roughly into three groups based on their scores on the General Satisfaction Scale. Using the General Satisfaction Scale, the top third and the bottom third of the subjects were identified for the discriminant function analysis. The purpose of this classification was to determine if a linear combination of Total Positive, Locus of Control, Relationship Satisfaction, and Work Satisfaction scores could successfully discriminate between groups of subjects in each of the tails of the General Satisfaction Scale distribution. The lowest third of the distribution were those who received General Satisfaction scores of less than or equal to 48. The highest third received scores greater than or equal to 54. The limits for the low and high

groups were plus or minus one-half standard deviation above or below the mean of 51.0 on the General Satisfaction Scale.

The means and standard deviations of the discriminating variables and the results of the univariate F-tests of the significance of the differences between group means are displayed in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Means and Standard Deviations of the Discriminating Variables for the Discriminant Function Analysis (N = 96)

Variable	Low Group (N = 40)		High Group (N = 56)		Univ. F	Sig.
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Total Positive	336.15	31.80	377.52	23.09	54.59	.001
Locus of Control	11.48	3.62	8.00	4.34	17.15	.001
Rel. Satisfaction	47.30	5.93	52.29	4.39	22.40	.001
Work Satisfaction	31.85	5.82	39.95	3.28	75.20	.001

The analysis of the data revealed significant differences between the groups on all of the discriminating variables.

Wilks' Lambda was used to test the multivariate null hypothesis of no relationship between group membership and scores on the discriminating variables. Lambda was .4237, which was significant at the .001 level. It can therefore be concluded that the low General



Satisfaction and high General Satisfaction group differ on an optimal linear combination of the discriminating variables.

The standardized discriminant function coefficients for this sample are displayed in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients (N = 96)

Variable	Coefficient
Total Positive	.58192
Locus of Control	-.21121
Relationship Satisfaction	.28207
Work Satisfaction	.90114

When all of the other variables have been controlled (i.e., statistically partialled), the single variable that maximally discriminates between the two groups is the Work Satisfaction Scale. The next most important discriminating variable is the Total Positive Scale (Self-Esteem). When the other variables are controlled, scores on the Relationship Satisfaction and Locus of Control Scales are the next most important discriminators.

One minus Wilks' Lambda is equal to the squared multiple correlation ( $R^2$ ) between the group membership

coded as a dummy variable and scores on the General Satisfaction Scale.<sup>129</sup> In this case, one minus Lambda equaled .576. Therefore, the multiple  $R^2$  between group membership and the discriminating variables was .576, which illustrates the strong relationship between group membership (i.e., high or low satisfaction) and scores on the discriminating variables.

Using the discriminant function weights, a classification analysis<sup>130</sup> was performed. The classification analysis tested the validity of the predictions by comparing the classification made by the discriminant function model to the person's actual group. The results of the classification analysis are shown in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Results of the Classification Analysis  
(N = 152)

<u>Actual Group</u>		No. of Cases	<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>	
Name	Code		Group 1	Group 2
Group 1	1	40	30 31.3%	10 10.4%
Group 2	2	56	4 4.2%	52 54.2%
Ungrouped	3	56	23 24.0%	33 34.4%

<sup>129</sup>Ibid.

<sup>130</sup>Klecka, op. cit.

The classification analysis program correctly classified 85% of the known cases based on the optimally weighted linear combination of discriminating variables. This result supports the assertion that people who score either high or low on the General Satisfaction Scale can be reliably differentiated based on their scores on the Work Satisfaction, Relationship Satisfaction, Total Positive, and Locus of Control Scales.

#### Further Analysis of the Data

##### Importance and Discrepancy Scales

The results of the analysis of the Importance Scale indicate some of the values that are important to this sample of people. In Table 4.8 the rank order of the means of items included in the Importance Scale is exhibited.

The range of differences in means of the items was not great (and most would not likely be statistically significant). However, the order in which the subjects ranked the importance of items is in itself revealing. (Please note that the subjects did not rank order the items. The rank order was derived by listing the items in order of their means.) The item most highly valued by subjects was "good health," followed very closely by "satisfying relationship with spouse or partner," and "love." "Achievement of my goals," "meaning in my

life," "happiness," and "opportunity to do what I want" were the next most valued aspects of life. Items ranking the lowest were "physical attractiveness," "money," "exercise and physical activity." Neither "friends and social life" (no. 17) nor "sex" (no. 15) seemed of particular relative importance to these subjects.

Table 4.8: Rank Order of the Importance Scale Items  
(N = 228)

Item	Mean
1. Good health	3.809
2. Satisfying relationship	3.801
3. Love	3.777
4. Achievement of goals	3.763
5. Meaning in life	3.761
6. Happiness	3.683
7. Opportunity to do what I want to do	3.674
8. Control over my life	3.670
9. Sufficient education	3.630
10. Satisfaction with job	3.613
11. Leisure time	3.443
12. Serenity	3.342
13. Success	3.338
14. Time with my children	3.274
15. Sex	3.209
16. Enjoyment of hobby	3.174
17. Friends and social life	3.191
18. Exercise or physical activity	3.026
19. Money	2.961
20. Physical attractiveness	2.900

The discrepancy between what people have and what they want contributed a significant amount of variance to General Satisfaction (see the results of the regression analysis above). However, the differences on individual items were not consistently great. These differences are exhibited in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Differences in Means Between "Have" and "Want" Scales (N = 228)

Item	Difference in Means
1. Good health	.518
2. Satisfying relationship	.819
3. Love	.526
4. Achievement of goals	.912
5. Meaning in life	.700
6. Happiness	.718
7. Opportunity to do what I want to do	.816
8. Control over my life	.751
9. Sufficient education	1.079
10. Satisfaction with job	.834
11. Leisure time	.874
12. Serenity	.777
13. Success	.625
14. Time with my children	.984
15. Sex	.546
16. Enjoyment of hobby	.626
17. Friends and social life	.386
18. Exercise and physical activity	.681
19. Money	1.205
20. Physical attractiveness	.460

As expected, the greatest discrepancy between "have" and "want" appeared for the item "money" (1.205). However, it is interesting that "money" is the next to the lowest ranked variable in the importance scale. The next largest discrepancy between "have" and "want" occurred for "sufficient education"--a finding that seems surprising in a sample of very-well-educated people (1.079). "Time with my children" also seems to be an area of dissatisfaction for this group of people. The difference between "have" and "want" on this item was .984, the third largest difference.

The variable with the smallest discrepancy between "have" and "want" was "friends and social life" with only a .386 difference in the means for "have" and "want." Another area where the sampled people seemed fairly satisfied was "physical attractiveness." There was only a .460 difference between the "have" and "want" means on this item. The items where the least discrepancy occurred between "have" and "want" were items which were not very important for these subjects. It seems that people are more aware of feeling dissatisfied with things that are more important to them.

Other aspects of life which members of this sample seem to feel "something missing" were: "achievement of my goals" (.912 difference), "leisure time"

(.874 difference), "satisfaction with job" (.834 difference), and "satisfying relationship" (.819 difference).

#### Factor Analysis of Items Constructed for the Study

In order to further explore the structure of the data, the items generated for this study were factor analyzed. The first method of factor analysis employed was principal factors solution. Use of a principal factors solution allows the investigator to examine the relationships among items and to find how item responses relate to each other. This method of analysis uses common variance or variance shared by items to arrive at a solution.<sup>131</sup> (Appendix D contains a display for the entire factor structure of the data for the principal factors solution.)

Factor 1 emerged as a general factor. Items with the strongest loadings (i.e., loadings above .4) are listed in Table 4.10. Prior to the factor analysis, all items were rescaled in a positive direction; therefore items that would be expected to load negatively are loaded positively. This general factor accounted for 42% of the variance.

---

<sup>131</sup>This method was chosen over a principal components solution, which also utilizes unique variance and is primarily a data-reduction technique.

Table 4.10: Items Loading on Factor 1, Principal Factors Solution (N = 228)

Item	Loading
Do you feel that your partner provides you with the <u>companionship</u> you want?	.67235
How <u>secure</u> do you feel in your relationship?	.64384
To what degree do you feel you and your spouse are <u>compatible</u> ?	.63108
How <u>close</u> do you think your partner feels to you?	.61184
How <u>optimistic or pessimistic</u> about your life are you?	.60081
How <u>satisfying</u> do you find the way you are spending your life?	.60059
How <u>satisfying</u> is your <u>job</u> to you?	.59744
How <u>exciting</u> is your <u>relationship</u> with your partner?	.56074
How <u>satisfying</u> is your <u>relationship</u> with your partner?	.56443
How <u>enjoyable</u> do you find your <u>work</u> to be?	.56255
Do you feel that your partner <u>respects</u> your opinions, thoughts, and ideas?	.56108
How often do you feel you have an opportunity to <u>do what you want to do</u> ?	.56074
If you were to <u>start over</u> again would you want a relationship with your partner?	.54836
How close do you feel to your partner?	.54642
Are you now in <u>love</u> with your partner?	.54291



Table 4.10: Continued

Item	Loading
When you and your partner <u>argue</u> do you resolve your differences?	.54218
How <u>meaningful</u> to you find your <u>work</u> to be?	.53058
Compared to most of your acquaintances how <u>happy</u> are you?	.49708
How often do you feel <u>depressed</u> ?	.47722
How often do you feel your life is full of <u>overwhelming problems</u> that cannot be solved?	.45135
I feel my life has <u>meaning and direction</u> .	.42400
How <u>committed</u> do you feel to your <u>work</u> ?	.41634
How <u>successful</u> have you been in achieving the <u>goals and aims</u> in your life?	.41575

The next factor emerging from the data was bipolar. Items measuring work satisfaction had positive loadings on this factor and items measuring relationship satisfaction displayed negative loadings. Items which loaded on Factor 2 are listed in Table 4.11. This factor accounted for 22% of the variance.

Factor 3, which accounted for 8.7% of the variance, contained a few work satisfaction items which had negative loadings on the factor, and the child satisfaction items, all of which loaded positively on the factor. These items are shown in Table 4.12.

Table 4.11: Items Loading on Factor 2, Principal Factors Solution (N = 228)

Item	Loading
<u>Items With Positive Loadings</u> <u>(Work Satisfaction)</u>	
How <u>meaningful</u> do you find your work to be?	.54506
How <u>satisfying</u> is your job to you?	.54743
How <u>enjoyable</u> do you find your work?	.51070
How <u>committed</u> do you feel to your work?	.49939
Do you feel that your <u>present job is the right job for you?</u>	.45316
<u>Items With Negative Loadings</u> <u>(Relationship Satisfaction)</u>	
How <u>close</u> do you feel to your partner?	-.59517
Are you now in <u>love</u> with your partner?	-.53522
Do you feel that you and your partner are <u>compatible</u> ?	-.51560
If you were to start over again would you want a <u>relationship with your present partner?</u>	-.48888
How <u>close</u> do you think your spouse or partner feels to you?	-.48498

Table 4.12: Items Loading on Factor 3, Principal Factors Solution (N = 228)

Item	Loading
<u>Items With Negative Loadings</u> <u>(Work Satisfaction)</u>	
How <u>meaningful</u> do you find your work to be?	-.40236
How <u>satisfying</u> is your job to you?	-.30936
How <u>enjoyable</u> do you find your work to be?	-.29683
How <u>committed</u> do you feel to your work?	-.25465
<u>Items With Positive Loadings</u> <u>(Child Satisfaction)</u>	
How <u>close</u> do you feel to your children?	.52392
How much of the time do you <u>enjoy</u> <u>being with your children?</u>	.52329
Do you feel you are the <u>parent you</u> <u>would like to be?</u>	.45448

The principal factors solution was then subjected to a varimax rotation. Because of the complexity of the data (i.e., the sizable number of variables on the scales), an analytic factor analysis (one in which the selection and rotation of the factors are done according to predetermined mathematical criteria<sup>132</sup>) was used. The factor analysis subroutine of the Statistical

---

<sup>132</sup>Gorsuch, R. L., Factor analysis. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1974.

Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was selected because of its comparatively flexible analytic capabilities and its general acceptance in the behavioral science community. According to the mathematical criterion for factor selection set forth by Guttman,<sup>133</sup> the eigenvalue criterion for retention of factors for further analysis was set at 1.00. The large number of factors which resulted from the selection of this minimum eigenvalue vindicated its choice.

The entire factor structure for the varimax rotation is shown in Appendix E. All but one of the relationship satisfaction items ("About how much of the time do you and your partner argue?") displayed high loadings on Factor 1. This factor accounted for 42% of the variance. Items that loaded above .4 on Factor 1 are listed in Table 4.13.

Factor 2 reflected work satisfaction. The items with the highest loadings came from the Work Satisfaction Scale and accounted for 22% of the variance. Items with loadings above .4 on Factor 2 are displayed in Table 4.14.

The General Satisfaction Scale items were found to be most heavily associated with Factor 3, and accounted for 8.7% of the variance. Table 4.15 contains a listing of the items that have loadings above .4 on Factor 3.

---

<sup>133</sup>Ibid., pp. 47-49.

Table 4.13: Items Loading on Factor 1, Varimax  
Rotation (N = 228)

Item	Loading
Do you feel that you and your partner are <u>compatible</u> ?	.81661
How <u>close</u> do you feel to your spouse or partner?	.81329
Are you in <u>love</u> with your spouse or partner?	.80939
How <u>close</u> do you think your spouse or partner feels to you?	.76026
If you were to <u>start all over again</u> would you want a relationship with your partner?	.75488
How <u>secure</u> do you feel in your relationship with your partner?	.71408
Overall, how <u>satisfying</u> is your relationship with your partner?	.66904
How much of the time do you feel your partner provides you with the <u>companionship</u> that you want?	.64561
How <u>exciting</u> is your relationship with your partner?	.63885
Do you feel your partner <u>respects</u> your thoughts, opinions, and ideas?	.60862
When you and your partner <u>argue</u> do you resolve your differences?	.54153
How <u>satisfied</u> are you with your <u>sexual experiences</u> with your spouse or partner?	.46221

Table 4.14: Items Loading on Factor 2, Varimax  
Rotation (N = 228)

Item	Loading
How <u>meaningful</u> do you find your work to be?	.85400
How <u>satisfying</u> is your job to you?	.83048
How <u>enjoyable</u> do you find your work to be?	.76473
How <u>committed</u> do you feel to your work?	.73236
Do you feel that your <u>present job is the right job for you?</u>	.65703
If you suddenly inherited a large fortune would you continue in your present job?	.58801

Table 4.15: Items Loading on Factor 3, Varimax  
Rotation (N = 228)

Item	Loading
How <u>optimistic or pessimistic</u> about your life would you say you are?	.57875
How <u>satisfying</u> do you find the way you are spending your life?	.56542
How often do you feel you have an <u>opportunity to do what you want to do?</u>	.55223
How often do you feel <u>depressed?</u>	.53544
How much of the time do you have <u>control over the pace</u> of your life?	.51633
Compared to most of your acquaintances how <u>happy</u> are you?	.48610
How often do you feel your life is full of <u>overwhelming problems</u> that cannot be solved?	.48502

A fourth factor was also found which contains only three items with loadings of any magnitude. The items which were associated with this factor were found in the Child Satisfaction Scale, and accounted for 8% of the variance. These items can be found in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16: Items Loading on Factor 4, Varimax Rotation (N = 228)

Item	Loading
How <u>close</u> do you feel to your children?	.71249
Do you feel you are the <u>parent you would like to be</u> ?	.68441
How much of the time do you <u>enjoy</u> being with your children?	.67134

Two other factors which were statistically insignificant and which account for only small portions of variance were found. These factors, however, display interesting configurations of the items. Factor 5 consisted of four items and accounted for 5.1% of the variance. Perhaps this could be called an elan vital factor. These items are displayed in Table 4.17.

Factor 6 contained high loadings for three work satisfaction items which did not load on stronger factors. This factor accounted for only 4.3% of the

variance and consisted of items that dealt with the subjects' human relations skills. These items are listed in Table 4.18.

Table 4.17: Items Loading on Factor 5, Varimax Rotation (N = 228)

Item	Loading
How much <u>energy</u> do you have compared to other people of your age?	.52948
How would you rate your <u>physical health</u> now?	.50618
Is what you do in your <u>spare time</u> <u>satisfying</u> to you?	.40542
How much of the time are you <u>bored</u> ?	.38239

Table 4.18: Items Loading on Factor 6, Varimax Rotation (N = 228)

Item	Loading
How well do you get along with your <u>supervisor or boss</u> ?	.50618
To what extent do you feel that you receive <u>appropriate recognition</u> for your contributions at work?	.51171
Generally, how well do you get along with your <u>co-workers</u> ?	.47193



Most of the results of the factor analyses were as predicted. The principal factor method yielded one larger factor with loadings from all the scales (i.e., General Satisfaction, Work Satisfaction, and Relationship Satisfaction). All of the factors are orthogonal.

In the varimax rotation of the principal factors solution (in which the factors are rotated, but still remain orthogonal), the items fell roughly into subscales. This finding suggests that the separate scales are indeed measuring separate aspects of satisfaction.

#### Intercorrelation of All Scales

In order to find possible relationships among the variables in the study and explore relationships that might further clarify the findings, product-moment correlations were calculated for all variables including selected subscales from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.<sup>134</sup>

As expected, the Tennessee subscales correlated quite highly with each other and with the Total Positive score. There are several correlations of interest among both the Tennessee subscales and between the Tennessee subscales and instruments used to measure other

---

<sup>134</sup>Appendix F contains a correlation matrix for all variables used in the study.

variables in the study. These correlations are displayed in Table 4.19 and are discussed below.

General Satisfaction. General Satisfaction scores correlated highly with all the TSCS subscales used in this study. The correlation found between Total Positive and General Satisfaction (.615) was discussed above. Correlations between General Satisfaction and the rest of the Tennessee subscales ranged from .705 for the Personal subscale to .322 for the Moral subscale. All of these correlations were significant at the .001 level. These findings offer evidence that General Satisfaction is related to all of the components of self-concept as they are operationally defined by the TSCS.

Work Satisfaction. Modest correlations appeared between Work Satisfaction and the TSCS scores. Total Positive and Work Satisfaction correlated .385 ( $p$  less than .001). Most correlations between Work Satisfaction and the TSCS variables were between .30 and .40, with the highest correlation for the Personal subscale (.458,  $p$  less than .001) and the Social subscale (.4058,  $p$  less than .001).

Relationship Satisfaction. Supporting the validity of the Relationship Satisfaction Scale was the

[illegible]

finding that the Family subscale from the TSCS (which measures perceptions of the self with reference to one's immediate personal associates) and the Relationship Satisfaction Scale correlated .449 ( $p$  less than .001). The Family subscale correlated more highly with the Relationship Satisfaction Scale than did any other variable in the study. It is also interesting that the correlation between the Family subscale and the Work Satisfaction Scale was only .1989. Other variables which were found to be moderately correlated with Relationship Satisfaction were Total Positive ( $r = .40$ ,  $p$  less than .001) and Identity ( $r = .39$ ,  $p$  less than .001).

Locus of Control. Because the Locus of Control Scale was scored in the external direction all correlations with other scales were found to be negative. Externality was found to be inversely related to General Satisfaction ( $-.3534$ ,  $p$  less than .001), which was the strongest correlation found between Locus of Control and other variables in the study. Total Positive (self-esteem) and Locus of Control correlated  $-.3246$  ( $p$  less than .001). Other correlations between Locus of Control and subscales of the TSCS were:  $-.2090$  ( $p$  less than .003) for the Moral subscale and  $-.2431$  ( $p$  less than .001) for the Family subscale. (Although statistically

significant, these are not particularly strong correlations.)

Total Discrepancy. The Total Discrepancy Scale was most strongly related to the General Satisfaction Scale ( $r = .532$ ,  $p$  less than .001). Meaningful and significant relationships were also found between Total Discrepancy and the Personal subscale ( $r = .45$ ). Total Discrepancy's weakest relationship was with the Moral subscale on the TSCS ( $r = .21$ ,  $p$  less than .002).

Overall, the TSCS subscale that yielded the weakest relationship with other TSCS scores and with the other variables in the study was the Moral subscale. The Total Positive (self-esteem) consistently produced the strongest relationships both with other TSCS variables and the other explanatory variables in the study. The other subscale yielding high correlations with the major variables of this study was the TSCS Personal subscale.

#### Demographic Characteristics

In order to determine whether demographic characteristics of the sample were related to the major variables in this study, analyses of variance using the general linear model<sup>135</sup> were performed on the data. The

---

<sup>135</sup>Cohen & Cohen, op. cit.

demographic factors that were used as independent variables in these analyses were: sex, age, occupation (teacher vs. university employee), relationship status ("attached" vs. "unattached"), education (bachelor's degree and/or "some graduate work" vs. M.A. and/or other advanced degree), total family income, and children (children vs. no children). The categorical variables (i.e., sex, occupation, relationship status, education, and children) were coded as "dummy variables" and linear regressions were separately performed on the following dependent variables: Total Positive, General Satisfaction, Work Satisfaction, Relationship Satisfaction, Locus of Control, and the Discrepancy Scale. A multivariate analysis of variance would normally be the appropriate analysis. However, because these dependent variables are correlated, interpretation of the individual tests of significance is not straightforward. The correlated variables share variance which conflicts with the assumption made when the significance of each variable is tested separately--that that variable is measuring a single unitary trait. In the situation in which the variables are correlated and hence share variance, each variable is no longer measuring a unitary trait and consequently must be tested "controlling for"

its relationship with other dependent variables. This is done in the multivariate analysis of variance.<sup>136</sup>

Tatsuoka also discusses the problem of an inflated alpha when significance tests are carried out on correlated dependent variables one variable at a time. This problem is analogous to the problem of an inflated alpha when multiple post-hoc t-tests are conducted in the univariate analysis of variance (see Glass & Stanley<sup>137</sup>). This simply means that the probability of a Type I error is increased over the nominal level.

The multivariate analysis of variance was not considered appropriate in this case because of the extent of the missing data on the Relationship Satisfaction Scale (i.e., one-fourth of the sample were "unattached" and it would have been questionable to replace all of these observations with the mean score).

In order to determine which independent variables were most highly related to the dependent variables, the magnitude of the regression weights was tested for statistical significance. Consequently, as in the earlier analysis of the best predictors of

---

<sup>136</sup>Tatsuoka, M. M., Discriminant analysis: The study of group differences. Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970.

<sup>137</sup>Glass, G. V., & Stanley, J. C., Statistical methods in education and psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

general satisfaction, the variance attributable to all other variables in the regression was controlled. Because age and total family income are "continuous" variables their tests are simply tests of their product-moment correlations with the dependent variables. The variance attributable to the other variables entered in the regression is partialled out.<sup>138</sup> Analyses of two-way interaction effects were performed for sex, occupation, relationship status, and education. Higher order interactions were not calculated because of the loss of degrees of freedom. The results of this analysis showed that there were few significant main effects for the demographic variables and only one significant two-way interaction among the categorical variables. The results of the analysis of the main effects are displayed in Table 4.20. (Only F-ratios greater than 1.00 and their accompanying levels of statistical significance have been presented in the table.)

The only variable that demonstrated a statistically significant relationship with general satisfaction was relationship status ( $p$  less than .03). No significant main effects were found for sex, age, educational level, occupation, or presence or absence of children.

---

<sup>138</sup>Cohen & Cohen, op. cit.



Table 4.20: Results of Analysis of Variance for Demographic Variables (N = 228)

Dependent Variables	Demographic Variables									
	Sex		Age		Occupation		Rel. Status		Education	
	F	Sig.	F	Sig.	F	Sig.	F	Sig.	F	Sig.
Total Positive	3.247	.07	--	--	1.892	.17	1.183	.28	--	--
General Satisfaction	1.457	.23	--	--	--	--	4.573	.03*	--	2.984 .09
Work Satisfaction	1.146	.27	1.860	.17	4.111	.04*	2.335	.13	1.224	.27
Relationship Satisfaction	1.406	.24	--	--	--	--	--	--	2.894	.09
Locus of Control	1.976	.16	5.190	.02*	1.508	.221	4.789	.03*	--	--
Discrepancy	--	--	1.230	.27	--	--	--	--	1.174	.28

\*p &lt; .05.

In observing the impact of the demographic variables on work satisfaction, the only significant main effects were found for occupation ( $p$  less than .04) and the presence or absence of children ( $p$  less than .01). University-affiliated subjects were more satisfied with their jobs than were public school teachers. People with children reported more work satisfaction than those with no children.

When all of the other independent variables were controlled, age showed a significant negative relationship with external locus of control ( $p$  less than .02) and "unattached" subjects scored significantly higher in the external direction on locus of control than did the "attached" subjects ( $p$  less than .03).

A significant sex by relationship status interaction ( $p$  less than .02) accounted for 2% of the variance in locus of control.

There were no significant effects of the demographic variables on the Discrepancy Scale.

### Summary

The variable that was found to have the strongest relationship with the General Satisfaction Scale was the Total Positive Scale of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale ( $r = .615$ ,  $p$  less than .001). Other explanatory variables that had meaningfully (as well as statistically) significant relationships with General Satisfaction

were: Work Satisfaction ( $\underline{r} = .559$ ,  $p$  less than .001) and Total Discrepancy ( $\underline{r} = -.533$ ,  $p$  less than .001). The remaining two explanatory variables, Locus of Control ( $\underline{r} = -.353$ ,  $p$  less than .001) and Relationship Satisfaction ( $\underline{r} = .332$ ,  $p$  less than .001), had statistically significant but less substantive relationships with the General Satisfaction Scale.

Multiple regression analysis of the data revealed a strong multiple correlation of .75 between the General Satisfaction Scale and the best linear combination of the explanatory variables. The multiple correlation squared ( $R^2$ ) of .569 indicated that 57% of the variance in the scores on the General Satisfaction Scale can be accounted for by scores on the Total Positive, Work Satisfaction, Relationship Satisfaction, Locus of Control, and Total Discrepancy Scales.

The relative magnitude of beta weights from the regression analysis indicated that self-concept (i.e., Total Positive score) was the best predictor of General Satisfaction scores when the other variables were controlled (Beta = .4392). The next best predictors were: Work Satisfaction (Beta = .3055), Relationship Satisfaction (Beta = .0532), Locus of Control (Beta = -.1138), and Total Discrepancy (Beta = .2417).

In order to determine if the scores on the explanatory variables could differentiate between very

satisfied and very unsatisfied persons, subjects were divided roughly into groups of thirds based on their scores on the General Satisfaction Scale. Data from subjects from the highest and lowest thirds of the distribution were used for discriminant function analysis. The means of the "high satisfaction" and "low satisfaction" groups differed meaningfully (i.e., by approximately one standard deviation or more) on Total Positive, Work Satisfaction, Relationship Satisfaction, and Locus of Control. (All mean differences were also statistically significant at the .001 level.) In contrast to the relative differences among the beta weights from the regression analysis, the variable with the highest discriminant weight was Work Satisfaction (.901), followed by Total Positive (.582), Relationship Satisfaction (.282), and Locus of Control (-.211).

Analysis of the Importance Scale items revealed that the aspects of life that were rated as being most important to members of the sample were good health, a satisfying relationship, and love. The aspects rated as least important were physical attractiveness, money, and exercise and physical activity. The largest discrepancies between "have" and "want" occurred for the variables money and sufficient education. The aspects of life with which people seem most satisfied (i.e., displayed the smallest discrepancy between "have" and

"want") were friends and social life and physical attractiveness.

Subjects who were "attached" (married, or cohabiting on a long-term basis) scored higher on the General Satisfaction Scale than their "unattached" counterparts (single, divorced, or widowed). Members of the sample who had children were significantly more satisfied with work than those who did not have children, and subjects employed by the university (typically graduate assistants) were significantly more satisfied than teachers.

Items of the General Satisfaction Scale, Work Satisfaction Scale, and the Relationship Satisfaction Scale were subjected to factor analysis (varimax rotation). Six factors were identified. The first factor that emerged accounted for 42% of the variance and consisted of Relationship Satisfaction items dealing with compatibility, closeness, being in love with one's partner, security, and companionship. The second factor accounted for 22% of the variance and contained items from the Work Satisfaction Scale. These items dealt with meaning in work, satisfaction in work, enjoyment of work, commitment to work, and the "rightness" of the job. Items from the General Satisfaction Scale loaded on the third factor, which accounted for 9% of the variance. Items with high loadings on Factor 3 reflected optimism or pessimism about life, satisfaction with the

way time is being spent, the feeling one has the opportunity to do what one wants, and feelings of happiness in life.

A fourth factor emerged that accounted for 8% of the variance and contained items from the Child Satisfaction Scale. A fifth factor accounted for 5% of the variance and consisted of items dealing with amount of energy the subject possesses, health of the subject, and the amount of time the subject feels bored. The final factor identified accounted for only 4% of the variance and seemed to be measuring the ability of the subject to relate to co-workers.

The intercorrelation matrix of all the variables used in the study revealed that the Total Positive Scale from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale correlated most highly with other Tennessee scales and with scales used to measure other variables in the study. The Tennessee subscale exhibiting the weakest association with other variables was the Moral subscale. The Family subscale from the TSCS and the Relationship Satisfaction Scale correlated .45, the highest correlation for the Family subscale in the study.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Summary of Findings

This chapter consists of a capsule summary of previous research, and conclusions based on the results of the study. The conclusions are discussed in light of previous research, and used to suggest some possible implications for future studies concerning life satisfaction.

This study was designed to look at possible areas that contribute to the life satisfaction of normal adults and at personality variables that were hypothesized to be related to life satisfaction. Furthermore, the study investigated the relationship of five variables--locus of control, self-concept, work satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, and the discrepancy between "have" and "want" with life satisfaction.

Subjects were 288 graduate students in education, all of whom were employed, either as a public school teacher or as a graduate assistant at Michigan State University. The sample was relatively young (mean age = 30), well educated (all subjects had at least a bachelor's degree), and reported modest family incomes (mean = \$13,500).

Three-fifths of the subjects were married (60%) and about one-third had children.

The subjects volunteered to complete questionnaires consisting of instruments to measure general satisfaction, work satisfaction, relationship satisfaction (all of which were constructed by the writer), along with Fitt's Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and Rotter's Locus of Control Scale.

Data collected from these questionnaires were analyzed to discover relationships among the variables. Product-moment correlation coefficients were used to estimate the strength of the relationships between each variable and general satisfaction. Multiple regression analysis was used to find the best predictors of life satisfaction and a discriminant function analysis was performed in order to find the variables that best discriminated between those people who scored high on general satisfaction and those who scored low. A factor analysis was used to discover the way in which the General Satisfaction Scale, the Work Satisfaction Scale and the Relationship Satisfaction Scale were related.

The hypotheses for the study and the results of the hypothesis tests are listed below, along with the results of other analyses that were performed.

1. There will be a positive correlation between the Total Positive scores (self-esteem) on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the scores on the General



Satisfaction Scale. The correlation found was .615 (p less than .001).

2. There will be a positive correlation between scores on the General Satisfaction Scale and scores on the Work Satisfaction Scale. The correlation found was .550 (p less than .001).

3. There will be a positive correlation between scores on the General Satisfaction Scale and scores on the Relationship Satisfaction Scale. The correlation found was .332 (p less than .001).

4. There will be a negative correlation between scores on Rotter's Locus of Control Scale scored in an external direction and scores on the General Satisfaction Scale. The correlation found was  $-.355$  (p less than .001).

5. There will be a negative correlation between the scores on the General Satisfaction Scale and scores on the Discrepancy Scale. A correlation of  $-.532$  (p less than .001) was found.

Regression analysis of the data revealed a strong multiple correlation (R) of .75 between General Satisfaction and the best linear combination of the explanatory variables (work satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, locus of control, total discrepancy, and total positive). The multiple correlation squared ( $R^2$ ) of .569 indicated that 57% of the variance in the General Satisfaction Scale scores could be accounted for by the explanatory variables.

The relative magnitudes of the beta weights from the regression analysis indicated that self-esteem (the Total Positive score) was the best predictor of general satisfaction (Beta = .4392). The beta coefficients for the other explanatory variables were: work satisfaction

(Beta = .3055), relationship satisfaction (Beta = .0532), locus of control (Beta =  $-.1138$ ), and total discrepancy (Beta =  $-.2427$ ).

A discriminant function analysis was performed to identify the variables that best differentiated people who scored either high or low on the General Satisfaction Scale. The variable with the highest discriminant weight was work satisfaction (.901) followed by total positive (self-esteem), which had a discriminant weight of .582. Others were relationship satisfaction (.282) and locus of control ( $-.211$ ).

Further analysis of the data revealed that the aspects of life most important to the subjects' satisfaction with life were: good health, a satisfying relationship, and love. The area in which subjects seem to find the least satisfaction (i.e., those areas or aspects of life in which the largest discrepancies appeared between what the subjects reported "having" and what they reported "wanting") were "money" and "sufficient education." Using this same criterion, subjects were most satisfied with "friends and social life" and "physical attractiveness."

Items from the General Satisfaction Scale, the Work Satisfaction Scale, and the Relationship Satisfaction Scale were factor analyzed. Most of the items from each scale loaded on the same factor. For example, the

Work Satisfaction Scale loaded on one factor, whereas items from other scales typically loaded on other factors.

### Conclusions

1. The personality variables selected for use in this study, self-concept and locus of control, are related to life satisfaction.

a. Self-concept is strongly and positively related to avowed satisfaction with life. People with high levels of self-esteem tend to be more satisfied with their lives.

b. Internal locus of control is moderately related to life satisfaction. Persons who are "internally controlled" are somewhat more likely than those who are "externally controlled" to be satisfied with their lives.

2. Satisfaction in role-related functions of life is positively related to life satisfaction.

a. Work satisfaction is strongly associated with life satisfaction. People who are satisfied with their jobs are more likely to be satisfied with their lives.

b. Satisfaction with relationships shows a moderate positive relationship with life satisfaction, which suggests that people who experience satisfaction

in a primary relationship are somewhat more inclined to say they are satisfied with their lives.

3. The discrepancy one experiences between what one "wants" and what one "has" is related to general satisfaction with life. There was a strong relationship between scores on the Discrepancy Scale and scores on the General Satisfaction Scale.

4. Out of all the explanatory variables, the best predictor of life satisfaction was the Total Positive score (self-esteem).

5. The explanatory variable that best discriminates between people who are highly satisfied with their lives and those who expressed less life satisfaction was work satisfaction.

6. In a sample of well-educated, employed people, demographic characteristics such as sex, age, and level of education demonstrated little ability to differentiate satisfied from dissatisfied subjects. Of the demographic variables, marital status proved to be the indicator that was most clearly related to overall life satisfaction.

7. Overall, most people seemed to be at least moderately satisfied with their lives.

Because subjects for this study were not randomly selected, generalizing beyond this sample is a rather risky procedure. However, according to an argument

presented by Cornfield and Tukey,<sup>139</sup> it may be assumed that these subjects are not all that different from other graduate students in education and teachers who volunteer to fill out questionnaires for dissertations. Therefore the results can be generalized at least to that population with some degree of confidence.

### Discussion

It was suggested in the first chapter that researchers need to explore the relationship of various personality variables and life satisfaction. Two of the major variables included in this study were self-concept and locus of control. The results indicate that self-concept has a particularly important role in explaining satisfaction with life. The self-esteem measure was the variable most highly related to all the other variables in the study including general satisfaction with life. When all the explanatory variables were entered into a regression analysis, self-esteem best predicted life satisfaction.

Locus of control was also found to be related to life satisfaction, although not so strongly as self-esteem. Campbell<sup>140</sup> found a relationship of .35 between

---

<sup>139</sup>Cornfield, J., & Tukey, J. W., Average values of mean squares in factorials. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 1956, 27, 907-949.

<sup>140</sup>Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, op. cit.

the "Index of Personal Competence" and the "Index of Well-Being." The present study supports Campbell's finding, in that a relationship of  $-.35$  was found between external locus of control and life satisfaction. Locus of control was not one of the better predictors of life satisfaction, nor was it particularly useful in discriminating between high scorers and low scorers on the General Satisfaction Scale.

Previous research has reinforced the conclusion that satisfaction with various "roles" in life is related to overall life satisfaction. The findings of this investigation demonstrate that the stronger of these role-related issues was the relationship between life satisfaction and work satisfaction. Given that the population sampled was young, very well educated, and all were employed, the relationship between work satisfaction and life satisfaction may reflect a preoccupation with completing an education and establishing a place in the world of work. The correlation between satisfaction with primary relationships and overall life satisfaction was fairly low but statistically significant. Bradburn<sup>141</sup> found the opposite pattern for personal happiness; i.e., the stronger of the two relationships was with marital satisfaction, not with job satisfaction. There are several possible explanations for this: (1) Bradburn was studying

---

<sup>141</sup>Bradburn, op. cit.

the relationships between personal happiness and job satisfaction and marital satisfaction. (2) While this study dealt with a rather "select" group of people, Bradburn sampled a much broader range of people.

(3) The overall failure of the Relationship Satisfaction Scale to demonstrate strong relationships with other variables may be an artifact of the psychometric properties of the scale. That is, the Relationship Satisfaction Scale exhibited a highly negatively skewed distribution and consequently, its correlations with other variables may have been attenuated, and its value in predicting life satisfaction may have been weakened. Other data from the study show that a "relationship with a spouse or partner" is the second most important quality for life satisfaction, and that relationship status is the only demographic variable with a significant relationship to life satisfaction.

Work satisfaction was the second best predictor of general life satisfaction. In the discriminant function analysis, however, work satisfaction was the variable that best discriminated between subjects in the high and low satisfaction groups. Self-esteem and locus of control were the second and third most significant discriminating variables. Relationship satisfaction made the least contribution to life satisfaction scores and

was the variable that did the poorest job of discriminating between high and low satisfaction with life.

In the review of the literature, the correlation between locus of control and self-esteem was found to be  $-.25$ .<sup>142,143</sup> The present research found a correlation of  $-.32$  between these variables. McCahan<sup>144</sup> found a correlation of  $.47$  between marital satisfaction and self-esteem. The data in this study revealed a correlation of  $.40$  between self-esteem and relationship satisfaction.

Ridley<sup>145</sup> found the relationship of marital adjustment and job satisfaction to be positive and significant for men in his sample, but not for women. Data for males and females were not analyzed separately for this study. However, the relationship between job satisfaction and relationship satisfaction in the total sample was not particularly strong ( $r = .19$ ). It may again be that the skewness of the Relationship Satisfaction Scale attenuated the magnitude of this correlation.

The literature offers no other attempt to measure the difference between what a person "has" and what a person "wants" within the context of life satisfaction. It was hypothesized in the first chapter that this

---

<sup>142</sup>Fish & Karabenick, op. cit.

<sup>143</sup>Ryckman & Sherman, op. cit.

<sup>144</sup>McCahan, op. cit.

<sup>145</sup>Ridley, op. cit.



discrepancy would be related to overall life satisfaction and further, that it could be used as a validity check since both were thought to measure life satisfaction. It was found that these two variables were strongly related ( $r = -.51$ ). A "weighted" discrepancy scale was constructed by weighting the discrepancy between "have" and "want" by the importance of each item to the subject's life satisfaction. The unweighted Discrepancy Scale correlated about as highly with life satisfaction as did the weighted Discrepancy Scale. (Seashore<sup>146</sup> has noted that weighting procedures rarely improve the quality of indicators used to measure constructs such as life satisfaction or work satisfaction.)

The data from the Importance Scale itself, however, revealed that "health" was the quality most important for subjects' satisfaction with life. The varimax rotation of the principal factors solution identified a factor that consisted of items from the General Satisfaction Scale measuring health, amount of time that the subject was "interested in life," and the satisfaction derived from leisure activities. These two findings indicate that an aspect of life which may be important to people is a sense of vitality. The importance of this "health-vitality" factor is also supported by a finding from

---

<sup>146</sup>Seashore and Faber, op. cit.

Flannagan's study of quality of life.<sup>147</sup> Flannagan found that good health was the factor rated most important for his subjects' quality of life. The Flannagan study also revealed that the second most important component of his subjects' quality of life was a "close relationship with a spouse, boyfriend, or girlfriend." In the present study the "relationship with a spouse or partner" emerged as the second most important aspect for life satisfaction, with "love" third.

The Discrepancy Scale revealed those aspects of life with which these subjects were most satisfied (i.e., the aspects of life that demonstrated the least discrepancy between "have" and "want"). These aspects were: "friends and social life" and "physical attractiveness." The greatest discrepancy between "have" and "want" appeared for "money" and "sufficient education."

The review of the literature discussed findings concerning the relationships between various demographic characteristics and life satisfaction. Age was found to be related to life satisfaction as older people claim to be more satisfied than younger people. In the present study, however, no significant age effects were found. Previous research also showed the presence of children in the home to be a deterrent to the experience of life satisfaction.

---

<sup>147</sup>Flannagan, op. cit.

This finding was not borne out in the current research. Level of income has been found to be related to life satisfaction. This study found that level of income had no significant relationship with scores on the General Satisfaction Scale. The likely reason that these characteristics have behaved unpredictably is that the range of the variables was restricted because the sampling procedures limited the distribution of age and income of this sample. Therefore, relationships with these variables may be smaller than if the entire range of the general population had been included in the sample. The review of the literature also showed there were no significant sex differences in avowed satisfaction with life. This was also found to be true in this study.

Married people have been found to be more satisfied with their lives than single, divorced, or widowed persons. In the present study, people who were "attached" (i.e., either married, cohabiting, or dating on a long-term basis) claimed more satisfaction with life than did single, widowed, or divorced subjects.

The popular belief is that people with more education are more satisfied with their jobs than persons who have less education. The findings of the study do not support this belief. The range of education of subjects in this study, however, was severely restricted (i.e., all subjects have at least a bachelor's degree).

There is therefore some possibility that a relationship would have emerged if people with little education were also included in the sample.

Work satisfaction was found to be more highly related to the demographic variables than any other variables employed in the study. The presence of children in the home was associated with higher levels of work satisfaction and subjects employed by the university were more satisfied with their jobs than were teachers.

Although age was not found to be related to the satisfaction measures, it was found that older people were more internally controlled than younger people.

#### Implications for Future Research

Further studies are needed to explore the impact of personality on avowed life satisfaction. The present research has established that two personality variables, locus of control and self-esteem, play an important part in determining a person's level of life satisfaction. However, more research is needed in order to understand how these variables behave in broader groups of people including an expanded range of age, income, occupational groups, and income levels.

Along with expanding the nature of populations studied, it may be fruitful to observe some other personality variables and their relationships with life

satisfaction. These could include: field dependence/independence, achievement motivation, risk-taking behavior, and instrumental-expressive behavior.

More complex and sophisticated models of life satisfaction must be considered. Life satisfaction is definitely a multivariate phenomenon. This study has demonstrated that role-related variables, personality variables, and certain demographic variables are related to the level of life satisfaction claimed by a subject. To be significant, further studies must include all of these variables and the model of life satisfaction must show how the variables are related under varying conditions.

Not only should new models of life satisfaction be considered, but other strategies should be employed in investigating the problem. Case studies of satisfied or dissatisfied individuals may be significant in discovering other variables that influence life satisfaction. Interviews with selected persons can provide depth and detail for researchers who wish to pursue a broader interest in life satisfaction.

Secondary analysis<sup>148</sup> (the re-analysis of data for the purpose of answering the original research

---

<sup>148</sup>Cook, T. D., The potential and limitations of secondary evaluations. Chapter 6, pp. 155-234 in M. W. Apple, H. S. Jakoviac, & J. R. Lufer (Eds.), Educational Evaluation: Analysis and responsibility. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974.

question with better statistical techniques, or answering new questions with old data) of researchers' data may be an effective method of establishing new hypotheses and clarifying just what we do know about life satisfaction.

Another interesting phenomenon in need of attention by researchers is the contradiction between what is generally thought to be true and what empirical studies have shown. The popular belief seems to be that the quality of life in this country is declining, yet indicators such as those used in this study reveal relatively high levels of satisfaction among people. A possible solution to this dilemma is "definitional." One way to approach the problem is to define various indices of life quality, such as satisfaction, happiness, or well-being and then experiment with ways to operationalize these terms. Further, the relationship of these constructs to each other should be explored.

Another aspect of social indicators must be taken into account in future research: their validity. Empirical validation studies of the instruments to be used in operationalizing these constructs must be carefully conducted, making use of criterion groups established for this purpose. Many researchers tend to gloss over issues of validity. However, in dealing with such abstract concepts, a serious attempt at empirical validation of scales is necessary to differentiate between life

satisfaction, quality of life, well-being, or happiness before seeking relationships with other variables.

Another issue in the validation of instruments of this type is social desirability. Although there were no significant relationships between defensiveness (measured by the Lie Scale from the TSCS) or acquiescence response set (T/F Ratio from the TSCS) and other variables in the study, it would be useful to measure social desirability and partial out its effects on outcome variables. Social desirability, particularly as defined by Crowne and Marlowe,<sup>149</sup> is different than traditional measures of defensiveness that may be associated with psychopathology. When investigating highly "desirable" traits such as life satisfaction, work satisfaction, or relationship satisfaction, knowledge of a person's social desirability score may yield more straightforward interpretations of available data.

---

<sup>149</sup>Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D., A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 349-354.

## APPENDICES



## APPENDIX A

### QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THE STUDY

## APPENDIX A

### QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THE STUDY

DIRECTIONS: For this section please mark an X beside the one alternative that best reflects your answer to the question.

1. Age \_\_\_\_\_
2. Sex M\_\_\_\_ F\_\_\_\_
3. What is your present occupation (please include graduate assistant as an "occupation")? \_\_\_\_\_
4. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1. Bachelor's degree
  - \_\_\_\_ 2. Some graduate school
  - \_\_\_\_ 3. Master's degree
  - \_\_\_\_ 4. Ph.D., Ed.D., or some professional degree
5. How enjoyable do you find your work to be?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1. Very enjoyable
  - \_\_\_\_ 2. Moderately enjoyable
  - \_\_\_\_ 3. Slightly enjoyable
  - \_\_\_\_ 4. Not at all enjoyable
6. Is what you do in your spare time satisfying to you?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1. Almost none of the time
  - \_\_\_\_ 2. Some of the time
  - \_\_\_\_ 3. Most of the time
  - \_\_\_\_ 4. All of the time
7. How well do you get along with your supervisor or boss?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1. Very well
  - \_\_\_\_ 2. Moderately well
  - \_\_\_\_ 3. I am neutral towards this person
  - \_\_\_\_ 4. Not very well
8. In general, how would you rate your physical health now?
  - \_\_\_\_ 1. Excellent
  - \_\_\_\_ 2. Good
  - \_\_\_\_ 3. Fair
  - \_\_\_\_ 4. Poor
  - \_\_\_\_ 5. Very poor

9. To what extent do you feel that you receive appropriate recognition for your contributions at work?
- ☐ 1. I receive more than enough recognition
  - ☐ 2. I receive an adequate amount of recognition
  - ☐ 3. I receive little recognition
  - ☐ 4. I receive no recognition
10. How committed do you feel to your work?
- ☐ 1. Very committed
  - ☐ 2. Moderately committed
  - ☐ 3. Slightly committed
  - ☐ 4. Slightly uncommitted
  - ☐ 5. Moderately uncommitted
  - ☐ 6. Very uncommitted
11. In general, how satisfying do you find the way you are spending your life?
- ☐ 1. Very satisfying
  - ☐ 2. Moderately satisfying
  - ☐ 3. Slightly satisfying
  - ☐ 4. Slightly unsatisfying
  - ☐ 5. Moderately unsatisfying
  - ☐ 6. Very unsatisfying
12. How optimistic or pessimistic about your life would you say you are?
- ☐ 1. Very optimistic
  - ☐ 2. Moderately optimistic
  - ☐ 3. Slightly optimistic
  - ☐ 4. Slightly pessimistic
  - ☐ 5. Moderately pessimistic
  - ☐ 6. Very pessimistic
13. How often do you feel you have an opportunity to do what you want to do?
- ☐ 1. All of the time
  - ☐ 2. Most of the time
  - ☐ 3. Some of the time
  - ☐ 4. Almost none of the time
  - ☐ 5. None of the time
14. How much energy do you have compared to other people of your age?
- ☐ 1. Much more energy
  - ☐ 2. Somewhat more energy
  - ☐ 3. About the same amount of energy
  - ☐ 4. Somewhat less energy
  - ☐ 5. Much less energy

15. How satisfying is your job to you?
- ☐ 1. Very satisfying
  - ☐ 2. Moderately satisfying
  - ☐ 3. Slightly satisfying
  - ☐ 4. Slightly unsatisfying
  - ☐ 5. Moderately unsatisfying
  - ☐ 6. Very unsatisfying
16. If you suddenly inherited a large fortune, would you continue in your present work?
- ☐ 1. Definitely not
  - ☐ 2. Probably not
  - ☐ 3. Not sure
  - ☐ 4. Probably yes
  - ☐ 5. Definitely yes
17. How often do you feel depressed?
- ☐ 1. Almost none of the time
  - ☐ 2. Some of the time
  - ☐ 3. Most of the time
  - ☐ 4. All of the time
18. How meaningful do you find your work to be?
- ☐ 1. Very meaningful
  - ☐ 2. Moderately meaningful
  - ☐ 3. Slightly meaningful
  - ☐ 4. Not at all meaningful
19. Compared to most of your acquaintances, how happy are you?
- ☐ 1. I am happier than my acquaintances
  - ☐ 2. I am somewhat happier than my acquaintances
  - ☐ 3. I am about as happy as my acquaintances
  - ☐ 4. I am somewhat less happy than my acquaintances
20. Do you feel that your present job is the right job for you?
- ☐ 1. Yes
  - ☐ 2. Yes, with some reservations
  - ☐ 3. No, with some reservations
  - ☐ 4. No
21. How much of the time are you bored?
- ☐ 1. All of the time
  - ☐ 2. Most of the time
  - ☐ 3. Some of the time
  - ☐ 4. Almost none of the time

22. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?  
I feel that my life has meaning and direction.
- ☐ 1. Strongly agree
  - ☐ 2. Moderately agree
  - ☐ 3. Slightly agree
  - ☐ 4. Slightly disagree
  - ☐ 5. Moderately disagree
  - ☐ 6. Strongly disagree
23. Generally, how well do you get along with your co-workers?
- ☐ 1. Very well
  - ☐ 2. Moderately well
  - ☐ 3. Slightly well
  - ☐ 4. Not at all well
24. How often do you feel your life is full of overwhelming problems that cannot be solved?
- ☐ 1. All of the time
  - ☐ 2. Most of the time
  - ☐ 3. Some of the time
  - ☐ 4. Very little of the time
  - ☐ 5. Never
25. How successful have you been in achieving the goals and aims in your life?
- ☐ 1. Very successful
  - ☐ 2. Moderately successful
  - ☐ 3. Slightly successful
  - ☐ 4. Slightly unsuccessful
  - ☐ 5. Moderately unsuccessful
  - ☐ 6. Very unsuccessful
26. Sometimes people feel they are not doing as good a job at work as they would like to. How true is this for you?
- ☐ 1. True of me
  - ☐ 2. Somewhat true of me
  - ☐ 3. Somewhat untrue of me
  - ☐ 4. Not true of me
27. How much of the time do you have control over the pace of your life?
- ☐ 1. Almost none of the time
  - ☐ 2. Some of the time
  - ☐ 3. Most of the time
  - ☐ 4. All of the time

28. What is your total family income before taxes?

- ☐ 1. Zero -\$ 6,999
- ☐ 2. \$ 7,000-\$ 9,999
- ☐ 3. \$10,000-\$12,999
- ☐ 4. \$13,000-\$15,999
- ☐ 5. \$16,000-\$19,999
- ☐ 6. \$20,000-\$24,999
- ☐ 7. \$25,000-\$49,999
- ☐ 8. Over \$50,000

29. Which of the following best describes your current status?

- ☐ 1. Single
- ☐ 2. Married, first time
- ☐ 3. Married, more than once
- ☐ 4. Divorced or separated
- ☐ 5. Widowed
- ☐ 6. Cohabiting on a long-term basis
- ☐ 7. Dating someone on a long-term basis
- ☐ 8. Casual dating

IF YOU ARE NOT MARRIED OR INVOLVED IN A LONG-TERM RELATIONSHIP,  
PLEASE GO TO ITEM NUMBER 43.

30. To what degree do you feel that you and your spouse or partner  
are compatible?

- ☐ 1. Not compatible
- ☐ 2. Slightly compatible
- ☐ 3. Moderately compatible
- ☐ 4. Very compatible

31. Overall, my relationship with my partner is:

- ☐ 1. Very satisfying
- ☐ 2. Moderately satisfying
- ☐ 3. Slightly satisfying
- ☐ 4. Slightly unsatisfying
- ☐ 5. Moderately unsatisfying
- ☐ 6. Very unsatisfying

32. How close do you feel to your spouse or partner?

- ☐ 1. Not close at all
- ☐ 2. Slightly close
- ☐ 3. Moderately close
- ☐ 4. Very close

33. How exciting is your relationship with your spouse or partner?
- ☐ 1. Very exciting
  - ☐ 2. Moderately exciting
  - ☐ 3. Neither exciting nor dull
  - ☐ 4. Moderately dull
  - ☐ 5. Very dull
34. How satisfied are you with your sexual experiences with your partner or spouse?
- ☐ 1. Very dissatisfied
  - ☐ 2. Moderately dissatisfied
  - ☐ 3. Slightly dissatisfied
  - ☐ 4. Slightly satisfied
  - ☐ 5. Moderately satisfied
  - ☐ 6. Very satisfied
35. If you were to "start all over again" would you want a relationship with your present spouse or partner?
- ☐ 1. Yes, definitely
  - ☐ 2. Yes, maybe
  - ☐ 3. Probably not
  - ☐ 4. Definitely not
36. How much of the time do you feel that your spouse or partner provides you with the companionship that you want?
- ☐ 1. None of the time
  - ☐ 2. Very little of the time
  - ☐ 3. Some of the time
  - ☐ 4. Most of the time
  - ☐ 5. All of the time
37. About how much of the time do you and your partner argue?
- ☐ 1. We never argue
  - ☐ 2. Very little of the time
  - ☐ 3. Some of the time
  - ☐ 4. Most of the time
38. Do you feel that your partner respects your opinions, thoughts, and ideas?
- ☐ 1. Yes
  - ☐ 2. Yes, with some reservations
  - ☐ 3. No, with some reservations
  - ☐ 4. No
39. Are you now in love with your spouse or partner?
- ☐ 1. Yes, definitely
  - ☐ 2. Yes, probably
  - ☐ 3. Probably not
  - ☐ 4. Definitely not

40. When you and your partner argue do you resolve your differences?

- ☐ 1. Most of the time
- ☐ 2. Some of the time
- ☐ 3. Very little of the time
- ☐ 4. Never

41. How secure do you feel in your relationship with your spouse or partner?

- ☐ 1. Very secure
- ☐ 2. Moderately secure
- ☐ 3. Slightly secure
- ☐ 4. Insecure

42. How close do you think your spouse or partner feels to you?

- ☐ 1. Very close
- ☐ 2. Moderately close
- ☐ 3. Slightly close
- ☐ 4. Not close at all

43. How many children do you have now?

- ☐ 1. None, do not plan to have any
- ☐ 2. None, plan to have one or more
- ☐ 3. None, cannot have any for medical reasons
- ☐ 4. One
- ☐ 5. Two
- ☐ 6. Three
- ☐ 7. Four or five
- ☐ 8. Six or more

IF YOU HAVE NO CHILDREN, PLEASE GO TO THE FOLLOWING SECTION.

44. If you were starting again, how many children would you have?

- ☐ 1. None
- ☐ 2. One
- ☐ 3. Two
- ☐ 4. Three or four
- ☐ 5. Five or more

45. Do you feel you are the parent you would like to be?

- ☐ 1. Usually
- ☐ 2. More often than not
- ☐ 3. Seldom
- ☐ 4. Never



46. How close do you feel to your children?

- ☐ 1. Very close
- ☐ 2. Moderately close
- ☐ 3. Slightly close
- ☐ 4. Not close at all

47. How much of the time do you enjoy being with your children?

- ☐ 1. None of the time
- ☐ 2. Very little of the time
- ☐ 3. Some of the time
- ☐ 4. Most of the time
- ☐ 5. All of the time

PLEASE RATE THE IMPORTANCE OF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING WORDS OR STATEMENTS TO YOUR GENERAL SATISFACTION WITH LIFE. USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE AND CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE:

1. Not at all important
2. Slightly important
3. Moderately important
4. Very important

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Sufficient education                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Physical attractiveness                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Sex   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Love  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Leisure time                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Achievement of my goals                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. Success   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. Serenity  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. Opportunity to do what I want to do             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. Good health                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. Satisfying relationship with spouse or partner | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. Friends and social life                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. Control over my life                           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. Happiness                                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15. Meaning in my life                             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16. Exercise or physical activity                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17. Time with my children                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18. Money  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19. Satisfaction with my job                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20. Enjoyment of a hobby or hobbies                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

The purpose of these questions is to find the degree to which you have some of the things in life that you may want.

In the first column, please rate the degree to which you have each of these elements. Please use the following scale for Column One.

1. I never have a sufficient amount of this.
2. I seldom have a sufficient amount of this.
3. I have a sufficient amount of this most of the time.
4. I have a sufficient amount of this all of the time.

In the second column rate the degree to which you want each of these elements. Please use the following scale for Column Two.

1. I never want this.
2. I rarely want this.
3. I sometimes want this.
4. I almost always want this.

DON'T WORRY IF YOUR RATINGS IN COLUMN ONE DO NOT MATCH THOSE IN COLUMN TWO!

	Column 1				Column 2			
	Degree to which you <u>have</u> this				Degree to which you <u>want</u> this			
1. Sufficient education	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
2. Physical attractiveness	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
3. Sex	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
4. Love	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
5. Leisure time	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
6. Achievement of my goals	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
7. Success	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
8. Serenity	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
9. Opportunity to do what I want to do	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
10. Good health	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
11. Satisfying relationship with spouse or partner	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
12. Socializing with friends	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
13. Control over my life	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
14. Happiness	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
15. Meaning in my life	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
16. Exercise or physical activity	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
17. Time with my children	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
18. Money	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
19. Satisfaction with my job	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
20. Enjoyment of a hobby or hobbies	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

DIRECTIONS: This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain events in our society affect different people. Each of the items consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please circle the one statement of each pair which more strongly reflects your belief. Please select only one statement. In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements, or neither one. In this case select the one statement with which you agree more strongly. Since this is a measure of personal belief, there are, of course, no right or wrong answers. Please circle your answer on the questionnaire and please be sure to answer each item.

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.  
b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.  
b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.  
b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.  
b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.  
b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.  
b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.  
b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.  
b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.  
b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
10. a. In the case of the well-prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.  
b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.
11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.  
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.  
b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.  
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.  
b. There is some good in everybody.
15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.  
b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.  
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability; luck has little or nothing to do with it.
17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand nor control.  
b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.  
b. There really is no such thing as "luck."

- 19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.  
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
- 20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.  
b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
- 21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.  
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
- 22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.  
b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
- 23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.  
b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
- 24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.  
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.
- 25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.  
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
- 26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.  
b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people; if they like you, they like you.
- 27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.  
b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
- 28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.  
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
- 29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.  
b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

APPENDIX B

ORIGINAL ITEM POOL GENERATED FOR  
CONSTRUCTION OF SCALES

## APPENDIX B

### ORIGINAL ITEM POOL GENERATED FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SCALES

1. Age? \_\_\_\_\_
2. What is your sex? \_\_\_\_\_
3. How long have you been a teacher or administrator? \_\_\_\_\_
4. In what grades have you taught?  
\_\_\_\_ Grades 1-4  
\_\_\_\_ Grades 5-6  
\_\_\_\_ Grades 7-9  
\_\_\_\_ Grades 10-12  
\_\_\_\_ None of these
5. If your primary duties are not in teaching which of the following best describes your activity?  
\_\_\_\_ 1. Superintendent  
\_\_\_\_ 2. Principal  
\_\_\_\_ 3. Counselor  
\_\_\_\_ 4. Consultant  
\_\_\_\_ 5. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
6. What is the highest level of education you have completed?  
\_\_\_\_ 1. Bachelor of Art or Bachelor of Science degree  
\_\_\_\_ 2. Some graduate school  
\_\_\_\_ 3. Master's degree  
\_\_\_\_ 4. Ph.D., Ed.D. or some professional degree
7. What is the occupation of your spouse or your live-in partner?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_ Not applicable (not married or living alone)
8. What is your total income before taxes?  
\_\_\_\_ 1. Less than \$5,000  
\_\_\_\_ 2. \$5,000-\$9,999  
\_\_\_\_ 3. \$10,000-\$14,999  
\_\_\_\_ 4. \$15,000-\$19,999  
\_\_\_\_ 5. \$20,000-\$49,999  
\_\_\_\_ 6. Over \$50,000



9. What is the income of your spouse, or your live-in partner?
- ☐ 1. Not applicable (not married or living alone)
  - ☐ 2. Less than \$5,000
  - ☐ 3. \$5,000-\$9,999
  - ☐ 4. \$10,000-\$14,999
  - ☐ 5. \$15,000-\$19,999
  - ☐ 6. \$20,000-\$49,999
  - ☐ 7. Over \$50,000
10. In general, how satisfying do you find the way you are spending your life?
- ☐ 1. Completely satisfying
  - ☐ 2. Satisfying
  - ☐ 3. Somewhat satisfying
  - ☐ 4. Not at all satisfying
11. Does your general level of contentment change often or remain fairly constant?
- ☐ 1. It changes very often
  - ☐ 2. It sometimes changes
  - ☐ 3. It rarely changes
  - ☐ 4. It never changes
12. When you begin the day, do you generally anticipate that it will be:
- ☐ 1. Very satisfying
  - ☐ 2. Moderately satisfying
  - ☐ 3. Neither satisfying or unsatisfying
  - ☐ 4. Moderately unsatisfying
  - ☐ 5. Very unsatisfying
13. How much of the time are you bored?
- ☐ 1. Everyday
  - ☐ 2. A few times a week
  - ☐ 3. Weekly
  - ☐ 4. Monthly
  - ☐ 5. Almost never
  - ☐ 6. Never
14. Compared to most of your acquaintances how happy are you?
- ☐ 1. I am much happier than my acquaintances
  - ☐ 2. I am somewhat happier than my acquaintances
  - ☐ 3. I am about as happy as my acquaintances
  - ☐ 4. I am somewhat less happy than my acquaintances
  - ☐ 5. I am much less happy than my acquaintances

15. If you suddenly inherited a large fortune, would you continue in your present work?
- ☐ 1. Definitely yes
  - ☐ 2. Probably yes
  - ☐ 3. Not sure
  - ☐ 4. Probably not
  - ☐ 5. Definitely not
  - ☐ 6. Not employed
16. How optimistic or pessimistic about your life would you say you are?
- ☐ 1. Very optimistic
  - ☐ 2. Moderately optimistic
  - ☐ 3. Slightly optimistic
  - ☐ 4. Slightly pessimistic
  - ☐ 5. Moderately pessimistic
  - ☐ 6. Very pessimistic
17. How successful have you been in achieving the goals and aims in your life?
- ☐ 1. Very successful
  - ☐ 2. Moderately successful
  - ☐ 3. Moderately unsuccessful
  - ☐ 4. Very unsuccessful
18. In general, how content are you with the way your life is going?
- ☐ 1. Very content
  - ☐ 2. Content
  - ☐ 3. Somewhat content
  - ☐ 4. Not at all content
19. Do you feel you have an opportunity to do what you want to do?
- ☐ 1. All of the time
  - ☐ 2. Most of the time
  - ☐ 3. Some of the time
  - ☐ 4. Very little of the time
  - ☐ 5. Never
20. Do you feel your life is full of overwhelming problems that cannot be solved?
- ☐ 1. All of the time
  - ☐ 2. Most of the time
  - ☐ 3. Some of the time
  - ☐ 4. Very little of the time
  - ☐ 5. Never

21. Do you feel your spare time is your own to spend as you wish?

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. All of the time
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Most of the time
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Some of the time
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Very little of the time
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. None of the time

22. People spend their time both planning for the future, and enjoying the present. About what proportion of your time do you spend engaged in each of these activities?

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. 0% enjoying the present-100% planning for the future
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. 25% enjoying the present-75% planning for the future
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. 50% enjoying the present-50% planning for the future
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. 75% enjoying the present-25% planning for the future
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. 100% enjoying the present-0% planning for the future

23. Do you feel you are making enough money to make your life happy?

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. I would be happier if I made much more money
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. I would be happier if I made somewhat more money
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. I am happy with the amount of money I make
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. I would be happier if I made less money

PLEASE USE THIS LIST TO ANSWER QUESTIONS 24 and 25. YOU MAY USE THE LETTERS CORRESPONDING TO THE ACTIVITY IN YOUR ANSWER.

- A. Go to movies
- B. Go to club meeting or activities
- C. Go to church or religious activities
- D. Go to classes or lectures
- E. Fishing or hunting
- F. Camping or hiking-picnic-pleasure drive
- G. Go to night clubs or bars
- H. Go to concerts or plans
- I. Go to parties
- J. Go to museums, fairs or exhibits
- K. Gardening or yard work
- L. Shopping, except for groceries
- M. Making and fixing things around the house
- N. Visiting with relatives, friends or neighbors
- O. Planing cards
- P. Time spent with hobbies
- Q. Watching television
- R. Studying or working
- S. Reading
- T. Family activities

24. Say that you wanted to have an evening or day of fun; choose five activities you would most like to do and rank them from 1 to 5. 1 is considered to be the most fun.

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_  
4. \_\_\_\_\_  
5. \_\_\_\_\_

25. Please list five of the above activities you are most likely to do in your spare time.

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_  
4. \_\_\_\_\_  
5. \_\_\_\_\_

26. During most of your childhood, with whom did you live?

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. Both natural parents  
\_\_\_\_\_ 2. One natural parent and one step-parent  
\_\_\_\_\_ 3. One natural parent  
\_\_\_\_\_ 4. Step-parents  
\_\_\_\_\_ 5. Adoptive parents  
\_\_\_\_\_ 6. Foster parents  
\_\_\_\_\_ 7. Other relatives  
\_\_\_\_\_ 8. In an institution  
\_\_\_\_\_ 9. Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

27. How would you describe your mother's relationship with you as you were growing up?

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. I had little or no contact with my mother  
\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Very warm and supportive  
\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Somewhat warm and supportive  
\_\_\_\_\_ 4. She was alternately warm and withdrawn  
\_\_\_\_\_ 5. Somewhat cool and rejecting  
\_\_\_\_\_ 6. Very cool and rejecting

28. How would you describe your father's relationship with you as you were growing up?

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. I had little or no contact with my father  
\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Very warm and supportive  
\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Somewhat warm and supportive  
\_\_\_\_\_ 4. He was alternately warm and withdrawn  
\_\_\_\_\_ 5. Somewhat cool and rejecting  
\_\_\_\_\_ 6. Very cool and rejecting

29. How would you describe your parents' relationship while they were together?
- ☐ 1. I did not live with my parents
  - ☐ 2. I lived with only one parent
  - ☐ 3. Very loving and stable
  - ☐ 4. Stable but emotionally cold
  - ☐ 5. Generally cold and conflicting
30. Were warm and loving emotions freely expressed by your parents?
- ☐ 1. I had little or no contact with my parents
  - ☐ 2. Both parents generally expressed these feelings
  - ☐ 3. My mother generally expressed these feelings
  - ☐ 4. My father generally expressed these feelings
  - ☐ 5. Neither parent expressed these feelings
31. Were angry and critical emotions freely expressed by your parents?
- ☐ 1. I had little or no contact with my parents
  - ☐ 2. Both parents generally expressed these feelings
  - ☐ 3. My mother generally expressed these feelings
  - ☐ 4. My father generally expressed these feelings
  - ☐ 5. Neither parent expressed these feelings
32. How did you feel about the expectations your mother had for you as you grew up?
- ☐ 1. I had little or no contact with my mother
  - ☐ 2. Her expectations were too high
  - ☐ 3. Her expectations were about the same as mine
  - ☐ 4. Her expectations were too low
  - ☐ 5. I do not know what my mother's expectations were
33. How did you feel about the expectations your father had for you as you grew up?
- ☐ 1. I had little or no contact with my father
  - ☐ 2. His expectations were too high
  - ☐ 3. His expectations were about the same as mine
  - ☐ 4. His expectations were too low
  - ☐ 5. I do not know what my father's expectations were
34. As you grew up, what was the financial condition of your family?
- ☐ 1. Very poor, never had enough money
  - ☐ 2. Poor, we were just able to get by
  - ☐ 3. We had adequate money
  - ☐ 4. We had enough for a few luxuries
  - ☐ 5. Very well off, we had more than enough money

35. Please mark the place on the following scale that best describes your life as a child (0-12 years).

Life was	Life was very tough
serene & stable	with lots of
/ / / / / / / /	hard knocks

36. Please mark the place on the following scale that best describes your life as an adolescent (12-18 years).

Life was	Life was very tough
serene & stable	with lots of
/ / / / / / / /	hard knocks

37. At what age did you first take a job for pay outside your home?

- ☐ 1. Under 12 years old
- ☐ 2. 12-13 years old
- ☐ 3. 14-16 years old
- ☐ 4. 17-18 years old
- ☐ 5. 19-20 years old
- ☐ 6. 20-22 years old
- ☐ 7. 23-25 years old
- ☐ 8. Over 25 years old

38. What job did you take? \_\_\_\_\_

39. At what age did you begin earning money to support yourself?

- ☐ 1. 14-16 years old
- ☐ 2. 17-18 years old
- ☐ 3. 19-20 years old
- ☐ 4. 20-22 years old
- ☐ 5. 23-25 years old
- ☐ 6. Over 25 years old
- ☐ 7. Not financially self-sufficient

40. How many brothers and sisters do you have?

- ☐ 1. None
- ☐ 2. One
- ☐ 3. Two
- ☐ 4. Three
- ☐ 5. Four or five
- ☐ 6. Six or seven
- ☐ 7. Eight or more

41. On the following ladder, list the order in which you, your brothers and your sisters were born. Use a B for brother, S for sister, and an X for yourself. Put twins on the same line.

\_\_\_\_\_ First born  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Second born  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Third born  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Fourth born  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other middle siblings  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Last born

IF YOU ARE AN ONLY CHILD PLEASE GO TO ITEM NUMBER 43

42. Overall, would you say that your relationships with your brothers and sisters as you grew up were:

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. Warm and stable, with few conflicts  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Full of emotional ups and downs; periods of closeness alternating with fights  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Moderately conflicted, we fought a lot  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Very conflicted, we fought all the time

IF YOUR PARENTS DID NOT DIVORCE OR SEPARATE PLEASE GO TO ITEM NUMBER 46

43. If your parents were divorced or permanently separated, how old were you when this happened?

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. Six years old or younger  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Seven to twelve years old  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Thirteen to seventeen years old  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Over seventeen years old

44. If your parents divorced, did the parent with whom you lived remarry or bring a live-in partner into your home?

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. Yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 2. No

45. If your parents divorced, did the parent with whom you lived separate from a spouse or live-in partner more than once?

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. No  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Yes, 2 times  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Yes, 3 times  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Yes, 4 times  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Yes, more than 4 times

IF YOUR MOTHER IS NOW LIVING GO TO ITEM NUMBER 47

46. How old were you at the death of your mother?

- ☐ 1. Six years old or younger
- ☐ 2. Seven to twelve years old
- ☐ 3. Thirteen to seventeen years old
- ☐ 4. Over seventeen years old

IF YOUR FATHER IS NOW LIVING GO TO ITEM NUMBER 48

47. How old were you at the death of your father?

- ☐ 1. Six years old or younger
- ☐ 2. Seven to twelve years old
- ☐ 3. Thirteen to seventeen years old
- ☐ 4. Over seventeen years old

IF BOTH OF YOUR PARENTS ARE DECEASED, PLEASE GO TO ITEM NUMBER 51

48. How would you describe your current relationship with your parents or parent who is still living?

- ☐ 1. Warm and stable with few conflicts
- ☐ 2. Cool and stable with few conflicts
- ☐ 3. Emotional ups and downs; periods of closeness alternating with fights
- ☐ 4. Moderately conflicted; we fight a lot
- ☐ 5. We are not speaking
- ☐ 6. I am close to one parent and not the other

49. How far do you live from your parents (parent)?

- ☐ 1. Within 10 miles
- ☐ 2. 51-100 miles
- ☐ 3. 101-200 miles
- ☐ 4. 201-300 miles
- ☐ 5. 301-500 miles
- ☐ 6. 501-1000 miles
- ☐ 7. Over 1000 miles

50. How do you feel about the distance you live from your parents (parent)?

- ☐ 1. It is too far
- ☐ 2. It is just right
- ☐ 3. It is too close



51. As a child (age 1-12), with whom did you spend most of your time (outside school)?

- ☐ 1. Alone
- ☐ 2. Mother
- ☐ 3. Father
- ☐ 4. Brothers and sisters
- ☐ 5. Other relatives
- ☐ 6. Other children

52. As an adolescent (12-18), with whom did you spend most of your time (outside school)?

- ☐ 1. Alone
- ☐ 2. Mother
- ☐ 3. Father
- ☐ 4. Brothers and sisters
- ☐ 5. Other relatives
- ☐ 6. Other children

53. As a child, how much time did you spend alone?

- ☐ 1. Most of my time
- ☐ 2. Moderate amount of time
- ☐ 3. Very little of my time
- ☐ 4. I was never alone

54. As an adolescent, how much time did you spend alone?

- ☐ 1. Most of my time
- ☐ 2. Moderate amount of time
- ☐ 3. Very little of my time
- ☐ 4. I was never alone

55. Would you describe yourself while you were growing up as:

- ☐ 1. Very lonely
- ☐ 2. Lonely
- ☐ 3. Somewhat lonely
- ☐ 4. I was never lonely

FOLLOWING IS A LIST OF ONE-WORD DESCRIPTIONS. PLEASE RATE EACH OF THESE ONE-WORD DESCRIPTIONS IN TERMS OF WHAT YOU WERE LIKE AS A CHILD. USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE:

1. Very much like me
2. Like me
3. Unlike me
4. Very much unlike me

56. Rambunctious	1	2	3	4
57. Sensual	1	2	3	4
58. Passive	1	2	3	4
59. Underweight	1	2	3	4
60. Fearful	1	2	3	4
61. Frail	1	2	3	4
62. Curious	1	2	3	4
63. Troublemaker	1	2	3	4
64. Outgoing	1	2	3	4
65. Popular	1	2	3	4
66. Misfit	1	2	3	4
67. Shy	1	2	3	4
68. Leader	1	2	3	4
69. Creative	1	2	3	4
70. Ingenious	1	2	3	4
71. Aggressive	1	2	3	4
72. Serious	1	2	3	4
73. Overweight	1	2	3	4
74. Adventurous	1	2	3	4
75. Nervous	1	2	3	4
76. Introverted	1	2	3	4

77. How far do you live now from the place you spent most of the time while you were growing up?

- ☐ 1. Within 10 miles
- ☐ 2. 11-50 miles
- ☐ 3. 51-100 miles
- ☐ 4. 101-200 miles
- ☐ 5. 201-300 miles
- ☐ 6. 301-500 miles
- ☐ 7. 501-1000 miles
- ☐ 8. Over 1000 miles

78. How do you feel about the distance you now live from the place you grew up?

- ☐ 1. I live too far from my hometown
- ☐ 2. I live about the right distance from my hometown
- ☐ 3. I live too close to my hometown

79. In general, how would you rate your physical health now?

- ☐ 1. Excellent
- ☐ 2. Good
- ☐ 3. Fair
- ☐ 4. Poor
- ☐ 5. Very poor

80. Do you have a pet or pets that you care about?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No

81. Do you have a hobby or hobbies?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No

82. About how much time do you spend on your hobbies?

- ☐ 1. No time--I have no hobbies
- ☐ 2. Less than one hour per week
- ☐ 3. One to five hours per week
- ☐ 4. Five to ten hours per week
- ☐ 5. Ten to fifteen hours per week
- ☐ 6. Fifteen to twenty hours per week
- ☐ 7. Over twenty hours per week

83. Do you enjoy watching a sport or sports?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No

84. Do you enjoy playing a sport or sports?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No

85. How much energy do you have compared to other people your age?

- ☐ 1. Much more energy
- ☐ 2. Somewhat more energy
- ☐ 3. About the same
- ☐ 4. Somewhat less energy
- ☐ 5. Much less energy

86. How attractive are you compared to others of your age?

- ☐ 1. Much more attractive
- ☐ 2. Somewhat more attractive
- ☐ 3. About the same
- ☐ 4. Somewhat less attractive
- ☐ 5. Much less attractive

87. How do you feel about the pace of your life?

- ☐ 1. Always feel rushed
- ☐ 2. Sometimes feel rushed
- ☐ 3. Just about right
- ☐ 4. Sometimes too slow
- ☐ 5. Always too slow

88. How much of the time do you have control over the pace of your life?

- ☐ 1. Always
- ☐ 2. Most of the time
- ☐ 3. Some of the time
- ☐ 4. Very little of the time
- ☐ 5. Never

89. How satisfied are you with the allotment of your time? (time spent in various activities)

- ☐ 1. Very satisfied
- ☐ 2. Satisfied
- ☐ 3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- ☐ 4. Dissatisfied
- ☐ 5. Very dissatisfied

90. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?  
I feel that my life has meaning and direction.

- ☐ 1. Strongly agree
- ☐ 2. Moderately agree
- ☐ 3. Slightly agree
- ☐ 4. Slightly disagree
- ☐ 5. Moderately disagree
- ☐ 6. Strongly disagree

91. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?  
Being ambitious and getting ahead in life is important to me.

☐ 1. Strongly agree  
☐ 2. Moderately agree  
☐ 3. Slightly agree  
☐ 4. Slightly disagree  
☐ 5. Moderately disagree  
☐ 6. Strongly disagree

92. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?  
Being independent and self-reliant is important to me.

☐ 1. Strongly agree  
☐ 2. Moderately agree  
☐ 3. Slightly agree  
☐ 4. Slightly disagree  
☐ 5. Moderately disagree  
☐ 6. Strongly disagree

93. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?  
I am a competitive person.

☐ 1. Strongly agree  
☐ 2. Moderately agree  
☐ 3. Slightly agree  
☐ 4. Slightly disagree  
☐ 5. Moderately disagree  
☐ 6. Strongly disagree

PLEASE RATE THE IMPORTANCE OF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING TO YOUR GENERAL SATISFACTION WITH LIFE. USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE:

1. Very important  
 2. Moderately important  
 3. Slightly important  
 4. Not at all important

94. Marriage or primary relationships	1	2	3	4
95. My children	1	2	3	4
96. My friends	1	2	3	4
97. My job	1	2	3	4
98. My home	1	2	3	4
99. My sex life	1	2	3	4
100. Education	1	2	3	4
101. Hobbies	1	2	3	4
102. Health	1	2	3	4
103. Love	1	2	3	4
104. Physical activity	1	2	3	4
105. Spending time alone	1	2	3	4
106. Making money	1	2	3	4
107. Recreation or playing	1	2	3	4
108. Relaxation	1	2	3	4

109. Is what you do in your spare time satisfying to you?
- ☐ 1. Most of the time
  - ☐ 2. Some of the time
  - ☐ 3. Little of the time
  - ☐ 4. None of the time
110. How competent do you feel at making common household repairs?
- ☐ 1. Very competent
  - ☐ 2. Somewhat competent
  - ☐ 3. Slightly competent
  - ☐ 4. Not at all competent
111. About how many hours do you sleep per day?
- ☐ 1. Less than 2 hours
  - ☐ 2. 3 to 4 hours
  - ☐ 3. 5 to 7 hours
  - ☐ 4. 8 to 9 hours
  - ☐ 5. 10 to 12 hours
  - ☐ 6. Over 12 hours
112. How meaningful do you find your work to be?
- ☐ 1. Very meaningful
  - ☐ 2. Somewhat meaningful
  - ☐ 3. Slightly meaningful
  - ☐ 4. Not at all meaningful
113. How satisfying is your job to you?
- ☐ 1. Very satisfying
  - ☐ 2. Somewhat satisfying
  - ☐ 3. Slightly satisfying
  - ☐ 4. Not at all satisfying
114. How do you generally feel when you are at work?
- ☐ 1. Excited
  - ☐ 2. Happy
  - ☐ 3. Relaxed
  - ☐ 4. Tense
  - ☐ 5. Angry
  - ☐ 6. No different than other times
  - ☐ 7. Cannot wait to get home
115. Generally what kind of relationship do you have with most of your co-workers?
- ☐ 1. Warm and close
  - ☐ 2. Friendly, but not particularly close
  - ☐ 3. Fairly cold and distant
  - ☐ 4. I do not relate to my co-workers

116. How do you get along with your supervisor or boss?
- ☐ 1. I have no supervisor or boss
  - ☐ 2. Very well
  - ☐ 3. Moderately well
  - ☐ 4. I am neutral toward this person
  - ☐ 5. Not very well
  - ☐ 6. Definitely not at all well
117. How often do you think of getting another job?
- ☐ 1. Daily
  - ☐ 2. Once a week
  - ☐ 3. Once a month
  - ☐ 4. Never
118. About how much time do you spend preparing for your job?  
(outside your actual work day)
- ☐ 1. Less than one hour per day
  - ☐ 2. One or two hours per day
  - ☐ 3. More than two hours per day
119. How committed do you feel to your work?
- ☐ 1. Very committed
  - ☐ 2. Committed
  - ☐ 3. Somewhat committed
  - ☐ 4. Uncommitted
120. How would you rate your success at what you do for a living?
- ☐ 1. Very successful
  - ☐ 2. Successful
  - ☐ 3. Somewhat successful
  - ☐ 4. Unsuccessful
121. How do you generally feel when you go home from work?
- ☐ 1. Tired, but happy
  - ☐ 2. Lively and exhilarated
  - ☐ 3. Irritated and upset
  - ☐ 4. Exhausted and drained
122. To what extent is the following statement true of you?  
My work is very much integrated with the rest of my life.
- ☐ 1. Very true of me
  - ☐ 2. Moderately true of me
  - ☐ 3. Slightly true of me
  - ☐ 4. Not true of me

123. What is your current marital status?

- ☐ 1. Single
- ☐ 2. Married, first time
- ☐ 3. Married, more than once
- ☐ 4. Divorced or separated
- ☐ 5. Widowed
- ☐ 6. Cohabiting on a long-term basis

124. How old were you when you first married or began a long-term relationship?

- ☐ 1. 16-18
- ☐ 2. 19-20
- ☐ 3. 21-22
- ☐ 4. 23-25
- ☐ 5. 25-30
- ☐ 6. Over 30

125. Are you now in love?

- ☐ 1. Yes, for the first time
- ☐ 2. Yes, but not for the first time
- ☐ 3. No, but I have been
- ☐ 4. I have never been in love

IF YOU ARE NOT MARRIED, OR IN A LONG-TERM RELATIONSHIP, PLEASE GO TO  
ITEM NUMBER 138

126. In many relationships, one person loves more than the other.  
Who now loves more in your relationship?

- ☐ 1. My love is not returned
- ☐ 2. I love more
- ☐ 3. We love equally
- ☐ 4. I do not return my partner's love
- ☐ 5. My partner loves me more than I love him/her

127. Considering only the relationship you are in now, how long have  
you been married or living with his person?

- ☐ 1. Less than 1 year
- ☐ 2. 1-2 years
- ☐ 3. 3-4 years
- ☐ 4. 5-10 years
- ☐ 5. 10-15 years
- ☐ 6. Over 15 years

128. Overall, my relationship with my partner is

- ☐ 1. Very satisfying
- ☐ 2. Satisfying
- ☐ 3. Somewhat satisfying
- ☐ 4. Not at all satisfying



129. About how much do you and your partner argue?

- ☐ 1. Most of the time
- ☐ 2. Sometimes
- ☐ 3. Very little
- ☐ 4. We never argue

130. When you and your partner argue do you resolve your differences?

- ☐ 1. Most of the time
- ☐ 2. Sometimes
- ☐ 3. Very little
- ☐ 4. Never

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING DO YOU FEEL FREE TO SHARE WITH YOUR PARTNER?  
CHECK ALL THAT APPLY TO YOU.

131. ☐ I share things that happen to me away from home (e.g., at work).

132. ☐ I share warm and positive feelings toward my partner.

133. ☐ I share negative feelings toward my partner.

134. ☐ I share my fears and anxieties.

135. ☐ I share my hopes and dreams for the future.

136. While married or in a permanent relationship, have you ever had sex with someone other than your spouse?

- ☐ 1. Never
- ☐ 2. One long-term affair
- ☐ 3. One brief encounter
- ☐ 4. Two to five partners
- ☐ 5. Six to ten partners
- ☐ 6. More than ten partners

137. Do you feel that your partner respects your opinions, thoughts, and ideas?

- ☐ 1. All of the time
- ☐ 2. Most of the time
- ☐ 3. Some of the time
- ☐ 4. Very little of the time
- ☐ 5. None of the time

138. In general, how satisfied are you with your sex life?

- ☐ 1. Very satisfied
- ☐ 2. Somewhat satisfied
- ☐ 3. Somewhat dissatisfied
- ☐ 4. Very dissatisfied

139. How many children do you have now?

- ☐ 1. None, do not plan to have any
- ☐ 2. None, plan to have one or more
- ☐ 3. None, cannot have any for medical reasons
- ☐ 4. One
- ☐ 5. Two
- ☐ 6. Three
- ☐ 7. Four or five
- ☐ 8. Six or more

IF YOU HAVE NO CHILDREN, GO TO ITEM NUMBER 143

140. If you were starting again, how many children would you have?

- ☐ 1. None
- ☐ 2. One
- ☐ 3. Two
- ☐ 4. Three or four
- ☐ 5. Five or more

141. All things considered, how would you rate your success as a parent?

- ☐ 1. Very successful
- ☐ 2. Successful
- ☐ 3. Moderately successful
- ☐ 4. Unsuccessful

142. All things considered, how much of the time do you enjoy having children?

- ☐ 1. All of the time
- ☐ 2. Most of the time
- ☐ 3. Some of the time
- ☐ 4. Very little of the time
- ☐ 5. None of the time

USE THESE CATEGORIES TO ANSWER QUESTIONS 143 through 146

- 1. Rural: up to 10,000 population
- 2. Town: 10,000 to 25,000
- 3. Small city: 25,000 to 100,000
- 4. Medium city: 100,000 to half million
- 5. Suburb of small or medium city
- 6. Large city: half million to one million
- 7. Metropolis: over one million
- 8. Suburb of large city or metropolis

PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER:

143. Where did you live during most of your childhood?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

144. Where have you lived most of the time since the age of 18?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

145. Where do you live now?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

146. If you had no responsibilities and could live anywhere you liked, where would that be?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

147. How often do you feel you would like to move to a completely new locality?

- ☐ 1. All of the time
- ☐ 2. Most of the time
- ☐ 3. Some of the time
- ☐ 4. Little of the time
- ☐ 5. Not at all

148. In which type of dwelling do you currently reside?

- ☐ 1. House
- ☐ 2. Apartment
- ☐ 3. Duplex
- ☐ 4. Condominium
- ☐ 5. Room
- ☐ 6. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

149. How often do you feel that you would like to move to a different type of home (i.e., from an apartment to a house)?

- ☐ 1. All of the time
- ☐ 2. Most of the time
- ☐ 3. Some of the time
- ☐ 4. Little of the time
- ☐ 5. Not at all

150. For me to be satisfied with the kind of person I am:

- ☐ 1. I must be involved in a church
- ☐ 2. Involvement with a church is not important

151. Which statement best characterizes your belief in God or a supreme being?

- ☐ 1. I cannot believe in God or a supreme being
- ☐ 2. I believe in a supreme power which is impersonal
- ☐ 3. I believe in a personal God
- ☐ 4. Not sure
- ☐ 5. None of the above

152. How important is religion to you now?

- ☐ 1. Very important
- ☐ 2. Moderately important
- ☐ 3. Slightly important
- ☐ 4. Not at all important

153. Do you believe in life after death?

- ☐ 1. No, I do not believe in any life after death
- ☐ 2. I am not sure
- ☐ 3. Yes, there must be something beyond death
- ☐ 4. Yes, I have definite beliefs about the after

154. Was religion important to you as you were growing up?

- ☐ 1. Very important
- ☐ 2. Moderately important
- ☐ 3. Slightly important
- ☐ 4. Not at all important

## APPENDIX C

COMPLETE ITEM STATISTICS FOR GENERAL SATISFACTION,  
RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION, WORK SATISFACTION, AND  
CHILD SATISFACTION SCALES AND ORIGIN OF ITEM

## APPENDIX C

### COMPLETE ITEM STATISTICS FOR GENERAL SATISFACTION, RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION, WORK SATISFACTION, AND CHILD SATISFACTION SCALES AND ORIGIN OF ITEM

#### General Satisfaction

	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>
6. Is what you do in your spare time satisfying to you?		
1. Almost none of the time	3	1.3%
2. Some of the time	67	29.1
3. Most of the time	140	60.9
4. All of the time	20	8.7
Mean = 2.770		
S.D. = .616		
Item-scale $r$ = .4216		
8. In general, how would you rate your physical health now?		
1. Excellent	126	54.8%
2. Good	83	36.1
3. Fair	16	7.0
4. Poor	4	1.7
5. Very poor	1	0.4
Mean = 1.570		
S.D. = .737		
Item-scale $r$ = .3721		
11. In general, how satisfying do you find the way you are spending your life? <sup>150</sup>		
1. Very satisfying	71	30.9%
2. Moderately satisfying	124	53.9
3. Slightly satisfying	18	7.8
4. Slightly unsatisfying	10	4.3
5. Moderately unsatisfying	5	2.2
6. Very unsatisfying	1	0.4

---

<sup>150</sup>Converse & Robinson, op. cit.

	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>
11. Cont'd.		
Mean = 1.939		
S.D. = .911		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .6398		
12. How optimistic or pessimistic about your life would you say you are? <sup>151</sup>		
1. Very optimistic	90	39.1%
2. Moderately optimistic	97	42.2
3. Slightly optimistic	22	9.6
4. Slightly pessimistic	13	5.7
5. Moderately pessimistic	6	2.6
6. Very pessimistic	1	0.4
Mean = 1.913		
S.D. = 1.009		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .6193		
13. How often do you feel you have an opportunity to do what you want to do?		
1. All of the time	9	3.9%
2. Most of the time	145	63.0
3. Some of the time	63	27.4
4. Almost none of the time	12	5.2
5. None of the time	0	0.0
Mean = 2.341		
S.D. = .513		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .6148		
14. How much energy do you have compared to other people of your age?		
1. Much more energy	48	21.0%
2. Somewhat more energy	94	41.0
3. About the same amount of energy	73	31.9
4. Somewhat less energy	14	6.1
5. Much less energy	0	0.0

---

<sup>151</sup>Freedman, J., & Shaver, P., Jefferson's artful  
dodger: A questionnaire. What makes you happy? Psychology  
Today, 1975, 9, 66-72.

	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>
14. Cont'd.		
Mean = 2.341		
S.D. = .850		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .3562		
17. How often do you feel depressed?		
1. Almost none of the time	82	35.8%
2. Some of the time	140	61.1
3. Most of the time	7	3.1
4. All of the time	0	0.0
Mean = 1.672		
S.D. = .532		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .5360		
19. Compared to most of your acquaintances how happy are you? <sup>152</sup>		
1. I am happier than my acquaintances	40	17.4%
2. I am somewhat happier than my acquaintances	77	33.5
3. I am about as happy as my acquaintances	102	44.3
4. I am somewhat less happy than my acquaintances	11	4.8
Mean = 2.087		
S.D. = .909		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .4379		
21. How much of the time are you bored? <sup>153</sup>		
1. All of the time	1	0.4%
2. Most of the time	8	3.5
3. Some of the time	111	48.3
4. Almost none of the time	110	47.8
Mean = 3.435		
S.D. = .586		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .3722		

---

<sup>152</sup>Ibid.

<sup>153</sup>Ibid.



	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>
22. To what extent do you agree with this statement? I feel that my life has meaning and direction. <sup>154</sup>		
1. Strongly agree	111	48.3%
2. Moderately agree	80	34.8
3. Slightly agree	5	2.2
4. Slightly disagree	5	2.2
5. Moderately disagree	2	1.7
6. Strongly disagree	2	0.9
Mean = 1.770		
S.D. = .968		
Item-scale $r$ = .5002		
24. How often do you feel your life is full of overwhelming problems that cannot be solved?		
1. All of the time	1	0.4%
2. Most of the time	4	1.7
3. Some of the time	56	24.3
4. Very little of the time	120	52.2
5. Never	49	21.3
Mean = 3.922		
S.D. = .749		
Item-scale $r$ = .4994		
25. How successful have you been in achieving the goals and aims in your life?		
1. Very successful	69	29.6%
2. Moderately successful	125	54.3
3. Slightly successful	26	11.3
4. Slightly unsuccessful	7	3.0
5. Moderately unsuccessful	3	1.3
6. Very unsuccessful	1	0.4
Mean = 1.935		
S.D. = .846		
Item-scale $r$ = .518		

---

<sup>154</sup>Ibid.

	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>
27. How much of the time do you have control over the <u>pace</u> of your life? <sup>155</sup>		
1. Almost none of the time	29	12.7%
2. Some of the time	76	33.2
3. Most of the time	107	46.7
4. All of the time	17	7.4

Mean = 2.489

S.D. = .809

Item-scale  $r$  = .4338

#### Work Satisfaction

5. How enjoyable do you find your work to be?		
1. Very enjoyable	113	49.1%
2. Moderately enjoyable	91	39.6
3. Slightly enjoyable	21	9.1
4. Not at all enjoyable	4	1.7

Mean = 1.633

S.D. = .668

Item-scale  $r$  = .7453

7. How well do you get along with your supervisor or boss? <sup>156</sup>		
1. Very well	140	60.9%
2. Moderately well	65	28.3
3. I am neutral toward this person	11	4.8
4. Not very well	3	1.3
5. Definitely not at all well	4	1.7

Mean = 1.502

S.D. = .805

Item-scale  $r$  = .3122

---

<sup>155</sup>Ibid.

<sup>156</sup>Ibid.

	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>
9. To what extent do you feel that you receive appropriate recognition for your contributions at work?		
1. I receive more than enough recognition	32	14.0%
2. I receive an adequate amount of recognition	149	65.1
3. I receive little recognition	43	18.8
4. I receive no recognition	5	2.2
Mean = 2.092		
S.D. = .639		
Item-scale $r$ = .4219		
10. How committed do you feel to your work?		
1. Very committed	103	44.8%
2. Moderately committed	100	43.5
3. Slightly committed	14	6.1
4. Slightly uncommitted	2	0.9
5. Moderately uncommitted	6	2.1
6. Very uncommitted	5	1.3
Mean = 1.759		
S.D. = .970		
Item-scale $r$ = .6203		
15. How satisfying is your job to you?		
1. Very satisfying	80	34.9%
2. Moderately satisfying	111	48.5
3. Slightly unsatisfying	23	10.0
4. Slightly unsatisfying	6	2.6
5. Moderately unsatisfying	6	2.6
6. Very unsatisfying	3	1.3
Mean = 1.934		
S.D. = .850		
Item-scale $r$ = .7856		

	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>
16. If you suddenly inherited a large fortune, would you continue in your present work? <sup>157,158</sup>		
1. Definitely not	37	16.1%
2. Probably not	47	20.4
3. Not sure	28	12.2
4. Probably yes	80	34.8
5. Definitely yes	37	16.1
Mean = 3.144		
S.D. = 1.354		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .485		
18. How meaningful do you find your work to be?		
1. Very meaningful	91	42.6%
2. Moderately meaningful	98	42.6
3. Slightly meaningful	28	12.2
4. Not at all meaningful	6	2.6
Mean = 1.748		
S.D. = .909		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .7707		
20. Do you feel that your present job is the right job for you?		
1. Yes	60	26.2%
2. Yes, with some reservations	108	47.2
3. No, with some reservations	38	16.6
4. No	22	9.6
Mean = 2.087		
S.D. = .586		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .581		

---

<sup>157</sup>Ibid.

<sup>158</sup>Morse & Weiss, op. cit.

	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>
23. Generally how well do you get along with your co-workers?		
1. Very well	167	73.6
2. Moderately well	56	24.7
3. Slightly well	4	1.8
4. Not at all well	0	0.0
Mean = 1.282		
S.D. = .489		
Item-scale $r$ = .2102		
26. Sometimes people feel they are not doing as good a job at work as they would like to. How true is this for you?		
1. True of me	25	11.0%
2. Somewhat true of me	100	43.9
3. Somewhat untrue of me	42	18.4
4. Not true of me	61	26.8
Mean = 2.610		
S.D. = .998		
Item-scale $r$ = .1292		

#### Relationship Satisfaction

30. To what degree do you feel that you and your spouse or partner are compatible?		
1. Not compatible	2	1.1%
2. Slightly compatible	12	6.9
3. Moderately compatible	48	27.6
4. Very compatible	112	64.6
Mean = 3.552		
S.D. = .676		
Item-scale $r$ = .7758		
31. Overall, my relationship with my partner is:		
1. Very satisfying	104	59.8%
2. Moderately satisfying	53	30.5
3. Slightly satisfying	3	1.7
4. Slightly unsatisfying	3	1.7
5. Moderately unsatisfying	4	2.3
6. Very unsatisfying	7	4.0

	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>
31. Cont'd.		
Mean = 1.684		
S.D. = 1.201		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .6541		
32. How close do you feel to your spouse or partner?		
1. Not close at all	2	1.1%
2. Slightly close	9	5.2
3. Moderately close	41	23.6
4. Very close	122	70.1
Mean = 3.626		
S.D. = .639		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .7538		
33. How exciting is your relationship with your spouse or partner?		
1. Very exciting	48	27.6%
2. Moderately exciting	92	52.9
3. Neither exciting nor dull	26	14.9
4. Moderately dull	8	4.6
5. Very dull	0	0.0
Mean = 1.966		
S.D. = .782		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .7538		
34. How satisfied are you with your sexual experiences with your partner or spouse?		
1. Very dissatisfied	10	5.8
2. Moderately dissatisfied	5	2.9
3. Slightly dissatisfied	9	5.9
4. Slightly satisfied	3	1.7
5. Moderately satisfied	84	48.6
6. Very satisfied	62	35.8
Mean = 4.919		
S.D. = 1.331		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .6208		

	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>
35. If you were to "start all over again" would you want a relationship with your present spouse or partner?		
1. Yes, definitely	120	68.6%
2. Yes, maybe	42	24.0
3. Probably not	9	5.1
4. Definitely not	4	2.3
Mean = 1.411		
S.D. = .696		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .6718		
36. How much of the time do you feel that your spouse or partner provides you with the companionship that you want?		
1. None of the time	2	1.1%
2. Very little of the time	11	6.3
3. Some of the time	29	16.7
4. Most of the time	99	56.9
5. All of the time	33	19.0
Mean = 3.862		
S.D. = .853		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .6735		
37. About how much of the time do you and your partner argue?		
1. We never argue	8	4.6%
2. Very little of the time	103	59.2
3. Some of the time	60	34.5
4. Most of the time	3	1.7
Mean = 2.333		
S.D. = .592		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .2890		
38. Do you feel that your partner respects your opinions, thoughts, and ideas?		
1. Yes	128	73.6%
2. Yes, with some reservations	40	23.0
3. No, with some reservations	3	1.7
4. No	3	1.7
Mean = 1.316		
S.D. = .597		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .6299		

	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>
39. Are you now in love with your spouse or partner?		
1. Yes, definitely	135	77.6%
2. Yes, probably	31	17.8
3. Probably not	6	3.4
4. Definitely not	2	1.1
Mean = 1.282		
S.D. = .585		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .7308		
40. When you and your partner argue do you resolve your differences?		
1. Most of the time	135	78.9%
2. Some of the time	26	17.8
3. Very little of the time	4	3.4
4. Never	2	1.1
Mean = 1.269		
S.D. = .562		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .5726		
41. How secure do you feel in your relationship with your spouse or partner?		
1. Very secure	118	67.8%
2. Moderately secure	41	23.6
3. Slightly secure	7	4.0
4. Insecure	8	4.6
Mean = 1.385		
S.D. = .693		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .6860		
42. How close do you think your spouse or partner feels to you?		
1. Very close	124	71.3%
2. Moderately close	37	21.3
3. Slightly close	9	5.2
4. Not close at all	4	2.3
Mean = 1.385		
S.D. = .693		
Item-scale <u>r</u> = .7314		



Child Satisfaction

	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>
Do you feel you are the parent you would like to be?		
1. Usually	57	56.0%
2. More often than not	29	32.0
3. Seldom	10	11.0
4. Never	1	1.0

Mean = 2.962

S.D. = 1.013

How close do you feel to your children?

1. Very close	61	67.0%
2. Moderately close	26	29.0
3. Slightly close	4	4.0
4. Not at all close	0	0.0

Mean = 1.347

S.D. = .571

How much of the time do you enjoy being with your children?

1. None of the time	0	0.0%
2. Very little of the time	0	0.0
3. Some of the time	18	21.0
4. Most of the time	57	62.0
5. All of the time	15	17.0

Mean = 3.956

S.D. = .613

APPENDIX D

COMPLETE FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR PRINCIPAL  
FACTORS SOLUTION

# APPENDIX D

## COMPLETE FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR PRINCIPAL FACTORS SOLUTION

Table D1: Principal-Factor Factor Analysis Loadings<sup>a</sup>

Item	Factor								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
V6 Satisfaction With Spare Time	.372								
V8 Physical Health	.352					.355			
V11 Satisfaction With Life	.601	.311							
V12 Optimism About Life	.601			-.345		-.328			
V13 Life's Opportunities	.561	.298			.317			-.300	
V14 Energy					.327				
V17 Not Depressed	.477		.315						
V19 Happiness	.497								
V21 Not Bored	.369	.315			.306				
V22 Life Has Meaning	.424	.294					.358		
V24 No Overwhelming Problems	.451			-.341					
V25 Achievement of Goals	.416	.326							
V27 Control Over Pace of Life	.384								
V5 Enjoyment of Work	.562	.512	-.297						
V7 Get Along With Boss	.336								
V9 Recognition at Work	.394				-.377	.387			

Table D1: Continued

Item	Factor								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
V10 Job Commitment	.416	.499							
V15 Job Satisfaction	.597	.547	-.301						
V16 Would Not Quit Present Job	.322	.400							
V18 Meaningful Job	.531	.545	-.402						
V20 Right Job	.370	.543							
V23 Get Along With Co-workers	.294							.291	
V26 Doing a Good Job?									
V30 Compatability	.631	-.516							
V31 Overall Relationship	.564	-.398							
V32 Closeness	.546	-.595							
V33 Excitement	.581	-.296							
V34 Sexual Satisfaction	.324	-.303							
V35 Start Over With Partner	.548	-.489							
V36 Companionship	.672	-.324							
V37 Lack of Arguments	.311							.414	
V38 Partner Respects Opinions	.561	-.374							
V39 Love	.543	-.535							

Table D1: Continued

Item	Factor								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
V40 Resolve Differences	.541	-.325							.309
V41 Security	.644	-.392						-.295	
V42 Closeness	.612	-.485							
V45 Ideal Parent?			.454	.356					
V46 Closeness to Children			.523	.483					
V47 Enjoyment of Children	3.10		.520	.389					

<sup>a</sup>Only items with loadings above .25 have been included.

APPENDIX E

COMPLETE FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR  
VARIMAX ROTATION

# APPENDIX E

## COMPLETE FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR VARIMAX ROTATION

Table E1: Varimax Rotation--Factor Analysis Loadings<sup>a</sup>

Item	Factor								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
V6 Satisfaction With Spare Time			.329		.405				
V8 Physical Health					.506				
V11 Satisfaction With Life			.565						
V12 Optimism About Life			.579				.423		
V13 Life's Opportunities		.297	.552						
V14 Energy					.529				
V17 Not Depressed			.534						
V19 Happiness			.486						
V21 Not Bored		.383		.339	.382				
V22 Life Has Meaning			.344				.531		
V24 No Overwhelming Problems			.485						.294

Table E1: Continued

Item	Factor								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
V25 Achievement of Goals					.439				
V27 Control Over Pace of Life			.516						
V5 Enjoyment of Work		.765							
V7 Get Along With Boss					.538				
V9 Recognition at Work					.512			.301	
V10 Job Commitment		.732							
V15 Job Satisfaction		.830							
V16 Would Not Quit Present Job		.583							
V18 Meaningful Job		.854							
V20 Right Job		.658							
V23 Get Along With Co-workers						.472			
V26 Doing a Good Job?									
V30 Compatability	.817								
V31 Overall Relationship	.669								



Table E1: Continued

Item	Factor								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
V32 Closeness	.831								
V33 Excitement	.639								
V34 Sexual Satisfaction	.462								
V35 Start Over With Partner	.755								
V36 Companionship	.646		.316						
V37 Lack of Arguments									.475
V38 Partner Respects Opinions	.609								
V39 Love	.809								
V40 Resolve Differences	.541							.401	
V41 Security	.714							.356	
V42 Closeness	.760								
V45 Ideal Parent?				.684					
V46 Closeness to Children				.712					
V47 Enjoyment of Children				.671					

<sup>a</sup>Only items with loadings above .25 have been included.

APPENDIX F

CORRELATION MATRIX FOR ALL VARIABLES  
USED IN THE STUDY

**Table F1: Correlation Matrix for All Variables Used in the Study (N = 228)**

[illegible]

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aller, F. Role of the self-concept in student marital adjustment. Family Life Coordinator, 1962, 11, 43-45.
- Allport, G. Becoming. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.
- Andrews, Frank M., & Withey, Stephen B. Developing measures of perceived life quality: Results from several national surveys. Social Indicators Research, 1974, 1, 1-26.
- Bernard, J. The future of marriage. New York: Bantam Books, 1972.
- Bradburn, Norman M. The structure of psychological well-being. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.
- Bradburn, Norman M., & Caplovitz, D. Reports on happiness. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.
- Bullock, Robert P. Social factors related to job satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1952.
- Campbell, A. Subjective measures of well-being. American Psychologist, 1976, 31, 117-124.
- Campbell, A., Converse, Phillip E., & Rodgers, W. The quality of American Life: Perceptions, evaluations, and satisfactions. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.
- Cantril, H. The pattern of human concerns. New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1965.
- Clauser, R. A., & Hjelle, L. A. Relationship between locus of control and dogmatism. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26, 1006.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum Associates, 1975.

- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfield, F. D., & York, R. L. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966. (Report from the Office of Education)
- Converse, P., & Robinson, J. The use of time: Activities of urban and suburban populations in twelve countries. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton, 1972.
- Cook, T. D. The potential and limitations of secondary evaluations. Chapter 6, pp. 155-234 in M. W. Apple, H. S. Jakoviac, & J. R. Lufer (Eds.), Educational evaluation: Analysis and responsibility. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974.
- Cornfield, J., & Tukey, J. W. Average values of mean squares in factorials. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 1956, 27, 907-949.
- Crandall, R. The measurement of self-esteem and related constructs. In J. P. Robinson & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor: The Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1973.
- Cronbach, Lee J. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 1951, 16, 297-334.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 349-354.
- Ebel, Robert L. Essentials of educational measurement. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Feather, N. T. Some personality correlates of external control. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1967, 19, 253-259.
- Fish, B., & Karabenick, S. Relationship between self-esteem and locus of control. Psychological Reports, 1971, 29, 784.
- Fitts, William H. Manual for the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

- Fitts, William H., Adams, Jennie L., Radford, G., Richard, Wayne C., Thomas, Barbara K., Thomas, Murphy M., & Thompson, W. The self-concept and self-actualization. Research Monograph III. Nashville, Tennessee: Dede Wallace Center, 1971.
- Flanagan, John C. Education's contribution to the quality of life of a national sample of 30 year olds. Educational Researcher, 1975, 4, 13-16.
- Freedman, J., & Shaver, P. Jefferson's artful dodger: A questionnaire. What makes you happy? Psychology Today, 1975, 9, 66-72.
- Glass, G. V., & Stanley, J. C. Statistical methods in education and psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Glenn, N. D. The contribution of marriage to the psychological well-being of males and females. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1975, 37, 66-72.
- Gorsuch, R. L. Factor analysis. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1974.
- Gough, Harrison G. The California Psychological Inventory test booklet. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1956.
- Gurin, G., Veroff, J., & Feld, S. Americans view their mental health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Harrison, F. T. Relationship between home background, school success, and adolescent attitudes. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1968, 14, 331-344.
- Heaton, Ronald C., & Duerfeldt, Pryse H. The relationship between self-esteem, self-reinforcement, and the internal-external personality dimension. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1973, 123, 3-13.
- Hersch, P. D., & Schiebe, K. E. On the reliability and validity of internal-external control as a personality dimension. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1967, 31, 609-614.
- Hovland, C., & Janis, I. (Eds.). Personality and persuasibility. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1959.

- Kerlinger, Fred N., & Pedhauzer, Elazar J. Multiple regression in behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Klecka, W. Discriminant analysis. In N. H. Nie, C. H. Hull, J. G. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner, & D. H. Bent. Statistical package for the social sciences manual (2nd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Knupfer, G., & Clark, R. The mental health of the unmarried. The American Journal of Psychiatry, 1966, 122, 841-851.
- Lefcourt, Herbert M. Recent developments in the study of locus of control. In B. A. Maher (Ed.). Progress in experimental personality research (Vol. 6). New York: Academic Press, 1972.
- Lessing, E. E. Racial differences in indices of eye functioning relevant to academic achievement. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1969, 115, 153-167.
- Levy, S., & Guttman, L. On the multivariate structure of well-being. Social Indicators Research, 1975, 2, 361-388.
- Locke, H., & Wallace, Karl M. Short marital adjustment prediction tests: The reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 1959, 21, 251-255.
- Lowenthal, M. F., Thurnher, M., & Chiriboga, D. Four stages of life. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.
- MacDonald, A. P. Internal-external locus of control. In J. P. Robinson & P. R. Shaver (Eds.). Measures of social-psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1973.
- MacMillan, A. M. The Health Opinion Survey: Techniques for estimating prevalence of psychoneurotic and related types of disorders in communities. Psychological Reports, 1957, 3, 325-339.
- Maslow, A. Toward a psychology of being. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1962.



- McCahan, George R. The relationship between self-concept and marital satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1975.
- Mehrens, William A., & Lehmann, Irvin J. Measurement and evaluation in education and psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
- Minton, H. L. Power as a personality construct. In B. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research (Vol. 4). New York: Academic Press, 1967.
- Morse, Nancy C., & Weiss, Robert S. The function and meaning of work and the job. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 191-198.
- Neugarten, Bernice L., Havighurst, Robert J., & Tobin, Sheldon S. The measurement of life satisfaction. Journal of Gerontology, 1961, 16, 134-143.
- Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. Manual for the statistical package for the social sciences (2nd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Nye, T. I., & MacDougall, E. The dependent variable in marital research. Pacific Sociological Review, 1959, 2, 67-70.
- Orden, Susan R., & Bradburn, Norman M. Dimensions of marriage happiness. The American Journal of Sociology, 1968, 73, 715-731.
- Organ, Dennis W., & Greene, Charles N. Role ambiguity, locus of control, and work satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 101-102.
- Phares, E. J., Wilson, K. G., & Klyver, N. W. Internal-external control and the attribution of blame under neutral and distractive conditions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 27, 104-105.
- Platt, Jerome J., Eisenman, R., & Darbes, A. Self-esteem and internal-external locus of control: A validation study. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26, 162.

- Platt, Jerome J., Pomeranz, D., & Eisenman, A. Validation of the Eysenck personality inventory by the MMPI and the internal-external locus of control scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1971, 27, 104-105.
- Quinn, R. B., & Mangione, T. W. The 1969-1970 survey of working conditions: Chronicles of an unfinished enterprise. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1972.
- Renne, Karen S. Correlates of dissatisfaction in marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 54-67.
- Rennie, T. A. C. The Yorkville community mental health research study. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Milbank Memorial Fund. New York City, November, 1952.
- Ridley, Carl A. Exploring the impact of work satisfaction and involvement on marital interaction when both partners are employed. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 35, 308-315.
- Robinson, John P., & Shaver, Phillip R. Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor: The Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1973.
- Rodgers, Willard L., & Converse, Phillip E. Measures of the perceived overall quality of life. Social Indicators Research, 1975, 2, 1-23.
- Rotter, Julian B. Social learning and clinical psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1954.
- Rotter, Julian B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1, Whole No. 609).
- Rotter, Julian B., Chance, June E., & Phares, E. J. Applications of a social learning theory of personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.
- Ryckman, R., & Sherman, M. Relationship between self-esteem and internal-external control for men and women. Psychological Reports, 1973, 32, 1106.

- Seashore, Stanley E., & Faber, Thomas B. Job satisfaction indicators and their correlates. American Behavioral Scientist, 1975, 18, 333-367.
- Seeman, M. Alienation and social learning in a reformatory. American Journal of Sociology, 1963, 69 270-284.
- Seeman, M., & Evans, J. W. Alienation and learning in a hospital setting. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 772-783.
- Shaver, P. Measurement of self-esteem and related constructs. In J. P. Robinson and P. R. Shaver (Eds.), Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1969.
- Somers, R. A new asymmetric measure of association for ordinal variables. American Sociological Review, 1969, 27, 799-811.
- Tatsuoka, M. M. Discriminant analysis: The study of group differences. Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970.
- Thompson, W. Correlates of the self-concept. Research Monograph VI. Nashville, Tennessee: Dede Wallace Center, 1972.
- Veroff, J., Feld, S., & Gurin, G. Dimensions of subjective adjustment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 192-245.
- Watson, G. Happiness among adult students of education. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1930, 21, 79-109.
- Wessman, Alden E., & Ricks, David F. Mood and personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1966.
- Wilson, W. Correlates of avowed happiness. Psychological Bulletin, 1967, 67, 294-336.
- Witkin, H. A., Dyk, R. B., Folerson, H. F., Goodenough, D. R., & Karp, S. A. Psychological differentiation. New York: Wiley, 1962.

- Wylie, R. The self-concept. Lincoln, Nebraska: The University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Ziller, R. C., Hagey, J., Smith, M. C., & Long, B. H. Self-esteem: A self-social construct. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 84-95.