

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2001

Differences between personality traits of DCS intake and carrier workers, their goodness of job fit, and its effect on job satisfaction

Diane Lynne Mathis

Virginia Lynne Reed

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mathis, Diane Lynne and Reed, Virginia Lynne, "Differences between personality traits of DCS intake and carrier workers, their goodness of job fit, and its effect on job satisfaction" (2001). *Theses Digitization Project*. 2081.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/2081>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERSONALITY TRAITS OF DCS INTAKE AND
CARRIER WORKERS, THEIR GOODNESS OF JOB FIT, AND ITS EFFECT
ON JOB SATISFACTION

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Social Work

by
Diana Lynne Mathis
Virginia Lynne Reed


June 2001

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERSONALITY TRAITS OF DCS INTAKE AND
CARRIER WORKERS, THEIR GOODNESS OF JOB FIT, AND ITS EFFECT
ON JOB SATISFACTION

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Diana Lynne Mathis
Virginia Lynne Reed
June 2001

Approved by:


Dr. Matt Riggs, Faculty Supervisor
Social Work

6/7/01
Date


Cathy Cimbalo, Director,
Department of Children's Services


Dr. Rosemary McCaslin,
M.S.W. Research Coordinator

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a different personality trait between Department of Children's Services, intake and carrier workers. If there is a difference, does it effect job satisfaction when the worker is placed in a position that is not compatible with their personality trait?

This study was conducted using a correlational design, utilizing a combination of 3 surveys, one for demographic variables, another to measure the level of job satisfaction, and the last measured the personality trait on a continuum level.

The Keirsey Temperament Scale measures eight different personality traits. These personality sub-scale traits are; the extrovert, introvert, sensing, intuitive, thinking, feeling, judgmental, and perceptual. All individuals have all of these eight personality traits but at varying degrees of intensity. This study is going to focus on the perceptive and judgment sub-scale.

The analysis used to test for differences in the perceptive and judgment personality traits between the two groups, intake and carrier, was a t-test. This test

indicated that there were no differences between intake or carrier workers and perceptive or judgment personality traits.

The hypothesis, there will be a positive or negative relationship between social workers that will be moderated by workers who are or are not in their preferred work positions.

The data received from the DCS population consisted of approximately 176 surveys. They were comprised of 25 intake workers, 48 carrier workers and 103 workers in other social work positions. Only seven of the DCS respondents indicated that they were not in their preferred positions. No test was conducted for this hypothesis due to such a small group of workers who indicated that they were not in their preferred position.

Hypothesis 3a, there will be a positive relationship for job satisfaction and perceptive traits for intake workers, and hypothesis 3b there will be a positive relationship for job satisfaction and judgment traits for carrier workers. Results for hypothesis 3a indicated a negative relationship between job satisfaction and perceptive traits for intake workers and a positive

relationship between judgment traits and job satisfaction. Results for 3b also indicated a negative relationship between job satisfaction and the judgment trait, but a positive relationship between job satisfaction and the perceptive trait. A correlational analysis was conducted to examine the strength of the relationship between the two criterion variables.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

 Theory of Personality Traits 10

 Temperament Theory 13

 Personality Tests 14

 Predictability of Personality Tests 15

 Personality Type and Occupation 19

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

 Study Design - Purpose of the Study 25

 Sampling. 27

 Feasibility 32

CHAPTER FOUR: PROCEDURE 35

 Protection of Human Subjects. 37

 Data Analysis 39

CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS 42

CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION 49

APPENDIX A: INFORMATIONAL LETTER. 52

APPENDIX B: APPROVAL LETTER FROM DEPARTMENT
 OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES 54

APPENDIX C: DEBRIEFING STATEMENT 56

APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT 59

APPENDIX E: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	63
APPENDIX F: JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY.	68
APPENDIX G: KIERSEY TEMPERAMENT SCALE.	71
REFERENCES	78
ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITEIS	82

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The position of a Department of Children's Services (DCS) social worker involves a variety of tasks, which include working with clients who are hostile, mentally ill, addicted to drugs, and who have criminal histories. Children that are in the custody of the Department of Children Services have numerous problems such as emotional and cognitive delays, medical and dental needs, and behaviors that are difficult to control.

In addition to the above, there is a tremendous amount of paperwork required by the county, state, and federal governments. Many of the forms are repetitious and cumbersome. Often, the same information is required on each form. Additionally, the state of California and the county are now requiring that all social workers are computer literate. A majority of the paperwork is now being completed using a computer. Paperwork not currently in the computer will be in the near future. The state mandated the integration of the computer at the county level for statewide communication and auditing. This program called the Case Management Services/Child Welfare

Services (CMS/CWS), a multi million dollar program, is currently being used by every DCS worker statewide.

The DCS Social worker has many responsibilities. There is significant pressure to complete referrals and court documents by the state and federal mandated time frames. One of those responsibilities is to testify in court where attorneys often attempt to discredit the social worker on the stand. The attorneys are relentless in questioning the social workers reasoning on how they have handled their client's case, often making it uncomfortable for the social worker.

Another responsibility of the DCS social worker is to be exceptional in their ability to resolve conflict. There are often many conflicts with clients, co-workers, and supervisors about how a case should be handled. Often times the attorney for the parents and the children will have differences in opinions about when to return children or ending services due to noncompliance with the parents. The social worker must apply their skills to resolve these issues and be ready to testify in court regarding their recommendations.

This is an extremely complex job that also has some elements of law enforcement, particularly with regards to investigating and comprehending the legal system. Social workers can only take children into custody where the parents have violated a Welfare and Institutions 300 code. The workers need to be familiar with these codes and be able to file a petition for a detention hearing and have prima facia evidence in order for the minors to be detained into custody.

There are numerous stresses in the job of DCS social workers, which creates a high turnover of employees. The national average that a social worker remains employed with DCS is two years. It is difficult recruiting social workers with the experience, education, and skills needed for these positions. Many social workers are concerned with this issue because they see and feel the high turnover rates. They see their fellow workers leaving and feel their caseloads increasing due to the difficulty recruiting adequate staffing.

Successful case intervention can only be observed after years of case management services, and since cases are divided into different service programs, it is

difficult for the social worker to see the outcome of their work.

There are two different types of social work positions that are the focus of this study. The first type is called "intake" in which the social worker is responsible for investigating referrals and making decisions regarding the safety of a child. The second position, "carrier" begins after the court has jurisdiction over the child and the case is transferred from the intake worker to the carrier worker. The carrier worker provides case management services to clients assisting them in the reunification services. The intake and carrier positions are entirely different. It is the belief of social workers that each job requires a specific personality trait to handle the stresses of the job and maintain job satisfaction.

DCS social workers often state that there is a difference between the characteristics of an intake worker and a carrier worker. Social workers state that it appears Intake workers are independent, self-assured, confident, risk-takers and usually work well under crisis situations. The intake workers tend to have more of the

perceptual (P) personality preference. Persons who have this personality preference tend to prefer to gather more data. They are more flexible and have an adapt as you go and let life happen attitude. They prefer to keep options open and prefer things open-ended.

Intake workers tend to do their investigations unscheduled and without an appointment. They are required to do "24 hour on call duty" which requires them to be out late at night or early mornings picking up minors and taking them into custody. This involves finding placements, notifying the parents of the detention hearing, and filing a petition to detain the minors into the custody of the Department of Children's Services. The petition has to be filed within 48 hours, the detention hearing must be held within 72 hours. The worker then needs to fill out placement packets, input required information into the computers, log the minor's placement, and other various activities. It involves dealing directly with conflict and dealing with minors who have been abused but do not want to be taken into custody.

Carrier workers tend to be more structured, organized, goal oriented, and like to see tangible results

of their work. Carrier workers work the cases after the minors have been taken into custody. They have contact with the minors and their parents monthly. They monitor visitations, and keep track of the parents' compliance with the service plan. Their caseload is more scheduled and planned. They have much more contact with the clients than an intake worker does. Carrier workers tend to have more of the judgmental (J) personality preference, and prefer being settled, decided, fixed, and tend to plan ahead. They also prefer closure, and schedules.

The purpose of this study will be to identify if there is a difference in the temperament of intake and carrier workers. After the personality traits are identified, test or hiring questions can be developed to assist the interviewer in hiring. It is hoped that by determining the personality traits of workers management will be able to place workers in a position more suited to their personality traits, which will create a more satisfied employee who will remain with the department, thus decreasing the turnover rate.

Determining the temperament traits of the intake and carrier positions will enable the agency to offer

employment to individuals whose personalities fit the job description. As well, it will give the agency a tool that will assist recruiters and supervisors in determining which position, intake or carrier would fit the traits of the person that was hired.

The caseloads of DCS workers are high and demanding; thus, even some experienced and qualified workers have a difficult time in handling the caseloads. The high turnover rate has always been an issue for the agency. Caseworkers' leaving the agency is due to many reasons. One possible reason is that social workers are assigned to positions not suited to their personality. It would appear that workers, who are in a position incompatible with their personality, would suffer a higher rate of burnout, which will increase their chances of leaving the agency.

Social workers whose personality traits are incongruent with the position may have an effect on the clients. If a carrier worker is in a position that requires workers to be flexible, go with the flow, and able to deal with a crisis, they will not be satisfied with their job. Their personality traits are stronger in

areas such as organization, planning their day, knowing what to expect. This worker will most likely experience a greater amount of frustration and discomfort in their position as their core needs are not being met. The workers' dissatisfaction with their job may trickle down to the clients, creating less effective intervention with families.

The results of the study could assist this agency and others in determining that if there are specific personality traits more conducive to specific positions. This study will be a success if it is able to provide statistical evidence that certain personality preferences can be used to determine what position would be best for an employee. This would not be the only tool used, but could be considered when placing workers in one of the two positions. If the employee is in the right position for their personality preference, the job satisfaction level should be higher. It is hoped that by placing workers where they will be more productive, happier, and successful, the agency will experience a decrease in the turnover rate.

The research study will determine if there is a specific temperament that can be identified with intake and carrier workers in order to assist supervisors in matching employees in the Department of Children's Services with carrier or intake positions. It will also determine if this is a factor in the level of satisfaction. The three research hypotheses for this study are: 1) the personality characteristics of social workers for the Department of Children's Services of San Bernardino County will be different for those who prefer intake verses those who prefer carrier positions, 2) the intake and carrier social workers who are in their preferred positions will have higher job satisfaction, and 3) intake workers who score high on the sub-scale for Perception will have more job satisfaction than those who score low, and carrier workers who score high on the Judgmental scale will have more job satisfaction.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theory of Personality Traits

In the early twenties, Carl G. Jung (1875-1961) developed the psychological type (also referred to as psychological type/temperaments) theory to explain human personality. The theory of psychological type asserts that human behavior is not random but has identifiable patterns.

Jung's theory of personality types states that characteristic differences in individuals are due to the subtle differences in the cognitive styles used to process the input of the world. Jung's theory posits that individuals are either judging (organizing and prioritizing information to arrive at decisions) or they are perceptive (taking in information) (Jung, 1971). People are born with preferences for the way in which they perceive and judge. These cognitive styles, also referred to as preferences, are primarily sensing, intuitive, thinking, or feeling (Jung, 1991). This determines the kind of information to which individuals pay attention, and the way they process the input of their environment

when making decisions. An individual with intuition preference processes information via unconscious ideas or association and is expressed intuitively. An individual with the preference for sensing is processing directly through the five senses. If the individual has a preference for feeling, then their information is expressed via subjective and emotional values. If their preference is thinking, the information is processed logically, analytically, and impersonally.

Jung subsequently theorized that another difference in an individual's cognitive style was related to their interest in the outer and inner worlds. There is the introvert temperament that tends to draw energy from the inner world of concepts and ideas, and the extraverted temperament that draws energy from the outer world of concepts and ideas (Jung, 1923/1971). The first three preferences were the basis of Jung's theory of personality types, and a questionnaire was developed to assess for these personality traits.

Myers (1962) added another preference scale to determine whether an individual is primarily judgmental or perceiving. If the individual's dominant trait is

judging, then the individual is organized, purposeful, and more comfortable with scheduled, structured environments and decision-making functions, much like what is required of a carrier worker. If an individual's primary trait is perception, then they tend to be more flexible and diverse, more comfortable with open, casual environments, and gathering information, which is a good quality of an intake worker. This particular preference scale differentiates an individual with the judging temperament who prefers order, predictability and structure required by carrier workers, as opposed to the perceptive temperament that prefers ambiguity and spontaneity (Ross, 1966; Stricker & Ross, 1964; McCrae & Costa, 1989), which is an essential requirement of an intake worker.

The theory of personality traits indicates that all individuals have a natural preference that falls into one of four personality trait subtypes defined by Jung (1971) and Myers-Briggs (1985). Personality traits can indicate how individuals are most likely to deal with different situations that life presents, and what types of environments in which they are most comfortable. It can also be beneficial in understanding why some struggle in

certain areas and others do not. It can also help us as individuals to communicate more effectively with others when it is known how they function best.

Temperament Theory

Your temperament or personality style is the distinctive pattern of your psychological functioning. It is a configuration of inclinations (Keirse, 1998). It is the way you think, feel, and behave. It is what represents the orderly arrangement of your attributes, thoughts, feelings, attitudes, behaviors, and coping mechanisms. Unlike character, temperament is a pre-disposition. It can be observed in consistency from a very early age, long before personal experience has an opportunity to imprint the person. Character is a configuration of habits, or a disposition.

In theory, temperament does not change and is not measurable, but can be observed by watching one's behavior over a long period of time. Since an individual's perception is subjective and varies in the degree of their ability to self observe, it can be an ongoing process. You get different assessments at different times. This is from

the changes in your character, not in your temperament (Keirsey & Bates, 1984).

Personality Tests

The study of personality modeling and or temperament typing has been attempted from the beginning of recorded history. These temperaments traits have remained the same from as far back as Plato, 340 B.C. (Keirsey, 1998). The idea that we are predisposed into one of four different formations of attitude and action, has survived for over two thousand years. The difference in the temperaments, from the beginning of history and presently, is the name of the temperaments, which has changed numerous times, and that the temperaments were viewed from a slightly different angle (Keirsey, 1998). Of all the models developed, none are the true model. Some argue that the personality is too complex to model perfectly, but the personality assessment tools have been developed enough to make them useful and predictive.

Isabel Briggs-Myers and Katherine Briggs developed a temperament assessment based on their interpretation of Carl Jung's type theory of personality trait (Myers & McCaulley, 1980). Isabel Briggs-Myers and Katherine Briggs

call the assessment the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The MBTI is an instrument used to measure healthy psychological types described by C.G. Jung (1933). The MBTI (Briggs & Myers, 1976) is alleged to be the most used personality inventory to assess an individual's temperament in non-psychiatric populations (Devito, 1985; Keirsey & Bates, 1984). Keirsey (1984) developed a personality test called the Keirsey Temperament Sorter. It has a 75 percent correlation with the MBTI and is a much shorter version. The Keirsey Temperament Sorter will be the choice of instrument for this study.

Predictability of Personality Tests

Longitudinal studies of temperamental differences indicate long-term consistencies in behavior. In one longitudinal study, personality ratings were obtained from 100 children in junior high school and repeated 35 years later. The findings indicated that there was very little change; the ones who were assessed as responsible, impulsive, or cheerful as children continued to have the same traits as an adult. This was especially significant with children who were assessed as happy and relaxed (Wilson, 1990).

There is a popular demand by organizations to use personality tests for improving recruitment, selection, development and promotional procedures (Furnham, 1994). The validity of the personality tests that predict job performance has become an interest to psychometricians (Barrick & Mount, 1991, Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991).

A study conducted by Drakeley & Furnham (2000) was an attempt to examine participants' abilities to predict their scores on a personality test designed for use in occupational assessments (Drakeley & Kellett, 1995). It was determined that the test participants are reasonably good at predicting their own personality test scores (Furnham, 1989, 1990a, 1990b). The participants were enrolled in a practical class on personality measurement and were first year students. These students had no prior experience in this type of testing and were just beginning the class. The participants completed a Hogan Personality Inventory (Hogan & Hogan, 1992), which yields seven scales. The adjustment scale reflects calmness and self-acceptance versus being tense and self-critical. The ambition scale assesses for the degree to which an individual is confident, values achievement and is status

seeking. The sociability scale assesses for extroversion versus introversion personality traits. The likeability scale assesses for social sensitivity. Is the individual warm, friendly and considerate versus are they unconcerned with how others regard them. The prudence scale measures self-control and conscientiousness. Is the individual orderly, dependable, conservative and over-controlling, or are they impulsive, disorderly, flexible and innovative. The intellectance scale measures the degree of an individual's interest in intellectual matters. This measures whether the individual tends to be original, imaginative, with a multitude of interests and hobbies or if they tend to be more practical, and cautious. The last scale is school success, which measures the degree to which an individual values education and enjoys academic education.

Other studies have been conducted in the prediction of the outcome with personality assessments. The Big Five personality test, The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, The Morningness-Eveningness Questionnaire, and the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior, were all studied for predictability by Farnham (1990a, 1997) and

all were determined to be predictable in various subscales. One possible reason for the prediction of outcome could be that an individual already knows their personality traits; however, they are unable to verbalize their traits as well as personality measurements are able.

Research conducted at another agency focused on personality traits and employment. This study used The Big Five Personality Trait as their instrument to measure temperament and career success across the life span. This study examined the relationship between general mental ability and career success, and the degree to which personality explains career success beyond cognitive ability. The study addressed the linkages between traits from the 5-factor model of personality, and general mental ability with career success. The data from this study was from a set of three studies that followed the participants from early childhood to retirement. There appear to be few studies that have taken a more comprehensive approach to the temperament and characteristic traits of employees. The results of this study indicated that relevant personality traits and general mental ability are capable of predicting many facets of career success. The knowledge

of a person's personality and intelligence level from early years was predictive of the career success in later years (Judge & Higgins, 1999) Career success was measured by job satisfaction.

Personality Type and Occupation

Individuals with the preference for Intuitive tend to be more creative than the rest of the population. The most likely professions for these individuals were architects, writers, research scientists or mathematicians. Dr. D.W. MacKinnon (1961) found the above occupations to almost entirely consist of individuals with the intuitive personality type (Myers & Myers, 1980).

Laney (1949) analyzed the personality trait of employees from Washington Gas Light and concluded that there was a high frequency of sensing and feeling traits in the sales and customer relation staff. The study analyzed the preferences separately and not in combinations. Nine years later, a more complete study was conducted on the complete personality traits. At this time it was discovered that four-fifths of the feeling types were still there, while approximately four-fifths of the thinkers had quit (Myers, 1962).

Another study conducted by Laney (Laney, 1949 and Myers, 1962) reveals that introverted and extroverted men with I Q's over 100 had double the turnover rate depending on the occupations. Introverted individuals, who were in jobs that were active, such as mechanics or meter readers, had twice the turnover rate as extroverts working in the same field. The extroverted individuals who worked in quiet, clerical jobs were also twice as likely to quit (Myers, 1980).

An extroverted supervisor at the First Pennsylvania Bank in Philadelphia was asked to rate sixteen typists she supervises on the quantity and quality of their work. Of these typists she rated eight introverted typists higher than the eight extroverted typists. Introverted individuals tend pay more attention to what is going on inside their heads than what is going on in the external environment. This is an important trait when the productivity depends on the ability to keep from being distracted (Laney, 1946-1950).

Hawkins and Associates (1993) conducted a strategic organizational assessment of the Department of Children Services of San Bernardino County. This agency research

project was conducted to collect information that would help to clarify employee concerns, determine causality, and assist the department with alternatives to address the problems with the agency.

The results of this study indicated that the staff was discontented about not having any input about office policy. There was also an issue with the lack of feedback given to the line staff with regards to agency decisions. This study also pointed out essential practices and behaviors that would promote a work environment conducive to increased work productivity and cooperation.

These recommendations resulted in the agency implementing the "District Issues Committee" (DIC) meetings. This meeting is for staff to express their concerns about office policy and other concerns the employees would like to see changed in the agency.

A state mandated study was conducted recently by the Child Welfare League of America (1999) to address the amount of work that DCS employees were doing on a daily basis and to address what kind of caseload would be reasonable for each employee. It also assessed the caseloads of the social workers to determine what was an

appropriate number of cases. It is surmised that high caseloads overburden the social worker and place the children at further risk. The risk to the children would come from inadequacies and mistakes made by the overwhelmed worker. Employees that are overwhelmed for an extended amount of time have a higher chance of burnout, which increases turnover. The result of the study indicated that the employees' caseloads were too high overall. This was an important research as it addressed and confirmed that caseloads were high. It also made a suggestion on what the caseload size should be to improve the agency, and to help maintain employees for longer periods of time.

A study was conducted by Public Child Welfare Training Academy (PCWTA, 2000), which stated child welfare worker studies identify a relationship between personal characteristics and turnover. Caseworker characteristics that correlate with retention include: self-efficacy; motivation; energy and persistence in overcoming obstacles to accomplish goals; personal responsiveness to client needs (doing for others); and goodness of fit (personal job competence) (PCWTA, 2000).

The Assembly Human Services Committee conducted a study designed to help understand the shortage of social workers. The study indicated that stressful, non-supportive working conditions, poor supervision, and low salaries were significant challenges to retaining current social workers. Veteran social workers, after serving clients for ten or more years, received no special recognition. The study further indicated a negative public image of the social work profession, particularly those working in government social services agencies. The lack of "continuity of care" creates a negative, frustrating work environment for those who spend extra time and effort to earn licenses. The study also indicates that the selective recruitment and retention efforts only rob social workers from one sector for another. It also indicates lack of supportive services creating social workers who are increasingly burdened by clerical duties (AHSCH, 2001).

Statewide in 1998, there were just fewer than 5,000 social work students in California (4,975), with about half in a MSW program and the other half in a BSW program. Just under half of those graduated from their program. 65

percent of those graduated with a Masters degree in social work and 35 percent graduated with a Bachelor's degree.

In the last decade, enrollment in BSW programs has steadily increased however, in has remained about the same in the MSW programs (AHSCH, 2001).

In February 2001, the ten largest county child welfare agencies had 7,500 social workers and 790 vacancies, which is 10.5 percent vacancy rate. It is estimated that 3,400 new social workers are needed among the largest 10 counties, 50 percent more than the number they currently have. In the 15 smallest counties, turnover rate is as high as 50 percent. This can be due to lower wages and distance from continuing education (AHSCH, 2001). Two years ago, 40 percent of the agency staff was MSW-level social workers. During the past year, that number has decreased to 25 percent.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Study Design - Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences in the personality preferences, between "Intake" and "Carrier" social workers in the Department of Children's Services (DCS) agency in the Department of Public Social Services in San Bernardino County. This survey identified whether or not there was a relationship between the perceiving and judgment personality traits specific to intake or carrier workers in the San Bernardino County, DCS Agency. This study was only generalized to San Bernardino County and was not applicable to other counties, departments or agencies.

The research design best suited for this study was a cross sectional research. In cross sectional research the data was collected on the phenomenon of the different temperaments between an intake and a carrier worker. The research compared the two groups of workers from a specific population, DCS of San Bernardino County.

The research design for this study involved a single psychological assessment instrument. The instrument

measured the temperament of intake and carrier workers. Intake and carrier workers were compared on the two different sub-scales, perceiving and judging.

Demographic variables also served as independent variables, e.g., the subject's age, gender, income, marital status and ethnicity. Other independent variables of this study were, which position the employee holds, the length of time they have been in their current position, the length of time they have been working for the agency, the position they have worked in, and if they prefer their current position.

The current study used a post-positivist paradigm (Rubin & Babbie, 1997). Post-positivist research emphasizes objectivity, precision, and general ability. Post-positivist research seeks to verify causality through attempts to sort out what is really causing the effect. The current study used the quantitative research method. Quantitative methods are empirically based and utilize statistical analysis. Using post-positivist research in the current study necessitates replication to achieve reliability and validity (Rubin and Babbie, 1997).

This study was conducted via survey research. Survey research was more effective because more social workers could be reached in a shorter amount of time. The questionnaires were completely confidential and anonymous. The research subjects were all adults and therefore no special permission was sought. Additionally, the research subjects were located in the eight separate offices that are within driving distance of no more than 60 miles.

Sampling

In this study, the sampling strategy used was the convenience sampling, because the study included all Social Service Practitioner's (SSP) and Social worker II's (SWII) for the Department of Children's Services. The study relied on the closest and most available subjects to constitute the sample.

The study provided data on the different personality traits of intake and carrier workers. The best data source was from the current employees in intake and carrier positions at the DCS Agency of San Bernardino County. There are approximately 450 social workers that were asked to participate in this study. There was approximately a 20 percent return rate. We received 176 responses.

The variables relevant to the study were identified as the intake and carrier positions. The best data source was from the current social workers in the County of San Bernardino, DCS. We sought permission from DCS to allow the employee's to complete the survey during normal work hours, which we believe increased the numbers of employee's who completed the questionnaires.

The questionnaires were given to employees who met the following criteria: 1) the social worker had to be employed by San Bernardino County 2) and the social worker had to have some experience with either intake or carrier position. Experience for an intake worker was defined as; anyone who has ever responded to an immediate response call or has any first hand knowledge of this position. Experience for a carrier worker was defined as a worker who has provided services to a family via family reunification or family maintenance case for 60 days or longer.

A personality preference assessment tool called the Keirsey Temperament Sorter 11 was the instrument used in this study. This assessment is a forced answer questionnaire that measures personality preferences. The

data was collected via convenience sampling from social workers employed in the eight DCS offices located in San Bernardino County. The offices included in this study are Barstow, Rancho Cucamonga, San Bernardino "E" Street, San Bernardino Mill Street, San Bernardino Sun West, Victorville Ramona Avenue, Victorville Victor Street and Yucca Valley.

This study consisted of three different questionnaires. The first questionnaire asked demographic information and was titled "Demographic Data" (see Appendix E). Demographic data included; gender, age, marital status, ethnicity, income level, level of education, academic degree, license, location of employment, length of employment at current location, length of employment at DCS, and current position.

The second questionnaire was a self-reported questionnaire on the job satisfaction level of the participants. This was to help analyze for a positive relationship among workers job satisfaction and personality types.

The third questionnaire in this study was a self-reported forced choice questionnaire in which data

collected was from a standardized instrument already developed to measure personality preference. This instrument is called the Keirsey Temperament Sorter, and has been in existence for over twenty years.

The Keirsey Temperament Sorter consists of 70 self-reported forced choice responses, a much shorter questionnaire than the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. A self-report scale is a source of data in which all participants respond in writing to the same list of written statements or questions that have been devised to measure a particular construct. (Rubin & Babbie, 1997).

Scoring boxes were provided for each temperament preference consisting of four bi-polar scales. The four bipolar preference scales consisted of Extroversion/Introversion (E/I), Sensing/intuition (S/N), Thinking/Feeling (T/F), and Judging/Perceiving (J/P). From the four bipolar preference scales a four-letter score can also be obtained. These are the scores that determine the sixteen different personality traits (e.g. ESTP, ESTJ, ESFP, etc.,). The higher number in each of the temperament scoring boxes determines the preferences. The scores on the bi-polar scales also give a two-letter score, which

dictates the subject's classification into one of the four temperament traits; Dionysian (S/P), Epimethean (S/J), Promethean (N/T), and Appollonian (N/F) (Keirsey, 1998).

There are strengths and weaknesses in using a self-report scale in a research study. Strengths include: survey questionnaires are relatively simple to complete, large amounts of information can be gathered in a uniform manner, and a large sample can be surveyed in a short span of time (Rubin & Babbie, 1997). Weaknesses include: the researcher is not available to answer questions, some questions may be left unanswered, and relevant issues may be missed due to pre-selection of questionnaire items by the researcher (Rubin & Babbie, 1997).

There are both strengths and weaknesses in using the self-report scale devised specifically for the current study. The self-report scale allows items to be constructed that reflect the problem addressed by the study (Rubin & Babbie, 1997). In the current study, the self-report scale reflects the different traits of intake and carrier workers in DCS offices. The findings from the self-report scale are applicable to the participants who

answered the survey questionnaire. The study will be generalized to DCS offices in San Bernardino County.

There has been some criticism regarding personality assessments. It has been indicated that because the user has no information about the occupational norms, scores could perpetuate discrimination of different ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic groups. Another criticism is that there is a lack of male and female norms, and they have failed to provide demographic information about occupational groups that are reported to be attractive to different psychological traits (Bunker, 1999).

For the purpose of this study we were only concerned with the perceptive and judging traits.

Feasibility

A potential problem was would there be lack of responses from the employees due to time constraints or disinterest in completing the questionnaires. Another possible problem was the availability of the resources needed to complete the research study. The department had stated their willingness to allow the questionnaire to be sent out and returned via interoffice mail and thus, we

did not incur any expense; therefore, funding was not an issue for this research project.

Another possible problem was that the research study did not allow intake workers who prefer to be carrier workers and visa versa. There are some carrier workers who do not like the position of intake and appear to more suited in their temperament to an intake worker and visa versa. To avoid any problem with the results, questions will be put in the demographics survey such as "which position would you currently like to be in, intake or carrier"? "Have you had experience in both positions"? There were many questions that needed to be answered to determine if the study could be completed or if the study needed to be refined. These answers were needed prior to the beginning of the study to prevent a problems later, which could have hindered the study. One concern was whether or not the department would allow the employees to receive the questionnaire at work or if they would provide the employees home addresses. It was clearly understood that social workers' time is valuable.

The questionnaires for the study were time consuming, therefore, it was crucial for the department to be

supportive and encourage their employee's to give it the appropriate time needed to for its completion. The Department of Children's Services management asked what questions they would like answered that would help the agency.

Cathy Cimballo, Deputy Director of DCS, submitted a letter of approval that was attached to the survey explaining the departments' position as well as any benefits for filling out the survey.

CHAPTER FOUR

PROCEDURE

Participation in this study was completely voluntary. A manila envelope and research study questionnaire was provided for every DCS intake and carrier worker in San Bernardino County. The envelope was interoffice mailed and delivered to their individual mailbox in their appropriate office. The participants were offered a raffle ticket for the returned questionnaire. There were two tickets with the same numbers in each questionnaire packet. The participant returned one of the tickets along with the questionnaire. The tickets were placed in a sealed box, and on 2-14-01, a winner was drawn. Two individuals in management, a manager and a supervisor witnessed the drawing. The winning raffle ticket was worth \$150.00 cash prize. The winning number was posted at the main door in each office for approximately one week. The individual who had the winning number was contacted by Virginia Reed and Diana Mathis and received their cash prize.

The manila envelope was labeled "survey." Each manila envelope contained an informational letter (see

Appendix A), a demographic data survey (see Appendix E), personality trait survey, informed consent form (see Appendix D), a detached debriefing statement (see Appendix C), and an additional manila envelope with a preaddressed return envelope. Upon opening the packet, the participant read and marked the informed consent with an X indicating they were agreeing to participate in the survey. The participant then completed the survey. The survey took approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Upon completion of the survey, the participant placed the questionnaires, drawing ticket, and the informed consent, into the pre-return addressed manila envelope and seal. The sealed envelope was mailed to the researcher through the San Bernardino County inter-office mail system. Participants were requested to answer the questionnaires by February 12, 2001. This was to allow the participants to answer the questionnaires at their leisure. Envelopes were collected until the above date.

Protection of Human Subjects

The researchers expected approximately 61 culturally diverse male and female DCS social workers to voluntarily participate in this research project. All participants were employees of the Department of Public Social Services, Department of Children's Services, in San Bernardino County. Participants included in this study were from eight different offices in San Bernardino County. All participants were treated in accordance with the "Ethical Principles of Psychology and Code of Conduct" (American Psychological Association, 1992).

The current study requested approval from the Department of Social Work Human Subjects Committee, under authority of the Institutional Review Board at California State University, San Bernardino. Approval to survey DCS employees was requested from the Department of Children's Services Director, Cathy Cimbalo (see Appendix B).

Adequate efforts were made to insure anonymity of all participants. To maintain the confidentiality of participants, personal names were not placed on the completed studies. An informed consent form was attached to the survey. The informed consent described the

purpose, procedures, risks, and benefits of participating in the study and requested the participant acknowledge participation of the survey by signing the survey with an X. There were no anticipated risks as a result of participation in this study. The signature of the participant as marked by an X will be used as evidence that the participant gave his/her consent and had an understanding of the nature of the study.

In spite of efforts, confidentiality problems could have existed. Problems with confidentiality could have occurred as a result of human error, however without the intent of the researchers. Problems could have occurred if participants failed to place their completed questionnaire and consent form in the return envelope and immediately seal the envelope. Unsealed studies could have been left on participants' desks within view of onlookers.

Participants received a debriefing statement with the telephone number of the faculty project adviser at California State University, San Bernardino. Participants were able to contact the project adviser to obtain information about the project or discuss the survey. The

survey and informed consent forms were collected and stored in a locked box at the private residence of the researchers. When analysis of the survey was completed, informed consent and surveys were destroyed.

Data Analysis

The focus of the current study was to determine if intake and carrier workers had different personality traits, specifically the judgment and perceiving traits. It was also to determine if there was a positive relationship between workers who were in their preferred job positions and job satisfaction. Another focus was if there was a positive relationship between perceptive traits and job satisfaction among intake worker. And, whether there was a positive relationship between the judging trait and job satisfaction among carrier workers. We predicted that there would be a decline in their job satisfaction if these workers have reversed personality traits.

The data was analyzed through quantitative methods (Rubin & Babbie, 1997; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Quantitative analysis was the product of empirical research of which the current study was a part (Strauss &

Corbin, 1990). Simply stated the quantitative analysis measures numbers.

Using quantitative analysis, the current study used descriptive statistics to analyze the data collected from self-reported scales on personality traits. "Descriptive statistics is a method for presenting quantitative descriptions in a manageable form (Rubin & Babbie)." Descriptive statistics will compute frequency distributions and central tendencies using the Statistical Software Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for demographic characteristics and the seventy quantitative self-report response items on the Keirse

An independent t-test will determine if the scores from the two different groups, intake and carrier indicate that there is a difference in the personality traits. Because this was a non-random sample, it is uncharacteristic of the larger population and can be relevant only to those individuals included in the sample.

No test was used to analyze the workers who were in preferred positions due to too small of a sample size of workers (7) who indicated they were not in preferred positions.

To determine the relationship between intake and carrier workers personality trait and job satisfaction, a two-tailed Pearson's r was used to analyze the data.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

There were 450 surveys sent to social workers and of these, 176 were returned. Although a small portion of the questionnaires contained some missing data or confusing responses, none of the questionnaires were omitted due to being grossly incomplete. The following results were based on the 176 surveys returned.

Univariate analysis was conducted initially to establish a baseline value for each variable, and to describe the most relevant characteristics of this sample. Means and frequencies were established, as appropriate, for all variables. These calculations were conducted on the entire sample population, as well as on the two sub groups, by discipline (Intake and Carrier). It was originally intended that data would be collected and comparisons made among several categories of workers; however, the responses provided too small a sub-sample for statistically reliable results. It was therefore necessary to eliminate them from the study. All statistical calculations were quantitative and computed using the SPSS 10.0.

The study sample was 20.5 percent male (n=36) and 79.5 percent female (n=140). They ranged in age from 23 years to 68 years, with an average age of 43 years. Marital status varied with 21 percent single (n=37), 55.7 percent married (n=98), and 2.3 percent separated (n=4), 18.2 percent divorced (n=32), and 2.8 percent other (n=5).

The study population did not represent a significant ethnic diversity with 68.8 percent Caucasian (n=121), 15.9 percent African American (n=28), 8 percent Hispanic (n=14), 2.8 percent Asian (n=5), 3.4 percent for other (n=6), and 1.1 did not respond (n=2).

Their length of employment as social workers ranged from approximately 3 months to 25.6 years, with an average of 2.4 years. All employees have completed high school, 26.1 percent have received a Bachelors degree (N=46), and 70.5 percent have a Masters Degree.

There are ten different offices located in San Bernardino County. There are four located in the desert region. In the Barstow office 4 individuals responded to the questionnaires, 3 stated they preferred Barstow and 1 stated they preferred the office on Hospitality, which was 75 percent. In the Ramona office 22 responded with 15

preferring the Ramona office, 3 preferred Victor Street, 1 "E" Street, 1 Barstow, 2 Rancho Cucamonga at 93.8. In the Victor Street office 9 responded with 8 preferring Victor Street and 1 "E" at 72.7. In the Yucca Valley office 8 responded with 8 stating they preferred that office at 100 percent.

In the Inland Empire there are six offices. The Rancho Cucamonga office 44 individuals responded, 41 preferred Rancho Cucamonga, 1 preferred Mill Street, 1 preferred E Street, and 1 person preferred Ramona office at 87.2 percent. The Mill Street office 25 individuals responded, 19 preferred Mill Street, 2 Rancho Cucamonga, 2 "E" Street and 2 Sunwest at 79.2 percent. The "E" Street office had 20 individuals who responded with 17 preferring "E" Street, 1 Sunwest office, and 2 Hospitality, at 81 percent. The Sun West office 13 responded with 11 individuals whom preferred Sunwest and 2 Mill Street office, at 64.7 percent. The Hospitality office had 21 responses, where 16 preferred Hospitality, 2 Sunwest, 2 Rancho Cucamonga, and 1 Mill Street. One social worker at Court responded and preferred the Hospitality office. Three social workers at the (Child Abuse Hotline) CAHL

office responded and two stated they preferred the Home Run office and the third individual preferred the Mill Street office.

The study sample of the intake workers was 20 percent male (n=5) and 80 percent female (n=20). They ranged in age from 26 years to 58 years, with an average age of 38.79 years. Marital status varied with 24 percent single (n=6), 60 percent married (n=15), 12 percent divorced (n=3), and 4 percent other (n=1).

The study sample of intake workers represented significant ethnic diversity with 64 percent Caucasian (n=16), 20 percent African American (n=5), 16 percent Hispanic (n=4), Asian Americans 0 percent, and all responded.

Their length of employment as intake workers ranged from approximately 3 months to 15 years, with an average of 2 years and 4 months. All employees have completed high school, 40 percent have received a Bachelors degree (N=10), and 60 percent have a Masters Degree (n=15).

The study sample of the Carrier workers was 21.2 percent male (n=22) and 78.8 percent female (n=82). They ranged in age from 25 years to 59 years, with an average

age of 42.52 years. Marital status varied with 17.3 percent single (n=18), 59.6 percent married (n=62), and 1.9 percent separated (n=2), 18.3 percent divorced (n=19), and 2.9 percent other (n=3).

The study sample of carrier workers represented significant ethnic diversity with 65.4 percent Caucasian (n=68), 17.3 percent African American (n=18), 11.5 percent Hispanic (n=12), 1 percent Asian American (n=1), 2.9 percent for other (n=3), and 1.9 did not respond (n=2).

Their length of employment as carrier workers ranged from approximately 2 months to 15 years and 9 months, with an average of 3 years and 2 months. All employees have completed high school, 26.9 percent have received a Bachelors degree (N=28), and 66.3 percent have a Masters Degree (n=69).

Hypothesis number one (1), intake workers from the DCS will score higher on the perceptive sub-scale and carrier workers will score higher on the judgment sub-scale. A t-test analysis was completed to compare the mean scores.

The result anticipated was that the intake and carrier social workers would have different personality

temperaments. The participants consisted of 25 intake workers and 48 carrier workers. The Judgmental score was ($t=.070$, $df=71$, $p=.94$) and its opposite, Perceiving ($t=.024$, $df=71$, $p=.827$). The results indicate no differences in personality traits.

Hypothesis number two (2), social workers who are in their preferred positions will have higher job satisfaction. There were 169 workers who were in their preferred positions out of 176 who responded. There were only 7 workers who indicated they were not in their preferred positions. Due to the small group of workers who indicated that they were not in their preferred positions, no t-score was conducted.

Hypothesis number three the relationship between perceptive traits and judgment personality traits and job satisfaction will be moderated by whether or not the position is intake or carrier. The correlation coefficient (r) between intake workers perceptive traits and job satisfaction is ($r=-.216$, $p<.01$) and for judgment traits and job satisfaction ($r= .205$, $p<.01$). The scores for the carrier workers perceiving traits and job

satisfaction was ($r=.262, p<.01$), and for judgment traits and job satisfaction ($r= -.305, p<.01$).

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis; intake worker's from the Department of Children's Service's will score higher on the perceiving traits and that carrier workers will score higher on the judgment traits was determined via t-test to have no relationship. The scores indicate that there is no relationship or substantial differences between the intake worker and the carrier worker regarding the two personality traits.

One reason for this may be due to the workers being assigned to these positions; thus they are not in their preferred positions. The numbers of participants may have been too small.

The second hypothesis, individuals who were in their preferred positions will have higher scores for job satisfaction, was unable to be determined. This was largely due to the small amount of workers who indicated that they were not in their preferred positions. There were 176 workers who responded and there were 7 who indicated that they were not in their preferred positions. There was not a large enough sample of workers who

indicated that they were not in their preferred position to conduct a t-test analysis.

Hypothesis number 3, the relationship between perceptive traits and judgment personality traits and job satisfaction will be moderated by whether or not the position is intake or carrier. The hypothesis is broken down into 3a and 3b below.

Hypothesis number 3a, among intake workers there will be a positive correlation between the perceptive traits and job satisfaction. A two-tailed Pearson's r analysis was used to determine the results. The correlation coefficient (r) between intake workers perceptive traits and job satisfaction is ($r = -.216$, $p < .01$), indicating a medium negative effect relationship. The correlation coefficient (r) between intake workers judgment traits and job satisfaction is ($r = .205$, $p < .01$), indicating a medium positive effect relationship. These results indicate that intake social workers that tend to have the perceptive traits and are in intake have less job satisfaction. This is the opposite of what was predicted, but still meaningful for the purpose of determining which trait is more suited for intake.

Hypothesis number 3b, among carrier workers there will be a negative correlation between the perceptive traits and job satisfaction. The correlation coefficient (r) between carrier workers perceiving traits and job satisfaction is ($r=.262, p<.01$), indicating a medium positive effect relationship. The correlation co-efficient (r) between carrier workers judgment traits and job satisfaction is ($r= -.305, p<.01$), indicating a medium negative effect relationship.

When the relationship for intake is positive between judgment traits and job satisfaction, there is a negative relationship between judgment traits and job satisfaction among the carrier workers. When the relationship for intake is negative between perception and job satisfaction, there is a positive relationship among carrier workers between the perceptive traits and job satisfaction

There is strong evidence that personality traits can effect job satisfaction based on this information. This was the opposite of what was hypothesized; however, these results still give important information.

APPENDIX A:
INFORMATIONAL LETTER

INFORMATIONAL LETTER

Date _____

Dear DCS colleague:

The following is a study being conducted on personality preferences among CPS intake and carrier workers in San Bernardino County. Understanding the differences in personality preferences and job preference may determine which position would suit your needs and feelings of greater job satisfaction. This survey will assist in this study by determining if there is a specific personality trait that prefers intake or carrier.

Please take a few minutes to complete the survey and mail it back to me in the inter-office envelope provided. We thank you in advance for your time. Please note: Participation is completely voluntary.

Sincerely,

Diana Mathis, MSW Intern

Virginia Reed, MSW Intern

APPENDIX B:
APPROVAL LETTER FROM DEPARTMENT
OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES

150 South Lena Road • San Bernardino CA 92415-0515



**COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
SOCIAL SERVICES GROUP**

CATHY CIMBALO
Director


October 31, 2000

Dr. TERESA MORRIS
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN BERNARDINO
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK
5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY
SAN BERNARDINO CA 92407-2397

This letter serves a notification to the Department of Social Work at California State University, San Bernardino, that Diana Mathis and Virginia Reed-Schwab have obtained consent from the Department of Children's Services (DCS) of San Bernardino County, to conduct the research project titled, "Differences in Personality Types of San Bernardino County Department of Children's Services Intake and Carrier Workers and Their Effect on Job Satisfaction."

This letter also serves as notification to the Department of Social Work that the Department of Children's Services, San Bernardino County, is giving consent to allow DCS staff to participate in this research project.

If you have any questions regarding this letter of consent, you may contact Diana Mathis at (909) 383-9833 or Virginia Reed-Schwab at (760) 243-6743.



CATHY CIMBALO, LCSW
Director

10-31-00

Date

CC:lh (Oct00-8.doc)

APPENDIX C:
DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

Thank you for participating in this survey,

The study in which you participated will explore if personalities differ between intake and carrier social workers in the Department of Children's Services in County of San Bernardino.

Please feel free to express any feelings you may have now about participating in this project. Your answers and feelings will be held in strict confidence and the investigator asks that you not discuss the nature of this study with other participants.

If you are interested in the results of this study they will be available June 2001 in the Phau Library at CSUSB. If you have any questions about the research, you may contact Diana Mathis at 909-891-3368 or Virginia Reed at 760-951-7531. Complete results will be available after June 2001. The drawing for participating in the study is for \$150.00 and will be held on February 14, 2001. All questionnaires need to be returned by August 15, 2000. The

winning ticket number will be posted on the front door to
each office on February 14, 2001.

APPENDIX D:
INFORMED CONSENT

INFORMED CONSENT

This study is designed to help San Bernardino county Department of Public Social Services understand the difference in personalities of an Intake and Carrier worker at the Department of Children's Services. This study is being conducted by Diana Mathis and Virginia Reed the supervision of Dr. Matt Riggs, Ph.D., and Professor of Psychology at Loma Linda University and has been approved by the Human Subjects Committee.

In this study you will answer a questionnaire that asks demographic information pertaining to your gender, age, marital status, ethnicity, and information pertaining to your employment, such as where you work, length of employment, and position. In addition, you are asked 70-forced choice questions based on your perception of your temperament on a two choice scale. This only measures healthy personality traits and these questions are not useful for diagnosing any personality defect.

Please be assured any information you provide will be held in strict confidence by the researcher. At no time will your name be reported along with your responses to

any Department of Public Social Services personnel, including supervisors and/or trainers. A contact phone number will be provided at the end of this consent form if any questions or concerns should arise.

It is hoped the results of this study will provide San Bernardino County, Department of Children's Services information that will be helpful in understanding the differences in personalities between Intake and Carrier workers. Your participation is necessary to attain this goal. Participation in this study is voluntary and you are under no obligation to respond. In addition, you are free to withdraw from this study at any time. If you have questions or comments regarding the study, please contact Dr. Riggs, Ph.D., in the psychology department at Loma Linda University. The phone number to reach Dr. Riggs, Ph.D., is 909-555-5555. Should you choose to participate, please mark the space provided below with an X. For participating in this study you were given two tickets with matching numbers for a drawing of \$150.00. Please keep the informed consent form attached to the demographic and the questionnaire. Upon completion place the informed consent, the drawing ticket, the demographic questionnaire

and the personality questionnaire in the envelope addressed to Virginia Reed, c/o VV/DCS or Diana Mathis, c/o SBD/Special Services and return it by placing them in the inter-office mail.

I acknowledge I have been informed of and understand the nature and purpose of this study. I freely consent to participate in the above study and that I am at least 18 years of age, and fully understand that my participation is absolutely voluntary.

Give your consent to participate by placing a check or an X here _____

Today's date is _____

Thank you,

Diana Mathis, MSW Student and Virginia Reed, MSW Student
Dr. Riggs, Ph.D., Research Advisor (909) 558-8709

APPENDIX E:
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Please mark your answers with a check or an X

- | | | |
|-------------------|-------|----------------|
| 1. Gender | _____ | 1) Male |
| | _____ | 2) Female |
| 2. Age | _____ | 1) Under 20 |
| | _____ | 2) 21-30 |
| | _____ | 3) 31-40 |
| | _____ | 4) 41-50 |
| | _____ | 5) 51-60 |
| | _____ | 6) 61 and over |
| 3. Marital Status | _____ | 1) Single |
| | _____ | 2) Married |
| | _____ | 3) Separated |
| | _____ | 4) Divorced |
| | _____ | 5) Other |
| 4. Ethnicity | _____ | 1) Caucasian |
| | _____ | 2) Hispanic |

- _____ 3) African American
- _____ 4) Asian American
- _____ 5) Other _____

5. Income Level
- _____ 1) Under 10,000
 - _____ 2) \$10,000 - 20,000
 - _____ 3) \$20,001 - 30,000
 - _____ 4) \$30,001 - 40,000
 - _____ 5) \$40,001 - 50,000
 - _____ 6) \$50,001 - 60,000
 - _____ 7) \$60,001 and over

6. What is your highest level of education? _____

7. What is your highest degree? _____

8. Do you have your license? _____ 1) No
- _____ 2) Yes

9. How long have you had your license? _____ 1) Months
- _____ 2) Years

10. What office do you currently work at?

- _____ 1) Barstow
- _____ 2) Rancho Cucamonga
- _____ 3) San Bernardino Mill Street
- _____ 4) San Bernardino "E" Street
- _____ 5) Sun West Street
- _____ 6) Victorville Ramona Avenue
- _____ 7) Victorville Victor Street
- _____ 8) Yucca Valley

11. How long have you worked in this location?

Months _____ Years _____

12. What is your current title?

- _____ 1) SSSP
- _____ 2) SSP
- _____ 3) SWII
- _____ 4) Other _____

13. How long have you worked under this title?

Months _____ Years _____

14. Have you ever held the following positions?

_____ Intake _____ Carrier

15. How long have you held each position?

_____ Intake _____ Months _____ Years

_____ Carrier _____ Months _____ Years

16. How many months and years paid social work related experiences have you had?

_____ Months _____ Years

17. How many months/years of unpaid (volunteer) social work related experience have you had?

_____ Months _____ Years

18. How many children do you have?

_____ Biological _____ Male _____ Female

_____ Stepchildren _____ Male _____ Female

APPENDIX F:
JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

Paul E. Spector
Department of Psychology
University of South Florida

Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION
THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION
ABOUT IT.

Disagree very much
Disagree moderately
Disagree slightly
Agree slightly
Agree moderately
Agree very much

1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1 2 3 4 5 6
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1 2 3 4 5 6
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1 2 3 4 5 6
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1 2 3 4 5 6
7	I like the people I work with.	1 2 3 4 5 6
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1 2 3 4 5 6
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	1 2 3 4 5 6
10	Raises are too few and far between.	1 2 3 4 5 6
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	1 2 3 4 5 6
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1 2 3 4 5 6
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1 2 3 4 5 6
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	1 2 3 4 5 6
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1 2 3 4 5 6
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6

PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.		Disagree very much	Disagree moderately	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly	Agree moderately	Agree very much
Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved.		1	2	3	4	5	6
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24	I have too much to do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30	I like my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31	I have too much paperwork.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35	My job is enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX G:
KIERSEY TEMPERAMENT SCALE

The Keirsey Temperament Sorter II

Copyrighted © 1998 David Keirsey

1. Is clutter in the workplace something you
 - take time to straighten up
 - tolerate pretty well
2. Do you think of yourself as
 - an outgoing person
 - a private person
3. In sizing up others do you tend to be
 - objective and impersonal
 - friendly and personal
4. Is it worse to be
 - a softy
 - hard-nosed
5. Are you more comfortable in making
 - critical judgements
 - value judgements
6. Are you more
 - observant than introspective
 - introspective than observant
7. Do you speak more in
 - particulars than generalities
 - generalities than particulars
8. At work do you tend to
 - be sociable with your colleagues
 - keep more to yourself
9. Which rules you more
 - your thoughts
 - your feelings
10. Do you more often prefer
 - final, unalterable statements
 - tentative, preliminary statements
11. Do you prefer contracts to be
 - signed, sealed, and delivered
 - settled on a handshake
12. In stories do you prefer

- o action and adventure
 - o fantasy and heroism
13. With people are you usually more
- o firm than gentle
 - o gentle than firm
14. In a heated discussion, do you
- o stick to your guns
 - o look for common grounds
15. Which appeals to you more
- o consistency of thought
 - o harmonious relationships
16. Are you inclined to be
- o easy to approach
 - o somewhat reserved
17. At work, is it more natural for you to
- o point out mistakes
 - o try to please others
18. Which do you wish more for yourself:
- o strength of will
 - o strength of emotion
19. Is it better to be
- o just
 - o merciful
20. Are you more
- o sensible than ideational
 - o ideational than sensible
21. Are you the kind of person who
- o is rather talkative.
 - o doesn't miss much
22. Is it your way to
- o make up your mind quickly
 - o pick and choose at some length
23. Are you inclined to be more
- o hurried than leisurely
 - o leisurely than hurried
24. Waiting in line, do you often
- o chat with others
 - o stick to business
25. Are you more inclined to feel
- o down to earth
 - o somewhat removed
26. Are you more interested in

- ● what is actual
 - ● what is possible
27. Are you more satisfied having
- ● a finished product
 - ● work in progress
28. Which is more of a compliment:
- ● "There's a logical person"
 - ● "There's a sentimental person"
29. At a party, do you
- ● interact with many, even strangers
 - ● interact with a few friends
30. Facts
- ● speak for themselves
 - ● illustrate principles
31. Are you more frequently
- ● a practical sort of person
 - ● a fanciful sort of person
32. Are you drawn more to
- ● fundamentals
 - ● overtones
33. Do you tend to
- ● say right out what's on your mind
 - ● keep your ears open
34. Do you consider yourself
- ● a good conversationalist
 - ● a good listener
35. Do you value in yourself more that you are
- ● reasonable
 - ● devoted
36. In trying circumstances are you sometimes
- ● too unsympathetic
 - ● too sympathetic
37. If you must disappoint someone are you usually
- ● frank and straightforward
 - ● warm and considerate
38. Are you prone to
- ● nailing things down
 - ● exploring the possibilities
39. Do you tend to notice
- ● disorderliness
 - ● opportunities for change
40. In making up in your mind are you more likely to go by

- o data
 - o desires
41. Do you think of yourself as a
- o tough-minded person
 - o tender-hearted person
42. Do you prefer to work
- o to deadlines
 - o just whenever
43. Do you prize in yourself
- o a strong hold of reality
 - o a vivid imagination
44. In most situations are you more
- o deliberate than spontaneous
 - o spontaneous than deliberate
45. When finishing a job, do you like to
- o tie up all the loose ends
 - o move on to something else
46. On the job do you want your activities
- o scheduled
 - o unscheduled
47. Are you more likely to trust
- o your experiences
 - o your conceptions
48. Do you usually want things
- o settled and decided
 - o just penciled in
49. Would you say you are more
- o serious and determined
 - o easy going
50. Do you feel better about
- o coming to closure
 - o keeping your options open
51. Do you find visionaries and theorists
- o somewhat annoying
 - o rather fascinating
52. Do you more often see
- o what's right in front of you
 - o what can only be imagined
53. Which seems the greater fault:
- o to be too compassionate
 - o to be too dispassionate
54. Does interacting with strangers

- o energize you
- o tax your reserves
- 55. When the phone rings do you
 - o hurry to get it first
 - o hope someone else will answer
- 56. Do you tend to be more
 - o factual than speculative
 - o speculative than factual
- 57. Are you swayed more by
 - o convincing evidence
 - o a touching appeal
- 58. Children often do not
 - o make themselves useful enough
 - o exercise their fantasy enough
- 59. Do you like writers who
 - o say what they mean
 - o use metaphors and symbolism
- 60. Common sense is
 - o usually reliable
 - o frequently questionable
- 61. Is it worse to
 - o have your head in the clouds
 - o be in a rut
- 62. Do you see yourself as basically
 - o thick-skinned
 - o thin-skinned
- 63. Are you more comfortable
 - o after a decision
 - o before a decision
- 64. Are you more often
 - o a cool-headed person
 - o a warm-hearted person
- 65. Is it easier for you to
 - o put others to good use
 - o identify with others
- 66. Is it preferable mostly to
 - o make sure things are arranged
 - o just let things happen naturally
- 67. Are you inclined to take what is said
 - o more literally
 - o more figuratively
- 68. Do you tend to choose

- rather carefully
 - somewhat impulsively
69. When in charge of others do you tend to be
- firm and unbending
 - forgiving and lenient
70. Are you more
- routinized than whimsical
 - whimsical than routinize
-

REFERENCES

- Barrick, M., & Mount, M. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44, 1-26.
- Briggs, K. C., & Myers, I. B. (1976). Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- DiVito, A. J. (1985). Review of Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. In J. V. Mitchell, Ju. (Ed.), Ninth mental measurements yearbook (Vol. 2, 1030-1032). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Drakeley, R., & Kellett, D. (1995). Criteria-relevant validity and personality questionnaire. Selection and Development Review, 11, 4-6.
- Furnham, A. (1986). Response bias, social desirability and dissimulation. Personality and individual differences, 7, 385-400.
- Furnham, A. (1990a). Can people accurately estimate their own personality test scores? European Journal of Personality, 4, 319-327.
- Furnham, A. (1990b). The fakeability of the 16 PF, Myers-Briggs and Firo-B personality measures. Personality and Individual Differences, 11, 711-716.

Furnham, A. (1994). Personality at work. London: Routledge.

Farnham, A. (1997). Knowing and faking one's five factor personality score. Journal of Personality Assessment, 69, 229-243.

Farnham, A., & Drakeley, R. (2000) The predicting occupational personality test scores. Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary & Applied, Jan 2000, Vol., 134, (1), p103, 9p, 2 charts.

Hawkins, K. & Associates, (1993). Strategic Organizational Assessment: San Bernardino County Department of Public Social Services.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1992). Hogan Personality Inventory manual. Tulsa, Ok: Hogan Assessment Systems.

Judge, Timothy A. & Higgins, Chad A. (1999) The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. Personnel Psychology, Autumn 1999, Vol. 52, (3), p621, 32p, 7 charts.

Jung, C. G. (1971). Psychological types. (H.G. Baynes, Trans., revised by R. F. C. Hull), Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1921).

Keirsey, D. & Bates, M. (1984) Please Understand Me: character & temperament types: Fifth Edition, Del Mar, Ca.: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.

Keirsey, D. (1998). Please Understand Me II: temperament character intelligence. Del Mar, Ca.: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.

Laney, A. R. Personal Communication. 1946-1950.

Laney, A. R. (1949). Occupational implications of the Jungian personality function-types as identified by the Briggs-Myers Type Indicator. Unpublished master's thesis, George Washington University.

MacKinnon, D. W. (1961). The personality correlates of creativity: A study of American architects. Berkley, Ca.: Institute of Personality Assessment and Research.

McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. (1989). Reinterpreting the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator from the perspective of the five-factor model of personality. Journal of Personality, 57, 17-39.

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

Myers, I. B. & Myers, P. B. (1980). Gifts Differing. Palo Alto, Ca.: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Ross, John (1966). The relationship between a Jungian personality inventory and tests of ability, personality, and interest. Australian Journal of Psychology, 18, (1). 1-17.

Rubin, A., & Babbie, E (1997). Research methods for social work (3rd. ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/ Cole Publishing Company.

Strickler, L. J. & Ross J. (1964) Some correlates of a Jungian personality inventory, Psychological Reports, 14, 623-643.

Tett, R., Jackson, D., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. Personnel Psychology, 44, 703-742.

Wilson, Glenn Dr., (Ed) (1990). The Marshall Cavendish Encyclopedia of Personal Relationships: Human Behavior. Volume 5, Your personality and potential.

ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITIES

This was a two-person project where authors collaborated throughout. However, for each phase of the project, certain authors took primary responsibility. These responsibilities were assigned in the manner listed below.

1. Data Collection:

Assigned leader Diana Lynne Mathis

Assisted by Virginia Lynne Reed

2. Data Entry and Analysis:

Assigned leader Virginia Lynne Reed

Assisted by Diana Lynne Mathis

3. Writing Report and Presentation of Findings:

a. Introduction and Literature

Assigned leader Diana Lynne Mathis

Assisted by Virginia Lynne Reed

b. Methods

Assigned leader Virginia Lynne Reed

Assisted by Diana Lynne Mathis

c. Results

Assigned leader Virginia Lynne Reed

Assisted by Diana Lynne Mathis

d. Discussion

Assigned leader Diana Lynne Mathis

Assisted by Virginia Lynne Reed