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ABSTRACT

Investigated in the present study were workplace social support variables and personality types as predictors of job satisfaction. Two hundred and fifty staff of Nigeria Breweries Ama Enugu State who volunteered participated in the study. Their average age was 28 years and they were mainly junior and medium level staff. Valid questionnaire were used to collected raw data about the study variables and multiple regression analysis using SPSS version 16 was used to analyze the data. The results showed that perceived workplace social support contributed to 13% of the models significant of $F_{3,249} = 13.8$, $P < .001$. Only supervisors support and organization support were significant predictors of job satisfaction, betas .33 and .13, $P < .001$ and .05 respectively. Colleagues support was not found to be significant predictor of job satisfaction. Also personality type contributed to 22% of the models significant of $F_{5,249} = 14.00$, $P < .001$. Only extraversion, neuroticism and conscientiousness were significant personality traits predictors of job satisfaction at betas .29, -.19, and .27, $P < .001$ and .05 respectively. Agreeableness and openness were not significant predictors of job satisfaction. Discussion was made drawing strength from literature review; implications of the results were highlighted. While limitation and suggestion for future research was stated.
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Introduction

Job satisfaction according to Weiss (2002) is a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job. It is an affective reaction to one’s job. One of the biggest preludes to the study of job satisfaction was the Hawthorne studies (1939). These studies, primarily credited to Elton Mayo of the Harvard Business School, sought to find the effect of various work conditions on workers productivity (Weiss 2002). The studies ultimately showed that novel changes in work condition temporarily increase productivity. It was later found that this increase resulted, not from the new conditions, but from knowledge of being observed. This finding provided strong evidence that people work for purposes other than pay, which paved the way for researchers to investigate other factors in job satisfaction. Orpen and Ryan (1995) stated that job satisfaction can be an important indicator of how employees feel about their jobs and a predictor of work behaviors such as organizational citizenship, absenteeism (Wegge, Schmidt, Parkes & Van Dick, 2007), and turnover (Saari, & Judge, 2004).

Also job satisfaction according to Mount, Illies and Johnson (2006) can partially mediate the relationship of personality variables and deviant work behaviors.
Job satisfaction is an individual or personal variable which can be determined by external factors such as workplace social support and internal factors such as personality type, in addition, Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory (1943), a motivation theory, laid the foundation for job satisfaction theory. This theory explains that people seek to satisfy five specific needs in life: physiological needs, safety needs, social needs, self-esteem needs, and self-actualization. This model served as a good basis from which early researchers developed job satisfaction theories (Mount et al., 2006). The present research focuses on the role of workplace social support and the five factor personality model in job satisfaction.

Workplace social support is a combined instrumental support, emotional support, and mentoring received from both colleagues and supervisors (Hill, Bahniuk, Dobos, and Rouner 1989). Social support is an informal social network that provides individuals with expressions of emotional concern or empathy, practical assistance, informational support or appraisal (Etzion, 1984). In other words, workplace social support focuses on collaborative problem solving and sharing information, reappraising situations and obtaining advice from a variety of personnel such as colleagues, supervisors and managers. Recent investigations of workplace social support have focused
on evaluating the impact of support received from various sources, typically supervisors and colleagues (Brough & Frame 2004). Other researchers such as Deelsra, Peter, Schaufeli, Stroebels, Zijlstra and Doorunen 2003 saw workplace social support as the actions of others that are either helpful or intended to be helpful. It includes a variety of interpersonal behaviors among workers that enhance individual’s psychological or behavioral functioning.

Beginning with earliest need-fulfillment theories of job satisfaction, workplace social support has been identified as a predictor of job satisfaction (Orpen & Pinshaw, 1975, Stamps, 1997). Most researchers have found workplace social support to be positively predicative of job satisfaction (Harris, Moritzen, Robitschek, Imhoff & Lynch, 2001). Yet others found it to predict a variety of negative outcomes including absenteeism and turnover (Winstead, Derlega, Montgomery & Pilkington 1995). Findings may be mixed because the construction of workplace social support is multifaceted (Bahniuk, Dobos, & Hill, 1990). The source of support may be a supervisor, mentor or colleague, the content of the support may include information, appraisal assistance with tasks or emotional support (Bahniuk, et al. 1990).

Hill and colleagues (1989) defined four types of workplace social support. Task support focuses on sharing and exchanging work assignments
and ideas. Career mentoring refers to parent like or adviser relationships with other individuals who have more experience. Coaching involves teaching organizational/ professional rules and goals. Collegial social support includes sharing friendships, personal problems and confidence.

Bahniuk and colleagues (1990) asserted that these workplace social support variables can influence individual job satisfaction. Therefore one of the targets of the present research is to take a position as to whether workplace social support has a role in job satisfaction.

Within the last 20 years, consensus has emerged that a five factor model of personality, often termed the Big five (Goldberg, 1990), can be used to describe the most salient aspects of personality. The five factors are; Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness. The five factor structure is generalized across measures, cultures, and sources of rating (McCrae and John, 1992). Although the five-factor model has been researched in many areas of industrial/ organizational psychology, most notably with respect to Job performance (Barnick & Mount, 1991), the relationship of the five factor model to job satisfaction is much less studied. A number of studies have investigated relations between an isolated facet of the five-factor model and job satisfaction. However, there is a virtual dearth of research that has linked the complete taxonomy to job satisfaction. This is
unfortunate because the five-factor model may provide needed integration to research in job satisfaction. Therefore included in the action of the present research also is whether five-factor model of personality have significant role in job satisfaction.

**Statement of the Problem**

Job satisfaction is a very important variable in industrial/occupational psychology and is equally important for appropriate management of the human resources of every establishment. Previous studies identified lack of job satisfaction as precursor to employee intention to leave (Bevendam 2001; Krueger et al 2002). Alexander, Lichtenstein, Oh and Ullman (1998) found that less supervisory support leads to lack of job satisfaction. Tokar et al 1998 pointed that job satisfaction is related to lower neuroticism and its variants, as well as higher extraversions. The present research therefore examines whether workplace social support and the five factor personality models are potent predicator of job satisfaction.
The present research will therefore attempt to provide answers to the following questions:

1. Will Supervisor social support be a significant predictor of job satisfaction among participants
2. Will Colleagues social support be a significant predictor of job satisfaction among participants
3. Will Organizational social support be a significant predictor of job satisfaction among participants
4. Will Extraversion be a significant predictor of job satisfaction
5. Will Agreeableness be a significant predictor of job satisfaction
6. Will Conscientiousness be a significant predictor of job satisfaction
7. Will Neuroticism be a significant predictor of job satisfaction
8. Will Openness be a significant predictor of job satisfaction
Purpose of Study

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the following,

- Whether supervisor social support is a potent predictor of job satisfaction?
- Whether colleague social support is a potent predictor of job satisfaction?
- Whether organizational social support is a potent predictor of job satisfaction?
- Whether the Extraversion is a potent predictor of job satisfaction?
- Whether Agreeableness is a potent predictor of job satisfaction
- Whether Conscientiousness is a potent predictor of job satisfaction
- Whether Neuroticism is a potent predictor of job satisfaction
- Whether Openness is a potent predictor of job satisfaction
Operational Definition of Terms

**Workplace social Support:** This is seen as either Supervisor support, colleagues support or organizational support and represent the scores obtained from scoring the responses of the participants in the perceived workplace social support inventory developed by the researcher, which measures the perceive actions of others in workplace such as (Supervisor, colleagues and organization) that are either helpful or intended to be helpful to an individual.

**Five-factor personality Model:**

This is determined by the score obtain from scoring the responses of participants in the big five inventory by John, Donalue and kentle (1991), and which assesses personality from a five dimensional perspective namely.

a. Extraversion: high energy and activity level, dominance, sociability, expressiveness and positive emotion.

b. Agreeableness: pro-social orientation, altruism, tender mindedness, trust and modesty.

c. Conscientiousness: Impulse control, task orientation, goal directedness.
d. Neuroticism: Anxiety, sadness, irritability and nervous tension.

e. Openness: It exemplifies the breadth, depth, and complexity of an individual’s mental and experiential life.

**Job satisfaction:** This is the total score obtained from scoring the responses of the participants in job satisfaction questionnaire by Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist (1967) which assesses the fulfillment a worker derives from his/her input into the job environment.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

The present chapter is divided into

1. Theoretical Review

2. Empirical Review

Theoretical Review

Job satisfaction model

Organizations reach different levels of satisfactions in their job. Job satisfaction according to Weiss (2002) is a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or an affective reaction to one’s job. Some of these models of job satisfaction: include:

Affect Theory: This theory was proposed Locke (1976), and is arguably the most famous job satisfaction model. The main premise of this theory is that satisfaction is determined by a discrepancy between what one wants in a job and what one has in a job. Further, the theory states that how much one values a given facet of work (e.g. the degree of autonomy in a position) moderates how satisfied / dissatisfied one becomes when expectations are or not met. When a person values a particular facet of a job his satisfaction is
more greatly impacted both positively (when expectations are met) and negatively (when expectations are not met); compared to one who does not value that facet.

To illustrate, if Employee A value autonomy in the workplace and Employee B is indifferent about autonomy, then Employee A would be more satisfied in a position that offers a high degree of autonomy and less satisfied in a position with little or no autonomy compared to Employee B. This theory also states that too much of a particular facet will produce stronger feelings of dissatisfaction the more a worker value that facet. The theory however fails to explain the causes of the affects, or rather suggest that the affects are originated from job factors.

**Dispositional Theory:** Another well-known job satisfaction theory is the dispositional theory. It is a very general theory that suggests that people have innate dispositions that cause them to have tendencies toward a certain level of satisfaction, regardless of one’s job. This approach became a notable explanation of job satisfaction in light of evidence that job satisfaction tends to be stable over time and across careers and jobs. Researches also indicated that identical twins have similar levels of job satisfaction. A significant model that narrowed the scope of the dispositional theory was the core self-evaluations model, proposed by Judge (1998). Judge, argued that there are
four core self-evaluations that determined one’s disposition toward job satisfaction; self-esteem, general self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism. The model states that lower levels of neuroticism lead to higher job satisfaction.

The major short fall of the model is that it sees job satisfaction only from internal perspective individual factor, undermining the job factor that can equally wade some affects on the level of job satisfaction.

**Two factor theory (Motivator-Hygiene Theory)**

In his theory, Herzberg (1959) suggested that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are caused by different and independent sets of factors. He found that when people are satisfied, they attribute their satisfaction to the work itself, while when people are dissatisfied with their jobs, they are concerned about the environment in which they work. Therefore, we can say that job satisfaction is caused, on the one hand, by a set of factors related to the work itself, such as nature of job, achievement in the work, possibilities of personal growth and recognition, and promotion opportunities.

These factors are called motivators by Herzberg, as they should motivate people to higher performances. On the other hand, job dissatisfaction is a result of conditions that surround the doing of the job, such as (Physical) working conditions, salary, company policies, job
security, quality of supervision, and relations with others. Herzberg called these factors Hygiene or maintenance factors. These are not an intrinsic part of a job but they refer to the environment and have the function of preventing job dissatisfaction. The hygiene factors must be continually maintained by management because they are never completely satisfied. It is important to underline that if hygiene factors are at a very low level, workers are dissatisfied, but the reverse is not true. When hygiene factors are satisfied and the environment is good, workers are not dissatisfied but neither necessarily satisfied and they are not motivated to higher performance. However, when motivators are satisfied, workers and often lead to better performances. In other words, Herzberg’s theory does not place dissatisfaction and satisfaction at opposite ends of a single, unbroken continuum (Kreitner, Kinicki, & Buelens, 1999) but it considers satisfaction and dissatisfaction as separated dimensions. There is a zero midpoint at which workers can be either be dissatisfied or satisfied.

Locke (1976) analyzed logical criticism of Herzberg’s theory and concluded that in one respect, Herzberg made a major contribution to job satisfaction theory, but on the other hand, the idea of separate and independent factors
seemed to be logically and empirically indefensible. Locke affirmed that these factors are separable but interdependent.

**Rosabeth Kanter’s (1979) structural theory of power in organizations**

According to Kanter (1993), workplace behaviors and attitudes are determined by social structures in the workplace, not personal predispositions. She claims that workers are empowered when they perceive that their work environments provide opportunity for growth and access to power needed to carry out job demands. When these conditions are lacking, employees experience powerlessness. This threatens organizational productivity since powerless individuals are more susceptible to burnout and reduced job satisfaction (Kanter 1979). Kanter defines power as the capacity to mobilize resources to accomplish work, and identifies structural characteristics within an organization that influence an individual’s ability to access and mobilize the resources of job-related empowerment: (1) power, that is, access to resources, support and information and (2) opportunity, that is, access to challenge, growth and development. Access to these organizational structures is influenced by the degree of formal and informal power an individual has in the organization. Formal power is acquired by excellent performance of job related activities that are extraordinary, visible or attract the attention of others, and are relevant to the solution of pressing
organizational problems (Brown & Kanter 1982). Informal power results from political and social alliances with sponsors, peers, and subordinates in the organization. Sponsors include mentors, coaches, and teachers with higher level positions in the organization who provide approval, prestige, or support to individuals that can lead to sponsored mobility within the hierarchy. Alliances with peers are necessary for any power base, as a peer one day could become an individual’s boss the next. The structure of power is derived from three sources: access to support, information and resources. Support refers to feedback and guidance received from superiors, peers, and subordinates. Information refers to the data, technical knowledge, and expertise required to function effectively in one’s position. Resources are the materials, money, supplies, equipment, and time necessary to accomplish organizational goals. Individuals who perceive themselves as having power tend to foster higher group morale and cooperation, delegate more control and latitude to subordinates, provide opportunities to subordinates and are viewed by others as helping rather than hindering (Kanter 1979, 1993). The structure of opportunity refers to the individual’s prospects of growth and mobility within the organization (Kanter 1993) and includes autonomy, growth, a sense of challenge and the chance to learn and develop. Those who perceive themselves as having access to opportunity invest in work and seek
ways to learn, contributing to personal growth and development. Individuals in low opportunity positions exhibit low self-esteem, disengage themselves from work, and lower their aspirations. Kanter (1993) maintains that individuals with access to power and opportunity structures can accomplish the tasks required to achieve organizational goals. Because they have these tools, they are highly motivated and able to motivate and empower others (Brown & Kanter 1982). Individuals without access to power structures perceive themselves to be powerless and become more rules-minded and less committed to organizational goals.

In summary, while no single reviewed theory provided all embracing link with the independent variables of interest (Workplace social support and five model personality), each of the theory has something to say about Job satisfaction and the independent variable. Thus depositional model for instance provides a good link between Job satisfaction and five model personalities, while two-factor theory and structural theory of power provided equally good link between job satisfaction and workplace social support. Therefore these theories are adopted models for the present research.
Empirical Reviews

Workplace social support and job satisfaction

Recent investigations of workplace social support has focused on evaluating the impact of support received from various sources, typical supervisors and colleagues (Brough & Frame, 2004). Empirical finding on the relationship between workplace social support and job satisfaction may be mixed because the construct of workplace social support is multifaceted (Bahniuk, Dobos, & Hill, 1990). However beginning with the earliest need fulfillment theories of job satisfaction, workplace social support has been identified as a predictor of job satisfaction (Orpen & Pinshaw, 1975). Smither (1988) and Buckingham and Coffman (1999) found that overall workplace social support is a potent predictor of job satisfaction. Also Stamps (1997) found workplace social support a potent predictor of job satisfaction. Some researchers have found that the source of workplace social support produced a substantial difference in the prediction of job satisfaction. Brough and Pears (2007) found that social support received from colleagues had no significant influence on job satisfaction, where as social support received from supervisors demonstrated strong associations with job satisfaction and also significantly predicted improved satisfaction outcomes. In a similar researcher, Schirmar and Lopez
(2001) reported a significant positive association between supervisor support and job satisfaction. Brough and Frame (2004) also demonstrated via structural equation modeling that supervisor support directly predicated job satisfaction, while colleague support did not. Harris, Winksowski and Englali (2007) found workplace social support as predictor of job satisfaction but supervisor’s related facet is a better predictor than support from colleague. In a related study Sarmiento, Laschiger, and Iwasiw (2004) investigated workplace empowerment among health workers and found that job satisfaction was explained by high levels of organizational empowerment. Also Laschinger et al. (2001) found that workplace support and are related to important organizational outcome such as job satisfaction. Similarly, DeStefano, Clark, & Potter (2005) in a study investigated organizational factors as predictors of Job Satisfaction among 742 staff employed by rural behavioral health agencies and the results indicated that the organizational factors of Support, Involvement and Innovation contributed significantly to 11 dimensions of job satisfaction among rural behavioral health professional and paraprofessional staff.

However, there are exceptions to this rule in the research literature, (Ducharme & Martin, 2000). Workplace social support also predicts a variety of negative outcomes, including absenteeism, (Winstead et al, 1995).
Other researchers that supported workplace social support as a predicator of job satisfaction include (Smith & Tziner, 1990). Winstead, Derlega, Montgomery, & Pilkington, 1995, Hans et al 2001).

In a study to investigate workplace support, role overload, and job satisfaction of direct care workers in assisted living, Chou and Robert (2008) found that job satisfaction is positively associated with institutional support, supervisor support and coworker emotional support.

From the various reviews it can be said that workplace social support is an important factor in job satisfaction. Therefore the present research will add to the existing literature in research in this area especially in a Nigerian context.

**Relationship of the Big five personality with job satisfaction**

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

**Extraversion:** Whereas neuroticism is related to the experience of negative life events, extraverts are predisposed to experience positive emotion (Costa & McGrae, 1992), and satisfaction. Evidence also indicates that extraverts have more friends and spend more time in social situations than do introverts and because of their social facility, are likely to find interpersonal interactions (such as those that occur at work) more rewarding (Watson & Clark, 1997).

**Openness to Experience:** Openness to experience is related to scientific and artistic creativity (Feist, 1998), divergent thinking, low religiosity, and political liberalism. None of these psychological states seem to be closely related to job satisfaction (Judge, Heller and Mount, 2002). Furthermore, DeNeve and Cooper (1998) noted that openness to experience is a double-edged sword that predisposes individuals to feel both the good and the bad more deeply, rendering its directional influence on affective reactions like subjective well-being or job satisfaction unclear.

**Agreeableness:** McGrae and Costa (1991) argued that agreeableness should be related to happiness because agreeable individuals have greater motivation to achieve interpersonal intimacy, which should lead to greater
level of well-being. McCrae and Costa (1991) found that agreeableness was positively related to life satisfaction, although at a relatively low level (Mean r=.16). Assuming these same communal motivations exist on the job, then the same process should operate with respect to job satisfaction. Organ and Lingl (1995) apparently agreed, commenting that agreeableness involves getting along with others in pleasant, satisfying relationship.

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

There are very few empirical studies that show the relationship between five-factor personality and job satisfaction. Jugde, Heller and Mount (2002) asserted that the five-factor personality model is a fruitful basis for examining the dispositional source of job satisfaction. In their study, the traits of neuroticism, extraversion and conscientiousness displayed moderate correlations with job satisfaction. In a meta-analytic review, (Judge, et al. 2002) found that neuroticism emerged as the strongest and
most consistent correlate of job satisfaction. It is also the big five trait that has been studied most often in relation to job satisfaction. Judge et al (2002) also found that the Extraversion displayed non zero relationships with job satisfaction across studies.

In their own study, Tokar, Fischer and Subich (1998) noted that greater job satisfaction is related to lower neuroticism and its variants, as well as to higher extraversions and related traits. Judge et al, (2002), Organ and Lingel (1995), Barrick and mount, (1991), all found that conscientiousness displayed a strong correlation with job satisfaction.

Agreeableness and Openness to experience displayed relatively weak correlation with job satisfaction. Judge colleagues summaries their finding on Agreeableness and Openness to experiences thus: “although the mean agreeableness correlation was non-zero, the correlations were highly variable across studies, more than one of five agreeableness correlation were negative and a roughly equal number were between 00 and .01”. DeNeve and Cooper (1998) also found that openness to experiences is divergence with job satisfaction.

Finally, Viswesvaran (2000) found that extraversion and neuroticism has the stronger relationship to job satisfaction than any other in the five-factor model. Because five factor personality model seem to give more rooms to
explore as many traits as possible in an individuals, the present research hope to explore this five-factor models in detail as it relates to job satisfaction in a Nigerian context.

**Hypotheses**

1. Supervisor perceived social support will not significantly predict job satisfaction among participants,
2. Colleagues perceived social support will not significantly predict job satisfaction among participants
3. Organizational perceived social support will not significantly predict job satisfaction among participants
4. Extraversion will not be a statistically significant predictor of job satisfaction
5. Agreeableness will not be a statistically significant predictor of job satisfaction
6. Conscientiousness will not be a statistically significant predictor of job satisfaction
7. Neuroticism will not be a statistically significant predictor of job satisfaction
8. Openness will not be a statistically significant predictor of job satisfaction
CHAPTER THREE

Method

Participants:

Two hundred and fifty (250) staff of Nigeria Breweries plc Ama Enugu who willingly volunteers to fill the questionnaire participated in this study. This type of sample is described as accidental sample technique and is suitable for a survey research (Bordens and Abbott, 2008). These participants included senior, middle and junior staff who have worked at least two years with the company. Their age ranges are 24 to 48 years with an average age of 28 years.

Instruments:

Three instruments will be used in this research they are;

Work place social support inventory:

This questionnaire was adapted from Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sowa’s(1986) survey of perceived organizational support(SPOS). Seven items was lifted from the SPOS and 18 items were added by the researcher making it 21 items. The response is patterned in a four points likert format ranging from 4 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree. 8 items were
negatively framed and must be inverted during scoring. The inventory has three subscales (perceived supervisor support scale, colleague support scale and organization support scale) see appendix A.

Four experts in industrial psychology and human resource management were given the questionnaire for face validity and their suggestions were used to rephrase some of the questions.

A pilot study was conducted to validate the items using 120 health workers in Enugu urban area.

Reliability studies were conducted; these include an item analysis which was used to measure the internal consistency of the items. The result of the items analysis showed that all the items loaded above .3 showing that the items have high internal consistency see appendix D. The result of the Cronbach alpha showed that the total items correlation is alpha=.97 while a split-half reliability of r=.87 was also obtained. A correlation of the PWPSS with self-esteem questionnaire of Rosenberg (1965) yielded a concurrent validity of r=.67.

**Big five inventory (BFI)** was developed by John, Donalue and kentle (1991), to assess personality from a five-dimensional perspective. The essence of the perspective is that personality characteristics can be resolved
into five broad dimensions which are distinct from one another see appendix B.

The five dimensions or subscales of (BFI) are:

a. Extraversion: high energy and activity level, dominance, sociability, expressiveness and positive emotion.

b. Agreeableness: pro-social orientation, altruism, tender mindedness, trust and modesty.

c. Conscientiousness: Impulse control, task orientation, goal directedness.

d. Neuroticism: Anxiety, sadness, irritability and nervous tension.

e. Openness: It exemplifies the breadth, depth, and complexity of an individual’s mental and experiential life.

BFI contain 44 items which are arranged in a likert format ranging from 1 = Disagree strongly to 5 = Agree strongly. The scoring and the norms are contained in the manual by the authors.

Psychometric properties: John et al (1991) provided the original psychometric properties for American samples, while Umeh (2004) provide the properties for Nigerian samples. A test retest reliability of r= 85 and Alpha of r = .80 was obtain by John et al (1991). The divergent validity
coefficient obtained by Umeh (2004) with University Maladjustment scale range from Extraversion = .05 to Neuroticism = .39.

**Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire:**

The questionnaire was developed by Weiss, Dawis, England and lofquist (1967) to assess job satisfaction which is the fulfillment a worker derives from his/her input into the job environment. The 20-item inventory is the short version of the 100 item-inventory earlier developed by the authors. The questionnaire is in a Likert format ranging from 1 = very dissatisfied to 5 = very satisfied see appendix C. It has three components which it measures, intrinsic satisfaction (I), extrinsic satisfaction (E) and general satisfaction (G). The scoring pattern is contained in the inventory manual by the authors. Weiss et al (1967) provided the psychometric properties for American samples while Mogaji (1997) provided the properties for Nigeria samples. While Weiss et al (1967) found a test retest reliability of $r = .80$ to .90 for the different components, Mogaji (1997) found the reliability of $r = .69$ to .94 equally of the different components. Also Mogaji (1997) found a concurrent validity of .50 correlating the inventory with job description index in Nigerian samples.
Procedure:

Permission letter was obtain from the authority of the company to allow the researcher administer his questionnaire to the staff. And a consent letter was given which permitted to researcher to conduct his study in the company. The researcher liaises with the human resource department of the company who admitted to help administer and collected the questionnaire on behalf of the researcher as this is their industrial rule.

The three instruments were given to all the volunteered participants simultaneously to fill and return the following day to the human resources department. Thereafter the questionnaire was collected from the human resource department by the researcher who scored them as described by their manuals and then uses SPSS 15 to analyze the data. Out of 260 volunteered staff only 250 fill the inventory properly within the period allowed by the authorities to conduct the research.

Design/Statistics

The design for the study will be cross sectional survey design and multiple regression analysis will be used to analyze the data.
Chapter Four

Results

Table 1: ANOVA Summary for social support as predictor of job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3194.91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1064.97</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>18877.73</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>76.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22072.64</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = Significant at P < .001

Table 2: Model summary for the workplace social support as predictor of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Standard error of estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>8.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged (F_{3, 249} = 13.8, P < .001). The Adjusted R square = .13
Table 3 shows the multiple regression coefficients for social support as predictor of job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients Beta</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague support</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization support</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: ** = P < .001, * P < .05.

Although the ANOVA summary in table 1 showed a significant model exists and the Adjust R square showed that the predictor variables contributed (perceived social support) to 13% of the explanation of job satisfaction, only supervisors support 33% and organizational support 13% were significant predictors of job satisfaction at P < .001 and P < .05 respectively. Colleagues support was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction. Thus hypotheses 1 and 2 were rejected while hypothesis 3 was accepted.
Personality and job satisfaction.

Table 4 ANOVA summary for big five personality type as predictors of job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4941.04</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>988.21</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>17131.59</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>70.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22072.64</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = P < .001

Table 5: Model summary for personality as predictor of job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Standard error of estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the enter method, a significant model emerged (F 5, 249=14.1, P < .001). The Adjusted R square = .21.
Table 6 shows the multiple regression coefficients for big five personality type as predictor of job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient Beta</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = P < .001, * = P < .05
,NS = Not Significant.

The ANOVA summary in table 4 showed a significant model exists and the Adjust R square showed that the predictor variable (big five personality type) contributed to 21% of the explanation of job satisfaction, only extraversion =29%, neuroticism = -.19% and conscientiousness = .27% were significant predictors of job satisfaction at P <.001 and P <.05 respectively. Agreeableness and openness was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction. Thus hypotheses, 4, 6, and 8 were rejected while hypotheses, 5 and 7 were accepted.
Summary of finding

The following are the summary of the results

i. Supervisors support was found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

ii. Colleague support was not found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

iii. Organizational support was found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

iv. Extraversion was found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

v. Agreeableness was not found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

vi. Neuroticism was found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

vii. Openness was not found to be a significant predictor of job satisfactory.

viii. Conscientiousness was found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.
CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

The findings of the present study show that perceived work place social support significantly predicted job satisfaction among the participants. This finding is consistent with the works of Buckingham and Coffman, 1999, Orpen and Pinshaw, 1975, and Stamps, 1997) who found in their various studies that overall workplace social support is a potent predicator of job satisfaction. However, the works of Bahniuk, Dobos and Hill (1990) asserted that perceived workplace social support is a multifaceted construct with sub types as supervisors support, colleagues support and organization support.

Thus an analysis of the sub types of perceived social support on job satisfaction showed that supervisors support is a significant predictor of job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with the studies by (Brough and pears 2007, Brough and frame, 2004, Harris, et al., 2007) who in their various studies using different participants found that perceived workplace social support is a significant predictor of job satisfaction. The result of the analysis further showed that colleague support was not found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. The present finding is concordance
with the finding by (Brough and Frame, 2004; Brough and Pears, 2007; Sarmiento Laschiger and Iwasiw, 2004) who found that colleague support was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction. However, this present finding is contrary to the findings of (Buckingham and Coffman, 1999, Chou and Robert 2008, Clark and Potter 2005, Laschinget, 2001, Orpen and Pinshaw, 1975) who found that colleague support minimally predict job satisfaction. Also, organizational support was found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. The finding is consistent with studies by (Chou and Robert 2008, Destefano, Clark and Potter, 2005, Hans et al, 2001, Laschinger et al 2001, Sarmierito, Laschinger and Iwasiw, 2004) who in their studies found that organizational support or institutional support were significant predictors of job satisfaction. The present finding that supervisors’ support and organizational support are significant predictors of job satisfaction can further be explained using Kanter’s (1979) structural theory of power in organizations. Kanter (1979) argued that workplace behaviors and expressions are determined by social structure in the workplace such as (supervisor, colleague, and management) and she claims that workers are empowered when they perceive that their work environments provide opportunity for growth and access to power needed to carry out job demands. Therefore, when the necessary supports from these social
structures in the workplace are lacking employees feel powerlessness and dissatisfied.

Thus job related satisfactions include access to resources, support and adequate information and access to challenge, growth and development. Bravn and Kanter (1982) noted specifically that formal satisfaction is acquired by excellent performance of job related activities, while informal satisfaction results from political and social alliances with sponsors, subordinates, superiors in the organization. Similarly, two factor theory by Herzberg supports the present findings. Motivators according to Herzberg are concerned about the environment in which people work which includes such things such as quality of supervision, and company’s policies. These factors are predicted to have significant impact on job satisfaction among workers. The findings of the present study are implicated in understanding other ways of improving job satisfaction among employees. Job satisfaction is a vital factor that determines productivity, burnout, absenteeism and the level of organizational citizenship in an organizational setting (Wegge, Schmidt, Parkes & Van Dick, 2007). Specifically supervisors and organizational social support are important factors that organizations should promote among their staff. This trend has given rise to mentoring which is
the state of art in organizational management (Appelbaum, Ritchie & Shapiro, 1994).

The result of the finding further showed that personality traits are a significant predictor of job satisfaction among workers. Personality traits were measured in the present study using big five personality inventory by (John et al 1991). The inventory have five sub types of personality traits namely, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism, openness and conscientiousness. When these five personality traits were regress with job satisfaction, the results showed that only extraversion, neuroticism and conscientiousness significantly predicted job satisfaction. Neuroticism is negatively related to job satisfaction, implying that those with low neuroticism should have high job satisfaction. Again extraversion and conscientiousness were positively related to job satisfaction, implying that those with high level of extraversion and conscientiousness will show high job satisfaction. This present finding is consistent with the study by (Barrick and Mount, 1991, Judge, Heller and Mount, 2002, Tokar, Fischer and Subich, 1998, Orpen and Lingel, 1995, viswesvaran, 2000) all found that extraversion, neuroticism and conscientiousness are significantly related to job satisfaction. Agreeableness and openness are found not to be
significantly related to job satisfaction. The result is consistent with the work of Barrick and Mount 1991, Judge et al 2002).

This finding is further explained using Judge (1998) dispositional theory of job satisfaction which states that people have innate dispositions that cause them to have tendencies toward a certain level of satisfaction regardless of the job. This further our understanding of why people select different career choice, because certain job routine may not really go well with their traits. The result of this finding is implicated in job placement, staff training and empowerment of the staff in establishments.

Implications of the research finding

Job satisfaction is an industrial psychological variable that has been well researched and has been shown to have many positive or negative impact on the amount of input an individual give to an organization were his or she works. Perceived work place social support is an independent variable which was found to be significant predictor of job satisfaction. This is implicated in understanding one of the work place environments that can influence job satisfaction. It also threw more light on the best way to improve workers job satisfaction. This may include increasing the level of formal or informed
supervisors support or organizational support given to workers in their workplace.

Also personality traits (Extraversion and conscientiousness) are easily satisfied, why neuroticism is negatively related to job satisfaction, implying that caution should be taken to really understand how best to motivate people with personality type like neuroticism, agreeableness and openness in workplace like the Breweries.

**Limitation of the study**

There are many other variable which can Co-predict the researchers dependent variable. However, the present study did not consider them all.

The study has some limitations, they include:

i. The Socio-economic status of the participants was not considered in the analysis.

ii. The factory have shift duties, some staff work in morning, afternoon or night shift and the present study did not considered it.

iii. The study did not show clearly how to improve workplace social support or personality traits.

iv. Majority of the participants were junior and medium staff.
Suggestion for future study

The replication of this study has to be within certain bounds, some factors obviously manifested themselves as problems during the process of the study. These factors were sufficient to jeopardize and limit the external validity of the result if proper care was not taken. Therefore, interested researchers in this area should make sure that the participants that were given the questionnaire are properly identified for easy collection. Also some of the participants has some questions they wanted to clarify from the researcher before filling the questionnaire but they were not able to do so because the questionnaire were indirectly administered to them through their human resources department. Therefore one by one administration of questionnaire by the researcher is preferable.

Summary/conclusion

One key factor that determines the progress of any organization is the staff and the amount of input they make in the organization. However, job satisfaction has been found to be major determinant of the amount of involvement or input the staff of any organization is ready to give to the organization.
Supervisor’s support which is the amount of informal or formal contact or mentoring an individual receives from his superiors in the workplace is shown to be a positive predictor of job satisfaction, so is organizational support too. Therefore organizations and human resources managers should promote supervisor social support and organizational support in their organization through formally introducing programs that improve teamwork and mentoring which are sources of social support to staff. Also, active involvement of staff in issues concerning them through focus group forums where each staff is allowed to express his/her view about a particular issue can improve individual personality to be extraverted and openness, where general explanation and clarification during such forum can improve an individual who has neuroticism personality.

Finally, future studies can explore other work settings such as health, education, and law enforcement agencies to see if similar results are obtainable there, while proper caution should be taken on issues such as socio-economic status, shift or non-shift works to make sure that these variables did not co-predict the outcomes.
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