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INTRODUCTION

This study is a systematic replication of an experiment performed by Abraham Korman (1970) which examined the effect of self-esteem and goal level on task performance. The present study differs from Korman's in two significant ways; the manner in which goals were established, and the inclusion of a measure of satisfaction with the task as a second dependent variable. The experiment described here, and the accompanying literature review, deal with the following questions:

1. What is self-esteem, and how does it fit into a hypothesis of motivation?

2. What are the effects of self-esteem on task performance and task satisfaction?

3. What are the effects of goal level on task performance and task satisfaction? Is the effect different if goals are set by the experimenter or set by the subjects?

4. Is there an interaction effect of self-esteem and goal level on task performance and task satisfaction?

Consistency Hypotheses

Korman's study was part of a series of experiments in which he was testing a consistency hypothesis of work behavior. Korman supposed that persons would be motivated to perform on a task or job in a manner consistent with the self-concept with which they approached the job or task situation; that is, the extent to which their self-concept concerning the task required effective performance in order for the performance to be consistent with their self-concept.

1 Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
He also supposed that persons would choose and find most satisfying those tasks that were consistent with their self concept.

Korman saw the self-concept as synonymous with self-esteem, and defined it as the degree to which one sees oneself as a competent, need satisfying individual. There were in his hypothesis, three types of self-esteem: Chronic self-esteem, a relatively persistent attitude that occurs across a variety of situations; task specific self-esteem, which is a person's attitude toward his ability to perform on a particular task based on his previous experience with the task or similar tasks; and socially influenced self-esteem, or self-competence based on others' opinions about one's ability to do specific things. Any or all of these could affect a person's self-perceived competence in a given situation.

Korman has described his hypothesis about the role of self-esteem in affecting behavior in a text book on industrial psychology (Korman 1971) in which he discussed three theories of motivation. One of these is the incentive theory, which suggests that persons will try to maximize their expected values and outcomes by their own work performance. The second is the theory of achievement motivation, which presumes that people possess a characteristic which predisposes them to try to attain a certain level of performance in task situations. The third, which Korman subscribed to, and attempted to document, is the theory of balance or self-consistency.

Korman's hypothesis of motivation has a number of antecedents. Lecky (1945) believed that personality represents the organization of an individual's values and that these values are felt by the
individual to be consistent with one another. A person's behavior is motivated by the need to maintain the integrity and unity of this organization. A person seeks those experiences that support his values, and avoids, resists, or rejects those that are inconsistent with them. A person may change his conceptions, but only if his responses are continually inconsistent with them. The tendency to maintain his existing organization of values is generally the stronger tendency. Lecky based his viewpoints primarily on clinical data, observations, and the internal consistency he found in personality measures.

Another consistency or balance theory is that of Heider (1958). The basic units in Heider's theory are "sentiments" or entities. Two or more sentiments form a unit when they are perceived as belonging together. The sentiments are cognitive units such as an attitude toward a person or idea, or knowledge of a fact or of relationships among facts. The formation of units, and the relations among units tend toward a balanced state. A balanced state is one in which there is no stress toward change. An imbalance between entities in a unit produces tension. This tension motivates the reduction in imbalance. If entities which belong together are all positive or all negative, a state of balance exists. Two kinds of changes can reduce tension; (1) changes in sentiment relations or attitudes towards units, or (2) changes in unit relations, that is, the attitudes towards the relations or the relations themselves.

Osgood and Tannenbaum (1955) described a balance or consistency hypothesis relating to changes in attitudes. According to their view,
changes in attitudes are always in the direction of increasing congruity with an existing frame of reference. Three variables are central to their formulation:

a. a person's existing attitude toward the source of a message.

b. a person's existing attitude toward the concept evaluated by the source.

c. the nature of the evaluating assertion that relates the source and concept in a message.

An example of a source concept pair might be "Jimmy Carter (source) favors (evaluating assertion) capital punishment (concept)." If one felt positive toward Jimmy Carter, but was opposed to capital punishment, and one's opposition to capital punishment was stronger (more in line with one's existing frame of reference) than one's positive feelings toward Jimmy Carter, then the positive feeling toward Jimmy Carter would decrease, in order for congruency to increase. Similarly, if one's positive feeling toward Jimmy Carter were stronger than one's negative feeling about capital punishment, one would change one's attitude toward capital punishment in order to increase congruency. A test of the congruity hypothesis using three different source-concept pairs, and 405 college students as subjects, showed that the predicted attitude changes occurred in every case (Osgood & Tannenbaum, 1955).

Perhaps the best known balance or consistency theory is that of Festinger (1957). His term for imbalance is "cognitive dissonance." Dissonance occurs between cognitions or elements. These cognitions are knowledges, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes about oneself, one's behavior, or one's surroundings. There are
three possible relations among elements: irrelevance, consonance, or dissonance. Irrelevant cognitions have no relationship to one another. Dissonance exists when, considering two elements alone, the obverse of one follows from the other. Consonance exists where one cognition follows from another. Basic to the theory are two hypotheses: 1. The existence of dissonance, being psychologically unacceptable, will motivate a person to try to reduce the dissonance and achieve consonance. 2. When dissonance is present, in addition to trying to reduce it, the person will actively avoid situations and information which would likely increase the dissonance.

Dissonance can be reduced in several ways. One way is to change a behavioral cognitive element by changing behavior. A second way is by changing an environmental cognitive element. This is more easily done when the social environment is involved. For example, one can find a new circle of associates whose attitudes support one's attitudes or behavior. A third method, which will reduce dissonance, but may not eliminate it, is to add cognitive elements which are consistent with one of the dissonant elements. A person trying to rationalize behavior which he knows is bad for him goes through this kind of process.

The greater the magnitude of dissonance, the greater will be the pressure to reduce it. There may also be resistance to reduction based on several factors: How consistent with reality is a behavior? Is the behavior otherwise satisfying? Is a change in behavior possible? Can the social environment be changed? Also,
an element is in some kind of a relationship with a number of other elements—changing it may produce more dissonance than consonance, if most of the present relationships are consonant.

One may also avoid dissonance (Festinger 1957). If past experience has led one to fear dissonance, one will avoid it. Festinger tied avoidance of dissonance to individual differences in tolerance for dissonance. Those with less tolerance will be more likely to avoid it.

From Festinger's formulation it can be hypothesized that persons whose behavior is inconsistent or dissonant with their opinions about themselves will be motivated to reduce dissonance either by changing their behavior, or changing their attitudes towards themselves. This hypothesis is very close to Korman's consistency hypothesis. The chief difference is that Korman's viewpoint does not require the creation of dissonance which must then be reduced, but rather involves the maintenance of existing consistency, as well as reduction of dissonance. The notion of maintenance of consistency is more in line with Lecky's theory (Lecky 1945).

An important test of Festinger's theory was conducted by Aronson & Carlsmith (1962). In this study, four groups of subjects were used. Subjects were given a succession of four tasks that were similar to one another. Two groups were led to believe they had done well, and two that they had done poorly on each of the four tasks. On the fifth task, one "high" group and one "low" group were given information about results opposite to what they had expected. This created dissonance. The subjects were then given another chance to do the
fifth task, on the pretext that the experimenter had erred. It was predicted that those subjects in the dissonant groups would change more answers than those in the consonant groups. This was borne out even for the group whose expectation was to do poorly. They changed correct answers to incorrect answers in order to achieve consistency.

Several attempts have been made to replicate Aronson & Carlsmith's study. One which supported the findings of Aronson & Carlsmith was by Cottrell (1965). The method used by Cottrell was basically the same as that of Aronson & Carlsmith. One additional variable, public-private disclosure, was introduced. Half the subjects were told that their results would be posted, and the other half were told their scores would be kept confidential. On the relationship between expectancy, performance discrepancy, and changed responses, the results of Aronson & Carlsmith were supported. The disclosure variable had no significant effect on the subjects' dissonance reduction responses.

Another test of Festinger's theory, which does not support Aronson & Carlsmith's findings, was conducted by Beijk (1966). He introduced the variable of measured self-concept, which Korman would identify as self-esteem. A thirty item, self-concept test was given to 120 first-year psychology students. From this group, the thirty-two students with the highest scores and the thirty-two students with the lowest scores were selected for the experiment. Within each self-concept level, subjects were randomly assigned to Aronson & Carlsmith's four conditions. Two hypotheses were tested:

1. Subjects whose performance on the fifth section of the test was
consistent with their expectancy, changed less when this section was repeated than subjects for whom the fifth section was dissonant;

2. Subjects with a positive self-concept would, when the fifth section was repeated, consistently try to do better than the low self-esteem subjects.

The first hypothesis was not supported. The results showed that subjects with a high score on the fifth trial changed less than subjects with a low score. Subjects with low self-concept changed more responses in all conditions than subjects with a positive self-concept. The difference was not statistically significant, however. Beijk could not explain to his own satisfaction the reason for the difference between his own results and those of Aronson & Carlsmith. He suggested that a variable of "commitment," the degree to which subjects engage in or feel responsible for behavior that involves the frustration of important drives, may be a factor.

Vroom (1964) provides us with yet another example of a balance or consistency theory. He hypothesized that if a person believes himself to possess an ability, and believes that successful performance of his task requires that ability, he will prefer to perform the task effectively rather than perform it ineffectively. If he thinks that effective performance is irrelevant to the ability he possesses, he will not care whether he performs the task effectively or ineffectively. If he believes that effective performance is negatively related to the ability, he will prefer not to perform the task effectively.

Kaufman (1962) carried out an experiment designed to test Vroom's
hypothesis. The effects of value placed on an ability, the relevance of the ability to task performance, and the nature of the outcome, were tested. Ninety-six male college students were given the Raven Progressive Matrices Test (Raven 1949). Each subject was told he had done extremely well, and that his performance indicated a high degree of "speed of closure." Half of the subjects were told that speed of closure was important only to the job of a textile spotter. The other half were told that it was an important ability in nearly all occupations. All were then given a second test, a modified version of the WAIS Digit Symbol Test. Half were told it was a measure of speed of closure, and half were told it was for some other purpose. Four groups were thus created in terms of what they were told the second test did or did not measure: measured an ability they possessed and valued, measured an ability they possessed and did not value, did not measure an ability they possessed and valued, did not measure an ability they possessed and did not value.

All four groups were told that they failed the second task, and were given another test which they also failed. They were then given a questionnaire that contained questions dealing with their satisfaction and liking for the task situation. The results supported the prediction that those who failed on a test of an ability they possessed and valued were most dissatisfied (group 1). Those who failed on a test of an ability they possessed but did not value, were least dissatisfied (group 2). Groups 3 and 4 fell in between.

In addition to the studies already cited in support of
refutation of the hypotheses and theories presented above, there are additional studies bearing on the balance or consistency model of motivation that should be mentioned.

Korman (1968) tested the effects of self-esteem on task liking. Three experiments were conducted. As a part of the study, Korman predicted that task success and task liking should be positively related for high self-esteem subjects, but unrelated for low self-esteem subjects. Success is consistent with the self-esteem of high self-esteem subjects but not with the self-esteem of low self-esteem subjects. In this experiment, chronic self-esteem was measured by the Ghiselli Self-Description Inventory (Ghiselli 1971). The tasks used were forms of the Watson-Glazer Critical Thinking Appraisal (Watson & Glazer 1952). Subjects were told that they "passed" or "failed" after they completed the tasks, and before they rated task liking. Those subjects with high self-esteem showed a significant difference in their liking for the task depending on success or failure. Those low in self-esteem did not. In the second experiment, Korman replicated the first experiment with one difference: When subjects were told of their "success" or "failure," they were also told that other students "did like" or "did not like" the task. The results of this again indicated a significant effect of self-esteem, but did not show a significant effect for social desirability. In the third experiment, experiment two was replicated with three exceptions: First, the task used was the Inferences Test from the Watson-Glazer Critical Thinking Appraisal. Second, in addition to the experimenter saying that other students did or did
not like the task, an accomplice was used to say that he liked it or did not like it, and additionally the experimenter gave his own opinion about the task. All three opinions concurred, hopefully providing a stronger social desirability measure. Third, self-perceived competence for the task was manipulated through the experimenter telling one group that standards for success or failure had been developed by previously administering the test to students from highly select schools, and the other group that the standards were based on administering the test to Jr. College students. The results showed a significant positive effect of social desirability on liking for both groups, but no success-failure effect on liking for the low self-esteem group.

Leonard & Weitz (1971) conducted a study in which an attempt was made to determine the effect of self-esteem on the relationship between success-failure and task enjoyment. Based on the self-consistency or balance model, it was hypothesized that success or failure on a task would be related to enjoyment of the task for individuals having high self-esteem, but not for individuals having low self-esteem. The subjects were measured on three self-esteem instruments; the Self Assurance Scale of the Ghiselli SDI (Ghiselli 1971) and the Trait Evaluation Index (Nelson 1968) which gives two scores; self-confidence, and personal adequacy, neither of which is defined. Subjects were also given a spatial relations puzzle, with instructions that their responses were providing data for the development of a new, less culturally biased intelligence test. After being given two minutes to complete the task, each subject was instructed
to rate his enjoyment of the task and the appropriateness of the task for studying problem solving behavior. After the ratings, subjects were given a second, more difficult task of the same type and told they could work on it as long as they wanted, but that they could stop and start the third puzzle any time.

The results showed that the three self-esteem measures were not highly intercorrelated, indicating that they were not measuring the same thing. The results predicted for the ratings of the first task were not obtained. Task success was significantly related to task liking, but self-esteem had no apparent effect on the performance satisfaction relationship. Korman's hypotheses were, in general, not supported.

A study by Feather (1969) tested the hypothesis that if a person has a positive attitude about himself, he will attribute success at a task to his own ability, and failure to external forces. If he has a negative attitude about himself, he will attribute success to outside forces and failure to himself. Feather based his hypothesis on Heider's (1958) balance theory formulations. He further hypothesized that a person's estimate of his ability on a particular task (task specific self-esteem) based on consistent performance in the past, will be more stable and resistant to change, and disconfirming outcomes will be even more likely to be attributed to external factors, than will confirming outcomes. Subjects worked on a ten item anagrams test containing items of approximately 50 percent difficulty. Subjects had rated themselves on a "self-esteem" scale using the instructions and format of the Semantic Differential. A second
measure, using the same format, gave a "competence" score. One week after the experiment, subjects completed a test of feelings of inadequacy. Before beginning the task, subjects rated themselves on how confident they were that they could pass the test. (Task specific self-esteem.) After they finished, they recorded the number of anagrams they had solved and indicated the degree to which they thought their performance was due to ability (internal attribution) or luck (external attribution). Unexpected outcomes were more often attributed to good luck than expected outcomes. Unexpected success was associated with greater satisfaction than expected success. Performance was positively related to initial confidence as predicted. Self-evaluation was not related to attribution of outcome. None of these measures showed a significant relationship. The first hypothesis, relating to the influence of chronic self-esteem, was not supported. Feather stated that the concept of general self-evaluation is ambiguous and that it may not be as meaningful to consider it in relation to a specific task as it is to consider initial confidence. This supported Korman's position that socially influenced self-esteem is more influential than chronic self-esteem.

Another study (Siegel & Bowen, 1971) shows a positive effect of self-esteem on the relationship between performance and satisfaction. They were concerned with the direction of the performance satisfaction relationship, as well as with the effects of self-esteem as an indicator. The subjects were randomly assigned to twenty work groups of four men each, and two groups of three men each. Each of the groups was instructed to turn in a short five to seven page literature
review paper at three week intervals over a fifteen week trimester. Instructor rankings and grades were reported to each group one week after each project was submitted and two weeks before the next one was due. A group evaluation questionnaire was completed by each student as his group submitted their papers before grading. The questionnaire dealt with the students' satisfaction with their own, and the group's performance. Each subject, also, completed the Ghiselli SDI, and his score on the self-assurance scale was used as a measure of self-esteem. The results of this experiment showed that self-esteem did have an effect on the performance satisfaction relationship, by showing a stronger tendency for a high performance satisfaction relationship among high self-assurance subjects than among low self-assurance subjects, when performance was measured before satisfaction, and then correlated with it. The effect was also indicated, but less strongly, when satisfaction and performance ratings were taken together and when performance was measured after satisfaction. In summary, the data showed that high self-esteem individuals were experiencing greater personal satisfaction for high performance in a group incentive situation, than low self-esteem subjects. This is consistent with Korman's hypothesis.

Fitch (1970), in a study similar to Feather's (1969), investigated the effect of self-esteem on causal attribution for success and failure. Self-esteem was measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Fitts 1964). The task was a dot estimation task. Success or failure was manipulated by the experimenter. The results showed a significant interaction effect of self-esteem and performance
(success-failure) on attribution of causality. Low self-esteem subjects who received failure feedback attributed significantly more causality to internal sources than did high self-esteem subjects, thus, supporting the self-esteem consistency hypothesis. However, high self-esteem subjects did not attribute significantly more causality to internal sources than low self-esteem subjects, when both groups received success feedback. The author interprets this in the light of two contradicting hypotheses in Heider's framework (Heider 1958). One hypothesis is that persons are motivated to perceive events in a way that is consistent with their chronic self-esteem. The other is that persons are motivated to perceive events in a way that enhances their self-esteem. This experiment offers partial support for both hypotheses.

From an evaluation of the various theories of self-consistency in the literature, and from a review of experiments bearing on the self-consistency hypothesis, it can be concluded that while the evidence in support of a self-consistency hypothesis is not conclusive, the concept is useful in explaining behavior. One problem in demonstrating the validity of a self-consistency hypothesis is that it is based on a construct, namely the self-concept, which is itself difficult to define.

Self Concept

Wylie (1961) conducted a review of literature on the self-concept. She pointed out that there is no general agreement among researchers as to what the self-concept is, or how it should be measured. There
are perhaps more than two hundred measures of self-esteem in psychological literature, most of them used only once. Definitions vary but they have some consistency. Korman (1970) prefers the definition of Gelfand (1962), that self-esteem is the extent to which a person sees himself as a competent, need satisfying individual. The characteristic measured by the Self-Assurance Scale of the Ghiselli Self-Description Inventory, is described by Ghiselli as the extent to which the individual perceives himself to be effective in dealing with the problems that confront him. Wylie defines the self-concept, a broader term than self-esteem, as a phenomenological construct consisting of a person's conscious perceptions of himself. But whatever the definition, an important question is whether or not the construct validity of measures of self-esteem can be demonstrated.

Construct validity has been explained by Cronbach & Meehl (1955). The steps necessary to establish construct validity are as follows:

**Group differences:** If the construct leads to expectations that two groups will differ on a test of it, this can be tested.

**Correlations:** If two tests are supposed to measure the same construct, they should be correlated.

**Studies of internal structure:** Some constructs may lead to the expectation of high internal consistency among test items.

**Studies of change over occasions:** Stability, particularly in the face of experimental manipulation. This may or may not be supportive, depending on the construct.

There is some evidence for the construct validity of the Self-Assurance Scale of the Ghiselli SDI as a measure of self-esteem. Korman (1968) provided evidence showing that the Self-Assurance Scale is significantly related to other measures of self-esteem, specifically,
the Grangh Adjective Check List Self-Confidence Scale, the Miner Sentence Completion Scale (a projective test of organizational power orientation) and Crites' Need For Social Service (a Likert type scale). Also reported in this study were the relationships between the Ghiselli Self-Assurance Scale and the ranking and rating of the Stien Self-Description Inventory. These results also showed a significant positive relationship in the expected direction. The data were obtained by giving these scales to subjects who had been separated into high and low groups on the Ghiselli SDI, and then testing the significance of the difference of the means for the groups.

When Ghiselli (1971) developed the Self-Assurance Scale, he first collected several hundred statements generally descriptive of the degree of adequate adjustment to problems of everyday life, especially occupational life. There were such statements as, "slow but satisfactory" and "quick and thorough in picking up new ideas." Twenty-five men in business and industry rated each one on a seven point scale indicating the degree of effectiveness of the behavior indicated by the statement. The twenty-five items on which the judges showed the best agreement, and which at the same time described all degrees of effectiveness of behavior, were selected as a final self-rating questionnaire. This questionnaire was administered to 243 persons who were divided into upper and lower groups on the basis of their scores. Those items on the SDI which differentiated the two groups formed the Self-Assurance Scale.

To check the validity of the scale, twenty-one personnel officers rated themselves in terms of their individual job effective-
ness on a fifteen step rating scale. The correlation between this
scale and the Self-Assurance Scale was .37. Also, the life histories
of fourteen men applying for management positions were examined and
rated for general effectiveness. The correlation between their
ratings and the Self-Assurance Scale scores was .66.

Korman (1968) reported that subjects separated into high and
low self-esteem groups on the Self-Assurance Scale showed significant
differences on two past history variables. These were: 1. Frequency
with which parents supervised subjects' jobs and tasks. A greater
frequency was associated with lower self-esteem, as would be
predicted from hypotheses about development of the self-concept;
2. The frequency with which subjects argued with their parents during
teenage. This showed more arguing for high self-esteem subjects than
for low, which again was predicted to be the case. How these past
history variables were measured was not reported.

In addition to the problems of determining construct validity,
self-concept measures present another difficulty. Self-esteem
results from a person's evaluations of himself as an object. Hence,
measures of self-esteem are subject to individual differences in
defensiveness and response biasing. The discrepancies found in the
results of the test of the Self-Consistency hypothesis may, in part,
be due to failure to accurately measure the construct.

Achievement Motivation

There is an additional factor which may pose difficulties for
any hypothesis based on the concept of self-esteem. Namely, how can
one be sure that self-esteem, in its effects, is any different from, or independent of, Achievement Motivation (n Ach)?

The achievement motive (Atkinson & Feather, 1966) is conceptualized as a relatively stable disposition to achieve success and avoid failure. This stable disposition interacts with expectancy (subjective probability of success) and the valence of incentive (the value to the individual of the regards of success to produce the motivation to perform a particular task). A simplified formula expressing this relationship is Motivation = (motive X expectancy X value of incentive). The formula would hold for motives other than the achievement motive (n Ach) as well.

There are two kinds of achievement motivation; the motive to achieve success and the motive to avoid failure. The predominance of one or the other in an individual leads to differing predictions about his behavior. The following tends to be true of persons with a relatively high motive to achieve success:

1. The motivation all else being equal, is greatest when uncertainty regarding the outcome of an act is greatest. That is when subjective probability of success (Ps) equals 50 percent (Atkinson 1966).

2. In a choice situation, they will set a moderately high level of aspiration (pick a task with Ps close to 50). If they succeed, they will choose another, more difficult task. If they fail, they will choose an easier task (Atkinson 1966).

3. They will have realistic vocational aspirations; i.e., possess ability commensurate with the chosen field, and interests congruent with those of people in their chosen field (Mahone 1966).

4. They will persist longer at a task if it is presented as easy rather than difficult (Feather 1966).
Failure oriented subjects (those whose incentive to avoid failure is greater than their motive to achieve success) tend to respond in these ways:

1. A tendency to avoid all tasks. However, if forced to choose they will avoid tasks of intermediate difficulty, since this is where the motivation to avoid failure, and the anxiety associated with it, would be greatest (Atkinson & Feather 1966).

2. In choice situations, they will either choose an extremely easy or extremely difficult task. If they choose a difficult task and succeed, the motivation to avoid the task is increased. If they fail at an easy task, the motivation to avoid the task increases (Atkinson 1966).

3. The vocational aspirations of persons who are motivated by a desire to avoid failure tend to be unrealistic; either too low or too high (Mahone 1966).

4. Failure oriented persons tend to persist longer in the face of failure at tasks which are presented as difficult than at tasks which are presented as easy (Feather 1966).

There have been a number of studies disputing parts of the theory of n Ach. Klinger (1966) has reviewed the literature on fantasy n Ach, that is, n Ach measured by the TAT or some other projective test. He found several things that call into question the theory of achievement motivation. All but two of eleven studies he reviewed failed to confirm that experimental instructions designed to arouse motives did so even though most of the instructions had an effect on fantasy n Ach. Klinger's review includes studies of the relationship of fantasy n Ach to performance. This is divided into two groups: Relationships with molar behavior, such as course grades, ratings of long term behavior patterns, and the like, and relationships with task instruments. The evidence relating n Ach scores to molar performance measures shows
about as many relationships failing to be statistically significant as achieving statistical significance.

Two variables appear to affect the relationship between n Ach and molar performance; age and sex. Female subjects consistently show a lack of relationship between n Ach and molar performance. Males, high school age or younger, tend to show a positive relationship; while males, college age or older, tend to show a negative relationship. Nothing in the theory predicts these differences. In studies using brief tasks, again about half the studies reported predominately significant relationships. In these studies the type of test used to measure n Ach appeared to be related to the significance of the results. The studies also suggested an interaction effect between measuring instruments and sex. Klinger concludes that fantasy n Ach may not be a direct reflection of level of aspiration but may be affected by situational factors that do not have a direct effect on motivation.

Another problem with the theory of achievement motivation is the idea that high achievement motivation leads to moderate risk taking and that low achievement motivation (high motivation to avoid failure) leads to extreme risk taking choices (very easy or very hard). The research evidence for this point has been reviewed by Maehr et al (1971). These authors concluded from their review that achievement oriented subjects are more likely than failure oriented subjects to prefer tasks of intermediate difficulty, but the hypothesis that the motivation of high n Ach subjects is less when subjective probability of success is very high or very low is not
supported. Conflicting results were found among studies relating \( n_{\text{Ach}} \) and subjective probability of success (\( Ps \)) to performance. Achievement oriented subjects do not necessarily show their best performance under \( Ps = .50 \) conditions, nor do failure avoidant subjects often show deteriorated performance at this level.

Other researchers and reviewers have indicated that in spite of some evidence supporting the moderate risk taking component of the Achievement Motivation Theory, it is a debatable point (Wallach & Kogan 1965).

The antecedents for high self-esteem are apparently similar to those which produce high \( n_{\text{Ach}} \). According to McClelland (1961), the family situations which produce children with high \( n_{\text{Ach}} \) are those where there is low mother dominance and father authoritarianism, where competence was expected of them, and where independence was granted at an earlier age.

Luck (1969) found that subjects with higher self-esteem reported more feelings of love, admiration and closeness to their parents during childhood than did those with low self-esteem. As stated in the previous discussion of the construct validity of self-esteem, Korman (1968) presented evidence that the frequency with which children argued with their parents during teenage was positively related to self-esteem.

Similarities were also found in the way in which both \( n_{\text{Ach}} \) and self-esteem affected vocational choice. Subjects with high \( n_{\text{Ach}} \) chose occupations which were realistic. They had ability commensurate with that required for success in the occupation, and interest
patterns that were congruent with people in the field (Mahone 1966). People with high self-esteem had higher self-occupational congruence than persons with low self-esteem (Korman 1966, 1967). Another study (Greenhaus 1971) did not support this relationship, however. Persons with low n Ach (high fear of failure) and persons with low self-esteem were more likely to choose unrealistic occupations.

Korman (1971) sees n Ach as fitting into his hypothesis of work behavior as one component of a person's self-concept. Ghiselli (1971) reports evidence that self-esteem and achievement motivation are correlated. There are theoretical distinctions, however, which indicate that n Ach is not the same thing as self-esteem. Self-esteem, as the self-concept, is considered to be a phenomenological construct, that is, a person's conscious perceptions and opinions about himself. N Ach, on the other hand, is not phenomenological, and therefore is measured by projective techniques, most commonly the TAT. Non projective measures of n Ach have not been found satisfactory (Klinger 1966). N Ach is a specific need, but only one of many. The motivation comes from the satisfaction of the need. The hypothesis that the desire to achieve consistency is motivating is a more general theoretical construct, which should apply to behavior that is not directed toward achievement as well.

From the preceeding, one can conclude that the constructs of desire to achieve, and desire for consistency have some usefulness as explanations of how behavior is motivated; that their antecedents are similar as are some of their effects, that they are related, but that they are not equivalent.
Antecedents of the Present Study

In Korman's 1970 experiment, which is the impetus for this study, the effects of chronic self-esteem on performance at different goal levels were tested. Korman allowed subjects to set their own goals, reasoning that if goals had been set by the experimenter, this would be a source of socially influenced self-esteem, and would eliminate the effects of chronic self-esteem. Korman's study was a two by two factorial design, in which high and low self-esteem subjects were each divided into two groups; those with high task goals and those with low task goals. Performance was measured by success or failure in achieving goals.

Korman found differences in performance as a function of self-esteem when goals were hard, and no significant differences when goals were easy. According to Korman, if goals had been set by the experimenter, there would be no effect of chronic self-esteem on either hard goal or easy goal attainment. The present experiment in which goals are set by the experimenter is designed to test this hypothesis.

The effects of goal levels on performance have been well documented by Locke (1968), who reviewed twelve of his own previous studies. He demonstrated convincingly that the harder the goal, the higher the level of performance. Korman (1970) attributed such results to socially influenced self-esteem. He reasoned that the higher the goals that the experimenter sets for the subject, the higher the subject's perception of the experimenter's opinion of his...
(the subject's) competency, therefore, the higher the socially influenced self-esteem, therefore, the higher the subject's performance.

Korman's reasoning about socially influenced self-esteem (as determined by the level of goals set by the experimenter) versus the effects of chronic self-esteem seems to be contradicted by his own hypothesis of work behavior, in which he stated that an individual is motivated by all three kinds of self-esteem in a given situation; that is, chronic, task specific, and socially influenced self-esteem. One could, therefore, expect to find a significant interaction effect between chronic self-esteem and socially influenced self-esteem (as determined by experimenter set goals).

In addition to measuring the effect of goals on performance, this experiment will measure the effects of goals on satisfaction. According to Korman (1970), persons will find most satisfying those task roles that are consistent with their self-cognitions. This means that for high self-esteem subjects, the relationship between task success and task liking will be positive, but for low self-esteem subjects, there will be no relationship between task success and task liking.

Locke (1965), on the other hand, has demonstrated that subjects tend to find more satisfying those tasks in which they achieve greater success. In his studies (Locke, 1965) subjects have shown greater task liking for easy goal tasks than for hard goal tasks. If the effects of experimenter set goals negate the effects of chronic self-esteem on satisfaction, as Korman predicts they will on performance, then subjects will show greater satisfaction with easy
goal tasks, since they will achieve greater success as defined by 
meeting or exceeding the established goal, than they will on hard 
goal tasks, regardless of their level of chronic self-esteem.

If chronic self-esteem has a positive effect on the 
success/failure satisfaction relationship, and if subjects achieve 
greater success on easy goal tasks, then high self-esteem subjects 
should show greater satisfaction on easy goal tasks than on hard 
goal tasks. Subjects with low self-esteem would show no significant 
difference in satisfaction between easy goal and hard goal conditions, 
since satisfaction and task success are hypothesized to be unrelated 
for low self-esteem subjects. Some evidence for this hypothesis was 
found by Korman (1968), who concluded that to a low self-esteem 
person, task achievement was irrelevant to task satisfaction.

Based on the above discussions about possible effects of chronic 
self-esteem and socially influenced self-esteem (manipulated by 
experimenter set goal level) on task performance, the following null 
hypotheses are to be tested:

a. Chronic self-esteem has no effect on task performance.
b. Chronic self-esteem has no effect on task liking.
c. Goal level (socially influenced self-esteem) has no 
effect on task performance.
d. Goal level (socially influenced self-esteem) has no 
effect on task liking.
e. There is no interaction effect of goal level (socially 
influenced self-esteem) and chronic self-esteem on task 
performance.
f. There is no interaction effect of goal level (socially 
influenced self-esteem) and chronic self-esteem on task 
liking.
METHOD

Subjects

The subjects in this experiment were eighty-nine students at Western Michigan University. Fifteen subjects dropped out between the self-esteem measurement and the task performance phases of the experiment. Seventy-four subjects completed the experiment. They were drawn from classes in Introductory Psychology, Introductory Sociology, Industrial Psychology, and Psychological Measurement. These subjects included fourteen graduate students and sixty undergraduates. Thirty-one subjects were men, forty-three were women. Their ages ranged from seventeen to fifty.

Design

The design of this experiment was a two by two factorial with two dependent variables. The independent variables were chronic self-esteem, and task difficulty. The two levels of task difficulty, according to Korman, would result in two levels of socially influenced self-esteem, so the two independent variables could be considered as two kinds of self-esteem, chronic and socially influenced. The dependent variables were task performance and task satisfaction.

The Ghiselli Self-Description Inventory (SDI) was given to all subjects. The subjects were divided into two groups; high chronic self-esteem and low chronic self-esteem, based upon the median
Ghiselli SDI Self-Assurance Scale score for the subjects. Appendix A shows the Ghiselli SDI and the scoring key for the Self-Assurance Scale.

Each of the two groups, high chronic self-esteem and low chronic self-esteem were randomly divided into two groups, using a table of random numbers as a basis for assigning subjects to groups. These groups were identified as easy goal and hard goal groups.

Two weeks after the Ghiselli SDI was administered, the subjects performed three tasks. Each task was to list words that could be described by a given adjective. The tasks were the same for both easy goal and hard goal groups. Subjects in the "hard goal" groups were told that they had to list more than twelve words for each task in order to be successful. Subjects in the "easy goal" groups were told that they had to list more than four words on each task in order to be successful. Subjects were given one minute to complete each task. Copies of the tasks, and the instructions for easy goal and hard goal subjects are shown in Appendix B. The performance measure for each subject was the average number of words listed for the three subjects. Words that were not in accordance with the instructions were not counted.

After completing the three tasks, all subjects were asked to complete a modified version of the Cornell Job Description Index (JDI), previously used by Locke (1964, 1965), to describe their liking for the task. A copy of the modified Cornell JDI and its scoring key are shown in Appendix C.
RESULTS

The results were analyzed through a multivariate analysis of variance using Wilkes Lambda criterion and canonical correlations, followed by univariate F tests for each dependent variable. Hummel and Sligo (1971) indicated that for multivariate data, an approach using multivariate analysis of variance followed by univariate analysis of variance is preferred for maintaining reasonably consistent error rates per comparison and experiment-wise error rates. This analysis was performed by the Computer Center of Western Michigan University. The .05 level of significance was used as the standard for rejecting null hypotheses. The results are shown in Table number 1 on page 31.

These results show that there is a significant main effect of goal level (variable B), but no significant main effect of A (chronic self-esteem as measured by Ghiselli SDI), and no significant interaction effect between goal level and chronic self-esteem (the A X B interaction).

Since the multivariate analysis of variance shows that only independent variable B (goal level) has a significant effect, it is legitimate only to test for univariate effects of variable B. All univariate F test results are reported in Table number 2 on page 32, for purposes of discussion. These results show a significant effect of variable B on task performance, but no significant effect on task liking. There is also a significant A X B interaction effect on
task performance, but because the MANOVA did not show a significant interaction, this cannot be considered.
TABLE 1

Tests of Significance Using Wilkes Lambda Criterion and Canonical Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P less than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (chronic self-esteem)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (goal level)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.419</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.826</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (within cell)</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>2.826</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2

**Univariate F Test for the Effects of Independent Variables A and B on Task Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P less than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (chronic self-esteem)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (goal level)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.048</td>
<td>22.294</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>5.686</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (within cell)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Univariate F Test for the Effects of Independent Variables A and B on Task Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P less than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (chronic self-esteem)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.087</td>
<td>2.555</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (goal level)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (within cell)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

Based on the results, it is necessary to reject the null hypothesis that goal level (socially influenced self-esteem) has no effect on task performance, and accept all other null hypotheses. The results support Korman's prediction about the effects of experimenter set goals on task performance: Namely that when goals are set by the experimenter, rather than by the subject, goal level alone will have a significant effect on task performance and satisfaction, and chronic self-esteem will have no effect, nor will there be a significant interaction effect of goal level and chronic self-esteem.

Although the multivariate analysis of variance shows a main effect for goal level only, supporting Korman's prediction, the univariate analysis of variance does show a significant interaction effect of goal level and chronic self-esteem on task performance alone. It appears that much of the error variance in the MANOVA is attributable to the satisfaction measure. This indicates that a similar experiment which measured performance only and not satisfaction, might show a significant interaction effect of chronic self-esteem and goal level on performance, which would not support Korman's prediction.

There are several possible reasons for the failure of this experiment to show any effects of either chronic self-esteem or socially influenced self-esteem on task liking or satisfaction. One
of these pertains to the way that successful performance is conceptualized. In the previous discussion of hypothesized effects of chronic self-esteem on the performance/satisfaction relationships, performance was conceptualized as either success or failure. Considered this way, the prediction was that high self-esteem subjects with easy goals, being more successful, would show greater satisfaction than high self-esteem subjects with hard goals. However, if a greater number of correct responses were considered to be greater success, whether or not an arbitrary standard was beaten, then high self-esteem subjects would be more successful, and would, therefore, show greater satisfaction. Considering these two possible views of success, it is difficult to know in what way subjects perceived their performance as being successful. Since they would only have the standard to compare their performance against, however, it does seem more logical to consider performance in terms of success or failure measured against a standard.

It might be a better approach to test for significance of differences among success/failure--task liking correlations under the four chronic self-esteem/socially influenced self-esteem conditions (1, low chronic self-esteem/easy goals, 2, low chronic self-esteem/hard goals, 3, high chronic self-esteem/easy goals, 4, high chronic self-esteem/hard goals). It would have been difficult, and probably meaningless to make such comparisons in this experiment because, under the hard goal conditions, none of the subjects achieved the standard of success. Under easy goal conditions, only one of the low self-esteem subjects and four of the high self-esteem subjects
failed to achieve success.

Another possible reason for the lack of any significant effects relates to Korman's (1968) suggestion that the tasks used in an experiment must meet some standard of social desirability before they will provide any satisfaction at all. Perhaps these tasks were perceived by the subjects as not worth doing. However, this experiment used the same general kind of tasks, and the same satisfaction measure, that Locke (1964) did in his experiments on goals and task satisfaction, in which significant differences in satisfaction were found.

One future experiment that might be tried, based on the experience gained in this study, would be to replicate this experiment without attempting to measure satisfaction. If a significant, positive interaction effect of goal level and chronic self-esteem on performance were found, it would lend support to this author's hypothesis that socially influenced self-esteem, as manipulated by goal level, will have an interaction effect with chronic self-esteem, on task performance.

To examine the effects of both chronic and socially influenced self-esteem on the performance/satisfaction relationship, it might be better to have goal level be the same for all subjects, at a level that would produce a more equal number of successes and failures. Socially influenced self-esteem could be manipulated by varying instructions about the task, leading some groups of subjects to believe that the experimenter expected them to succeed, and leading other groups to believe that the experimenter expected them to fail.
A two by two factorial design could be used, with chronic self-esteem and instructions as the independent variables, and the success/failure relationship under each of the four conditions as the dependent variable.

In addition to suggesting that changing the experimental design might lead to different results, some other points need to be addressed in this discussion. One of these is the appropriateness of Korman's equating of goal level with socially influenced self-esteem. In this experiment, the instructions given to subjects did not indicate any expectations of the experimenter about whether or not the subjects were capable of achieving the goal. They simply stated the goal. No instructions that might have made the subject expect to succeed or fail, such as, "these goals are based on the average performance of college sophomores" were used. Without knowing whether the experimenter expected them to succeed or fail, it may be that subjects felt no particular satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their performance. It may also be that if the instructions did not elicit any expectations of success or failure, they could not fairly be said to influence self-esteem.

In two books published since this study was conducted (Korman 1974, 1977), Korman has reiterated his self-consistency hypothesis, but has not continued to identify three sources of self-esteem, chronic, socially influenced, and task specific. He has discussed social influences on the development of self-esteem, indicating that others' expectations can influence the development of self-esteem, but he has implied that the social influence is on the development of
chronic self-esteem rather than being a separate, identifiable type of self-esteem. He has not specifically recanted his identification of three kinds of self-esteem, but rather he has discontinued identifying them. The general consistency hypothesis has remained the same, although he has indicated that it may not be a complete explanation of behavior.

It might also be worthwhile to examine the effects of anxiety on task performance in the same manner as this experiment examined the effects of self-esteem. There is some evidence that self-esteem and anxiety are related inversely (McCandles, 1967, Logiudice, 1970), although Miller (1972) did not find a significant relationship between these two variables. If levels of anxiety are related to differences in task performance in the opposite way that levels of self-esteem are related to task performance, it may be that anxiety is as useful a construct for explaining behavior as is self-esteem.

In summary, Korman's prediction is supported, but there is some indication that a different design might have produced results inconsistent with Korman's hypothesis. Furthermore, Korman's view of self-esteem appears to have changed somewhat. Also, there is some evidence that the construct of anxiety might be used to predict task performance as well as the construct of self-esteem.
APPENDIX A

The Ghiselli Self-Description Inventory

The purpose of this inventory is to obtain a picture of the traits you believe you possess, and to see how you describe yourself. There are no right or wrong answers, so try to describe yourself as accurately and honestly as you can.

In each of the pairs of words below, check the one you think most describes you.

1. __ capable 12. __ sharp-witted 23. __ appreciative
   __ discreet  __ deliberate  __ good-natured
2. __ understanding 13. __ kind 24. __ pleasant
   __ thorough  __ jolly  __ modest
3. __ cooperative 14. __ efficient 25. __ responsible
   __ inventive  __ clear-thinking  __ reliable
4. __ friendly 15. __ realistic 26. __ dignified
   __ cheerful  __ tactful  __ civilized
5. __ energetic 16. __ enterprising 27. __ imaginative
   __ ambitious  __ intelligent  __ self-controlled
6. __ persevering 17. __ affectionate 28. __ conscientious
   __ independent  __ frank  __ quick
7. __ loyal 18. __ progressive 29. __ logical
   __ dependable  __ thrifty  __ adaptable
8. __ determined 19. __ sincere 30. __ sympathetic
   __ courageous  __ calm  __ patient
9. __ industrious 20. __ thoughtful 31. __ stable
   __ practical  __ fair-minded  __ foresighted
10. __ planful 21. __ poised 32. __ honest
    __ resourceful  __ ingenious  __ generous
11. __ unaffected 22. __ sociable
    __ alert  __ steady
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In each of the pairs of words below, check the one you think least describes you.

33. shy _ lazy
34. unambitious _ reckless
35. noisy _ arrogant
36. emotional _ headstrong
37. immature _ quarrelsome
38. unfriendly _ self-seeking
39. affected _ moody
40. stubborn _ cold
41. conceited _ infantile
42. shallow _ stingy
43. unstable _ frivolous
44. defensive _ touchy
45. tense _ irritable
46. dreamy _ dependent
47. changeable _ prudish
48. nervous _ intolerant
49. careless _ foolish
50. apathetic _ egotistical
51. despondent _ evasive
52. distractible _ complaining
53. weak _ selfish
54. rude _ self-centered
55. rattle-brained _ disorderly
56. fussy _ submissive
57. opinionated _ pessimistic
58. shiftless _ bitter
59. hard-hearted _ self-pitying
60. cynical _ aggressive
61. dissatisfied _ outspoken
62. undependable _ resentful
63. sly _ excitable
64. irresponsible _ impatient
Scoring Key for the Ghiselli Self-Description Inventory

The following list gives the correct responses for the Self Assurance Scale of the Ghiselli Self Description Inventory. The first number is the item number and the last number is the weight or score of the item. T means the top adjective of the pair is the correct response, and B means the bottom adjective is correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2B2</td>
<td>3B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B1</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11B1</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12T2</td>
<td>41B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13T1</td>
<td>43T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B2</td>
<td>46T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18T2</td>
<td>50T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20T1</td>
<td>51T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22B1</td>
<td>53T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24T2</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26T1</td>
<td>57T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27B1</td>
<td>58T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30B1</td>
<td>59B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31B2</td>
<td>60T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62T1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Instructions: Easy Goals

On the following pages, you will be given a series of short tasks to do. For each one you will be given an adjective, and asked to list things you can think of that could be described by the adjective. For example, if you were given the adjective "greasy," you might write "hair," "meat," etc. There are some restrictions on what you can write. 1. You may not repeat a word. 2. You may not write two examples of the same class of adjectives, for example, you could not say "pork, lamb, veal, bacon," etc. in response to "greasy."

On each of these tasks, your objective is to beat a standard of performance. This standard is based on previous studies with this kind of task. Your standard is four (4) responses in one (1) minute, which is about average performance on this task. To be considered successful on the task, you must beat the standard. Tying will not be considered successful.

For each of the tasks, the adjective will appear at the top of the page. You may write your responses on the lines below the adjective. A sample page would look like this.

GREASY

1. _____________
2. _____________
3. _____________
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After you finish reading these instructions, please wait until you are instructed to begin. Please do not turn the page until told to do so.
Instructions: Hard Goals

On the following pages, you will be given a series of short tasks to do. For each one you will be given an adjective, and asked to list things you can think of that could be described by the adjective. For example, if you were given the adjective "greasy," you might write "hair," "meat," etc. There are some restrictions on what you can write. 1. You may not repeat a word. 2. You may not write two examples of the same class of adjectives, for example, you could not say "pork, lamb, veal, bacon," etc. in response to "greasy."

On each of these tasks, your objective is to beat a standard of performance. This standard is based on previous studies with this kind of task. Your standard is twelve (12) responses in one (1) minute, which is somewhat above the average performance on this kind of task. To be considered successful on the task, you must beat the standard. Tying will not be considered successful.

For each of the tasks, the adjective will appear at the top of the page. You may write your responses on the lines below the adjective. A sample page would look like this.

GREASY

1. _______________
2. _______________
3. _______________

___________
After you finish reading these instructions, please wait until you are instructed to begin. Please do not turn the page until told to do so.
Task 1

SHARP

1. ____________________
2. ____________________
3. ____________________
4. ____________________
5. ____________________
6. ____________________
7. ____________________
8. ____________________
9. ____________________
10. _____________________
11. _____________________
12. _____________________
13. _____________________
14. _____________________
15. _____________________

Did you beat the standard set for you? Yes _____; No _____.
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Task 2

FAST

1. __________________
2. __________________
3. __________________
4. __________________
5. __________________
6. __________________
7. __________________
8. __________________
9. __________________
10. ________________
11. ________________
12. ________________
13. ________________
14. ________________
15. ________________

Did you beat the standard set for you? Yes ____; No ____.
Task 3

LIGHT

1. ____________
2. ____________
3. ____________
4. ____________
5. ____________
6. ____________
7. ____________
8. ____________
9. ____________
10. ____________
11. ____________
12. ____________
13. ____________
14. ____________
15. ____________

Did you beat the standard set for you? Yes ____; No ____.
APPENDIX C

Modified Cornell Job Description Inventory

Listed below are fourteen (14) words, with a blank space preceding each word. Write a "Yes" before each word that describes the three (3) tasks you have just completed; write "No" before each word that describes what the task is not; and write "?" before each word that is irrelevant to a description of the task.

______________ Fascinating
______________ Routine
______________ Satisfying
______________ Useful
______________ Boring
______________ Tiresome
______________ Good
______________ Creative
______________ Pleasant
______________ Challenging
______________ Frustrating
______________ Simple
______________ Endless
______________ Gives sense of accomplishment
Scoring Key for Modified Cornell Job Description Inventory

+__________ Fascinating  
-___________ Routine  
+___________ Satisfying  
+___________ Useful  
-___________ Boring  
-___________ Tiresome  
+___________ Good  
+___________ Creative  
+___________ Pleasant  
+___________ Challenging  
-___________ Frustrating  
-___________ Simple  
-___________ Endless  
+___________ Gives sense of accomplishment

For each positive adjective answered positively, and for each negative adjective answered negatively, one point was given. No points were subtracted for positive adjectives answered negatively or negative adjectives answered positively. The minimum possible score was zero.
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