Fall 1987

Job Satisfaction Among Female Employees as Predicted by Work Friendships

Melinda Jan Montgomery
Old Dominion University

JOB SATISFACTION AMONG FEMALE EMPLOYEES

AS PREDICTED BY WORK FRIENDSHIPS

by

Melinda Jan Montgomery
B.B.A. May 1985, Memphis State University

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

PSYCHOLOGY

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
December, 1987

Approved by:

Barbara A. Winstead (Director)

Valerian Derlega

Sarah J. Beaton

ABSTRACT

JOB SATISFACTION AMONG FEMALE EMPLOYEES

AS PREDICTED BY WORK FRIENDSHIPS

Melinda Jan Montgomery

Old Dominion University

Director: Dr. Barbara A. Winstead

The purpose of the present study was to predict job satisfaction among female employees using social environment variables which relate to work friendships. The predictor variables used were target persons' perceived job satisfaction level, breadth of workplace friendships, frequency of interaction, friendship quality, and the interaction of friendship and quality.

Thirty-seven female faculty members and 80 female staff employees at Old Dominion University served as subjects. The subjects were asked to complete the Communal scale (Clark, 1986), selected sections of the Acquaintance Description Form (Wright, 1969, 1974), and the work-in-general scale from the Job Descriptive Index on a co-worker considered to be their best friend at work. The subjects were also asked to complete the individual scales of the Job Descriptive Index as indices of their own job satisfaction.

Multiple regression analyses revealed that the predictive equation accounted for almost twice the variance in the faculty scores as in the staff scores. Variance in overall job satisfaction, work satisfaction, co-worker satisfaction, and promotion satisfaction, accounted for by the predictor variables was significant for both groups. The most powerful predictor was the perceived level of job satisfaction of the subject's closest co-worker friend. Frequency of interaction was found to share a curvilinear relationship with the staff scores and, a linear relationship with the faculty scores. These findings were discussed in terms of their implications for job satisfaction.

Dedication

To my mom and dad, who taught me that I could do anything and be anything I wanted. Thank you for all the support and encouragement that you've given me. I love you.

Acknowledgements

My deepest thanks go to Dr. Barbara Winstead, who taught me more than how to write a thesis. Her support, patience, and guidance is gratefully appreciated. Special thanks also go to Dr. Sarah Beaton who helped me to put order and logic behind my thoughts and writings. Also, thanks go to Dr. Val Derlega for his time and contributions.

I would also like to thank two very special people in my life, my brothers Alan and Tim. You two have always stood behind me, ready to help whenever you could. Even though you didn't always understand why I did certain things, you still supported me 100 percent. I love you.

To Linwood, you listened to me always, and helped me to get through both the good and bad times. I know it wasn't always easy, but you stayed beside me throughout. I'm glad.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Job Satisfaction Among Female Employees as Predicted by Work Friendships

Chapter One

Most people would not enjoy the idea of spending 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, for 40-45 years, locked in an isolated room, performing a specific task, for some predetermined monetary reward, no matter how large that reward might be. Luckily, we are not required to work as quarantined individuals, but rather as part of a larger network of peers, supervisors, and subordinates, or more basically, as part of a network of co-workers and friends. Because of the interactive and time-consuming nature of the workplace, it becomes easy to see how important both the professional and social aspects of work relationships can be in determining an employee's satisfaction with the job.

Because of the monetary consequences associated with employee job dissatisfaction, ways of reducing dissatisfaction are always welcome. Workers who are more satisfied with their job, have lower absenteeism and turnover rates than those workers who are dissatisfied with the job (Terborg, Lee, Smith, Davis, & Turbin, 1982; Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1977). The dollar values associated with such absenteeism and turnover rates can be staggering (Cascio, 1987). The ability of the social environment to help reduce

absenteeism and turnover rates can be staggering (Cascio, 1987). The ability of the social environment to help reduce such costs should not be overlooked.

In general, the question to be asked is whether the nature of the co-worker's relationships makes the work experience a more enjoyable part of the day? The purpose of the present research was to investigate whether workplace friendships positively affect job satisfaction, and thus, help to predict levels of job satisfaction.

Definitions of friendship

Researchers have different conceptions of what constitutes a friendship. Is a "friend" the person known since childhood, or is it that person seen each day at the next desk who provides conversation and assistance? Maybe, it is the person who has only been known a short time, but has helped you through a particularly difficult period in your life. Are these three "friendships" equal in intensity, equal in emotional value, equal in degree of liking? Researchers say probably not (Feld, 1984; Kurth, 1970).

Because of the variation in individual responses to friendly interactions, friendships can provide different things for different people. Friendship can provide a means for affiliation and increased self-confidence, can furnish a pathway for the disclosure of both impersonal and intimate life events, and can allow for the expression of personal beliefs and attitudes (Duck, 1983).

Friendship involves voluntary interdependence as well as

the ability to see the other person not as a good listener, provider of money, etc., but as all these characteristics, good and bad, fused together. The focus is on the total person, not on one or two desirable aspects of the person (Wright, 1978). Kurth (1970) defines friendship as an "intimate interpersonal relationship involving each individual as a personal entity" (p. 136). In the same vein, "the person who is a friend must be appreciated as a unique self rather than simply a particular instance of a general class" (Suttles, 1970, p. 100).

Clark and Mills (1979) define friendship on the basis of benefit distribution. Communal relationships, where the exchange of benefits is on an as-needed basis and may be unequal, fall under the heading of "true" friendships. When the benefits given and received are of equal quality and quantity, the relationship is termed an exchange relationship. Kurth's (1970) conception of a friendly relation parallels the idea of an exchange relationship. A friendly relation is one in which the amount and degree of interaction required is dictated by the times and settings the two persons are placed in. Friendly relations lack the deep intimacy or sense of uniqueness that often characterizes communal relationships.

Feld (1984) argues that situations, being either spatially constraining or normatively constraining, will necessitate the use of different friends for the two different situations. Spatially constraining situations are

ones in which people are placed together in the same location on numerous occasions indicating availability or convenience. Because of the inherent accessibility, friends in these situations will be used for small services, services for which they are the most convenient. Such services include discussion of work, discussion of hobbies, loaning of office supplies, etc. Normatively constraining situations are ones in which interpersonal connections are determined by social norms. Relationships in these situations require participants to be trusting and helpful. Large services, such as borrowing a large sum of money, require trust on the part of the lender. When a person needs such a service, he or she will turn to those individuals found in a normatively constraining setting (family or close friends).

Co-worker friendships

Under Feld's distinction, co-workers interact in spatially constraining situations. Therefore, they are likely to be the friends one turns to for services that require little thought or personal involvement. Co-workers may be thought of as acquaintances, the "person at the next desk." On the other hand, shared interests and frequent association may lead co-workers to think of one another as close and intimate friends. Either way, co-workers help create the social environment at work and can be vital in the determination of job satisfaction.

Little empirical work has been done on co-worker

relationships. Two studies have focused on criteria used in choosing friends in the workplace. Verbrugge (1977) found that both social similarities and physical proximity have an impact on friendship development. Adults base friendship choices on comparable attitudes, social status, demographics, and the amount of time they see one another. As such, the work setting furnishes a good opportunity for the development and maintenance of friendships. The person deeply committed to his work will often be the one to choose co-workers as friends. Because of the intensity of work involvement, co-workers are better able to understand and be empathetic with work-related activities and difficulties. Co-workers also become more feasible friendship choices because of the limited degree of contact with others outside the job, due to work involvement and/or work schedule. For example, persons who work night shifts have fewer interaction opportunities (Verbrugge, 1979).

Schutte and Light (1978) distinguished between upper and lower hierarchial levels and examined the effects of status and proximity on friendship choices. Those employees considered to be in the "upper" organizational level were management level employees given the freedom to make "executive-type decisions" (p. 262). The "lower" level employees were those whose jobs did not entail strategic type plans or details, but were more concerned with production oriented tasks (secretaries, repairmen, etc.). It was found that while proximity is important for both lower and upper

hierarchial levels, status becomes a more important friendship criterion among the higher level employees.

These studies suggest that co-worker relationships can have a positive impact on the work environment, just as the task does. However, they do not indicate whether high quality co-worker friendships are related to increased job satisfaction.

Models of friendships

Two friendship models have been proposed to help explain and measure both specific and general details of relationships. Margaret Clark devised the Communal/Exchange questionnaire (1986) as a means of distinguishing these two types of relationships. Paul Wright (1969, 1974) developed the Acquaintance Description Form as a measure of friendship strength, benefits, and difficulties.

Communal/exchange relationships. Under the Clark and Mills (1979) paradigm of communal and exchange relationships, the distribution and acceptance of benefits is the cue to the classification of relationships. Communal-type relationships exemplify authentic or actual friendships. The exchange of benefits is unequal, denoting that the benefit given is not to repay a debt, but to show concern or appreciation for the other. Clark (1981) found that "perceived friendship was greater when pairs of people gave one another noncomparable benefits than when they gave one another comparable benefits" (p. 378). If the benefits exchanged are unequal or are not given concurrently, the perception becomes one of wanting to

give instead of an obligation to give.

Describing the characteristics of a friendship, Suttles (1970) noted "it is inappropriate to express friendship by making a gift that is not of value to the other's real self irrespective of the general value placed on the gift" (p. 99). "The rule in communal relationships is to respond to a need, rather than to reciprocate benefits" (Clark & Mills, 1979, p. 17).

Attraction is increased in communal relationships when a benefit is given, but not returned (Clark & Mills, 1979). This does not mean that benefits are not given in a communal relationship, but that the rules governing the interaction are different. The receipt of a benefit does not also mean the receipt of a debt, as it does in exchange relationships. Communal relationships are not characterized by the record-keeping of individual inputs into a joint task for future reward purposes. A record of inputs may be kept, but this record is not used as a basis for achieving equality of inputs, but rather, as a means for responding to needs (Clark, 1984).

Exchange-type relationships are based on equality of reward distribution. The act of giving is precipitated with the thought that the benefit will be repaid in some specific way. The adage, "I'll scratch your back, if you'll scratch mine" describes an exchange-type relationship. "A benefit given in response to a benefit received in the past or expectedin the future is appropriate in an exchange

relationship..." (Clark & Mills, 1979, p. 13).

Interaction in exchange-type relationships is limited to that dictated by formal roles or social norms. Persons in such relationships "feel no special responsibility for one another beyond that felt for any other human" (Clark, 1984, p. 549). The receipt of a benefit in response to a benefit given increases attraction in exchange-type relationships (Clark & Mills, 1979). In a joint task, records of individual inputs are kept to facilitate the equitable distribution of rewards (Clark, 1984).

Acquaintance Description Form. The Acquaintance Description Form (ADF), developed by Paul Wright (1969, 1974), is a means of measuring friendship through ratings of (a) the intensity of the relationship, (b) the amount of tension or strain in the relationship, and (c) the rewards or benefits derived from the friendship (Wright & Bergloff, 1984).

Friendship intensity is measured by the degree of voluntary interdependence present in the relationship and by the degree to which the two persons respond to one another as person-qua-persons. Person-qua-person (PQP) is the degree to which the two persons see one another as unique and irreplacable to the relationship. Voluntary interdependence (VID) refers to the degree to which one person's plans are dependent upon the other person's plans, when both are free from external constraints. When added together, the criteria voluntary interdependence and person-qua-person, provide a

measure of overall friendship strength (Wright, 1982).

Other aspects of friendship that Wright considers to be important are maintenance difficulty and the rewards or benefits derived from the friendship. Friendships are often difficult to maintain. Conflict occurs to the extent that the goals of the participants are not complementary. Maintenance difficulty, rather than being a negative aspect of the relationship, is often a sign of the strength of the relationship. Weak or superficial friendships are usually abandoned long before the stress or the pressure of the conflict becomes too large. Persons in strong friendships will work to keep the friendship alive when conflicts arise (Wright, 1978). Friendship also provides various rewards or benefits. Such rewards include the degree to which the friend is seen as exciting and stimulating; the friend's willingness to help and cooperate in the attainment of one's own goals and needs; the degree to which the friend helps in maintaining one's own positive self-image; and, the ability of the friend to bring out important self attributes (Wright, 1969 & 1982). Scales have been developed which measure each of these individual areas (Wright, 1982).

Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been studied repeatedly in both direct and indirect fashions. Locke, in 1976, identified over 3,000 articles that dealt with job satisfaction as either the main focus of the study or as a tangential part of the study. The questions researchers are trying to answer

are varied. What causes job satisfaction? What are the consequences of job satisfaction? Is job satisfaction moderated by other job aspects? A consensus has not been reached on the answers to these and other job satisfaction questions. It is agreed that job satisfaction is important and that managers should be concerned about the level of satisfaction found through the job, but the methods necessary to achieve satisfaction and the specific benefits that will accrue as a result are not globally agreed upon.

Locke (1969) has said that job satisfaction is a match between what one desires from the job and what one actually receives from the job, such that, job satisfaction is a pleasurable state of mind associated with the work experience. Job satisfaction, from this definition, is assumed to be a global construct encompassing many unique job aspects from pay to working conditions to organizational culture.

Job enrichment. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) divided components of the job into hygiene factors and motivating factors. External elements such as salary, working conditions, status, and friendly relations with peers and supervisors were labeled as hygiene factors. These factors are necessary to reduce the potential for job dissatisfaction, but higher levels of these factors will not produce job satisfaction. Thus, it would be expected that the hygiene factors (such as co-worker friendships) act as a sort of buffer against unpleasant aspects of the job. The

motivators, those elements with the potential for generating job satisfaction, are internal attributes such as achievement, advancement, recognition, and responsibility. These internal characteristics are not believed to produce dissatisfaction if absent.

Hackman and Lawler (1971) and later Hackman and Oldham (1976) believe that job satisfaction is increased as a result of increases in task variety, responsibility, autonomy, feedback, and task significance, a program generally called job enrichment. The job enrichment school of thought came about as a result of Herzberg's two-factor theory. Herzberg's theory opened the eyes of many researchers to the motivating potential present in a job (Tosi, Rizzo, & Carroll, 1986). Persons most affected by these increases are persons with "high growth need strength." That is, those workers with high internal motivation and desire to achieve will become more satisfied with increases in the above areas. Steers (1975) found need for achievement to be a moderator of the performance- satisfaction relationship. Those persons high in need for achievement showed stronger performance-satisfaction correlations than those persons low in need for achievement. Oldham (1976) discovered that co-worker relationships have a positive influence on internal motivation and subsequently the quantity and quality of work. When employees become overly concerned with personal relationships because of arguments or jealousies, attention to the task is decreased. A friendly

relationship with peers, void of personal difficulties, allows the worker to devote attention to the job and enjoy the benefits inherent in the task. Locke (1976) says that employees are satisfied with co-workers to the extent that the co-workers help in the achievement of work goals and rewards, and to the extent that workers share important values or attitudes.

The job enrichment literature shows a positive relationship between enrichment and satisfaction. Workers given more internally appealing tasks experience higher levels of satisfaction than those workers whose jobs entail little or no worker responsibility, autonomy, feedback, or variety (Umstot, Bell, & Mitchell, 1976). Oldham, Hackman, and Pearce (1976) found that workers dissatisfied with the hygiene factors of their job (pay, job security, working conditions, co-workers, etc.) were not as likely to experience increased job satisfaction when the job enrichment paradigm was utilized. Attention was focused on the unsatisfying job areas and the workers were not able to appreciate the benefits flowing from the enriched areas. Once the problem areas are resolved or adapted to, the workers become able to respond positively to the job enrichment program.

These studies suggest that good co-worker relationships, perhaps good friends in the workplace, are a precondition for benefitting from other positive aspects of the job. Maybe, in order to fully appreciate enriched tasks, the worker must

also be in a social environment that is considered "enriched." That is, the worker may need to be surrounded with positive social relationships in order to concentrate on and profit from the job enrichment program.

Social influence. The social information processing (SIP) view (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977, 1978) argues that a worker's perception of the job is not solely determined by the objective realities of the job, but is also influenced by the social world surrounding the job. Comments made by co-workers about the task, working conditions, wages, management, will influence the individual worker's view of the job. The SIP view states that an individual worker does not exist in a vacuum, but is influenced, both positively and negatively, by those around him.

In a product evaluation task, Cohen & Golden (1972) found that informational social influence affected the product evaluations given. Informational social influence is a bias to accept information provided by others as being representative of reality. In other words, when presented with an ambiguous situation, what others have to say will influence our conception of reality, just as the physical characteristics present do. Not only will we look at the physical characteristics for information, but we will also turn to relevant others for information.

Investigating the social influence view, White, Mitchell, and Bell (1977) found that the social cues received from fellow workers influence both job performance and job

satisfaction. White et al. concluded that goal setting, performance evaluation, and peer pressure led to workers being highly motivated, highly productive, and satisfied. Peer pressure, in the form of pressure to conform to socially set standards and the fear of being negatively evaluated by relevant others (the appropriate social group), may cause workers to produce more.

Research on the effects of enriched versus unenriched tasks and positive versus negative social comments showed that positive social comments increased both job satisfaction and job performance, while job enrichment affected neither variable (White & Mitchell, 1979). These social comments were not of an extreme nature. For example, a positive social comment was "This is interesting. It is nice to finally use the skills I've developed in school." (White & Mitchell, 1979, p. 4.). An example of a negative comment would be "this job isn't interesting, it doesn't require any of my skills." Workers' perceptions of the motivational content of the task were affected by both job enrichment and social comments. That is, not only did workers process the objective, physical characteristics of the task, but also the subjective comments of co-workers in order to determine the motivational properties inherent to the task.

O'Reilly and Caldwell (1979) tested the degree of skill variety, autonomy, feedback, and task significance present in a task using a group structure similar to that of White and

Mitchell (1979) (enriched vs. unenriched tasks and positive vs. negative social cues). They found that skill variety, autonomy, feedback, and task significance were each rated lower by subjects performing enriched tasks, but receiving negative, as compared to positive, social cues (i.e., comments were made suggesting the task was not challenging enough or there was not much autonomy associated with the job). Futhermore, job satisfaction was higher in the unenriched task, positive comments group, than in the enriched task, negative comments group. The point was made that when presented with an ambiguous work situation, the employee may turn to the social environment (informational social influence) in order to clarify and better understand the situation.

Summary and hypotheses.

The literature suggests that relationships with co-workers may affect job satisfaction in three ways: (a) as a hygiene factor, good co-worker relationships can help prevent job dissatisfaction; (b) co-worker relationships can have a positive effect on internal work motivation; and (c) the comments made by co-workers can serve as a social influence on subsequent job or task evaluations.

In the present study, the relationship between the subjects' job satisfaction and the job satisfaction of their co-worker friends was examined. It is thought that co-worker friends exert a considerable influence on the subjects' own perception of job satisfaction. That is, the worker tends to

see his own job satisfaction as being highly similar to that of his co-worker friends.

Specifically, the present study assessed the impact five social environment predictor variables have on the criterion of job satisfaction. The specific hypotheses were:

Hypothesis 1: The quality of the work friendship, as defined by the Communal scale and the voluntary interdependence (VID) and person-qua-person (PQP) scales from the Acquaintance Description Form, would be positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2: The depth or breadth of work friendships, as measured by how many "close" work friends a person has, was also believed to be positively related to job satisfaction. The enlarged and enriched social environment, resulting from two or more close friends at work was expected to contribute to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3: From the research on social influence, it was hypothesized that the subject's job satisfaction and the job satisfaction of their co-worker friend would be positively related. It was also believed that the job satisfaction of the co-worker friend would help predict the subjects' own job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4: Because of more opportunities for social support through communication, frequency of interaction was expected to be positively correlated with job satisfaction and act as a predictor variable.

Hypothesis 5: Frequency of interaction and quality of

the friendship were thought to share an interactive relationship, rather than an additive one. For example, frequent interaction with a close (higher quality) friend should contribute more to job satisfaction than frequent interaction with a less well-liked friend. The interaction of frequency and quality was expected to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

CHAPTER TWO

Method

Subjects

Questionnaires were mailed to 148 female faculty members and 277 female staff employees of Old Dominion University. The staff employees were those classified as having secretarial/clerical jobs. As an incentive, subjects who returned the questionnaire were invited to enter a drawing for a free dinner for two at an area restaurant. Completed questionnaires were received from 37 faculty members (25%) and 80 staff employees (29%). The overall return rate was 27.5%. Participation was both voluntary and anonymous.

Measures

The subjects were asked to complete the Communal questionnaire, selected sections of the Acquaintance Description Form (ADF), and the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) on a co-worker considered to be their best friend at work. This co-worker was referred to as the target person or TP throughout the questionnaire. The JDI was also completed as a measure of the subject's own satisfaction.

Communal questionnaire. Clark's Communal questionnaire (1986) is a measure of the subject's preference for communal relationships. In the present study, it was used as a measure of the quality of a specific relationship. The questionnaire

consists of ten questions concerning the dimension. Subjects were asked to respond on the basis of a 5-point scale ranging from extremely uncharacteristic of their relationship to extremely characteristic of their relationship. The maximum value on the scale was 28, with higher scores denoting a more communal-type relationship. Questions were modified so that they measured a specific relationship and were made more applicable to the work setting (see Appendix A).

Acquaintance Description Form. Two scales of the Acquaintance Description Form (ADF), (Wright, 1969, 1974), person-qua-person (PQP) and voluntary interdependence (VID), were used as a measure of the quality of the relationship. In the questionnaire, situations were described such as, "TP is the kind of person I would miss very much if something happened to interfere with our acquaintanceship" (PQP) and, "When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with TP to see if we can arrange to do things together" (VID). The subject was asked to respond on the basis of "how often" or "how likely" the situation was encountered in the relationship. The maximum score on the two scales was 45, with higher scores suggesting a more personalistic, unique relationship (see Appendix B).

Job Descriptive Index. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI), developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), is a measure of job satisfaction. The JDI asks for yes, no, or undecided responses to characteristics associated with work, pay, supervisors, promotional opportunities, co-workers, and

work-in-general. The first five subscales can be used as individual indices of job satisfaction or can be summed to give an overall measure of job satisfaction. The sixth subscale, work-in-general, was recently developed and can be used alone as a measure of overall job satisfaction (Smith, 1987). The work-in-general scale was used to measure the co-worker friend's (TP's) job satisfaction and act as a measure of social influence. This scale, even though named the same as one of the earlier scales, does not have the same adjectives describing the dimension. Thus, while subjects rated both their own and their friend's job satisfaction, they never used the same descriptors to make these ratings. The maximum score on the individual scales is 54, and on the overall scale, the maximum score is 270. Higher values on each of the scales indicate higher satisfaction with that job element (see Appendix C and D).

Demographic information. Demographic and general information about the subject and target person were also obtained. This included employment classification, age, length of employment, amount of time the target person had been known, status of the target person, the number of hours spent interacting with the target person per week, the actual number of interactions per week, the number of co-workers considered to be "close" friends, and whether the target person worked in the same department as the subject. When estimating the frequency of interaction, the subjects were told to include all interactions both short and long,

covering both work-related and social issues (see Appendix E and F).

Summary of predictors and criteria.

1. The number of close work friendships (CLOSE) was measured by asking the subjects how many of their co-workers were considered to be close friends.

2. The frequency of interaction (FREQOV) was measured by two questions concerning how many hours and how many times the subject and target person interacted each week.

3. The quality of the friendship (QUALITY) was measured by summing the scores on the Communal and ADF scales.

4. The interaction of frequency and quality (FREQOV * QUAL) was measured by multiplying the scores on the interaction (FREQOV) and quality (QUALITY) dimensions.

5. Target person's perceived job satisfaction level (TPSAT) was measured by the subject's rating of her friend's job satisfaction on the work-in-general subscale from the JDI. TPSAT was used as a measure of social influence to determine the degree to which the job satisfaction of the subject and the target person were related.

6. The criteria used in the study were work, pay, co-worker, supervision, promotion, and overall job satisfaction. Overall job satisfaction was computed by summing the scores on the individual job satisfaction scales.

Procedure

The questionnaire was mailed to subjects with the instruction to return it within 12 days. A follow-up letter

was mailed at the end of the first week as a reminder. Subjects were told to complete the demographic questions, the Communal scale, the ADF scale, and the job satisfaction work-in-general scale on one co-worker whom they considered to be their best friend at work. This friend was labelled the target person (TP) (see Appendix G). Each subject was asked to complete the work-in-general scale in the way she thought her target person would complete it. This score was then taken as a measure of the perceived job satisfaction of the target person (TPSAT).

The subjects were asked to complete the work, pay, supervisor, promotional opportunities, and co-worker scales, from the JDI, as indices of their own job satisfaction. Scores on the individual scales were used as specific measures of job satisfaction and were then summed to give an overall measure of job satisfaction.

CHAPTER THREE

Results

Because of light markings and unanswered questions, the number of subjects for questionnaire responses varies. Only those questionnaires that were at least 75% complete were used.

Demographic statistics

The results were analyzed separately for the faculty and staff employees. The demographic data, *t*-values, and χ^2 values are presented in Tables 1 and 2. No differences were found in age or length of employment as shown in Table 1. In Table 2, the t-test shows that the staff and the faculty significantly differed in terms of the amount of time spent interacting each week. The direction of the difference indicates that the staff interacted for more hours per week ($t(111)=-2.19$, $p<.05$) and a greater number of times per week ($t(112)=-2.99$, $p<.05$) than did faculty. The χ^2 analysis shows that the staff and faculty significantly differed with regards to the status of the target person and to whether the subject and target person worked in the same department. For the faculty, the TP was more likely to be a peer ($\chi^2=103.00$, $df=2$, $n=113$, $p<.01$), and to work in the same department ($\chi^2=11.368$, $df=1$, $n=113$, $p<.01$).

Table 1

Subject Demographic Data

	Faculty		Staff		
Question	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	t
Age?					
< 26	1	2.8%	9	11.2%	
26-35	11	30.6	35	43.8	
36-45	16	44.4	22	27.5	1.54
46-55	5	13.9	7	8.7	
over 55	2	5.6	6	7.5	
Length of employment?					
< 1 yr.	4	11.1%	6	7.5%	
1-3 yrs.	12	33.3	22	27.5	-1.30
3-6 yrs.	7	19.4	15	18.8	
> 6 yrs.	12	33.3	34	42.5	

Table 2

Descriptive Data Concerning Co-worker Friends

	Faculty		Staff		
Question	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	
How long known TP?					
< 6 mos.	3	8.3%	4	5.0%	
< 1 yr.	1	2.8	5	6.3	
< 2 yrs.	6	16.7	12	15.0	t=-.04
< 3 yrs.	7	19.4	20	25.0	
> 3 yrs.	18	50.0	37	46.2	
Status of TP?					
Peer	32	88.9%	56	70.0%	
Supervisor	2	5.6	13	16.2	χ^2=103.00*
Subordinate	1	2.8	9	11.2	
Interaction per week?					
< 1 hour	5	13.9%	5	6.3%	
1-3 hours	14	38.9	23	28.7	
3-5 hours	6	16.7	16	20.0	t=-2.19*
5-8 hours	7	19.4	18	22.5	
> 8 hours	3	8.3	17	21.2	
Times interacting per week?					
1-5	14	38.9%	18	22.5%	
6-10	10	27.8	14	17.5	
11-15	4	11.1	9	11.2	t=-2.99*
16-20	3	8.3	14	17.5	
> 20	4	11.1	24	30.0	
Number of close friends?					
0-1	14	38.9%	27	33.7%	
2-3	17	47.2	41	51.2	t=.03
4-5	2	5.6	9	11.2	
6 or more	1	2.8	1	1.2	
Work in the same department?					
Yes	25	69.4%	50	62.5%	χ^2=11.37*
No	9	25.0	29	36.2	

*p<.05.

Descriptive statistics

The means, standard deviations, t-values, and reliabilities for the friendship scales (Communal and ADF), the job satisfaction scales, and the social influence scale (TPSAT), are given in Table 3. Higher values on each of these scales indicates greater amounts of the variable or characteristic. The reliabilities were satisfactory with the exception of the Communal scale and the ADF scale. Three questions from the Communal scale and one question from the ADF were deleted to increase the reliability coefficients. All analyses were then computed with these questions deleted.

From the computation of t-tests, several differences were found between the faculty and staff. With regards to job satisfaction, faculty were more satisfied with work ($t(108)=2.60$, $p<.05$) and pay ($t(108)=3.82$, $p<.05$), while the staff were more satisfied with the supervision received ($t(91)=-2.00$, $p<.05$). Other studies utilizing faculty and staff employees show similar levels of job satisfaction (Hulin, 1966; Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969; Smith & Plant, 1982; O'Brien & Pembroke, 1982). A significant difference was also found with regards to the person-qua-person dimension of the ADF. Staff described their friendships as more personalistic and unique than did faculty ($t(111)=-2.17$, $p<.05$).

Correlational statistics

Pearson correlations between target person's perceived job satisfaction level, number of close work friends, overall

Table 3

Scale Means and Reliability Coefficients for Faculty and Staff

	Faculty		Staff			
Scale	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	Alpha Coeff.
Communal	18.27	3.32	18.24	3.47	.04	.5876
VID	9.03	4.09	9.75	3.88	-.90	.7186
PQP	11.37	2.96	12.72	3.09	-2.17*	.7718
ADF	20.40	5.99	22.40	5.94	-1.64	.7932
TPSAT	39.82	13.33	37.96	12.77	.69	.9096
People	37.97	9.16	35.43	13.68	.93	.8661
Pay	15.16	8.33	8.96	7.46	3.82*	.8198
Promotion	11.58	9.23	8.34	7.51	1.90	.8286
Job	36.50	7.34	31.24	10.73	2.60*	.7696
Supervisor	34.63	12.81	40.70	12.81	-2.00*	.8871
Overall	135.24	33.88	124.55	37.39	1.17	.7262

*p<.05.

frequency of interaction, quality of the relationship and the job satisfaction criteria are given in Table 4. Significant correlations were found for target person's perceived job satisfaction (TPSAT) and overall (.53), work (.41), and co-worker (.47) satisfaction for the faculty members. For the staff employees, target person's perceived satisfaction was significantly correlated with all the job satisfaction measures, overall (.38), work (.35), co-worker (.38), promotion opportunities (.29), supervision (.21), and pay (.21). Breadth of close co-worker friendships (CLOSE) correlated significantly with pay satisfaction (.39) for the faculty members, and with work (.23) and co-worker (.19) satisfaction for the staff. Overall frequency of interaction (FREQOV) correlated with overall (.41) and co-worker (.41) satisfaction for faculty members, but did not significantly correlate with the job satisfaction measures for the staff members. Quality of the friendship (QUALITY) was significantly correlated with work (.34) and promotion (.40) satisfaction for the faculty members. Promotion satisfaction (-.27) negatively correlated with quality of the friendship for the staff.

Multiple regression statistics

Using multiple regression, predictive equations were computed for each of the individual job satisfaction variables (job, pay, promotional opportunities, supervisory relations, co-workers) and for the overall job satisfaction variable. These predictive equations were computed for both

Table 4

Pearson Correlation Coefficients Using Predictors and Criteria

Faculty

	Overall	Work	Co-worker	Promo	Super	Pay
TPSAT	.5296*	.4130*	.4731*	.2559	.3125	.0744
CLOSE	.2923	.2056	.1324	.1125	.1581	.3915*
FREQOV	.4112*	.2785	.4092*	.1605	.3049	.1353
QUALITY	.2198	.3430*	.1204	.3955*	-.0307	.1386

Staff

	Overall	Work	Co-Worker	Promo	Super	Pay
TPSAT	.3818*	.3572*	.3821*	.2924*	.2057*	.2130*
CLOSE	.0890	.2305*	.1906*	-.0965	.0066	-.0242
FREQOV	-.0417	-.1142	.0032	-.0177	-.0988	.0943
QUALITY	-.1257	-.0462	.0682	-.2699*	-.1105	-.1362

Promo=Promotion satisfaction

Super=Supervisor satisfaction

*p<.05.

faculty and staff. The predictors used in these equations were target person's perceived job satisfaction (TPSAT), breadth of friendships in the workplace (CLOSE), overall frequency of interaction (FREQOV), quality of the friendship (QUALITY), and the interaction of frequency and quality (FREQOV*QUAL). Variables were entered in the order discussed above. Because of the consistent and high correlations of TPSAT with the job satisfaction measures, it was entered first. The interaction was entered last so that the contributions of the main effects could each be seen.

Overall job satisfaction. Looking at overall job satisfaction, the predictive equations accounted for 57% of the variance for the faculty, but only 22% of the variance for the staff; R for both were significant. Target person job satisfaction was the only variable to have a significant R^2 change and a significant beta coefficient for both equations. The beta coefficient for the interaction of frequency and quality was also significant, but only for the faculty scores (see Table 5).

Work satisfaction. The predictive equations accounted for 35% of the variance in faculty work satisfaction scores, but only 21% of the variance in the staff scores, both with a significant R. Target person job satisfaction and frequency of interaction each had significant R^2 changes in the faculty scores, with target person job satisfaction also having a significant beta coefficient. For the staff scores, target person job satisfaction and depth of close friendships each

Table 5

Multiple Regression Dependent Variable: Overall Job Satisfaction

Faculty

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	TPSAT	.5296*	.5296*	.2805	.2805*	.5190*
2	CLOSE	.2923	.5513*	.3039	.0235	.0550
3	FREQOV	.4112*	.6470*	.4186	.1147#	-1.8949#
4	QUALITY	.2198	.6500#	.4225	.0039	-.3933
5	FREQOV*QUAL	.4759*	.7566*	.5724	.1500*	2.4103*

Staff

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	TPSAT	.3818*	.3818*	.1458	.1458*	.4664*
2	CLOSE	.0890	.3909*	.1528	.0070	.0693
3	FREQOV	-.0417	.4348*	.1891	.0363	-.7218
4	QUALITY	-.1257	.4583*	.2100	.0210	-.3482
5	FREQOV*QUAL	-.0561	.4712*	.2221	.0121	.6359

Note: Beta coefficients given are those found after all variables have entered.

*p<.05.

#p<.10

had significant R^2 changes and significant beta coefficients (see Table 6).

Co-worker satisfaction. Looking at co-worker satisfaction, 44% of the variance was accounted for in the faculty scores, and 19% of the variance was accounted for in the staff scores, with both having a significant R. Target person job satisfaction and frequency of interaction each had significant R^2 changes for the faculty scores, with target person job satisfaction also yielding a significant beta coefficient. For the staff scores, target person job satisfaction yielded a significant R^2 change and a significant beta coefficient (see Table 7).

Promotion satisfaction. The predictive equation accounted for 35% of the variance in the faculty scores and 22% of the variance in staff scores, with regards to promotion satisfaction. The R for the faculty equation approached significance, while the R for the staff equation was significant. A significant R^2 change was found for the interaction among the faculty scores. Frequency alone and the interaction each yielded significant beta coefficients. For the staff scores, significant R^2 changes and beta coefficients were found with target person job satisfaction and quality of the friendship (see Table 8).

Supervision satisfaction. For satisfaction with supervision, 26% of the variance was accounted for in the faculty scores. No significant R, R^2 changes, or beta coefficients were found. For the staff scores, 9% of the

Table 6

Multiple Regression Dependent Variable: Work Satisfaction

Faculty

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	TPSAT	.4130*	.4130*	.1705	.1705*	.4046*
2	CLOSE	.2056	.4509*	.2033	.0327	.0926
3	FREQOV	.2785	.5601*	.3137	.1104*	-.8488
4	QUALITY	.3430*	.5719*	.3271	.0134	-.0669
5	FREQOV*QUAL	.3891*	.5955*	.3547	.0276	1.2450

Staff

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	TPSAT	.3572*	.3516*	.1236	.1236*	.3785*
2	CLOSE	.2305*	.4203*	.1767	.0531*	.2198*
3	FREQOV	-.1142	.4518*	.2041	.0274	-.6292
4	QUALITY	-.0462	.4533*	.2054	.0014	-.1999
5	FREQOV*QUAL	-.1017	.4627*	.2141	.0087	.5379

Note: Beta coefficients given are those found after all variables have entered.

*p<.05.

Table 7

Multiple Regression Dependent Variable: Co-worker Satisfaction

Faculty

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	TPSAT	.4731*	.4731*	.2238	.2238*	.5734*
2	CLOSE	.1324	.4745*	.2252	.0014	-.1181
3	FREQOV	.4092*	.6363*	.4049	.1798*	-.4229
4	QUALITY	.1204	.6483*	.4203	.0154	-.2972
5	FREQOV*QUAL	.3905*	.6622*	.4386	.0182	1.0032

Staff

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	TPSAT	.3821*	.3821*	.1460	.1460*	.3853*
2	CLOSE	.1906*	.4250*	.1806	.0346#	.1773
3	FREQOV	.0032	.4309*	.1856	.0050	-.1627
4	QUALITY	.0682	.4335*	.1879	.0023	.0233
5	FREQOV*QUAL	.0190	.4337*	.1881	.0002	.0868

Note: Beta coefficients given are those found after all variables have entered.

*p<.05.

#p<.10.

Table 8

Multiple Regression Dependent Variable: Promotion Satisfaction

Faculty

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	TPSAT	.2559	.2559	.0655	.0655	.3143
2	CLOSE	.1125	.2587	.0669	.0014	-.0103
3	FREQOV	.1605	.3125	.0976	.0307	-2.7143*
4	QUALITY	.3955*	.4426	.1959	.0983#	-.0947
5	FREQOV*QUAL	.2532	.5929#	.3515	.1556*	2.9889*

Staff

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	TPSAT	.2924*	.2925#	.0856	.0856*	.3595*
2	CLOSE	-.0965	.3222*	.1038	.0183	-.1365
3	FREQOV	-.0177	.3479*	.1210	.0172	-.6875
4	QUALITY	-.2699*	.4472#	.1999	.0789*	-.5112*
5	FREQOV*QUAL	-.0701	.4644*	.2156	.0157	.7271

Note: Beta coefficients given are those found after all variables have entered.

*p<.05.

#p<.10.

variance was accounted for, with target person job satisfaction giving a significant beta coefficient. The R for the staff scores was not significant (see Table 9).

Pay satisfaction. For the faculty, 20% of the variance in pay satisfaction scores was accounted for by the equation. Ten percent of the variance was accounted for in the staff scores. Neither group had a significant R. The breadth of close friendships had a significant R^2 change and beta coefficient for the faculty scores. No significant changes in R^2 or beta coefficients were found with the staff scores (see Table 10).

Additional analyses

Because of the differential predictive ability of frequency of interaction, an additional multiple regression analysis was computed. It was thought that frequency of interaction might have a linear relationship with the faculty scores and a curvilinear relationship with the staff scores. To test this hypothesis, new variables were created by taking the value of the overall frequency of interaction term to the second, third, fourth, and fifth powers. The predictors for this new analysis were overall interaction frequency (FREQOV), FREQ2, FREQ3, FREQ4, and FREQ5 with each variable entered in its respective order.

For both the staff and faculty, only the overall frequency of interaction term and the squared term (FREQ2) entered into the equation. For the staff scores, FREQ2 yielded significant changes in R^2 and significant positive

Table 9

Multiple Regression Dependent Variable: Supervisor Satisfaction

Faculty

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	TPSAT	.3125	.3125	.0977	.0977	.3297
2	CLOSE	.1581	.3211	.1031	.0055	.0277
3	FREQOV	.3049	.4299	.1848	.0817	-1.0882
4	QUALITY	-.0307	.4543	.2063	.0215	-.4378
5	FREQOV*QUAL	.3077	.5129	.2631	.0568	1.5408

Staff

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	TPSAT	.2057*	.2057#	.0423	.0423#	.2943*
2	CLOSE	.0066	.2057	.0423	.0000	-.0221
3	FREQOV	-.0988	.2782	.0774	.0351	-.1023
4	QUALITY	-.1105	.2985	.0891	.0117	-.0830
5	FREQOV*QUAL	-.1211	.2989	.0893	.0002	-.0911

Note: Beta coefficients given are those found after all variables have entered.

*p<.05.

#p<.10.

Table 10

Multiple Regression Dependent Variable: Pay Satisfaction

Faculty

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	TPSAT	.0744	.0744	.0055	.0055	-.0222
2	CLOSE	.3915*	.4260#	.1815	.1759*	.4015*
3	FREQOV	.1353	.4334	.1878	.0063	-.7771
4	QUALITY	.1386	.4340	.1884	.0006	-.1235
5	FREQOV*QUAL	.1746	.4518	.2041	.0157	.9319

Staff

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	TPSAT	.2130*	.2189#	.0479	.0479#	.2252#
2	CLOSE	-.0242	.2354	.0554	.0075	-.0713
3	FREQOV	.0943	.2358	.0556	.0002	-.5485
4	QUALITY	-.1362	.2908	.0846	.0289	-.3910
5	FREQOV*QUAL	.0756	.3155	.0995	.0150	.7100

Note: Beta coefficients given are those found after all variables have entered.

*p<.05.

#p<.10.

beta coefficients. These significant values, as shown in Tables 11 and 12, were found for both overall job satisfaction and work satisfaction. These results indicate that frequency of interaction actually has a curvilinear relationship with staff job satisfaction scores. For the staff employees, not only was high job satisfaction associated with high frequencies of interaction, but also with low frequencies of interaction. Low job satisfaction was characterized by moderate frequencies of interaction. FREQ2 was not found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction for the faculty.

Table 11

Multiple Regression Dependent Variable: Overall Satisfaction using two Predictors

Faculty

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	FREQOV	.4112*	.4112#	.1691	.1691#	.8969
2	FREQ2	.3273	.4470	.1998	.0307	-.5164

Staff

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	FREQOV	-.0417	.0417	.0017	.0017	-1.3909*
2	FREQ2	.0348	.3260	.1063	.1045*	1.3874*

Note: Beta coefficients given are those found after all variables have entered.

*p<.05.

#p<.10.

Table 12

Multiple Regression Dependent Variable: Work Satisfaction using two Predictors

Faculty

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	FREQOV	.2785	.2785	.0776	.0776	-.0126
2	FREQ2	.2336	.2914	.0849	.0074	-.2692

Staff

Step	Variable	r	R	R^2	R^2 Change	Std. Beta
1	FREQOV	-.1142	.1142	.0130	.0130	-1.4084*
2	FREQ2	-.0208	.3647*	.1330	.1200*	1.3398*

Note: Beta coefficients given are those found after all variables have entered.

*p<.05.

CHAPTER FOUR

Discussion

The present study investigated the influence of work friendships on job satisfaction among female faculty and staff employees. It was expected that variation in job satisfaction could be explained in part by the social environment of the workplace. The predictor variables were first examined with regards to their relationship with the job satisfaction measures, and were then entered into regression equations for each of the six measures. The more consistent predictor variables and their implications for job satisfaction are discussed below.

It is recognized that with correlational data such as these, no causal statements can be made. It is not known whether people who are satisfied with their jobs are more inclined to develop friendships in the workplace; or whether, people who have more work friendships consequently have higher job satisfaction. These data only confirm significant relationships between the social environment at work and job satisfaction and alert us to the importance of the social aspects of the job.

Descriptive results

Chi-square results. The chi-square analysis showed that the faculty and staff differed with regards to the status of

the target person. The target person was typically a peer among the faculty members. This contradicts the finding of Schutte & Light (1978) who state that higher-level employees typically choose friends who have a higher status in the organization. This contradiction can be explained by the fact that faculty members do not have supervisors, per se. Faculty members are given much autonomy in their work and colleagues are usually thought of as having equal status, even though the colleague may be a junior level faculty member. For the staff workers, the organizational divisions are much clearer, with supervisory positions being easily recognizable.

Correlational results. For the faculty members, the predictor variables (TPSAT, CLOSE, FREQOV, and QUALITY) were each positively correlated with at least one of the job satisfaction variables. These correlations suggest that the social environment, as defined by the job satisfaction level of one's closest co-worker friend, the number of close friendships on the job, the quality of one's closest co-worker friendship, and the interaction opportunities provided by the job, is an important predictor of satisfaction with various job elements. As satisfaction with the social aspects of the workplace increases, so too does satisfaction with specific job elements.

For the staff employees, target person job satisfaction was significantly correlated with each of the job satisfaction measures. The positive correlation of TPSAT

suggests that the work evaluations made by close co-workers may have a global influence on job satisfaction for staff employees. How the job is perceived by others can affect the job evaluation made by the individual or, the individual's own evaluation of the job may color her view of the satisfaction of others. Number of close work relationships also had a significant positive correlation with work and co-worker satisfaction. This indicates that as the number of close work friendships increase, so too does satisfaction with work and co-workers. The quality of the friendship was negatively correlated with promotion satisfaction, indicating that as satisfaction with promotional opportunities increase, satisfaction with the quality of the relationship will decrease. A speculative explanation for this is that with upwardly mobile individuals, the desire or the time necessary to develop friendships may not be strong.

It was interesting to note that frequency of interaction had a curvilinear relationship with overall and work satisfaction for the staff and a linear relationship with all satisfaction measures for the faculty. The explanation for this is not a simple one. Given the type of questions asked in this study, only tentative hypotheses can be offered.

One hypothesis is that we were sampling two types of staff workers. One type may work solely because of the pay or the task, and have no interest in the social aspects of the job. The other type may have a strong interest in her

co-worker friends and look forward to the interaction opportunities provided by the job. The first group, who showed interest in the task or the pay, but no interest in the social environment, would yield high job satisfaction scores when frequency of interaction scores are low. The second group, who showed a much greater interest in the social environment, would give high job satisfaction scores when frequency of interaction scores are high.

A second explanation could be the different office arrangements found for staff. Typically, staff workers have open offices. Some of the staff workers, though, may also have closed offices. Several studies have reported the effects of open office designs. It is generally agreed that distractions and disturbances increase, while privacy decreases in an open office (Wineman, 1982; Hedge, 1982). Because of their intrinsic interest, particularly annoying activities are telephone conversations and conversations among fellow workers (Wineman, 1982). It becomes exceedingly easy to listen to a passing conversation and thus, be distracted from typing reports, filing letters, or other work. The staff workers with the typical open office arrangement, are then frequently bombarded with such interruptions and distractions. Distractions are not only caused by strangers, but also by close friends. Rather than interaction opportunities, privacy becomes a key issue. Thus, as interruptions by close friends decrease, job satisfaction may increase. On the other hand, the staff with

the closed offices and ease of privacy, may have a larger communication gap, making interaction opportunities a more desired option. Information about office arrangements, not gathered in this study, might clarify the complex relationship between frequency of interaction with a close co-worker friend and job satisfaction.

Multiple regression results

Predictive ability of TPSAT. Looking at the regression equations, TPSAT was a significant predictor of job satisfaction for both the faculty and staff employees. The positive beta coefficients indicate that as the perceived job satisfaction level of the target person increases, so too does the satisfaction level of the subject. Comments and actions made by fellow workers concerning work in the workplace, may have an influence on one's own job evaluations. It is also possible that an employee may choose friends who have similar attitudes toward work; or she may misjudge her friend's level of job satisfaction to make it more congruent with her own. The latter possibility could be investigated by obtaining job satisfaction ratings from the friend. Regardless of the direction of influence, congruence between one's own job satisfaction and that of a close co-worker friend is a demonstrated phenomenon.

The potential power of social influence, as evidenced by the predictive ability of target person's perceived job satisfaction level, is an important factor when handling morale problems within an organization. One dissatisfied

person in a group could cause a domino effect, where other group members become dissatisfied through indirect means. This dissatisfaction could accrue without the other group members ever having tangible, concrete, personal arguments against the company. The converse is also true. That is, one satisfied person could cause others to become satisfied, or at least tolerant, with the job. This corresponds with the social information processing viewpoint of Salancik and Pfeffer (1977, 1978), who state that workers are influenced by the social environment, be it positively or negatively. As such, the organization should be aware of the far-reaching powers of comments made by one co-worker to another.

Predictive ability of friendship breadth. Friendship breadth, the number of close co-worker friends, was a significant predictor of pay satisfaction among faculty members, and work satisfaction among staff employees. This indicates that a larger number of co-worker friends is related to greater satisfaction with work or pay for some employees.

The results for friendship breadth indicate that perhaps it is not only one co-worker friend that makes a contribution to job satisfaction, but a number of co-worker friends. One co-worker may be liked regardless of the work situation but, two or more friends may reflect a broader satisfaction with the job. If the job, itself, is not well liked, but the person has two or three close friends at work, then the satisfaction from the friendships may compensate for the

dissatisfaction with the job.

Frequency of interaction. Frequency of interaction was a significant predictor of promotion and co-worker satisfaction among the faculty, but was not linearly related to any aspect of job satisfaction among the staff. As discussed earlier, office arrangements may account for differences in the shape of the relationship between frequency of interaction and job satisfaction. Staff workers typically have open office arrangements where interaction opportunities are quite frequent, while faculty members typically have closed office making interaction opportunities a less frequent, but more desired, occurrence. Thus, for the faculty as the opportunities for communication with co-workers increase, satisfaction with promotional opportunities and co-workers also increase.

Faculty/staff differences

One of the more interesting findings of this study was the large discrepancy in the variance accounted for between faculty and staff. On the average, the variance accounted for in the faculty scores was twice that for staff scores. Several reasons for these differences are suggested.

Crowding. One possible explanation for this again lies in the open office design of the staff employees. With open office designs, traffic flow increases and perceptions of crowding are likely to be felt. Studies show that when subjects are placed in a crowded situation, performance decreases, anxiety levels increase, and other persons are

viewed in a more negative manner (Mackintosh, West, & Saegert, 1975; Langer & Saegert, 1977; Griffit & Veitch, 1971). Because of the crowded conditions, the social environment and/or work relationships may not always be viewed as a positive aspect of the job. This is not to imply that the social environment is not important for staff employees. It is only meant to suggest a possible explanation for the divergent predictability of the equation. Antecdotal evidence gathered during the study suggests that work friendships are a very large part of the workday for the staff employees.

Frequency of interaction. Another reason, which is related to the crowding explanation, stems from the ability of the linear component of frequency of interaction to predict for faculty, but not for staff. Even though not always significantly, frequency of interaction still accounted for a large proportion of the variance in the faculty scores. This was not true for the staff scores.

Involvement. A third explanation may be the inherent involvement of the faculty with their work. The decision to become a faculty member necessitates many years of training and the acceptance of a pay scheme that is often lower than could be found elsewhere. This deep involvement, often enhanced by collaborations on research projects, may lead to the development of friendships among work colleagues. As Verbrugge (1979) states, workers who are deeply committed to their jobs will often choose their friends from among their

colleagues, because of the mutual understanding and empathy that they share. Work friendships thus may be a more important part of the job for the faculty members than for the staff workers.

Summary.

In conclusion, the results have shown that the social environment is an important component of job satisfaction. Past research has been directed at understanding qualities of the job or task which might influence job satisfaction. This research suggests that instead of solely concentrating on the concrete characteristics of the job, examination of the periphery of the job, the social environment, and its' implications for job satisfaction is warranted. The results of this study suggest that not only should efforts be directed towards enriching the job itself, but efforts also need to be made to enrich the social environment.

Future research.

For future study, this research has raised at least three additional questions. First, friendship depth and job satisfaction implications should be investigated. Questionnaires concerning two or more close co-worker friends might be administered to help clarify the possible effects of multiple work friendships. Second, subjective and objective measures of crowding should be included, to examine how density interacts with work friendships to determine job satisfaction. The results of such a study could have significant implications for future workplace designs.

Third, this research should be carried out with male subjects to see what effects, if any, work friendships have on their job satisfaction. It would be interesting to note the differences or similarities between men and women with regards to work friendships and job satisfaction.

References

Cascio, W. F. (1987). Costing human resources: The financial impact of behavior in organizations. Boston: Kent Publishing Co.

Clark, M. S., & Mills, J. (1979). Interpersonal attraction in exchange and communal relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 12-24.

Clark, M. S. (1981). Noncomparability of benefits given and received: A cue to the existence of friendship. Social Psychology Quarterly, 44, 375-381.

Clark, M. S. (1984). Record keeping in two types of relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 549-557.

Clark, M. S. (1986, Fall). Personal communication with the author.

Cohen, J. B., & Golden, E. (1972). Informational social influence and product evaluation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56, 54-59.

Duck, S. (1983). Friends, for life: The psychology of close relationships. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Feld, S. L. (1984). The structured use of personal associates. Social Forces, 62, 640-652.

Griffit, W., & Veitch, R. (1971). Hot & crowded: Influences of population density and temperature on interpersonal affective behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17, 92-98.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 259-286.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16, 250-279.

Hedge, A. (1982). The open-plan office: A systematic investigation of employee reactions to their work environment. Environment and Behavior, 14, 519-542.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley.

Hulin, C. L. (1966). Job satisfaction and turnover in a female clerical population. Journal of Applied Psychology, 50, 280-285.

Ilgen, D. R., & Hollenback, J. H. (1977). The role of job satisfaction in absence behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 19, 148-161.

Kurth, S. (1970). Friendships and friendly relations. In G. J. McCall, M. M. McCall, N. K. Denzin, G. D. Suttles, & S. B. Kurth, (Eds.), Social relationships (pp. 136-150). Chicago: Aldine.

Langer, E. J., & Saegert S. (1977). Crowding and cognitive control. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 175-182.

Lawler, E. E., & Porter, L. W. (1967). The effects of performance on job satisfaction. Industrial Relations 7, 20-28.

Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4,309-336.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Mackintosh, E., West, S., & Saegert, S. (1975). Two studies of crowding in urban public places. Environment and Behavior, 7, 159-184.

O'Brien, G. E. & Pembroke, M. (1982). Crowding, density and the job satisfaction of clerical employees. Australian Journal of Psychology, 34, 151-164.

Oldham, G. R. (1976). Job characteristics and internal motivation: The moderating effect of interpersonal and individual variables. Human Relations, 29, 559-569.

Oldham, G. R., Hackman, J. R., & Pearce, J. L. (1976). Conditions under which employees respond positively to enriched work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 395-403.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Caldwell, D. F. (1979). Informational influence as a determinant of perceived task characteristics and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 157-165.

Rubin, L. B. (1985). Just friends. New York: Harper & Row.

Salancik, G., & Pfeffer, J. (1977). An examination of need-satisfaction models of job attitudes. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 427-456.

Salancik, G., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 224-253.

Schutte, J. G., & Light, J. M. (1978). The relative importance of proximity and status for friendship choices in social hierarchies. Social Psychology, 41, 260-264.

Slocum, J. W. (1971). Motivation in managerial levels: Relationship of need satisfaction to job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 312-316.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction by work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Smith, D. B., & Plant, W. T. (1982). Sex differences in the job satisfaction of university professors. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 249-251.

Smith, P. C. (1987, Fall). Personal communication with the author.

Steers, R. M. (1975). Effects of need for achievement on the job performance-job attitude relationship. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 678-682.

Suttles, G. (1970). Friendship as a social institution. In G. J. McCall, M. M. McCall, N. K. Denzin, G. D. Suttles, S. B. Kurth (Eds.), Social relationships (pp. 95-135). Chicago: Aldine.

Terborg, J., Lee, T., Smith, F., Davis, G., & Turbin, M. (1982). Extension of the Schmidt and Hunter validity generalization procedure to the prediction of absenteeism behavior from knowledge of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 440-449.

Tosi, H. L., Rizzo, J. R., & Carroll, S. J. (1986). Managing organizational behavior. Maine: Pitman.

Umstot, D. D., Bell, C. H., & Mitchell, T. R. (1976). Effects of job enrichment and task goals on satisfaction and productivity: Implications for job design. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 379-394.

Verbrugge, L. M. (1977). The structure of adult friendship choices. Social Forces, 56, 576-597.

Verbrugge, L. M. (1979). Multiplexity in adult friendships. Social Forces, 57, 1286-1307.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.

White, S. E., Mitchell, T. R., & Bell, C. H. (1977). Goal setting, evaluation apprehension, and social cues as determinants of job performance and job satisfaction in a simulated organization. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 665-673.

White, S. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1979). Job enrichment versus social cues: A comparison and competitive test. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 1-9.

Wineman, J. D. (1982). Office design and evaluation: An overview. Environment and Behavior, 14, 271-298.

Wright, P. H. (1969). A model and a technique for studies of friendship. Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology, 5, 295-308.

Wright, P. H. (1974). The delineation and measurement of some key variables in the study of friendship. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 5, 423-436.

Wright, P. H. (1978). Toward a theory of friendship based on a conception of self. Human Communications Research, 4, 196-207.

Wright, P. H. (1982). Men's friendships, women's friendships and the alleged inferiority of the latter. Sex Roles, 8, 1-20.

Wright, P. H., & Bergloff, P. J. (1984, July). The Acquaintance Description Form and the study of relationship differentiation. Paper presented at the second international conference on personal relationships. Madison, WI.

APPENDIXES

Work Friendship Questionnaire

A Communal Questionnaire

B Acquaintance Description Form

C Target Person Satisfaction Questionnaire

D Job Descriptive Index

E Biographical Questions

F Target Person Questions

G General Instructions

Communal Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions concerning the person you have chosen as your best friend at work. Remember, TP in the following statements will refer to that person. There are no right or wrong answers. The right answer is the one which best describes your feelings. Indicate on the op-scan sheet provided, how characteristic of your relationship each statement is, using the following scale:

1 = extremely uncharacteristic
2 = uncharacteristic
3 = neutral
4 = characteristic
5 = extremely characteristic

28. It bothers me when TP neglects my needs.
29. When making a decision, I take the needs and feelings of TP into account.
30. I'm not especially sensitive to the feelings of TP.
31. I don't especially enjoy giving TP aid.
32. I expect TP to be responsive to my needs and feelings.
33. I do not often go out of my way to help TP.
34. I believe it's best not to get involved in taking care of the personal needs of TP.
35. When I have a need, I turn to TP to help.
36. When TP gets emotionally upset, I tend to avoid TP.
37. When I have a need that TP ignores, I'm hurt.

Acquaintance Description Form

This form lists some statements about your reactions to your Target Person (TP). Perhaps some of the situations have never come up in your relationship with your TP. If this happens, try your best to imagine what things would be like if the situation did come up.

Please record your response to each of the statements about your Target Person (TP) on the op-scan sheet provided. Decide which of the scale numbers best describes your reaction and record your choice by darkening that number. You will notice that some of the statements are best answered in terms of "how often" and some are best answered in terms of "how likely." This will not be confusing. Simply read the following codes carefully and use them as guides in darkening your choices.

HOW OFTEN		HOW LIKELY
5=ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS	or	5=DEFINITELY
4=USUALLY	or	4=PROBABLY
3=ABOUT HALF THE TIME	or	3=PERHAPS
2=SELDOM	or	2=PROBABLY NOT
1=NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER	or	1=DEFINITELY NOT

48. If TP were to move away or change departments, I would really miss the special kind of companionship he/she provides.

49. If I hadn't heard from TP for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact her/him just for the sake of keeping in touch.

50. TP expresses so many personal qualities I like that I think of him/her as being "one of a kind," a truly unique person.

51. If TP and I could arrange our schedules so that we each had a free day, I would try to arrange my schedule so that I had the same free day as TP.

52. "False sincerity" and "phoniness" are the kinds of terms that occur to me when I am trying to think honestly about my impressions of TP.

Acquaintance Description Form continued

HOW OFTEN		HOW LIKELY
5=ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS	or	5=DEFINITELY
4=USUALLY	or	4=PROBABLY
3=ABOUT HALF THE TIME	or	3=PERHAPS
2=SELDOM	or	2=PROBABLY NOT
1=NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER	or	1=DEFINITELY NOT

53. When TP and I get together, I enjoy a special kind of companionship I don't get from any of my other acquaintances.

54. If I had decided to leave town on a certain day for a leisurely trip or vacation and discovered that TP was leaving for the same place a day later, I would seriously consider waiting a day in order to travel with him/her.

55. TP is the kind of person I would miss very much if something happened to interfere with our acquaintanceship.

56. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with TP to see if we can arrange to do things together.

57. If I had just gotten off work or out of class and had some free time, I would wait around and leave with TP if he/she were leaving the same place an hour or so later.

Part III (TPSAT)

The following questions are concerned with the way you think your TP feels. Think of the job your TP does. How do you think your TP feels about it most of the time? Darken...

1 if it describes your TP's feelings about his/her job

2 if it does NOT describe your TP's feelings about his/her job

3 if you cannot decide how your TP would feel about his/her job

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

10. Pleasant
11. Enjoyable
12. Ideal
13. Waste of time
14. Bad
15. Acceptable
16. Worthwhile
17. Worse than most
18. Undesirable
19. Like to leave
20. Better than most
21. Disagreeable
22. Inadequate
23. Makes him/her content
24. Excellent
25. Rotten
26. Good
27. Poor

Part IV (JDI)

Part IV concerns your reaction to various aspects of your job. Think of the pay you get now. How well does of each of the following words describe your present pay? Darken...

1 for "Yes" if it describes your pay

2 for "No" if it does NOT describe your pay

3 if you cannot decide

PRESENT PAY

58. income adequate for normal expenses
59. satisfactory profit sharing
60. barely live on income
61. bad
62. income provides luxuries
63. insecure
64. less than I deserve
65. highly paid
66. underpaid

Part IV continued

Think of the work on your present job. What is it like most of the time? On the op-scan sheet, darken...

1 for "Yes" if it describes your work

2 for "No" if it does NOT describe your work

3 if you cannot decide

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

67. Fascinating
68. Routine
69. Satisfying
70. Boring
71. Good
72. Creative
73. Respected
74. Hot
75. Pleasant
76. Useful
77. Tiresome
78. Healthful
79. Challenging
80. On your feet
81. Frustrating
82. Simple
83. Endless
84. Gives sense of accomplishment

Part IV continued

Think of the majority of the people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words describe these people? On the op-scan sheet, darken...

1 if it describes the people you work with

2 if it does NOT describe them

3 if you cannot decide

PEOPLE ON PRESENT JOB

85. Stimulating
86. Boring
87. Slow
88. Ambitious
89. Stupid
90. Responsible
91. Fast
92. Intelligent
93. Easy to make enemies
94. Talk too much
95. Smart
96. Lazy
97. Unpleasant
98. No privacy
99. Active
100. Narrow interests
101. Loyal
102. Hard to meet

Part IV continued

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words describe these? Darken...

1 for "Yes" if it describes your opportunities for promotion

2 for "No" if it does NOT describe them

3 if you cannot decide

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

103. good opportunities for promotion

104. opportunity somewhat limited

105. promotion on ability

106. dead-end job

107. good chance for promotion

108. unfair promotion policy

109. infrequent promotions

110. regular promotions

111. fairly good chance for promotion

Part IV continued

Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words describe this supervision?

Darken...

1 if it describes the supervision you get on your job

2 if it does NOT describe it

3 if you cannot decide

SUPERVISION ON PRESENT JOB

112. asks my advice

113. hard to please

114. impolite

115. praises good work

116. tactful

117. influential

118. up-to-date

119. doesn't supervise enough

120. quick tempered

121. tells me where I stand

122. annoying

123. stubborn

124. knows job well

125. bad

126. intelligent

127. leaves me on my own

128. around when needed

129. lazy

Biographical Questions

This first section of the questionnaire concerns yourself. We would like some personal information from you so that we can have a better idea of who our respondents are. Please darken the number corresponding to the correct response.

1. Would you be classified as...

    1. Faculty?
    2. Staff (Hourly)?
    3. Staff (Classified)?

2. How old are you?

    1. Less than 25
    2. 26-35
    3. 36-45
    4. 46-55
    5. Over 55

3. How long have you worked for Old Dominion University?

    1. Less than one year
    2. More than one year but less than three years
    3. More than three years but less than six years
    4. More than 6 years

Target Person Questions

This section concerns your feelings about the person you have selected as your best friend at work. Remember, this person is referred to as your target person or TP. The person you select may be male or female, work in the same department with you, or work in a different department. The only requirement is that the person work for ODU. Please answer the following questions with that specific person in mind.

4. How long have you known your TP? Darken...
    1. if less than 6 months
    2. if less than one year
    3. if less than two years
    4. if less than three years
    5. if greater than three years

5. Would you characterize your TP as ...
    1. Peer?
    2. Supervisor?
    3. Subordinate?

6. Try to estimate the amount of time that you spend interacting with your TP. This includes talking on the phone, carpooling, taking breaks together, talking in the hall, talking about both work related issues and personal issues, going to lunch together, socializing outside of work, etc. We realize this is difficult to do, but try to estimate the total amount of time you interact with your TP per week. Darken...

    1. if less than one hour
    2. if one to three hours
    3. if three to five hours
    4. if five to eight hours
    5. if more than eight hours

7. We realize that some of your interactions take one to two minutes, while other interactions may take one to two hours. Including all interactions, both short and long, try to estimate the number of times per week that you interact with your target person. Darken...

    1. if you interact 1 to 5 times per week
    2. if you interact 6 to 10 times per week
    3. if you interact 11 to 15 times per week
    4. if you interact 16 to 20 times per week
    5. if you interact more than 20 times per week

Target Person Questions continued

8. Including your TP, how many of your co-workers would you consider to be "close" friends...

    1. Ø-1
    2. 2-3
    3. 4-5
    4. 6 or more

9. Does your TP work in the same department?

    1. Yes
    2. No

Do you have any comments about the relationships you have at work and their contributions to your job satisfaction? If so, write them here and include this page with your op-scan sheet.

General Instructions

My name is Melinda Montgomery and I am a graduate student in psychology. For my Master's degree, I am doing research involving co-worker relationships and their effects on job attitudes.

I would like you to complete this questionnaire on a person you work with, who you consider to be your best friend at work. Take a moment to decide who this person is for you. This is a person you enjoy spending time with, feel very comfortable with, and who you can share both personal and impersonal information with. You may spend time with this person both at work and outside of work, or you may only see this person when on the job. In the questionnaire, this person will be referred to as your target person or TP. Whenever I refer to your TP, think of the person and his or her characteristics.

All answers are to be placed on the op-scan sheet provided. Record your answer to every item on the op-scan sheet by blackening the appropriate lettered circle to the right of the number of the item. Please use a #2 pencil and be sure your pencil marks are dark. Omit the personal identification section of the op-scan sheet. All information will remain confidential. You should not place your name, your target person's name, or your department name anywhere on the questionnaire or answer sheet.

Do not be overwhelmed by the size of the questionnaire. During a pilot study, average completion time was 20 minutes.

General Instructions continued

Please do not spend too much time on each individual question. I would like you to record your first response to each question.

Please return the questionnaire to me via intercampus mail, by October 10. Enclosed you will find a label with my name and address. If you have any questions or comments please feel free to call me at 440-4453 or Dr. Barbara Winstead at 440-4212.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated. Copies of the results will be made available to those interested.