

Facets of Job Satisfaction

By

Josette Lehman

Applied Research Project

jjlehman01@gmail.com



Submitted to the Department of Political Science
Texas State University-San Marcos
In Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Public Administration

Fall 2014

Faculty Approval:

Dr. Hassan Tajalli, Ph.D.

Dr. Willard Fields, Ph.D.

Jessica Marek, MPA

Abstract

Purpose. The purpose of this Applied Research Project is to explore job facets that affect public employees' job satisfaction and then determine to what extent these facets influence the Master of Public Administration (MPA) students' overall job satisfaction in the public sector. Lastly, the facets that impact MPA students' job satisfaction the most are revealed. *Methods.* The job facets used to assess satisfaction among public employees' is developed through the literature review. To collect the data, a questionnaire was sent electronically to the students enrolled in the MPA Program as of Fall 2014. The survey was designed to (a) evaluate employees' overall satisfaction with their public sector job and (b) determine the facets that significantly influence job satisfaction within the public sector. *Results.* In total, 47 students in the MPA Program participated in the survey. The findings show that 66 percent of respondents are generally satisfied with their employment in a public agency. Multiple regression analysis identified promotional opportunities in the public sector as the sole facet to significantly impact job satisfaction. *Conclusion.* The results of this study suggest public agencies should focus on increasing employees' perception of promotional and career advancement opportunities. This can be accomplished through an increased knowledge of an organization's succession planning system as well as management development programs to reinforce the notion that the organization is concerned with giving every employee an opportunity to advance.

About the Author

Josette Lehman received her Master of Public Administration degree at Texas State University in 2014. She also holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science with a minor in Public Administration from Texas State University (2011). Josette can be contacted at: jlehman01@gmail.com

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	5
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	7
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	26
Chapter 4: Results.....	32
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	36
Bibliography.....	43
Appendix A- Survey.....	48
Appendix B- Email.....	50

Chapter 1: Introduction

There are several factors that attribute to employees' feeling satisfied with their job. These factors range from pay, to the relationship with their supervisor, to the performance appraisal process. More important than identifying *what* influences job satisfaction is understanding *why* employee job satisfaction matters at all. Indeed, the search to explain job satisfaction has been motivated by both utilitarian and humanitarian reasons (Ellickson and Logsdon 2001, 173). Utilitarian reasons include the desire to increase productivity and organizational commitment, decrease absenteeism and turnover, and increase overall organizational effectiveness. Humanitarian reasons for understanding job satisfaction rely on "the notion that employees' deserve to be treated with respect and have their psychological and physical well-being maximized" (Ellickson and Logsdon 2001, 173).

Job satisfaction is particularly important in the public sector, a sector that encompasses nearly 22 million workers (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2014). This is because public sector workers have shown distinctive motives and work preferences as well as a penchant for specific workplace attributes, which can affect their overall job satisfaction (Taylor and Westover 2011, 732). Also essential to note is the specific environment in which public employees operate that affects their level of job satisfaction. Specifically, public sector workers must carry out their tasks in a highly political and politicized work environment that is subject to rigid accountability measures and intense public and media scrutiny (Taylor and

Westover 2011, 732). For these reasons, understanding what factors contribute to public employees' job satisfaction is essential.

Conventional wisdom suggests that government and nonprofit workers derive job satisfaction simply by fulfilling their "desire to serve the public." Indeed, if this notion were true research focusing on job satisfaction in the public sector would be limited. A quick online search of "job satisfaction in the public sector" reveals something else, finding nearly 5.3 million results on the topic. Factors other than simply the "desire to serve the public" must contribute to and influence job satisfaction among government and nonprofit workers. This study seeks to identify those facets that influence job satisfaction within the public sector. First, a model composed of eight job facets is developed and explained. Next, the model is applied to students currently (Fall 2014) enrolled in the Master in Public Administration Program (MPA) to examine their job satisfaction levels within the public sector. Lastly, statistical analysis is used to determine which facets of a job have the greatest impact on MPA students' satisfaction with their public sector employment.

Summary of Chapters

This research is organized into five chapters. In Chapter 2, a review of the literature is presented, and it is demonstrated how the eight job facets are developed. Chapter 3 explains the research methodology used to operationalize the conceptual framework developed in the previous chapter. Chapter 4 presents the results of the survey. Lastly, Chapter 5 discusses the outcome of the job satisfaction survey results.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Nearly 80 years ago Robert Happock wrote, “subject any group of normal persons to intolerable working conditions and revolt is inevitable; first in strikes; if they fail, in riots; finally, if necessary, in political or social revolution” (Happock 1935, 5; Conway 1987,48). Happock wrote this in his book, *Job Satisfaction* (1935), to describe the importance of an employee’s job satisfaction. His assertion may seem extreme but given that turnover costs can reach almost 40 percent of earnings for the average company (Saratoga 2006), developing employee job satisfaction should be examined.

Since the 1930s, numerous studies on employee attitudes have been undertaken attempting to pinpoint specific facets of a job that contribute to and influence an employee’s satisfaction with his or her job. Previous research has attempted to identify and understand the determinants of employee job satisfaction because it was believed to increase productivity. Research linking job satisfaction to productivity and performance has been inconsistent, whereas relationships between absenteeism and turnover have been identified. There has been renewed interest in studying employee job satisfaction but with the outcome instead aimed at increasing organizational commitment and reducing turnover and absenteeism (Agho, Mueller and Price 1993).

In order to fully understand the concept of employee job satisfaction, clarification of the term must first be established. Many definitions for “job satisfaction” have been put forth, however, Edwin Locke’s definition is probably the most universally recognized. Locke defines the concept of “job satisfaction” as “a

pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (Locke 1976, 1300).

Under current and growing fiscal constraints, both public and private organizations are being forced to find ways to do more with less in terms of productivity, quality, and quantity of services (Joshi and Sharma 1997). If managers are able to identify specific job facets that can influence an employee's attitude towards their job, they would essentially be able to effectively promote job satisfaction simply by altering or adjusting those facets--all without increasing expenditures (Conway 1987; Durst and DeSantis 1997).

Chapter Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature that pertains to job satisfaction in order to develop a model of the facets that influence employee job satisfaction. This knowledge can help organizations gain a more in-depth understanding of employee preferences when developing programs and policies aimed at increasing satisfaction and reducing absenteeism and turnover.

Conceptual Framework

To assess public employee job satisfaction among the students enrolled in the MPA Program, key job facets are identified. Based on a thorough review of the literature as well as the job facets identified by Ellickson and Logsdon (2001), Durst and DeSantis (1997), and Schappe (1998), the conceptual framework of this research consists of the following eight job facets:

1. Promotional Opportunity
2. Compensation
3. Work Environment

4. Adequate Training & Training Opportunity
5. Positive Relationship with Supervisor
6. Work Group
7. Nature of the Work
8. Perceived Fair Treatment

Job facets one through six were developed by Ellickson and Logsdon (2001). The “Nature of the Work” component was conceived by Durst and DeSantis (1997). The last job facet, “Perceived Fair Treatment,” was identified by Schappe (1998) as playing a vital part to understanding employee job satisfaction, and therefore it was incorporated into this research model. The following pages of this paper provide an examination and justification for the facets of employee job satisfaction based on the scholarly literature.

Promotional Opportunity

The opportunity for promotion is the first key facet discussed in employee job satisfaction. This component includes dimensions of whether the chances for promotion are good, whether promotions are handled fairly, and whether the employer is concerned about giving everyone the opportunity for a promotion (Kalleberg 1977, 128). Specifically, the opportunity for promotion reflects the extent to which promotions are available and fairly allocated among workers (Lambert 1991, 350). One of the most dissatisfying aspects of a job that an employee may experience is the feeling that they are stuck in their position and see no room for growth or advancement. Employees want to feel like they are working towards some end and that through hard work and dedication they will be recognized for their efforts by being promoted. As reported by the 2012 Society for

Human Resource Management Survey, the emphasis on career advancement opportunities has been on a gradual upward trend since 2007. This may be attributed to employees' feeling that they have mastered their current positions responsibilities and are looking for more challenging positions within their organization (SHRM 2012, 10). The results of the Price and Mueller (1981, 558) study demonstrate the significance of promotional opportunity finding that opportunity was almost four times as important as pay.

It is vital that organizations pay close attention to employees' level of satisfaction with career advancement as they may become discouraged if they are continuously passed over for promotions. Indeed, these unsatisfied employees are more likely to look for opportunities outside their organization (SHRM 2012, 10).

Compensation

- Pay

In order to attract high quality employees, organizations must research the market in their area and industry to ensure their salaries and benefits are in line with their talent strategy (SHRM 2012, 24). Since compensation has remained on the list as one of the top five factors in determining job satisfaction, it is important for organizations to develop attractive compensation packages as a strategy in competing for and retaining top talent (SHRM 2012, 24).

The Society for Human Resource Management identifies four components specific to pay that affect employee job satisfaction. The components are: (1) being paid competitively with the local market; (2) base rate of pay; (3) opportunity for variable rate of pay; and (4) stock options. Of the four components that affect

employee job satisfaction, being paid competitively within the local market ranked as most important for satisfaction. Williams, et al. (2007, 429) also found that satisfaction with pay has four dimensions: (1) pay level; (2) pay raises; (3) benefit level; and (4) pay structure and administration. While studies have shown that pay is often not the only or number one determinant of employee satisfaction, it is still a key component because salary is considered to be a reward or recognition for work performance (Zhang, et al. 2011, 679).

The Society for Human Resource Management (2012, 5) recommends that managers address the issue of compensation dissatisfaction by sharing information concerning the organization's compensation philosophy, helping employees' understand how their pay is determined, and frequently updating employees' on what their total rewards package includes.

- Benefits

The role of benefits has become an increasingly vital aspect for an employee's job satisfaction. Properly designed employee benefit packages can be extremely effective in attracting, motivating, satisfying, and retaining employees (Durst and DeSantis 1997, 8). Current benefits usually include health, retirement, profit sharing, stock ownership, legal, educational, child-care assistance, dental, vision, life insurance, and vacation (Barber, et al. 1992, 55). The results of the Barber, et al. study (1992, 69) demonstrate that an increased understanding by the employees of the benefits actually generates increased satisfaction. This is because extensive communication and training lead the employees to have a better understanding and thus a more favorable view of their benefits package. Barber, et

al. (1992, 69) advise that communication and training should be viewed as an inherent part of the process by which benefits increase employee's job satisfaction.

When developing benefits packages, it is important that employers take into account and anticipate the needs, preferences, and make-up of their workforce (SHRM 2012, 26). Providing cost-effective and affordable benefits to employees can be challenging for an organization, but given that 54 percent of respondents rated benefits as a very important contributor to their job satisfaction, employers should keep this in mind (SHRM 2012, 26). An organization must realize the full extent to which benefits influence employees' initial attraction to and retention with the agency, and the value of these benefits in influencing job behaviors and satisfying basic needs (Bergmann, et al. 1994, 398).

Work Environment

Research indicates that organizational obstacles such as inadequate equipment, a lack of resources, cramped workspaces, and unsafe work environments may be underappreciated predictors of the employees' attitude towards their job (Ellickson and Logsdon 2001, 174). Brown and Mitchell (1993, 2) have found that there are two types of organizational obstacles: technical and social. Technical obstacles include malfunctions or limitations in technology, information, work material, and equipment. Obstacles that are social in nature involve cramped workspaces shared with co-workers, co-workers who do not carry their share of the workload, or inadequate formal decision-making authority (Brown and Mitchell 1993, 2). Studies demonstrate that if factors in both of these categories (technical and social) present obstacles to employees, job satisfaction may be negatively affected (Brown and Mitchell 1993, 2; Peters and O'Connor, 1988).

Employees' spend a vast amount of time at work and therefore organizations should take steps to see that the work environment is conducive for employees to be productive, satisfied, and engaged (SHRM 2012, 32). Kalleberg (1977) as well as Emmert and Taher (1992) found that the work environment could have a positive effect on the satisfaction of the employee. Specifically, workers who perceive the environment positively and who relate well with their fellow employees display greater job satisfaction. Ellickson and Logsdon (2001, 175) emphasize the importance of removing all organizational obstacles in order to enhance employee attitudes. The authors posit an inverse relationship between organizational obstacles and job satisfaction. The Ellickson and Logsdon (2001, 181) study also reveals that by removing organizational obstacles, management sends the message that they care; conversely, by not doing so reinforces employee beliefs that management is unwilling to improve the environment, thereby contributing to reduced levels of employee satisfaction.

According to a survey by the Society for Human Resource Management, 47 percent of respondents indicated that feeling safe at work was very important to their job satisfaction. This means that employees have certain expectations of the organization they work for in ensuring their safety.

The literature examined illustrates significant links between a worker's environment and his or her satisfaction with the job. Besides the direct effect on employee satisfaction, the removal of organizational obstacles may indirectly affect employee motivation and satisfaction when workers see that their managers care enough to improve the work system (Brown and Mitchell 1993, 12).

Adequate Training & Training Opportunity

Adequate training and training opportunities are identified as the fourth component within the model of job satisfaction. Job training is defined as “a set of planned activities on the part of an organization to increase the job knowledge and skills or to modify the attitudes and social behavior of its members in ways consistent with the goals of the organization and the requirements of the job” (Landy 1985, 306; Schmidt 2007,483).

Training is an important determinant of employee job satisfaction because it is meant to develop and enhance the employees’ skills and knowledge so they can use this information to improve in their current position (Society for Human Resource Management 2012, 11). Agho, et al. (1993, 7) observe, “employees are less satisfied with their jobs when they do not have the information needed to perform their tasks adequately.” The lack of a complete understanding of one’s job can lead to frustration and tension between co-workers and with management. Employees are satisfied with their organization’s training when adequate training facilities are made available, the training provided is relevant to the work assigned, the quality of trainers is good, and there is sufficient and accessible follow-up training (Joshi and Sharma 1997, 55.)

Research done by Schmidt (2007, 492) examined the relationship between overall job satisfaction with these three factors: methodology; type of training; and amount of time spent training. The findings revealed that all three factors together are significant in their relationship to job satisfaction (Schmidt 2007, 493).

The notion of training goes beyond simply job-specific training so that the employee may perform their duties. Training opportunities should be made

available to the employee so that they can advance to higher-up positions. Through web-based training, cross-training opportunities, and stretch goals employees are able to enhance their skills and competencies to determine the next step in their career (SHRM 2012, 12).

A high-quality training and development program is beneficial to both the employee and employer. The implications for organizations that offer effective training programs are many. Organizations may find that they have better trained and more satisfied employees. Employees that are more satisfied with job training are also more committed to the organization, are more willing to accept organizational goals and values, are motivated, are willing to exert more effort in the workplace, and are more likely to stay in that organization (Schmidt 2007, 494).

Positive Relationship with Supervisor

Much of the employees' satisfaction with their job stems from the type of relationship they have with their supervisor. The supervisor's management style sets the tone for the work environment and "can provide the workforce with direction" (SHRM 2012, 15). The way in which a supervisor manages in many ways dictates employee behaviors (SHRM 2012, 15). According to a yearly survey performed by the Society for Human Resource Management, the "communication between employee and senior management" aspect has ranked in the list of top five contributors to employee job satisfaction five times since 2002. Indeed, employees' from the 2012 survey rated the relationship with their supervisor as more important to their job satisfaction than benefits. Ellickson and Logsdon (2001, 181) suggest that managers develop work environments that continually strive to foster

mutually trustworthy relationships with employees through better communication and employee empowerment.

The use of a participatory management style has been shown to positively affect an employee's job satisfaction (Kim 2002, 232). Participatory management practices involve managers and their subordinates participating jointly in information processing, decision making, and problem solving (Kim 2002, 232). Singh and Pestonjee (1974, 408) point out that subordinates who are involved in decision-making processes have more positive attitudes, fewer absences, lower turnover, and are more productive. In sum, these involved employees are more satisfied. The results of the Singh and Pestonjee (1974) study indicate that employee-oriented supervision is more conducive to job satisfaction with overall satisfaction scores significantly higher under employee-centered supervisors. London, et al. (1999, 8) found that employees were most satisfied when supervisors were supportive and encouraged them to voice their own concerns, provided positive and informational feedback, and facilitated skill development. According to Kim (2002, 232), the main premise behind participatory management is that a manager who shares decision-making power with employees will enhance performance and satisfaction. Kim (2002, 236) writes that "executive leaders and managers should become aware of the importance of a manager's use of participative management, employees' participation in strategic planning processes, and the role of effective avenues of communication with supervisors" and employees.

Senior management can increase employee satisfaction by keeping the staff well informed and by frequently communicating information throughout the

organization (SHRM 2012 p. 49). The most effective leaders in developing employee satisfaction are those who create conditions conducive to innovation, encourage subordinates to find new and better ways of accomplishing tasks, and take the necessary steps to implement organizational change effectively (Fernandez 2008, 197).

Work Group

Given that workers usually spend eight hours a day at their job interacting with coworkers, it is not surprising that the work group is a significant determinant of job satisfaction. The “worker attitudes, including satisfaction, are developed through interaction with other workers within the context of the work environment” (Naumann 1993, 62).

The work group is the “extent to which there is evidence of a team spirit within the organization” (Vitell and Singhapakdi 2008, 345). The quality of the work-group relationship identifies the level in which co-workers are competent, helpful, friendly, and personally interested in the worker (Lambert 1991, 350). This psychological climate also includes “cooperation and friendliness among work-group members, a perception that group members produce work of a quality and quantity higher than that of other groups in the organization, and the existence of open lines of communication and trust among all members of the department” (Ellickson and Logsdon 2001, 180; Jones and James 1992). A study done by Ellickson and Logsdon (2001, 180) revealed that of the 14 facets studied, departmental pride (the work group) was the strongest variable in determining overall job satisfaction.

Brown and Mitchell (1993, 2) explored the extent to which perceptions of several types of organizational obstacles were linked to employee job satisfaction, noting that the social variables, i.e., those which involve interactions with other individuals within the organization, predicted job satisfaction to a greater extent than the technical variables. Emmert and Taher (1992, 45-47) found similar results reporting that intrinsic needs (social relations among fellow employees) were a better predictor of job satisfaction than that of extrinsic (pay, promotion, benefits) job factors. The authors suggest that efforts to increase job satisfaction should not focus solely on skill variety, task identity and significance, autonomy, and feedback from the work but rather the social relations among fellow employees, including feedback from colleagues (Emmert and Taher 1992, 47).

The research suggests that employee job satisfaction seems to be more of a function of the social relations and interactions among co-workers, which reflects the importance of social interactions in the workplace between co-workers and the role it plays in the employee's overall satisfaction.

Nature of the Work

Often referred to as "job characteristics" or "the work itself," the nature of the work deals with how interesting, challenging, or exciting an employee's job is (Durst and DeSantis 1997; SHRM 2012, 33). The way in which a job is designed has a substantial impact on the attitudes, beliefs, and feelings of the employee (Lawler and Hall 1970, 305). Durst and DeSantis (1997, 9) observe, "People generally need and like jobs that make use of their talents, knowledge, and abilities." Studies have shown that simple, routine, non-challenging jobs result in employee dissatisfaction and lead to increases in absenteeism and turnover (Hackman and Lawler 1971, 259).

When addressing the issue of challenging work, managers must be mindful that just as too little challenge can result in dissatisfaction, so can too much. If the degree of challenge is so great that the employee cannot successfully cope with it, the employee will experience a sense of frustration and failure (Locke 1976, 1320).

Turner and Lawrence (1965) have developed the following six task attributes that are positively related to worker satisfaction: (1) variety; (2) autonomy; (3) required interaction; (4) optional interaction; (5) knowledge and skill required; and (6) responsibility. The more workers experiences these six task attributes, the greater their overall job satisfaction will be; while employees who routinely perform a task are more likely to feel unchallenged and unsatisfied (Durst and DeSantis 1997, 9). According to research by Stinson and Johnson (1977, 319) task repetitiveness, the extent to which an individual perceives himself to be performing the same task over and over in a short time cycle, consistently negatively affects satisfaction.

When the work itself is not stimulating, employees find it difficult to remain engaged, motivated, and satisfied (SHRM 2012, 33). Fifty-two percent of the respondents in the Society for Human Resource Management Survey indicated that “the work itself” was a very important factor in determining their job satisfaction. Oldham and Cummings (1996) found that the types of tasks employees perform significantly influence their intrinsic motivation. Higher levels of intrinsic motivation are the result of employees performing work that they are excited and engaged about. Lawler and Hall (1970, 311) propose that jobs that allow the employee greater control, a chance to be creative, and that are appropriate to their abilities are more satisfying than jobs that are low in these characteristics. Their

findings suggest that the way in which jobs are designed can directly influence the satisfaction levels of the employee.

Interestingly, in a study examining the importance of job attributes, employees ranked interesting work as the most important attribute and good wages as the fifth, whereas when managers ranked what they believed was most important to the employee they ranked good wages first and interesting work as fifth (Saari and Judge 2004, 397; Kovach 1995, 94-95). These findings suggest the existence of major practitioner knowledge gaps in what managers think will satisfy their employees.

Although many studies have demonstrated that increases in the repetitive nature of work leads to decreases in job satisfaction, some jobs inherently involve repetitive work (Iverson and Maguire 2000, 829). For example, factory and assembly line work typically involves repeating the same task over and over. Iverson and Maguire (2000, 829) posit that organizations should find ways in which to relieve this task “boredom.” One way put forth to address the issue of task repetitiveness in jobs that are by nature “repetitive” is to institute programs that allow employees to rotate to other jobs that require new skills (Iverson and Maguire 2000, 829).

The research has consistently indicated that a variety of job/task characteristics and organizational characteristics are significantly related to employee satisfaction (Naumann 1993, 62). Employees will find their jobs to be more satisfying and the work more meaningful when there is a variety of activities and types of skills they use at work. As one of the most important areas of the work situation to influence job satisfaction--the work itself-- should not be overlooked by

practitioners when addressing employee job satisfaction (Saari and Judge 2004, 396). Employees should be given opportunities to work on new kinds of assignments that foster and develop a range of skills and abilities (SHRM 2012, 36).

Perceived Fair Treatment

Perceived fair treatment is the eighth and final aspect in the job satisfaction model. A growing body of literature has endeavored to identify the effects of perceived fair treatment by an organization on employee attitudes. The notion of organizational fairness can be understood as ***distributive and procedural justice***. Distributive justice focuses on the perceived fairness of decision *outcomes* and resource allocation while procedural justice deals with the perceived fairness of the *processes* by which decisions are made or allocations determined (Schappe 1998, 493). It is important to note that the construct of procedural justice can be further broken down into structural and interactive qualities. Structural qualities are simply the characteristics of formal procedures while interactive qualities are the interpersonal treatment people receive from decision makers (Schappe 1998, 494; Greenberg 1990). Table 2.1 provides a visual description of these organizational justice concepts.

Table 2.1: Organizational Justice Construct

Organizational Justice		
Distributive Justice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focuses on decision outcomes and resource allocations ▪ Is the <i>what</i> 	Procedural Justice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focuses on the processes by which decisions are made and allocations determined ▪ Is the <i>how</i> 	
	Structural The characteristics of formal procedures	Interactive The interpersonal treatment people receive from decision makers

An influential contributor to the concept of procedural justice is Leventhal, et al. (1980) allocation preference theory. The authors hypothesize that individuals follow six procedural rules to determine the fairness of procedures. The six rules involve (Schappe 1998, 495):

(1) The *consistency* with which the procedure is applied across both people and time; (2) the extent to which decision-makers are *free from bias*; (3) the *accuracy of the information* on which decisions are based; (4) whether there exists the *opportunity to correct or change* the decisions that have been made; (5) how *representative* the allocation process is of all concerned parties; and (6) the degree to which an allocation procedure follows conventional *moral and ethical standards*.

Although results have been mixed on which justice, distributive or procedural, is more significant in predicting job satisfaction, the supposition that perceptions of both should significantly predict job satisfaction is theoretically and practically sound (Schappe 1998, 495).

One of the most contentious aspects of perceived fair treatment in the workplace deals with an organization's pay policies. Some reports have even found that nearly 55 percent of employees perceive their organization's pay policies as unfair (Burnett, et al. 2009, 469). Companies can influence employees' perceptions of the fairness and favorability of pay by developing a "written reward strategy that asserts the importance of fair, non-discriminatory pay" and by training managers to be open and honest when communicating information about compensation (Brown 2009, 14; Burnett, et al. 2009, 470).

The use of ***performance appraisals*** has often been regarded as one of the most controversial human resource practices, generating a range of opinions from advocacy to outright disapproval (Roberts 1998, 301). The controversy is due to

issues involving the process such as rater bias, unclear performance standards, inadequate documentation, heuristic and attribution errors, feedback mechanisms, and a lack of proper training (Roberts 1998, 302; Blau 1999, 1100). Much of the literature on performance appraisals focuses on “the development of the methodologies and the construction of the instruments by which to more objectively and validly measure employee performance” rather than on the actual delivery of the appraisal (Kikoski 1999, 302). Given the research on the importance of a positive relationship between employee and supervisor, more time should be dedicated towards improving the actual delivery of the performance appraisal rather than the appraisal construct.

The employees’ satisfaction with the appraisal process is critical for two reasons. The first is that the appraisal is essential to determining the appraisal’s actual effectiveness: If employees are dissatisfied with the appraisal system or perceive it as unfair, they are less likely to use the evaluation as feedback to improve their performance (Dobbins, et al. 1990, 619; Ilgen, et al. 1979). Secondly, the performance appraisal has the potential to influence certain distributive outcomes an employee receives such as pay, promotion, change in work responsibilities, and job security (Blau 1999, 1101).

Research suggests that employee satisfaction with a process positively affects satisfaction with outcomes that are based on that process. Hence, employee satisfaction with the performance appraisal should be positively linked to subsequent satisfaction facets affected by appraisal, such as pay, promotion, supervision, work environment, benefits, training, work itself, and co-workers (Blau 1999, 1101).

Conceptual Framework

Based on the literature review, Table 2.2 lists the facets that influence employee job satisfaction and links the categories to the supporting literature.

Table 2.2: Conceptual Framework Linking Job Facets to the Literature

Conceptual Framework	
Job Facets	Literature
Promotional Opportunity	Lambert (1991) SHRM (2012) Ellickson & Logsdon (2001) Kalleberg (1977) Price & Mueller (1981)
Compensation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pay ▪ Benefits 	SHRM (2012) Zhang, Yao & Cheong (2011) Williams, McDaniel & Ford (2007) Ellickson & Logsdon (2001) Durst & DeSantis (1997) Barber, Dunham & Formisano (1992) Bergmann, Bergmann & Grahn (1994)
Work Environment	Brown & Mitchell (1993) Peters & O'Connor (1988) Kalleberg (1977) Emmert & Taher (1992) Ellickson & Logsdon (2001) SHRM (2012)
Adequate Training & Opportunity	SHRM (2012) Agho, Mueller & Price (1993) Joshi & Sharma (1997) Ellickson & Logsdon (2001) Landy (1985) Schmidt (2007)
Positive Relationship with Supervisor	SHRM (2012) Ellickson & Logsdon (2001) Kim (2002) Singh & Pestonjee (1974) London, Larsen & Thisted (1999) Fernandez (2008)

Table 2.2: Continued

Work Group	Naumann (1993) Vitell & Singhapakdi (2008) Lambert (1991) Jones & James (1979) Ellickson & Logsdon (2001) Brown & Mitchell (1993) Emmert & Taher (1992)
Nature of the Work	Lawler & Hall (1970) Hackman & Lawler (1971) Durst & DeSantis (1997) SHRM (2012) Turner & Lawrence (1965) Oldham & Cummings (1996) Saari & Judge (2004) Kovach (1995) Naumann (1993) Stinson & Johnson (1977) Locke (1976) Iverson & Maguire (2000)
Perceived Fair Treatment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Distributive and Procedural Justice ▪ Satisfaction with Performance Appraisals 	Schappe (1998) Ellickson & Logsdon (2001) Roberts (1998) Blau (1999) Kikoski (1999) Dobbins, Cardy & Platz-Vieno (1990) Ilgen, Fisher & Taylor (1979) Greenberg (1990) Leventhal, Karuza & Fry (1980) Burnett, Williams & Bartol (2009) Brown (2009)

Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the research methods used to assess job satisfaction of the MPA students at Texas State University who are working in a public agency. The eight facets of job satisfaction identified in the previous chapter are promotional opportunity, compensation, work environment, adequate training and opportunities, positive relationship with supervisor, work group, nature of the work, and perceived fair treatment. A questionnaire is used to assess job satisfaction among the MPA students based on the eight facets identified.

Operationalization

Table 3.1 demonstrates how each of the eight facets are operationalized and linked to survey statements. A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix A. In order to determine the strength and direction of the participants' responses to questions 2-21, a five-point Likert scale where 1 denotes "Strongly Agree" and 5 represents "Strongly Disagree" is utilized. Question one is measured on a five-point Likert scale as well but here 1 represents "Very Satisfied" and 5 represents "Very Dissatisfied." The first column of Table 3.1 identifies the dependent variable (overall job satisfaction) and the independent variables (promotion, compensation, work environment, training, supervisor relations, work group, nature of work, and perceived fair treatment). The second column presents the survey statements that are linked to the corresponding facet. The third column identifies the source of the survey question. Table 3.2 provides the demographic questions from the survey and how they are each coded.

Table 3.1: Operationalization of the Conceptual Framework

Variables	Survey Statement	Source
Dependent Variable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall Satisfaction 	1. What is your level of overall satisfaction with your job?	Ellickson & Logsdon (2001)
Independent Variables		
Promotional Opportunity	2. I am satisfied with my promotional and career opportunities in my present position.	Ellickson & Logsdon (2001)
Compensation	3. I am satisfied with my pay. 4. I am satisfied with my benefits.	Ellickson & Logsdon (2001)
Work Environment	5. I have the necessary equipment and resources to do my job well. 6. I have enough physical space to do my job well. 7. My employer takes proper precautions to ensure a safe workplace.	Ellickson & Logsdon (2001)
Adequate Training and Opportunities	8. I receive the training I need to perform my job well.	Ellickson & Logsdon (2001)
Positive Relationship with Supervisor	9. My supervisor listens to my suggestions and ideas for improvement. 10. My supervisor delegates to me the authority and responsibility to do my job well. 11. My supervisor motivates me to look for better ways to perform my job. 12. My supervisor provides clear expectations regarding my work.	Ellickson & Logsdon (2001)
Work Group	13. I am proud to tell people that I work for my department.	Ellickson & Logsdon (2001)
Nature of the Work	14. My job is interesting. 15. My job is challenging. 16. My job makes use of my knowledge, skills, and abilities.	Durst & DeSantis (1997)
Perceived Fair Treatment	17. I get enough feedback about my performance. 18. The evaluation form my department uses accurately evaluates my performance. 19. My performance appraisal is conducted on time each year. 20. My job performance has improved as a result of the performance appraisal process. 21. The feedback I received at my most recent performance appraisal was very useful.	Ellickson & Logsdon (2001)

*Questions 2-21 are measured on a 5-point Likert scale:

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Neutral
- (4) Disagree
- (5) Strongly Disagree

Table 3.2: Demographic Questions

Gender	Female=0 Male=1
Age	Open Comment
Job Level	Non-Supervisor=0 Supervisor=1
Race	White=0 Black, Hispanic, Other=1
Years worked for public agency	Open Comment
Type of agency	State, Federal, Municipal, County, School, Non-profit

Method of Data Collection

For this research, a survey is used to collect data that will address the purpose of this paper. The survey assesses the student's level of satisfaction with their job in the public sector based on a series of statements. Employee surveys are a diagnostic tool that affords employees the ability to express their level of (dis) satisfaction while simultaneously providing management unique, raw, and practical information to assist in workplace improvements (Anderson 1974).

The survey presents 21 statements that are designed to assess the student's attitude and opinion concerning eight different facets of a job including promotional opportunity, compensation, work environment, adequate training and opportunities, positive relationship with supervisor, work group, nature of the work, and perceived fair treatment. To measure the dependent variable, job satisfaction, the first survey question asks the respondent to express their level of overall satisfaction ranging from "Very Satisfied" to "Very Dissatisfied." Additionally, demographic information regarding the respondent's gender, age, job level, race, years working for the public agency, and type of public agency are also collected. Job level is identified as nonsupervisory or supervisor/management. Race is listed as White, Black, Hispanic, and Other. Type of public agency is categorized as: state, federal, municipal, county, school district, or non-profit.

Averaged Variables

Five of the variables (compensation, work environment, supervisor relations, nature of the work, and perceived fair treatment) in this research are generated by averaging answers to multiple survey questions. Survey responses to pay and benefits were combined and averaged as compensation. Satisfaction with equipment, physical space, and safe environment are averaged to find overall satisfaction with the work environment. Four questions assessing one's supervisor were amalgamated to find overall satisfaction with supervisor relations. Satisfaction with the nature of the work was composed of answers to three questions; while perceived fair treatment was constructed from answers to five questions concerning performance appraisals.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Survey Research

As a research method, surveys can be a valuable mechanism. With the rapid expansion of the Internet, Web-based surveys specifically have become one of the most powerful research tools (Sills and Song 2002, 22). The advantages of using Web-based surveys are numerous. Some of the major strengths to using Web-based surveys are include their global reach, flexibility, speed and timeliness, convenience, ease of data entry and analysis, question diversity, low administrative cost, ease of follow up, controlled sampling, large samples easier to obtain, and required completion of answers (Evans and Mathur 2005, 197).

Although the strengths of utilizing Web-based surveys are numerous, inherent weaknesses do exist. For example, the perception of the survey as junk mail, respondent's lack of online experience, technological problems, unclear

answering instructions, impersonal, privacy issues, respondents forwarding survey to non-sample members, and low response rates (Evans and Mathur 2005).

Sample

The students currently enrolled in the Master of Public Administration Program at Texas State University served as the sample for this research. The survey was distributed electronically through the online survey engine “SurveyMonkey.com” and was sent to the student’s school email address. A copy of the email can be found in Appendix B. In total, the survey was sent to 81 students.

The demographic variables in this study are gender, age, job level, years of service, and type of agency. Table 3.3 summarizes the demographic information to describe the general makeup of the respondents.

Table 3.3: Demographics

Gender	Female=62% Male=38%
Average Age	34 years old
Job Level	Nonsupervisory=60% Supervisor=40%
Race	White=51% Hispanic=25% Black=13% Other=11%
Average Years of Service	7 years
Agency	Municipal=43% State=38% Nonprofit=9% School=6% Federal=4%

As table 3.3 illustrates, the demographic composition of the sample is: 62 percent of the respondents are female, 60 percent are not supervisors, 51 percent are white,

43 percent work for a municipality, the average age is 34, and the average years of service is seven.

Procedures

This research uses descriptive statistics and regression analysis to examine the data. Descriptive statistics are used to summarize the data collected from the survey questionnaires. Descriptives are suitable for this research because they provide simple summaries of the data and present quantitative descriptions in a more manageable form (Trochim 2006). Regression analysis is applied to identify the impact and direction each variable had on overall job satisfaction.

Human Subjects Protection

This research involves the use of human subjects and must address potential ethical concerns. Information concerning the nature of this research was submitted to and approved by the Institutional Review Board. The approval number is X975084A. To ensure the participants were not harmed nor deceived, all surveys contained a description of the research purpose as well as information concerning how the findings of the research would be used. Respondents were also made aware that participation in the study was voluntary and confidential.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the survey and facilitate understanding of how the eight facets influence job-satisfaction levels among the MPA students who are employed in the public sector. In total, 81 potential participants were emailed the survey (all students enrolled in the MPA Program at Texas State University as of Fall 2014). The survey was available electronically for 12 days. Upon its close, 47 individuals had completed the survey yielding a 58 percent response rate.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this research was job satisfaction. In order to measure overall job satisfaction a single-item measure was used and derived from the answers to the question (Ellickson & Logsdon 2001), “What is your level of overall satisfaction with your job?” Table 4.1 provides the results to question one concerning overall job satisfaction. The findings reveal that nearly 15 percent of respondents indicate they are “very satisfied”; 51 percent are “satisfied”; 15 percent answered “neutral”; 17 percent are “dissatisfied”; and 2 percent are “very dissatisfied” with their job in the public sector.

Table 4.1: Responses to Overall Satisfaction

Question	n	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
What is your level of overall satisfaction with your job?	47	14.89%	51.06%	14.89%	17.02%	2.13%

Statistics

Multiple regression analysis was used to identify and explain the impact that the job facets had on overall job satisfaction. Table 4.2 displays the regression results. According to Table 4.2, 58 percent ($R^2 = .582$) of the variations in job satisfaction within the public sector are due to the combined influence of the variables in this study. Consistent with previous research conducted by Price and Mueller (1981), promotional opportunities and advancement did significantly influence employees' job satisfaction. Promotional and career advancement opportunity was the only facet found to have an impact in this study. Regression analysis indicated that none of the other independent variables significantly influenced overall job satisfaction, although the variable age was close at .074.

Table 4.2: Regression for facets of job satisfaction

Variables	B
Promotional Opportunity	.381**
Training	.203
Work Group	.290
Work Environment	-.043
Supervisor Relations	.082
Nature of Work	.138
Performance	.103
Compensation	-.234
Gender	.284
Age	-.029
Job Level	.028
Race	.133
Constant	.960
R^2	.582
F	3.943**

* Significant at $\alpha < .05$

** Significant at $\alpha < .01$

Descriptive Statistics

Each job facet was measured using a five-point Likert scale, with 1 corresponding to “Strongly Agree” to 5 representing “Strongly Disagree.” Therefore, a high mean score indicates high dissatisfaction while a low mean indicates high satisfaction. Table 4.3 reports the descriptive data in rank order according to which facets respondents were most to least satisfied with for each of the eight components of job satisfaction. Among the facets, respondents in this study were most satisfied with their work environment (mean=1.97) and least satisfied with the promotional opportunities (mean=2.89) within their organization.

Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Work Environment	1	3.67	1.97	.685
Work Group	1	4.00	2.09	.775
Training	1	4.00	2.19	.947
Supervisor Relations	1	4.25	2.23	.793
Nature of Work	1	5.00	2.25	1.061
Compensation	1	4.50	2.62	.905
Performance	1	4.80	2.85	.842
Promotional Opportunity	1	5.00	2.89	1.108

* 1= strongly agree, 2= agree, 3= neutral, 4= disagree, 5= strongly disagree

Summary

The only facet that was found to significantly impact job satisfaction among public employees was opportunities for promotion and career advancement.

Chapter Five provides a discussion concerning the results and offers the researchers assumptions of the implications on the outcome of this survey. Table 4.4 provides the responses to all of the survey statements (1-21).

Table 4.4: Responses to Survey Questions

Question	n=47	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Overall satisfaction		7	24	7	8	1
2. Satisfied with promotional and career opportunities		5	14	11	15	2
3. Satisfied with pay		2	18	7	17	3
4. Satisfied with benefits		11	24	4	6	2
5. Have necessary equipment and resources to do my job well		10	29	5	2	1
6. Have enough physical space to do my job well		13	22	7	4	1
7. Employer ensures a safe workplace		16	26	4	1	0
8. Receive training I need to perform my job well		12	19	11	5	0
9. Supervisor listens to my suggestions & ideas		15	22	4	5	1
10. Supervisor delegates to me authority and responsibility		12	25	7	3	0
11. Supervisor motivates me to look for better ways to perform my job		10	16	12	9	0
12. Supervisor provides clear expectations		9	19	8	10	1
13. Proud of the department I work in		10	25	10	2	0
14. My job is interesting		14	18	7	6	2
15. My job is challenging		15	19	5	5	3
16. My job makes use of my K, S, A		9	24	6	5	3
17. I get enough feedback about my performance		10	13	11	11	2
18. Evaluation form accurately evaluates my performance		4	10	17	13	3
19. Performance appraisal on time each year		11	16	10	7	3
20. Performance improved as a result of appraisal process		4	6	14	16	7
21. Feedback from recent performance appraisal was very useful		5	13	16	11	2

Chapter 5: Conclusion

The purpose of this Applied Research Project was to first identify facets that influence job satisfaction in the public sector. Next, a paradigm of job facets was used to assess satisfaction levels among the students in the MPA Program. Lastly, statistical analysis is applied to identify the facets that impact job satisfaction the most.

The results show that 66 percent of the respondents are generally satisfied (satisfied to very satisfied) with their employment in the public sector, while 19 percent reported they are dissatisfied (dissatisfied to very dissatisfied). It should be elucidated that the results and discussion in this study can only be applied to the specific sample referenced (MPA students working in the public sector). Therefore, findings in this study may not be generalized to include all public employees.

Although only one facet (promotional and career advancement opportunities) was found to significantly impact job satisfaction, notable implications are explained.

Promotional Opportunity and Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction among public employees being significantly influenced by promotional and career advancement opportunities is consistent with research identified in the literature; however, that this facet is the *only* factor to impact job satisfaction is not. The descriptive analysis also indicated that respondents were dissatisfied the most with their organizations promotional opportunities. This finding may be attributed to frustrations with the bureaucratic nature of public sector personnel systems that rely on strict and detailed promotional guidelines.

Although the idea that frustration with rigid promotional guidelines in the public sector accounting for the significance of this facet is sound, a better rationale for explaining this study's unique results is put forth. The particular segment analyzed, i.e., public employees who are pursuing advanced degrees, perhaps hold certain career expectations that would account for the study's results. Students pursuing a bachelor's degree are often doing so with the goal of *gaining* employment, while graduate students are usually pursuing a master's degree with an intended goal of *advancing* their career. From the fact that all 47 respondents identified that they work or have worked for a public organization, it can be assumed that the respondents in this study are seeking a graduate degree to increase their promotability. The verity that promotional opportunity was identified as the sole determinant in shaping the MPA students' overall satisfaction with their public sector job is unambiguous and logical. Promotional and career advancement opportunity is the most important job facet for the MPA students because this represents why they are pursuing a graduate degree in the first place--the ability to promote and advance their careers. Research conducted in 2012 observed that promotional and career advancement opportunities were a higher priority for employees with college degrees than those with a high school diploma. The same research also found promotional and career advancement opportunities to be more important to employees under the age of 47. In the current study, the entire sample is composed of employees pursuing a master's degree; and 41 out of a total of 47 respondents in the present study are currently under the age of 47.

Public organizations must realize and accept that promotional and career advancement opportunities are critical aspects of employee engagement in the

workplace (SHRM 2012). Employees, who view promotions and advancement in their agency as limited, are more likely to look for opportunities outside their organization, especially during profitable economies.

Demographics and Job Satisfaction

The fact that none of the demographic variables (gender, age, job level, race) were significant predictors of job satisfaction in the public sector is a positive finding and indicates that job satisfaction is not limited to a certain group(s) of employees.

Compensation and Job Satisfaction

Compensation was composed of the two variables pay and benefits and was insignificant in influencing job satisfaction. This finding might indicate that public employees perceive their pay as competitive with the local market. Also, overall job satisfaction may not have been impacted by satisfaction with benefits in this study due to the respondents possessing a concrete understanding of the value of their total benefits package.

Work Environment and Job Satisfaction

Combining the questions from equipment, physical space, and safe environment the variable work environment was developed and found to have no impact on determining job satisfaction. This outcome could indicate that public sector employers are doing a good job to ensure organizational barriers/obstacles are limited and/or removed as to not hinder the employee from effectively carrying out their work.

Training and Job Satisfaction

The variable training did not reach a level of significance in this study. Training may not have been found to impact job satisfaction due to the increased use of online training. Rather than the traditional classroom based training, organizations have found it not only more effective but cost efficient as well to implement e-learning techniques. Employees are able to work on and complete training at their own speed.

Supervisor Relations and Job Satisfaction

The variable relations combined questions regarding the employees' perception of how well their supervisor listens, delegates, motivates, and provides clear expectations. The results expressed that job satisfaction levels were not impacted by the employee's relationship with their supervisor. These results give the impression that public managers are becoming more skilled in developing effective lines of communication between the employee and management as well as incorporating more participatory management techniques.

Nature of the Work and Job Satisfaction

Nature of the work involved the employees' perception of their job as being interesting, challenging, and making use of their knowledge, skills, and abilities. This facet was found to be irrelevant in determining job satisfaction in this study. The insignificance of nature of the work in impacting job satisfaction perhaps signifies that public organizations have been successful in designing jobs that are stimulating, exciting, meaningful, and engaging. Public sector employers may be

fostering a work environment that allows employees to learn and work on different kinds of assignments as well as develop a range of new skills and abilities.

Perceived Fair Treatment and Job Satisfaction

Perceived fair treatment dealt with the employee's satisfaction with the amount of feedback, accuracy of evaluations, timeliness of evaluations, and the usefulness of feedback. Unexpectedly, performance did not influence job satisfaction. This is surprising because promotional opportunity and advancement did significantly impact satisfaction. Considering that promotions in the public sector are considerably linked to performance evaluations, it would be assumed that both variables would be significant mutually. Instead, these results suggest that public employees perceive the performance appraisal and process as fair and equitable.

Work Group and Job Satisfaction

The work group did not emerge as significant in impacting job satisfaction. This finding conflicts with previous research conducted as many other studies have shown the work group/departmental pride as "the most powerful determinant of variation in overall job satisfaction" (Ellickson and Logsdon 2001, 180). Referring to the literature review, the work group was identified by Naumann (1993) as being "developed through interaction with other workers within the context of the work environment." The fact that this variable did not impact overall job satisfaction in this study may reveal a shift in the nature of social interactions among co-workers today. An emphasis may be placed more on individual work and tasks rather than group projects and collaboration. This would account for why the work group was not significant in determining overall job satisfaction in this study.

Summary

This research created a paradigm of facets that can be utilized to assess job satisfaction among public employees who are pursuing advanced degrees. As a result of this study, two important findings were revealed: First, students in the MPA Program who are employed in the public sector are overall satisfied with their job. Second, public sector organizations must recognize the importance and role that promotions and career advancement opportunities play in influencing job satisfaction, especially as the employee's educational level increases. Public sector employers should focus on improving employee perceptions of their promotional and career advancement opportunities.

Limitations

This research was limited in scope as only the MPA students who work in the public sector were surveyed resulting in a possible maximum sample size of only 81. Future research should attempt to incorporate Alumni graduates from the MPA Program as this may increase the sample size as well as allow for more generalities to be made concerning job satisfaction among public sector employees.

Future research would also benefit by incorporating survey questions concerning students' internship satisfaction while working for a public or nonprofit organization. This is because all students enrolled in the MPA Program must either participate in a semester-long internship with a public/nonprofit organization or obtain an exemption for past or current employment in the public sector. Incorporating internship satisfaction questions may have increased the number of responses in this survey as some students may not have participated in this survey

because they do not/have not worked for any public/nonprofit entity, but they have completed the internship requirement.

Additionally, subsequent research may find improved results by not including “neutral” in the answer scale. The Likert scale would consist of only 1 through 4, whereas 1 would represent “Strongly Disagree” and 4 representing “Strongly Agree.” The current study observed that “neutral” was chosen 183 times. Choosing “neutral” to answer a question in this study did not help in identifying the impact of the various facets on job satisfaction. Without the “neutral” option respondents would be forced to decide if they are satisfied or not and agree or not. This would lead to all of the answers in the survey benefiting its overall purpose.

A final suggestion is to incorporate a ranking and open-ended question in the survey. Respondents would be asked to rank the eight facets in order of importance to their overall job satisfaction. This would allow the researcher to compare how the respondents answered the satisfaction questions compared to how they actually ranked the eight job-satisfaction facets. The open-ended question would permit the respondents to identify some other job characteristic (facet) that impacts their job satisfaction the most that was not one of the eight facets addressed in the survey.

Bibliography

- Agho, A., C. Mueller, J. Price. 1993. Determinants of employee job satisfaction: An empirical test of a causal model. *Human Relations*, 46(8): 1007.
- Anderson, M.F. 1974. Employee attitude surveys. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 6(1): 34-37.
- Barber, A., R. Dunham, R. Formisano. 1992. The Impact of Flexible Benefits on Employee Satisfaction: A Field Study. *Personnel Psychology*, 45(1): 55-75.
- Bergmann, T., M. Bergmann, J. Grahn. 1994. How important are employee benefits to public sector employees'. *Public Personnel Management*, 23(3): 397-406.
- Blau, Gary. 1999. Testing the Longitudinal Impact of Work Variable and Performance Appraisal Satisfaction on Subsequent Overall Job Satisfaction. *Human Relations*, 52(8): 1099-1113.
- Brown, D. 2009. Rewards for fairness: How much bonus is enough? *Personnel Today*, January 29, 2009: 14.
- Brown, K., T. Mitchell. 1993. Organizational Obstacles: Links with Financial Performance, Customer Satisfaction, and Job Satisfaction in a Service Environment. *Human Relations*, 46: 725-757.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2014. Table B-1. Employees' on nonfarm payrolls by industry sector and selected industry detail.
<http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empst.t17.htm>
- Burnett, M., I. Williamson, K. Bartol. 2009. The Moderating Effect of Personality on Employees' Reactions to Procedural Fairness and Outcome Favorability. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24(4): 469-484.
- Conway, Patricia. 1987. A Model of Job Facet Satisfaction. *Journal of Social Work Education*, Winter No. 1: 48-57.
- Dobbins, G., R. Cardy, S. Platz-Vieno. 1990. A Contingency Approach to Appraisal Satisfaction: An Initial Investigation of the Joint Effects of Organizational Variables and Appraisal Characteristics. *Journal of Management*, 16(3): 619-632.
- Durst, S., V. DeSantis. 1997. The Determinants of Job Satisfaction among Federal, State, and Local Government Employees'. *State & Local Government Review*, 29(1): 7-16.
- Ellickson, M., K. Logsdon. 2001. Determinants of Job Satisfaction of Municipal Government Employees'. *State & Local Government Review*, 33(3): 173-184.

- Emmert, M., W. Taher. 1992. Public sector professionals: The effect of public sector jobs on motivation, job satisfaction and work involvement. *American Review of Public Administration*, 22(1): 37-48.
- Evans, J., A. Mathur. 2005. Value of online surveys. *Internet Research*, 15(2): 195-219.
- Fernandez, Sergio. 2008. Examining the Effects of Leadership Behavior on Employee Perceptions of Performance and Job Satisfaction. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 32(2): 175-205.
- Greenberg, Jerald. 1990. Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2): 399-432.
- Hackman, R., E. Lawler. 1971. Employees' reaction to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55(3): 259-286.
- Happock, R. 1935. *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Harper
- Ilgen, D., C. Fisher, M. Taylor. 1979. Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64: 349-371.
- Ibezim, Chidi Francis. 1994. A Descriptive Study of the Perceptions of Supervisors On How Three Types of Supervisory Management Training Influence Employees' Job Satisfaction and Motivation in Texas Department of Health. *Applied Research Projects, Texas State University-San Marcos*.
<https://digital.library.txstate.edu/handle/10877/3770>
- Iverson, R., C. Maguire. 2000. The relationship between job and life satisfaction: Evidence from a remote mining community. *Human Relations*, 53(6): 807-839.
- Jones, A., L. James. 1992. Psychological climate and affect: Test of a hierarchical dynamic model. In *Job Satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*, 89-117. C.J. Cranny, P.C. Smith, and E.F. Stone, eds. New York: Lexington Books.
- Joshi, R., B. Sharma. 1997. Determinants of Managerial Job Satisfaction in a Private Organisation. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 33(1): 48-67.
- Kalleberg, Arne. 1977. Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 42(1): 124-143.
- Kikoski, John. 1999. Effective Communication In The Performance Appraisal Interview: Face-to-Face Communication for Public Managers In the Culturally Diverse Workplace. *Public Personnel Management*, 28(2): 301-322.

- Kim, Soonhee. 2002. Participative Management and Job Satisfaction: Lessons for Management Leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2): 231-241.
- Kovach, Kenneth. 1995. Employee Motivation: Addressing a crucial factor in your organization's performance. *Employment Relations Today*, 22: 93-107.
- Lambert, S.J. 1991. The Combined Effects of Job and Family Characteristics on the Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement and Intrinsic Motivation of Men and Women Workers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12(4): 341-363.
- Landy, F. 1985. *Psychology of work behavior*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Lawler, E., D. Hall. 1970. Relationship of Job Characteristics to Job Involvement, Satisfaction, and Intrinsic Motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54(4): 305- 312.
- Leventhal, G., S. Karuza, and W. Fry. 1980. Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In G. Mikula (Ed.), *Justice and social interaction* (pp. 167-218). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Locke, Edwin. 1976. The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. In *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, edited by M.D. Dunnette, 1297-1349. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- London, M., H. Larsen and L. Thisted. 1999. Relationships between Feedback and Self-Development. *Group and Organization Management*, 24(1): 5-27.
- Naumann, Earl. 1993. Organizational Predictors of Expatriate Job Satisfaction. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24(1): 61-80.
- Oldham, G., A. Cummings. 1996. Employee Creativity: Personal and Contextual Factors at Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3): 607-634.
- Peters, L., E. O'Connor. 1988. Measuring work obstacles: Procedures, issues, and implications. In F.D. Schoorman and B. Schneider, (Eds.), *Facilitating work effectiveness*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.
- Peterson, Jordan. 2013. Predicting Job Satisfaction in a Medium Sized Texas Police Department. *Applied Research Projects, Texas State University-San Marcos*. <https://digital.library.txstate.edu/handle/10877/4608>
- Price, J., C. Mueller. 1981. A causal model of turnover for nurses. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(3): 543-565.
- PricewaterhouseCoopers Saratoga Institute. 2006. *Driving the bottom line* (White Paper). https://www.pwc.com/en_US/us/hr-saratoga/assets/saratoga-improving-retention.pdf

- Roberts, Gary. 1998. Perspectives on Enduring and Emerging Issues in Performance Appraisal. *Public Personnel Management*, 27(3): 301-320.
- Saari, L., T. Judge. 2004. Employee Attitudes and Job Satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 43(4): 395-407.
- Schappe, Stephen. 1998. Understanding Employee Job Satisfaction: The Importance of Procedural and Distributive Justice. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 12(4): 493-503.
- Schmidt, S., 2007. The Relationship Between Satisfaction with Workplace Training and Overall Job Satisfaction. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 18(4): 481-498.
- Shields, P., N. Rangarajan. 2013 *A Playbook for Research Methods: Integrating Conceptual Frameworks and Project Management*. Stillwater OK: New Forums Press.
- Sills, S., C. Song. 2002. Innovations in Survey Research: An Application of Web-Based Surveys. *Social Science Computer Review*, 20(1): 22-30.
- Singh, A., D. Pestonjee. 1974. Supervisory Behaviour and Job Satisfaction. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 9(3): 407-416.
- Society for Human Resource Management. 2012. 2012 Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement: How Employees' Are Dealing With Uncertainty.
- Stewart, L. 2009. Factors Contributing to Download Activity for Applied Research Projects Completed at Texas State University in the Master of Public Administration Program. *Applied Research Projects, Texas State University-San Marcos*. <https://digital.library.txstate.edu/handle/10877/3585>
- Stinson, J., T. Johnson. 1977. Tasks, individual differences, and job satisfaction. *Industrial Relations*, 16(3): 315-322.
- Taylor, J., J. Westover. 2011. Job Satisfaction in the Public Service: The effects of public service motivation, workplace attributes and work relations. *Public Management Review*, 13(5): 732-751.
- Trochim, William. 2006. Research Methods Knowledge Base. Center for Social Research Methods. <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/index.php>
- Turner, A., P. Lawrence. 1965. *Industrial jobs and the worker*. Boston: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration.

- Vitell, S., A. Singhapakdi. 2008. The Role of Ethics Institutionalization in Influencing Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Espirit de Corps. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81(2): 343-353.
- Williams, M., M. McDaniel, L. Ford. 2007. Understanding Multiple Dimensions of Compensation Satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 21(3): 429-459.
- Zhang, Y., X. Yao, J. Cheong. 2011. City Managers' Job Satisfaction and Frustration: Factors and Implications. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 41(6): 670-685.

Appendix-A

Overall Satisfaction	
1. What is your level of overall satisfaction with your job?	Very Satisfied/ Satisfied/ Neutral/ Dissatisfied/Very Dissatisfied
Promotional Opportunity	
2. I am satisfied with my promotional and career opportunities in my current position.	Strongly Agree/ Agree/ Neutral/ Disagree/ Strongly Disagree
Compensation	
3. I am satisfied with my pay 4. Overall, I am satisfied with my benefits.	Strongly Agree/ Agree/ Neutral/ Disagree/ Strongly Disagree
Work Environment	
5. I have the necessary equipment and resources to do my job well. 6. I have enough physical space to do my job well. 7. My employer takes proper precautions to ensure a safe workplace.	Strongly Agree/ Agree/ Neutral/ Disagree/ Strongly Disagree
Adequate Training and Opportunities	
8. I receive the training I need to do my job well.	Strongly Agree/ Agree/ Neutral/ Disagree/ Strongly Disagree
Positive Relationship with Supervisor	
9. My supervisor listens to my suggestions and ideas for improvement. 10. My supervisor delegates to me the authority and responsibility to do my job well. 11. My supervisor motivates me to look for better ways to perform my job. 12. My supervisor provides clear expectations regarding my work.	Strongly Agree/ Agree/ Neutral/ Disagree/ Strongly Disagree
Work Group	
13. I am proud to tell people that I work for my department.	Strongly Agree/ Agree/ Neutral/ Disagree/ Strongly Disagree
Nature of the Work	
14. My job is interesting 15. My job is challenging. 16. My job makes use of my knowledge, skills, and abilities.	Strongly Agree/ Agree/ Neutral/ Disagree/ Strongly Disagree

Appendix-A: Continued

Perceived Fair Treatment	
17. I get enough feedback about my performance. 18. The evaluation form my department uses accurately evaluates my performance. 19. My performance appraisal is conducted on time each year. 20. My job performance has improved as a result of the performance appraisal process. 21. The feedback I received at my most recent performance appraisal was very useful.	Strongly Agree/ Agree/ Neutral/ Disagree/ Strongly Disagree
Demographics	
22. What is your gender? 23. What is your age? 24. What is your job level? 25. What is your race? 26. How long have you (did you) worked for the public agency you are referencing in this study? 27. Which of the following best describes your agency?	Male/Female Open-ended Nonsupervisory/Supervisor White/Black/Hispanic/Other Open-ended State/Federal/Municipal/County/School District/Non-profit

Appendix-B

Hello:

I am a graduate student in the MPA program at Texas State University and am working on completing my Applied Research Project. My research seeks to identify certain facets that influence public employees' job satisfaction. I have developed a satisfaction survey and your participation would be appreciated.

*Participation in the survey is voluntary. All participants' information and responses to this survey will remain confidential.

Here is the link to the survey: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PDW9PRW>

Thanks for your participation!

Josette Lehman