Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study of what Matters Most

DOI: 10.26573/2019.13.2.2
Volume 13, Number 2
May 2019, pp. 107-126

Amit Shah
Michael Monahan
Kari Shumaker
Frostburg State University
(AShah@frostburg.edu)

Attracting and retaining employees is possibly the greatest challenge for any employer. Often the right blend of salary, benefits, culture, relationships, and working conditions are the deciding factors. But, what are the factors, how satisfied are the workers with them and how important are these factors to the workers? To answer these questions, over three hundred respondents were surveyed to ascertain their level of satisfaction and importance on a variety of common workplace factors. Five intrinsic and five extrinsic work factors were evaluated. The responses were analyzed in total, and on the basis of gender, ethnicity, and income level to ascertain if statistically significant differences emerged. Some surprising results were found signifying that salary, while important, is not the only component for employee satisfaction.

Keywords: Intrinsic, Extrinsic, Work Satisfaction, Importance, Herzberg

1. Introduction

Finding and retaining talent is a critical need for nearly every business and organization. Some employers offer pay higher than their competitors, while others seek to mollify their workforce with extravagant benefits, and some focus on creating an atmosphere which is reflective of their culture. Human Resource departments are desperate to find the magic formula to attract and retain their labor force. However, are the items being offered valued by employees and are the workers satisfied with those factors? Earning a wage to satisfy human wants and needs is often the paramount consideration since very few are independently wealthy and must work. But is pay alone the only factor?

Job satisfaction is regarded as an extension of achievement, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and the work itself (Lundberg, Gudmundson, & Andersson, 2009). When these five factors, called growth factors, exist within a job, the individuals' basic needs will be fulfilled. The result leads to workers being more satisfied with their jobs and performing better (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). These factors are also called intrinsic factors (Lundberg et al., 2009). Conversely, Herzberg et al. (1993) indicated that job dissatisfaction results from an entirely different group of work factors, all of which relate to the external environment in which the work is performed. For instance, company policy, interpersonal relationships, job security, working conditions, pay, and benefits are all correlated with job dissatisfaction (Lundberg et al., 2009). The factors that lead to

dissatisfaction are called hygiene factors, or extrinsic factors, and when properly provided, can aid in removing dissatisfaction and improving performance up to a point (Miner, 2015). However, Miner (2015) noted hygiene factors don't usually increase a person's job satisfaction or performance in that job. In order to achieve these goals, companies must instead focus on growth factors which lead to an increase in satisfaction (Miner, 2015). This means that hygiene factors should exist within a job, but that these factors will mainly keep workers from being dissatisfied. Beyond that, the focus needs to be on the intrinsic aspects of the work itself, the growth factors, in order for workers to have increased job satisfaction.

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to assess the satisfaction of several factors common in the workplace, and then compare the employee's satisfaction with those factors. In addition, the independent variables of gender, ethnicity, and salary level will also be tested to ascertain if they influence the results

1.2 Research Hypotheses

H1: Males will rate their satisfaction with work factors higher than females.

H2: Caucasians will rate their satisfaction with work factors higher than Non-Caucasians

H3: Workers earning more than \$50,000 will rate their satisfaction with work factors higher than workers earning less than \$50,000.

H4: Females will rate the importance of work factors higher than males.

H5: Non-Caucasians will rate the importance of work factors higher than Caucasians

H6: Workers earning less than \$50,000 will rate the importance of work factors higher than workers earning more than \$50,000.

H7: Participants will rank the importance of factors higher than their satisfaction of those factors.

H8: Females will rank the importance of factors higher than their satisfaction of those factors.

H9: Non-Caucasians will rank the importance of factors higher than their satisfaction of those factors.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Work Factors

As indicated by Schwartz (1999), work factors are goals or rewards that a person looks to gain from their job. Studies have established that work factors are able to forecast a person's work behaviors and work outcomes (O'Brien, 1992). Additionally, both loyalty and job satisfaction have been found to be significantly correlated with work factors (Vansteenkiste et al., 2007). Frieze, Olson, Murrell, & Selvan, (2006) also found that some values were associated with higher earnings and job performance.

Knoop (1994) noted that work factors are broken down into two categories: extrinsic factors and intrinsic factors. While extrinsic factors include pay and job security, intrinsic factors include achievement and responsibility.

Work factors can vary based on both individual and cultural characteristics (Lebo, Harrington, & Tillman, 1995). Lebo et al. (1995) explained that certain work factors were found to be similar among individuals around the globe, while other work

factors may be insignificant to a particular group of people due their culture. For instance, some facets of work factors for individuals in the United States may not be important in other cultures (Lebo et al., 1995).

Independence and individualism are core components of culture in the U.S. (Haslett & Leidel, 2015). Consequently, as indicated by Haslett and Leidel (2015), work achievement, individualized work, and competition are highly valued by workers in the United States. Assisting others, finding fulfillment in work, flexibility within the job hours and tasks, and suitable pay are some of the job characteristics that are most important to employees (Jones, 2006). The same study also found the most disliked features of a job to be low salary, inadequate managers, and dull work. Extrinsic work factors are said to be most important among workers in the United States (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007; Haslett & Leidel, 2015). A recent study noted that workers in the U.S. believe that job security is the most important work factor (Lee, Terada, Shimizu, Lee, & Lee, 2017). Even so, it seems that disparities are present in individuals' personal work values. Duffy and Sedlacek (2007) argued that the development of personal work values is contingent upon both gender and individual background.

2.2 Gender

Gender is one variable that may affect the development of personal work factors. Haslett and Leidel (2015) found that in a study of 51 different work values, gender significantly affected 43 (84%) of them. The same study also indicated that among the work values that did not vary significantly, females rated the values as more important than did males.

Differences between the work factors that males and females value have been noted in several studies (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007; Jones, 2006; Westover, 2010). It has been found that amongst older adolescents and adults, males usually favor jobs characterized by high pay, risk taking, advancement opportunities, influence or authority over others, high status, and a high degree of responsibility (Konrad, Ritchie, Lieb, & Corrigan, 2000; Post-Kammer, 1987; Weisgram, Bigler, & Liben, 2010). Alternatively, females tend to seek jobs that allow them to cultivate their knowledge or skills, help others, and devote time to their families (Cinamon & Rich, 2002; Konrad et al., 2000; Post-Kammer, 1987).

Many studies have found that men find extrinsic factors to be most important, while women appreciate intrinsic factors, more specifically the social aspects, of work (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). Jones (2006) found similar results, indicating that women reported the social component of a job to be a more important element of job satisfaction than men did. Clark (1997) revealed that men are much more likely to denote pay as the most important job characteristic. In addition, another study found that males believe pay and responsibility are more important job factors than do females (Konrad et al., 2000). On the other hand, that study also determined that females deem good colleagues, a good boss, and the importance of the job to be more important than do males.

2.3 Ethnicity

Clark (1998) presented that nationality has a considerable effect on the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic work factors. It has been indicated that in individualistic cultures, workers tend to be self-motivated, self-sufficient, and hold their individual

interests as most important (Hofstede, 1991). As noted by Huang and Van de Vliert (2003), bearing in mind that culturally inherited values are used to evaluate jobs and companies' management strategies, it should be no surprise that employees that come from individualistic cultures value intrinsic job factors more than those who come from collectivistic backgrounds.

However, financial and social security is often considered to be more imperative in collectivist cultures than is control and autonomy in a place of work (Kanungo, 1990). Thus, financial as well as social factors are rated higher than individual factors (Huang & Van de Vliert, 2003). This was also indicated by Hofstede (1991) who contents higher needs are motivators. For example, self-actualization tends to fall behind lower needs like financial security and social connection in collectivist cultures. Therefore, extrinsic job factors are usually found to be most important to employees who hold collectivist cultural beliefs (Huang & Van de Vliert, 2003).

Some studies have indicated a difference in work values between African American and Caucasian workers. While this research is somewhat dated, it has been found that African American workers were more likely to place higher value on extrinsic rewards, while Caucasian workers are more likely to place higher value on intrinsic rewards (Martin & Tuch, 1993; Ovadia, 2001; Shapiro, 1977). Duffy and Sedlacek (2007) also found similar results, as they noted African Americans and Asian Americans were more likely to express extrinsic values, whereas Caucasians were more likely to express intrinsic values.

While there is a paucity of information regarding differences in the importance of work factors among different ethnicities in the United States, there is evidence from other countries that may be applicable. Many studies found that Chinese college students held of high value advancement opportunity, the opportunity to learn, and salary (Chow & Ngo, 2011; Walk, et al., 2013; Zhao, 2006; Zupan et al., 2015). However, some studies found that other elements, such as working environment, feelings of accomplishment, and work-life balance were important values (Baum & Kabst, 2013; Chullen, Adeyemi-Bello, & Xi, 2015; Nordhaug et al., 2010; Walk et al., 2013).

In India, the work culture has traditionally been centered on high power distance, collectivism, and affective reciprocity (Kumar and Sankaran, 2007). Power distance was found to be one of the highest rated work factors in the past (Hofstede, 1984; Christie, Kwon, Stoeberl, & Baumart, 2003). Due to the cultural legacy of collectivistic beliefs, as well as the lack of industrialization in the past, job satisfaction of Indian employees is assumed to be influenced heavily by extrinsic rewards (Lange, Pacheco, & Shrotryia, 2010). However, as economic development and competitiveness have begun to increase, it has also been speculated that individualistic behaviors will increase, thus leading to an increase in importance regarding intrinsic values (Lange et al., 2010). According to Lange et al. (2010), both extrinsic and intrinsic factors are important to employees in India.

2.4 Income Level

In economically advanced countries, individuals are inclined to take survival for granted (Inglehart, 1997). As these countries have gone through economic development, a gradual yet remarkable change in values has come to be (Huang & Van de Vliert, 2003). For instance, Inglehart (1997) noted that values associated with economic success have become less significant than values related to increasing

individualism. This has led to employees in richer countries attaching more value to intrinsic job factors, thus being driven more by intrinsic rewards, since they have taken survival, which relates to extrinsic rewards like pay, for granted.

However, it has been shown that in poorer nations, intrinsic job factors, including acknowledgement, independence, and the work itself are less correlated to overall job satisfaction, whereas extrinsic job factors, including job security, salary, and working conditions are more strongly associated with overall job satisfaction (Huang & Van de Vliert, 2003). This relates back to the classical deprivation theory, which suggested that individuals who lack material or social possessions will value them greatly (Runciman, 1966). While there is an absence of research as this relates to individual income level, it is possible that this same concept can be applied, meaning that individuals who earn a lower income may be more concerned about extrinsic work factors than intrinsic factors.

This concept has been shown in past studies. For instance, one study found that male students expected a higher salary when their fathers had a lower education level (Smith & Powell, 1990). Duffy & Sedlacek (2007) also found that university students with parents who earned a low salary, or a high salary, found extrinsic values to be more important than students with parents who fell into the median salary classification.

2.5 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a pleasant emotional state that is a result of a person's job (Locke, 1976). Parker and Brummel (2016) indicated that various aspects of a job affect satisfaction, including relationships, responsibilities, and rewards. One study found that monetary benefit, social connections, energy expenditure, prestige, and production of goods and services are some of the reasons that individuals choose to work (Vroom, 1964). The degree to which individuals are satisfied with each of these aspects makes up the overall level of job satisfaction (Parker & Brummel, 2016). Job satisfaction can be evaluated by either considering an individual's satisfaction associated with each aspect of the job separately or by gaging the worker's overall satisfaction with the job (Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989).

Employees' levels of job satisfaction are important to employers, as studies have found that employee satisfaction is positively correlated with workers' commitment to the company (Watson, 2008).

While it is apparent that both intrinsic and extrinsic job factors are positively associated with overall job satisfaction, it is important to realize that other factors have an impact on this relationship (Dunnette, Campbell, & Hakel, 1967). As noted by Mottaz (1985), the value that individuals place on each of these factors also affects how much the individual's satisfaction is impacted by the presence or lack of these job factors.

2.6 Gender

Many studies have compared differences in job satisfaction between genders (Hersch & Xiao, 2016; Moyes, Shao, & Newsome, 2008; Sabharwal & Corley, 2009). Hersch and Xiao (2016) noted that women are overall more satisfied in their jobs than are their male counterparts.

This is ironic, considering female employees are frequently in comparatively lower level jobs, have less job flexibility, receive lower salaries, have less opportunity for company-provided training, encounter more stress in the workplace, and suffer more discrimination than their male equivalents (Blau & Kahn, 1992; Lynch, 1992; Roxburgh, 1996; Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2000).

This finding may be due to different importance of job factors for men and women, as well as differing job expectations (Hersch & Xiao, 2016). It is also noted that men place higher value on pay and advancement than women. In addition, women are said to have lower pay and advancement expectations, which could lead to higher satisfaction rates (Moyes et al., 2008; Sabharwal & Corley, 2009).

Another study also stressed the difference of work factors between genders, noting that females hold job contentment, positive relationships with coworkers, and the social and emotional parts of the workplace at a high level of importance (Moyes et al., 2008). Furthermore, Moyes et al. (2008) found that opportunities for advancement, the ability to work independently, high pay, and job security were most important to males.

According to Sabharwal and Corley (2009), many studies have shown that male faculty members in university settings are more satisfied with their jobs than females, especially when it comes to salary and benefits. Conversely, another study found no significant differences in overall job satisfaction between female and male faculty (Ward & Sloane, 2000). Still, this same study did conclude that in terms of opportunity for advancement, the male faculty's job satisfaction levels were nearly three times that of the females. It has also been found that women who are in higher ranking academic positions report more satisfaction with their jobs than their male counterparts (Okpara et al., 2005). Among one group of community college faculty, women reported more dissatisfaction relating to balancing family life, and work and benefits (Rosser & Townsend, 2006).

Though a plethora of research has indicated that women are more satisfied than men are in the workplace, not all results have been entirely conclusive (Westover, 2012). In addition, numerous studies have indicated that there are no significant differences in the job satisfaction between males and females (Fields & Blum, 1997; Westover, 2009; Zoghi, 2003). Additionally, a meta-analysis, which included a total sample size of over 10,000 workers, concluded that although some research has endorsed the belief that significant differences exist between male and female job satisfaction, overall the results were unreliable and inconclusive (Brush, Moch, & Pooyan, 1987).

Westover (2012) found little difference in overall job satisfaction between males and females. Furthermore, this study indicated only minute differences in each of the intrinsic job factors looked at in the study, including relationships with coworkers, autonomy, relationships between management/employees, and interesting work, in addition to job security in the extrinsic factor category. On the other hand, women had significantly lower mean scores for perceived opportunity for advancement and pay than did their male colleagues. (Westover, 2012).

2.7 Ethnicity

Many studies have compared job satisfaction rates between ethnicities. One study indicated that both Asian and black employees are less satisfied in their jobs than white employees of the same sex (Hersch & Xiao, 2016). However, another study

found that black workers reported higher satisfaction in their jobs (Stoermer et al., 2017). It is also possible, as reported by Hoppe, Fujishiro and Heaney (2014), that some minority groups are more satisfied with their jobs if they have coworkers who are of the same race or ethnicity.

One study among Latinx workers in the U.S. indicated that individuals' cultural identity, as well as high levels of acculturation, had a positive impact on job satisfaction (Valdivia & Flores, 2012). On the other hand, the same study found that perceptions of the community associated with racism and discrimination had a negative influence on overall job satisfaction. Among the job factors unrelated to job satisfaction were job tenure, wages, and hours worked.

Feeling of empowerment or control over work can help to increase individuals from Western cultures overall job satisfaction (Buhler & Land, 2003; Innstrand, Espnes, & Mykletun, 2004). Bowen and Lawler (1992) stated that individuals must be permitted to make significant decisions in their positions to feel that they are empowered at their jobs. This empowerment can increase overall job satisfaction, as well as the individual's plan to continue working for the same business for over one year (Nedd, 2006).

2.8 Income Level

It seems obvious that income level would influence a person's job satisfaction. In fact, most of the pay satisfaction models postulate a positive correlation between income level and pay satisfaction, with pay satisfaction considered to be an essential factor of overall job satisfaction (Judge, Piccolo, Podsakoff, Shaw, & Rich, 2010). Then again, according to Deci and Ryan (1985), self-determination theory proposes that extrinsic motivators are actually dissatisfying and demotivating to workers. Extrinsic rewards have been found to weaken a person's perceived autonomy, as they have shown to have to a negative impact on an individual's interest in the intrinsic factors of a job (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

In general, studies focusing on the relationship between income level and job satisfaction have yielded confusing results. Review of the literature indicated conflicting results among several studies. One study noted that the stability of the income level-pay satisfaction correlation is likely the strongest finding related to the causes of pay satisfaction (Heneman & Schwab, 1985). On the other hand, Pfeffer (1998) indicated that a multitude of studies have documented that external rewards are essentially ineffective. In addition, another study found that pay alone is not a very strong aspect related to a person's job satisfaction (Spector, 1997).

Some studies have found income level to have an impact on overall job satisfaction. Diener and Biswas-Diener (2002) reasoned that income level and job satisfaction are less correlated in the United States as opposed to many other countries, as the U.S. is one of the richest countries in the world. However, it was found in one study that job satisfaction and income level were positively correlated (Malka & Chatman, 2003). In addition, the study found that those who placed more value on extrinsic factors showed a stronger correlation between the two. Conversely, those who held intrinsic factors at a higher value showed a negative correlation between job satisfaction and income (Malka & Chatman, 2003).

Still, other studies have indicated little or no relationship between overall job satisfaction and income level. For instance, results of one study indicated that income level had only minute correlation to job satisfaction and pay satisfaction

(Judge, et al., 2010). Thus, it appears that even between individuals working for the same company, those who have higher incomes are, at most, slightly more satisfied than those who have considerably lower incomes (Judge et al., 2010).

3. Methods

A confidential voluntary survey was completed by over 330 respondents from a mid-Atlantic Masters I institution in the USA. Respondents agreed to participate in the study via a Google Forms invitation which does not permit participant identification. Respondents ranked their satisfaction with nineteen common job factors on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). Then, the respondents ranked the importance of those responses on the same Likert scale. The data was then entered into SPSS for analysis.

4. Results

4.1 Demographics

Nearly two-thirds of the 330+ usable respondents were female. Since nearly eighty-four percent were Caucasian, the non-Caucasians were grouped together. Interestingly, the respondents were nearly perfectly distributed by income level.

Table 1 *Demographics*

Gender	N	%			
Male	117	35%			
Female	219	65%			
Total	336				
Ethnicity	N	%		N	%
African American	33	10.0%	Caucasian	277	84%
Asian	15	4.5%	Non-Caucasian	53	16%
Caucasian	277	83.9%			
Hispanic	3	0.9%			
Middle Eastern	1	0.3%			
Other	1	0.3%			
Total	330	100.0%			
Level of Income	N	%			
Less than \$25,000	84	25%			
\$25,001 to \$50,000	85	25%			
\$50,001 to \$75,000	80	24%			
\$75,001 to \$100,000	46	14%			
More than \$100,000	39	12%			
Total	334				

Ten factors, five extrinsic and five intrinsic, were ranked by the respondents on their satisfaction with each factor. The highest rated factor was “Being able to help others” was while participants were least satisfied with their level of pay. When examining the responses by gender and ethnicity, no statistically significant differences emerged. In addition, the average score of participants’ satisfaction with the five intrinsic factors by gender and ethnicity was higher than their satisfaction with extrinsic factors (see Table 2).

Table 2 Satisfaction with Work Factors by Total, Gender, and Ethnicity

	Total Mean	Male	Female	Caucasian	Non-Caucasian
Extrinsic Factors					
Good health insurance and benefits	3.753	3.821	3.717	3.758	3.729
Job Security	3.857	3.923	3.822	3.848	3.898
Having Vacation Time	3.860	3.949	3.813	3.888	3.729
Sufficient Pay	3.104	3.154	3.078	3.083	3.203
Flexible Hours	3.958	4.026	3.922	3.971	3.898
Average	3.707	3.774	3.670	3.710	3.692
Intrinsic Factors					
Being Able to Work Independently	4.134	4.205	4.096	4.155	4.034
Recognition from Co-workers	3.566	3.684	3.502	3.556	3.610
Being Able to Help Others in Your Job	4.205	4.128	4.247	4.188	4.288
My Work is Important to Society	3.872	3.838	3.890	3.830	4.068
Being Treated with Respect	3.830	3.983	3.749	3.794	4.000
Average	3.921	3.968	3.897	3.905	4.000

However, multiple differences were revealed when viewing the factors by income level (see Table 3). In fact, a t-test revealed nine of the ten factors had shown statistically significant differences. Only “being treated with respect” which did not show a significant difference. The differences between the other factors and the income level groups are shown in Table 4.

The largest F score was in the factor of “Good health insurance and benefits” followed by “Job Security”. As one might expect, the level of satisfaction increased as respondents moved to higher incomes. Interestingly, for both categories of factors, respondents in the 50K-75K level were slightly more satisfied than workers in the 75K-100K (see Table 3).

Respondents in the lowest three income brackets had the most satisfaction in “being able to help others in your job”. Conversely, four of the five incomes agreed they were least satisfied with their level of pay. Those earning less than 25K were the lone defectors as they were the least satisfied with their health insurance and benefits (see Table 4).

Table 4 *Most and Least Satisfied by Income Level*

	< \$25K	\$25-50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-100K	> \$100K
Most Satisfied					
Being Able to Help Others in Your Job	3.952	4.282	4.288		
Being Able to Work Independently				4.217	
My Work Is Important to Society					4.590
Least Satisfied					
Good health insurance and benefits	2.750				
Sufficient Pay		3.059	3.063	3.109	3.923

The respondents were then asked to rate the importance of each of the factors. The factor which was rated the highest was “Being Treated with Respect” which earned a rating of 4.78, the greatest mean observed in this survey and higher than “Sufficient Pay”. Conversely, “Recognition from Co-workers” was rated at the lowest level of importance (3.595). However, despite being treated with respect as the highest factor, the average of the five extrinsic factors were deemed more important than the intrinsic factors.

When examining the factors by gender, five weak, but statistically significant differences were found. “Being Treated with Respect” was the most important factor for both genders. However, females rated this factor slightly higher which resulted in a weak, but statistically significant difference (see Table 5).

However, no statistically significant differences on these ten factors emerged when examined by ethnicity.

Table 5 *Importance of Work Factors by Total, Gender, and Ethnicity*

	Mean	Male	Female	r	Sig	Caucasian	Non-Caucasian
Extrinsic Factors							
Good health insurance and benefits	4.598	4.496	4.653			4.592	4.627
Job Security	4.628	4.547	4.671			4.643	4.559
Having Vacation Time	4.464	4.325	4.539	0.139	0.011	4.458	4.492
Sufficient Pay	4.631	4.521	4.689	0.134	0.014	4.635	4.610
Flexible Hours	4.262	4.094	4.352	0.146	0.007	4.235	4.390
Average	4.517	4.397	4.581			4.513	4.536
Intrinsic Factors							
Being Able to Work Independently	4.354	4.325	4.370			4.339	4.424
Recognition from Co-workers	3.595	3.573	3.607			3.556	3.780
Being Able to Help Others in Your Job	4.336	4.205	4.406	0.120	0.027	4.318	4.424
My Work Is Important to Society	4.140	4.111	4.155			4.112	4.271
Being Treated with Respect	4.780	4.701	4.822	0.130	0.017	4.776	4.797
Average	4.241	4.183	4.272			4.220	4.339

Similarly, extrinsic factors were deemed more important than intrinsic factors across every income range. Interestingly, the results were remarkably homogenous except for two factors. Sufficient pay, while highly rated by all, was less important to those earning \$75K or more. Conversely, being able to work independently was less important to those earning the lowest salary range. In fact, the Tukey Post- Hoc tests reveal “Being able to work independently” is more valued as respondents earn more in salary (see Table 6).

Table 6 Importance of Work Factors by Income Level

	< \$25K	\$25- 50K	\$50- 75K	\$75- 100K	> \$100K	F	Sig.
Extrinsic Factors							
Good health insurance and benefits	4.548	4.565	4.663	4.522	4.744		
Job Security	4.619	4.706	4.675	4.565	4.462		
Having Vacation Time	4.381	4.624	4.513	4.348	4.359		
Sufficient Pay	4.679	4.741	4.688	4.413	4.436	3.695	0.006
Flexible Hours	4.286	4.306	4.225	4.109	4.462		
Average	4.502	4.588	4.553	4.391	4.492		
Intrinsic Factors							
Being Able to Work Independently	4.107	4.353	4.438	4.435	4.641	4.801	0.001
Recognition from Co-workers	3.524	3.600	3.625	3.609	3.641		
Being Able to Help Others in Your Job	4.202	4.318	4.475	4.304	4.436		
My Work Is Important to Society	4.012	4.129	4.125	4.196	4.487		
Being Treated with Respect	4.845	4.812	4.738	4.717	4.744		
Average	4.138	4.242	4.280	4.252	4.390		
Tukey Post-Hoc Tests				25-50	<25K	<25K	<25K
.05 = *, <.01=**, <.001 = ***				50-75	25-50	50-75	>100
Sufficient Pay				*			
Being Able to Work Independently					*	*	***

To both summarize and depict the degree of differences when comparing the satisfaction and importance, means of the ten factors are shown in Table 7. Nine out of the ten factors revealed a statistically significant difference. Not surprisingly, the greatest disparity was sufficient pay, as its importance was rated 49% higher than the respondent's satisfaction with it followed by “being treated with respect and “having good health insurance and benefits”.

Interestingly, “recognition from coworkers” was the only factor which did not have a statistically significant difference. It received the second lowest satisfaction mean and the lowest importance mean, which was less than one percent more than its satisfaction.

When viewing these factors based on gender, the only statistically significant finding was in “being able to help others in your job” as females found it more important. In relation to ethnicity, non-Caucasians valued “recognition from coworkers” more than Caucasians.

Table 7 *Comparison of Satisfaction and Importance of Work Factors*

	Satisfaction Mean	Importance Mean	% Change	t test	p
Extrinsic Factors					
Good health insurance and benefits	3.753	4.598	23	11.8	0.000
Job Security	3.857	4.628	20	12	0.000
Having Vacation Time	3.860	4.464	16	8.6	0.000
Sufficient Pay	3.104	4.631	49	20.3	0.000
Flexible Hours	3.958	4.262	8	4.5	0.000
Intrinsic Factors					
Being Able to Work Independently	4.134	4.354	5	3.9	0.000
Recognition from Co-workers	3.566	3.595	1		
Being Able to Help Others in Your Job	4.205	4.336	3	2.55	0.011
My Work is Important to Society	3.872	4.140	8	4.1	0.000
Being Treated with Respect	3.830	4.780	25	14.6	0.000
Comparison of correlations from independent samples					
		Male	Female	Test Z	P
Being Able to Help Others in Your Job		0.185	0.379	-1.829	0.034
		Caucasians	Non-Caucasians		
Job Security		-0.018	0.246	-1.835	0.033
Recognition from Co-workers		0.076	0.407	-2.427	0.008

5. Hypothesis Assessment

5.1 Hypothesis Testing

H1: Males will rate their satisfaction with work factors higher than females. Not supported

While the raw mean score for eight of the ten factors was slightly higher than the females, these differences were minute with no statistical difference.

H2: Caucasians will rate their satisfaction with work factors higher than Non-Caucasians. Not supported

Caucasians declared a slightly higher raw mean than Non-Caucasians on only four of the factors, but these differences were minute with no statistical difference.

H3: Workers earning more than \$50,000 will rate their satisfaction with work factors higher than workers earning less than \$50,000. Supported

Participants who earned more than \$50,000 were more satisfied than their lower earning peers.

H4: Females will rate the importance of work factors higher than males. Supported
Females rated importance higher than males on all ten factors. In addition, in five of these factors the female importance mean was statistically higher than the male responses.

H5: Non-Caucasians will rate the importance of work factors higher than Caucasians. Not supported.

Even though Non-Caucasians rated the eight work factors slightly higher than their peers, none of the differences were statistically significant.

H6: Workers earning less than \$50,000 will rate the importance of work factors higher than workers earning more than \$50,000. No supported.

While lower income level workers were more prone to rate extrinsic factors slightly higher, the only factor where statistical significance occurred was in pay. Conversely, higher income workers valued “being able to work independently”.

H7: Participants will rank the importance of factors higher than their satisfaction of those factors. Supported.

The participants ranked the importance of all ten factors higher than their satisfaction with those factors. In fact, nine of the factors differed by a statistically significant manner.

H8: Females will rank the importance of factors higher than their satisfaction of those factors. Not supported.

There was remarkable consistency between the responses of males and females. The factor “being able to help others in your job” was the only facet which females ranked higher than males.

H9: Non-Caucasians will rank the importance of factors higher than their satisfaction of those factors. Not supported.

There was remarkable consistency between the responses of Caucasians and Non-Caucasians. Only two factors: “Job security” and “Recognition from Coworkers” shown Non-Caucasians ranked work factors higher than their satisfaction of those factors.

In summary, there was practically no difference in the satisfaction of work factors by gender or ethnicity. As expected, workers earning over \$50K were more satisfied with these work factors. However, females were more apt to rate the importance of these factors higher than males. But, no difference was found by ethnicity. Again, the importance of factors was dependent on the income level. It was universal that these participants rated the importance of factors over the satisfaction of them, yet minimal differences emerged by gender or ethnicity.

5.2 Literature Support

The results of this study confirm the work of Duffy & Sedlacek, (2007) and Haslett & Leidel, (2015) in that extrinsic factors are more important to workers and that females tend to value helping others in their jobs.

In addition, these findings confirm Fields & Blum, (1997); Westover, (2009); Zoghi, (2003) and (Brush, Moch, & Pooyan, (1987) that differences in male and female job satisfaction do not exist.

This study supports the findings of Judge, Piccolo, Podsakoff, Shaw, & Rich, (2010) who found a positive correlation between income level and pay satisfaction. In addition, the work Deci & Ryan, (2000) is confirmed in that lower salary workers tend to have lower interest in intrinsic factors.

5.3 Literature Contradiction

The results of this contradict the findings of Martin & Tuch, (1993); Ovadia, (2001); and Shapiro, (1977) as the Non-Caucasian respondents in this study were not more focused on extrinsic rewards than Caucasians.

Further, this study contradicts the work of Hersch & Xiao, (2016); Moyes, Shao, & Newsome, (2008); and Sabharwal & Corley, (2009) who asserted that females were more satisfied in their jobs than are their male counterparts. The females in this study were not more satisfied than their male peers.

6. Managerial Implications

While having sufficient pay is the most important factor for everyone, it is more highly valued by those at the lower salary levels. However, regardless of gender, ethnicity or income, workers cited the importance of the intrinsic factors of respect, being able to help others, and the ability to work independently. Since these factors do not have a cost component, the researchers encourage employers to adopt the aforementioned practices to make their workers feel more a part of their organization, which in turn will increase their commitment, satisfaction, and productivity.

7. Conclusion

While pay and benefits were the most important items regardless of income, the importance of respect cannot be overstated. Respect was the highest rated factor in importance regardless of gender, ethnicity, or income level. Therefore, it would behoove businesses and organizations which may not have the wherewithal to increase the extrinsic factors, to focus on this simple item, showing respect, which does not generally have a cost associated with it.

While not a scientific finding since it assumes all the factors carry an equal weight, the average satisfaction of the intrinsic factors was six percent higher than the extrinsic factors. However, when examining by importance, the extrinsic factors was six percent higher than the intrinsic factors.

8. Future Study

Aside from income level, minimal differences by gender and ethnicity occurred in the Satisfaction and Importance of these factors. More differences emerged when comparing by income level. Future research could include additional work factors. Further, other variables such as marital status, age, level of education, and position within their organization could be examined.

9. References

1. Baum, M., & Kabst, R. (2013). How to attract applicants in the Atlantic versus the Asia-Pacific region? A cross-national analysis on China, India, Germany, and Hungary. *Journal of World Business*, 2, 175.

2. Blau, F. D., & Kahn, L. M. (1992). The gender earnings gap: learning from international comparisons. *The American Economic Review*, 82(2), 533-538.
3. Bowen, D., & Lawler, E. (1992). The empowerment of service workers: what, why, how and when. *Sloan Management Review*, 31-39.
4. Brush, D. H., Moch, M. K., & Pooyan, A. (1987). Individual demographic differences and job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 8(2), 139-155.
5. Bühler, K. E., & Land, T. (2003). Burnout and personality in intensive care: an empirical study. *Hospital topics*, 81(4), 5-12.
6. Chow, I. H., & Ngo, H. Y. (2011). Gender differences in job attribute preferences and job choice of university students in China. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 18(2).
7. Christie, P., Kwon, I., Stoeberl, P., & Baumhart, R. (2003). A cross-cultural comparison of ethical attitudes of business managers: India, Korea, and the United States. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 263-275.
8. Chullen, C. L., Adeyemi-Bello, T., & Xi, X. (2015). Job expectations of Chinese college students: Re-examining gender differences. *Equality, Diversity & Inclusion*, 34(8), 742-763.
9. Cinamon, R. G., & Rich, Y. (2002). Gender differences in the importance of work and family roles: Implications for work-family conflict. *Sex Roles*, 47, 531-541.
10. Clark, A.E. (1997). Job satisfaction and gender: Why are women so happy at work? *Labour Economics*, 4(4), 341-372.
11. Clark, A.E. (1998), Measures of Job Satisfaction: What makes a good job? Evidence from OECD countries. *OECD Labour Market and Social Policy Occasional Papers*, No. 34, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/670570634774>
12. Deci, E., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer Science & Business Media.
13. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
14. Diener, E., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2002). Will money increase subjective well-being? *Social indicators research*, 57(2), 119-169.
15. Duffy, R. D., & Sedlacek, W. E. (2007). The work values of first-year college students: Exploring group differences. *Career Development Quarterly*, 359-364.
16. Dunnette, M. D., Campbell, J. P., & Hakel, M. D. (1967). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in six occupational groups. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 2(2), 143-174.
17. Fields, D. L., & Blum, T. C. (1997). Employee satisfaction in work groups with different gender composition. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 18(2), 181-196.
18. Frieze, I. H., Olson, J. E., Murrell, A. J., & Selvan, M. S. (2006). Work values and their effect on work behavior and work outcomes in female and male managers. *Sex Roles*, 54, 83-93.

19. Haslett, B. B., & Leidel, K. (2015). Work values in a changing global environment: Comparing Chinese and U.S. students. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 42(2), 11-34.
20. Heneman III, H. G., & Schwab, D. P. (1985). Pay satisfaction: Its multidimensional nature and measurement. *International journal of Psychology*, 20(1), 129-141.
21. Hersch, J., & Xiao, J. (2016). Sex, race, and job satisfaction among highly educated workers. *Southern Economic Journal*, 38(1), 1-24.
22. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1993). The motivation to work with a new
23. introduction by Frederick Herzberg. New Brunswick: NJ Transaction Publisher, cop.
24. Hofstede, G. (1984). The cultural relativity of the quality of life concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 389-398.
25. Hofstede, G. H. (1991). Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. London: McGraw-Hill.
26. Hoppe, A., Fujishiro, K., & Heaney, C. A. (2014). Workplace racial/ethnic similarity, job satisfaction, and lumbar back health among warehouse workers: Asymmetric reactions across racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(2), 172-193.
27. Huang, X., & Van de Vliert, E. (2003). Where intrinsic job satisfaction fails to work: National moderators of intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(2), 159-179.
28. Inglehart, R. (1997). Modernization and post-modernization: Cultural, economic and political change in 43 societies. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
29. Innstrand, S., Espnes, G., & Mykletun, R. (2004). Job stress, burnout and job satisfaction: an intervention study for staff working with people with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 119-126.
30. Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M., & Paul, K. B. (1989). Construction of a Job in General scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of applied psychology*, 74(2), 193.
31. Jones, J. (2006, August 7). *Personal fulfillment frequently cited as a top job 'like'*. Retrieved from Gallup Poll.
32. Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., Podsakoff, N. P., Shaw, J. C., & Rich, B. L. (2010). The relationship between pay and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2), 157-167.
33. Kanungo, R. N. (1990). Work alienation in developing countries: Western models and Eastern realities. *Management in developing countries*, 1937208.
34. Konrad, A. M., Ritchie, J. E., Lieb, P., & Corrigan, E. (2000). Sex differences and similarities in job attribute preferences: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 593-641.
35. Knoop, R. (1994). Work values and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Psychology*, 128(6), 683-690.
36. Kumar, M., & Sankaran, S. (2007). Indian culture and the culture for TQM: a comparison. *The TQM Magazine*.

37. Lange, T., Pacheco, G., & Shrotryia, V. K. (2010). Culture, industrialisation and multiple domains of employees' job satisfaction: a case for HR strategy redesign in India. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(13), 2438-2451.
38. Lebo, R. B., Harrington, T. F., & Tillman, R. (1995). Work values similarities among students from six countries. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 43(4), 350-362.
39. Lee, S. M., Terada, M., Shimizu, K., Lee, M., & Lee, D. H. (2017). Comparative analysis of work values across four nation. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 132-144
40. Locke, E. (1969). What is Job Satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 309-336.
41. Lundberg, C., Gudmundson, A., & Andersson, T. D. (2009). Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of work motivation tested empirically on seasonal workers in hospitality and tourism. *Tourism management*, 30(6), 890-899.
42. Lynch, L. M. (1992). Private-sector training and the earnings of young workers. *The American Economic Review*, 82(1), 299-312.
43. Malka, A., & Chatman, J. A. (2003). Intrinsic and extrinsic work orientations as moderators of the effect of annual income on subjective well-being: A longitudinal study. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(6), 737-746.
44. Martin, J. K., & Tuch, S. A. (1993). Black-white differences in the value of job rewards revisited. *Social Science Quarterly*, 74(4), 884-901.
45. Miner, J. B. (2015). *Organizational behavior 1: Essential theories of motivation and leadership*. Routledge.
46. Mottaz, C. J. (1985). The relative importance of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards as determinants of work satisfaction. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 26(3), 365-385.
47. Moyes, G. D., Shao, L. P., & Newsome, M. (2008). Comparative analysis of employee job satisfaction in the accounting profession. *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, 6(2), 50-80.
48. Nedd, N. (2006). Perceptions of empowerment and intent to stay. *Nursing Economics*, 13-18.
49. Nordhaug, O., Gooderham, P., Zhang, X., Liu, Y., & Birkelund, G. E. (2010). Elite female business students in China and Norway: Job-related values and preferences. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 54(2), 109-123.
50. O'Brien, G. E. (1992). Changing meanings of work. In J. F. Hartley, & G. M. Stephenson, *Employment relations: The psychology of influence and control at work* (pp. 44-66). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
51. Okpara, J. O., Squillace, M., & Erondur, E. A. (2005). Gender differences and job satisfaction: A study of university teachers in the United States. *Women in Management Review*, 20(3-4), 177-190.
52. Ovadia, S. (2001). Race, class, and gender differences in high school seniors' values: Applying intersection theory in empirical analysis. *Social Science Quarterly*, 82(2), 340-356.
53. Parker, K. N., & Brummel, B. J. (2016). Examining the curvilinear relationship between income and job and pay satisfaction. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*.
54. Pfeffer, J., & Jeffrey, P. (1998). *The human equation: Building profits by putting people first*. Harvard Business Press.

55. Post-Kammer, P. (1987). Intrinsic and extrinsic work values and career maturity of 9th- and 11th-grade boys and girls. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 65, 420-423.
56. Rosser, V. J., & Townsend, B. K. (2006). Determining public 2-year college faculty's intent to leave: An empirical model. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 124-147.
57. Roxburgh, S. (1996). Gender differences in work and well-being: Effects of exposure and vulnerability. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 265-277.
58. Runciman, W. G. (1966). Relative deprivation & social justice: Study attitudes social inequality in 20th century England.
59. Sabharwal, M., & Corley, E. A. (2009). Faculty job satisfaction across gender and discipline. *The Social Science Journal*, 46(3), 539-556.
60. Schwartz, S. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48(1), 23-47.
61. Shapiro, E. G. (1977). Racial differences in the value of job rewards. *Social Forces*, 56(1), 21-30.
62. Smith, H. L., & Powell, B. (1990). Great expectations: Variations in income expectations among college seniors. *Sociology of Education*, 194-207.
63. Sousa-Poza, A., & Sousa-Poza, A. A. (2000). Taking another look at the gender/job-satisfaction paradox. *Kyklos*, 53(2), 135-152.
64. Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences* (Vol. 3). Sage publications.
65. Stoermer, S., Hitotsuyanagi-Hansel, A., & Froese, F. J. (2017). Racial harassment and job satisfaction in South Africa: The moderating effects of career orientations and managerial rank. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(1), 1-20.
66. Valdivia, C., & Flores, L. Y. (2012). Factors affecting the job satisfaction of Latino/a immigrants in the Midwest. *Journal of Career Development*, 39(1), 31-49.
67. Van der Schyff, R., Botha, D., & Ellis, S. (2018). Undergraduate students' perceptions of factors affecting job satisfaction. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(1), 1-10.
68. Vansteenkiste, M., Neyrinck, B., Niemiec, C., Soenens, B., De Witte, H., & Van den Broek, A. (2007). On the relations among work value orientations, psychological need satisfaction and job outcomes: A self-determination theory approach. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80, 251-277.
69. Vroom, V. H. (1982). *Work and motivation* (Rev. ed.). Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company.
70. Ward, M. E., & Sloane, P. J. (2000). Non-pecuniary advantages versus pecuniary disadvantages: Job satisfaction among male and female academics in Scottish universities. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 47(3), 273-303.
71. Watson, L. M. (2008). Factors influencing job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Radiologic technology*, 80(2), 113-122.
72. Westover, J. H. (2009). A cross-national look at the changing nature of gender differences in perceived job satisfaction. *International Journal of Global Business and Economics*, 2(1), 62-7.

73. Westover, J. H. (2010). "Gendered" Perceptions: Job Satisfaction and Gender Differences in the Workplace. *International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities & Nations*, 10(1).
74. Westover, J. H. (2012). The job satisfaction-gender paradox revisited: A cross-national look at gender differences in job satisfaction, 1989-2005. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 3(2), 263-277.
75. Weisgram, E. S., Bigler, R. S., & Liben, L. S. (2010). Gender, values, and occupational interests among children, adolescents, and adults. *Child Development*, 81(3), 778-796.
76. Zhao, H. (2006). Expectations of recruiters and applications in large cities of China. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(5), 459-475.
77. Zoghi, C. (2003). Why have public university professors done so badly? *Economics of Education Review*, 22(1), 45-57.

About Our Authors

Amit Shah is professor of Management at Frostburg State University (FSU) in Maryland. He has over 30 years of experience in industry and academia. Dr. Shah has taught a variety of business courses including management, strategic management, leadership, organizational behavior, and international business. He has presented over 100 papers at various conferences, published over 60 refereed articles in various journals and published proceedings, authored/co-authored two texts published by McGraw-Hill, and conducted workshops for various organizations in the area of business, strategy, and learning. Further he has earned a gold medal as an international researcher and has been honored as a Fellow in AIMS International.

Michael Monahan Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Management at Frostburg State University in Maryland. He has 40 years of experience in administration and academia. His primary areas of interest are management, leadership, operations and strategic management. He has published articles on Entrepreneurship, Leadership, Operations, and has conducted management development workshops for businesses in the community. He is the advisor for the Frostburg chapter of the Society for the Advancement of Management (SAM) and has twice been awarded the Advisor of the Year by SAM.

Kari Shumaker is the Graduate Assistant in the Department of Management at Frostburg State University in Maryland. She is earning a Master of Science Degree in Counseling Psychology. She hopes to enter family counseling with a focus on helping children.