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Abstract
The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of job satisfaction as defined by both nonmanagement and management employees. This study suggests that little difference exists in the perceptions of job satisfaction importance between management and nonmanagement employees.
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Introduction / Background
The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of job satisfaction for gender, age group, length of time with the organization, and between management and nonmanagement employees. Three organization types participated in the study: sales/service, state governmental department, and manufacturing.

Turnover is costly to an organization, both financially and in the impact it has on those individuals remaining with the organization (Hannay & Northam, 2000; Michaud, 2000; Mosley & Hurley, 1999; Rust, Stewart, Miller, & Pielack, 1996; Sigler, 1999). Every effort possible needs to be undertaken to reduce the amount of turnover within the organization. A contributing factor leading to turnover is a gap between what employees believe is important to them and what management believes is important (Kay & Jordan-Evans, 1999). The boundaries of the gap need to be identified before any effort can be made to reduce or bridge the gap (Peters, 2001). Once the boundaries are identified, policies can be analyzed and the possibility of reducing the gap investigated.

Such information can be acquired only through communication with employees. First, employees must be recognized as being a worthwhile source of information (Rust et al., 1996). Second, employees must be asked for their opinion (Blanchard & Waghorn, 1997; Kay & Jordan-Evans, 1999). Third, the examination of information must occur repeatedly and frequently, because life situations for both the employees and the organization are in a constant state of change (Abrashaff, 2001; Rust et al., 1996).
Regardless of what management may believe the basis of job satisfaction to be, Kay and Jordan-Evans (1999) suggested that the surest way of knowing is to ask the employees what is of value to them. According to Kay and Jordan-Evans, the question that management should ask when a good employee leaves is not “Why didn’t they tell me?” but instead, “Why didn’t I ask?” (p. xvii). Abrashaff (2001) tells the manager/ supervisor to “recruit your people everyday, even though they are already on board” (p. 91) and “you have to grow your people to grow your business” (p. 91). If Peters (2001) is correct, the need to communicate with each individual employee has never been greater. According to Peters, business is transitioning from a period when “promise them everything” was important (early 1990s–2000) to a period when “performance and getting results” will be critical to a manager’s survival. Performance and results are directly connected to managers being able to communicate with their employees and to increasing the individual’s level of job satisfaction.

This study combined this philosophy and a survey whose development started with Pritchard and Shaw’s (1978) 257 rewards. Seven experts from both business and academia were asked to comment on Pritchard and Shaw’s reward topics.

Any factor whose category was not agreed upon by at least five of the seven experts would not pass to the questionnaire development phase. Analysis of the feedback from the seven experts resulted in the decision to categorize 97 reward topics before developing a data collection instrument. The 97 reward topics were combined into seven category topics, with the following definitions:

**Organizational Communication**: the “informing of information process” used by management to all employees as well as the “listening process” whereby management listens to employees and accepts advice from all members of the organization.

**Employee Development Opportunities**: includes having a career path within the organization and the presence of a career-planning program that enhances the abilities of the individual employee. Employee development represents the degree to which organizational culture provides employees with growth paths that include advancement opportunities, career counseling, and training of new skills.

**Intrinsic Rewards**: rewards of a nonmonetary nature, such as recognition and the degree to which employees feel that they have control over the presence of an intrinsic reward as well as the opportunity to exert their influence. Intrinsic factors include such nonmonetary rewards as public recognition, letters of recognition, praise, certificates of accomplishments, use of personally determined methods of doing the job, and flexible work breaks.

**Work Conditions**: include the physical work area, safety conditions, oppressive individuals, and demands generated by management on the output of employees (such as required overtime and working to the point at which mental and physical problems develop). The conditions include convenient restrooms, rest areas, liquids and food at workstations, and the ability to take breaks when the employee feels the need.

**Employee Interaction**: type and quality of interaction that employees experience with their peers and their management representatives. Interaction includes the amount of involvement that management representatives have with management representatives in other areas of the organization and the extent to which upper management desires and demonstrates interaction with employees at all levels of the organization.

**Compensation**: monetary-related benefits that include competitive pay; a fair pay system; and benefits such as retirement, medical insurance, life insurance, dental insurance, and paid vacation time. This includes medical, insurance, and retirement forms of compensation.
Work-life Balance: concern for employee’s family, clear identification of work time limits, and meeting family-related needs such as caregiving.

Survey Methods

The primary methods used to collect survey data included direct observation, interview, and surveys distributed by mail organizations such as the United States Postal Service. Two new distribution methods followed the development of the Internet: e-mail and Web pages. E-mail was still seen as a new technology in 1995 (Tse, A. C. B., Tse, K. C., Yin, C. H., Ting, C. B., Yi, K. W., Yee, K. P. & Hong, W. C., 1995). It was so new that some potential participants may have refrained from survey participation simply due to technophobia. Mehta and Sivadas (1995) reported that e-mail participants tended to include more comments than survey participants who were required to return their survey via conventional mail. Results tended to be similar when the question was close-ended. A study conducted by Tse (1998) indicated that response rates were about the same for e-mail compared to surveys. Tse concluded that e-mail survey distribution may become a standard as e-mail technology improves.

Ira Kerns (2000), Principle Consultant for GuideStar Communications, examined methods of data collection including the use of e-mail HyperText Markup Language (html) attachments and Web site questionnaires (e-surveys). Members of the American Society of Business Publication editors were asked about their data collection methods. Members reported being more satisfied with e-surveys, which tended to result in higher response rates and a higher quality of responses. Considering the accuracy of responses, Klassen and Jacobs (2001) found no significant differences across technologies. However, they did suggest that caution is needed when surveying managers and that a combination of technologies might provide better results. The research found that, while response rates may be lower for the new technologies, the item completion rates tended to be higher. Boyer, Olson, Calantone, and Jackson (2002) suggested that dislike for “spam” (unsolicited mass distributed e-mail) may contribute to lower response rates being reported by researchers. They also cautioned that much of the research has been conducted on college campuses with student participants with little application of the latest technology to business research. The researchers determined that their findings confirmed those of Klassen and Jacobs (2001). The study concludes that surveys administered by mail are largely interchangeable with technology administered methods.

Each participant completed a survey, either electronically or via printed document. All participants answered the question “How important is it to you?” for each topic presented. Responses were indicated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Very Unimportant to Very Important. Also included in each survey were a limited number of demographic questions that did not include any personal identifier information.

Once the participant completed the survey supplied via the Internet, the participant’s data were fed directly into a Microsoft Access database, thus eliminating the need for data entry procedures and also eliminating potential data entry errors. When needed, printed surveys were administered. Entry of the data collected using printed surveys utilized the Internet data entry process with the assistance of an individual unrelated to the study.
Results

SPSS statistical analysis software was used for all statistical analysis, which was set at the 0.05 confidence level. All managerial and all nonmanagerial data entries were included in the reliability analysis to investigate the relationship of individual items to determine the level of internal consistency for the questionnaire. Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient is based on the average inter-item correlation. Alpha scores range from zero to one (0.0 - 1.00). The closer the score is to 1.00, the greater the predicted reliability. The questionnaire received an overall rating of .9855.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS 1

H₁: There will be no statistical significant difference between the perception of nonmanagement employee job satisfaction and management job satisfaction rating as measured by job satisfaction topic means.

The null hypothesis:
H₀: 0 sub{management job satisfaction rating} = 0 sub{nonmanagement job satisfaction rating}

The alternate hypothesis:
Hₐ: 0 sub{management job satisfaction rating} ≠ 0 sub{nonmanagement job satisfaction rating}

A MANOVA test was performed to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between managerial employee and nonmanagement employee perceptions of importance by topic category. Management employees are defined as those individuals having hiring and firing authority. Table 1 reflects the analysis for a 95% confidence rating. No topics reported a statistically significant difference (p-Value). Thus, the null hypothesis failed to rejected (see Table 1).
Table 1

Statistical Relation of Group (Management, Nonmanagement) Means Within Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic description</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational communication</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68.72</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonmanagement</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>66.69</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee development opportunities</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonmanagement</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>64.68</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic rewards</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.44</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonmanagement</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>29.88</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work conditions</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75.88</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonmanagement</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>76.20</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee interaction</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73.06</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonmanagement</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>71.98</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52.64</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonmanagement</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>51.15</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.60</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonmanagement</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wilks’ Lambda .970.

Research Hypotheses 2 & 3

H_2: There will be no difference between organizationally chosen job satisfaction items and those perceived by nonmanagement employees.
The null hypothesis:
\( H_0: \) items identified by nonmanagement as addressed = items identified by personnel as addressed

The alternate hypothesis:
\( H_A: \) items identified by nonmanagement as addressed \( \neq \) items identified by personnel as addressed

\( H_3: \) There will be no difference between organizationally chosen job satisfaction items and those perceived by management representatives.

The null hypothesis:
\( H_0: \) items identified by management as addressed = items identified by personnel as addressed

The alternate hypothesis:
\( H_A: \) items identified by management as addressed \( \neq \) items identified by personnel as addressed

Crosstab calculations were used to determine percentage of agreement. Percentage of agreement was tested on each job satisfaction item to indicate the perception accuracy of whether an item is covered by organizational policy and procedures as determined by human resources. The same test also provided total percentage of disagreement for all participants for each job satisfaction item.

Data collected indicated that hypotheses 2 and 3 should be rejected (see Table 2 below). Management participants were in 100% agreement with their respective human resources representatives for only 4 of the 96. Nonmanagement participants were all in agreement with their respective human resource representatives on none of the 96 items, although one work condition item did report 99.8% agreement for nonmanagement employees. Thirteen of the 96 items fell in the 90-99% range for management participants, and 14 of the items fell in this range for nonmanagement participants. Half of the items (7) were in agreement by both groups. The lowest percentage reported for management participants was 48% for “fairness in determining bonus amounts.” The lowest percentage reported for nonmanagement participants was 45.5% for “having managerial training available to all employees.” Thus, there was a difference between organizationally chosen job satisfaction items and those perceived by management participants, indicating that hypothesis six should be rejected. Also, there was a difference between organizationally chosen job satisfaction items and those perceived by nonmanagement participants, indicating that hypothesis 3 should be rejected. Table 2 provides a list of each survey items grouped by topic with percentage of agreement values, Pearson chi-square values, and \( p \)-values.
Table 2

*Job Satisfaction Items Percent of Agreement With Human Resources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Non-management</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational communication</td>
<td>Having clear rules and instructions available to all employees</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having a clear understanding of products produced by the organization</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>2.618</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearly defined status levels</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>1.577</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear, easy to understand company policies</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being aware of organization's long range plans</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving information in advance about changes that will impact work</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>2.014</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management that insures that employees have a clear understanding of long range plans</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>2.860</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management providing information to all employees</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>2.260</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management that provides employees with clear instructions</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers who communicate the organization's long range plans</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>1.651</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being asked for wants and needs</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>5.249</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management that demonstrates a willingness to act on ideas put forth by any employee</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>1.390</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management being receptive to employees having a voice in their physical working environment</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>.509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2

*(table continues)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Non-management</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational communication (continued)</td>
<td>Management that is receptive to employees having a voice in their physical work location</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>66.40%</td>
<td>2.634</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management that is receptive to hourly employees receiving paid overtime</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>72.</td>
<td>1.788</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management being receptive to opinions from all employees</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>1.688</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee development opportunities</td>
<td>Having a program to help develop employee's career plan</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>2.577</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management that provides employees with opportunity to improve personal abilities and skills</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>6.004</td>
<td>.050 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to work in different areas of the organizations</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having managerial training available to all employees</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having the opportunity to learn useful skills</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a career path within the organization</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>2.053</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having access to a career planning program</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having diversity training available to employees</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management viewing employees as deserving an internal organizational career</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>3.633</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2  
*(table continues)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Non-management</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee development opportunities (continues)</td>
<td>Management believing that employees deserve quality training</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>2.194</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management providing employees with opportunities to improve personal skills and abilities</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having management training available to all employees</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taking management training</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>7.237</td>
<td>.027 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having the opportunity to improve personal skills</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>1.472</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having technical training available to employees</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>1.971</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding career options</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>1.410</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic rewards</td>
<td>Receiving certificates of accomplishments</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving non-monetary rewards for success</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>1.582</td>
<td>.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving formal public recognition</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>1.342</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving letters of recognition</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>1.612</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving recognition for recruiting new employees</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager that praises employees frequently</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>.587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
### Table 2

*(table continues)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Non-management</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic rewards (continued)</strong></td>
<td>Being able to use personally determined methods of doing the job</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having flexible breaks</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working conditions</strong></td>
<td>Casually dressed</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working in an environment where there are no dangerous or unhealth</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working in an environment where there is little possibility of being</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having little noise in the work area</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working in an environment where there is little possibility of</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physically hurting coworkers</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having pleasant working conditions</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having a spacious work environment</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having sufficient lighting in the work area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2

*(table continues)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Non-Management</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions (continued)</td>
<td>Having a well ventilated work area</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having a work area that is a fun work area</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whether you are being overworked</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being required to work more hours than scheduled</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whether you are experiencing mental fatigue</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced workloads</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>2.651</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being able to eat at the workstation</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>4.116</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being able to have water and other drinks at workstation</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>6.635</td>
<td>.036 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having restrooms (toilets) conveniently placed within work area</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having rest areas</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee interaction</td>
<td>Working with cooperative peers</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working with coworkers that are hard workers</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working with coworkers who accept criticism</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>1.577</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2  
*(table continues)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic (Employee interaction (continued))</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Non-management</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with peers that are helpful</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having peers who are honest in work matters</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having co-workers who express sympathy when difficulties develop on the job</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being trusted by peers</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with coworkers who provide support</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>6.271</td>
<td>.043 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with coworkers who recognize when support is needed</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with friendly peers</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>1.293</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not feeling management pressure to conform</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>4.919</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers that ask for ideas</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving peer respect</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a constructive relationship with management</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having management listen to employee ideas</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>1.932</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization demonstrating a concern for community</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2

*(table continues)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Non-management</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>Providing quality products and services</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having a competitive pay system</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>3.717</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairness in determining bonus amounts</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairness in determining pay raise amount</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>1.596</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving compensation based on fair market value</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>5.249</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having a pay system that includes bonus opportunities</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having profit sharing</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>1.695</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regularity of pay</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having dental benefits</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having life insurance</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having medical benefits</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>1.218</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retirement benefits</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2
*(table continues)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Non-management</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation (continued)</td>
<td>Having stock options</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>3.173</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Balance</td>
<td>Child care assistance</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>4.140</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of extended parental leave</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having increased time for family</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having increased leisure activity time</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>2.368</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager that helps employees find a balance between personal and organizational values</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having the opportunity for parental leaves to take care of elder family members</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager demonstrates a concern for the impact a decision will have on families</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having organizational support for family needs</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant @ 0.05
Discussion

A goal of this study was to investigate potential relationships between employee job satisfaction perceptions and those set forth in organizational policies and procedures. A review of the literature revealed a trend toward investigating relationships attributed to an organization’s management team without including nonmanagement employees (e.g., sales representatives, assembly line workers, clerical). It also revealed a trend toward a diversified workforce that includes not only male and female employees but employees from countries other than the United States (e.g., India, Middle East, Europe). This trend suggests that organizations may wish to revisit any studies they previously conducted to refresh their organizational knowledge base with up-to-date job satisfaction information.

Three organizations participated in this study. They represented three different organizational types: sales and service, state government department, and manufacturing. The variety allowed the researcher to investigate employee job satisfaction relationships across three organization types. Two data collection methods were made available to all participating organizations: Internet-completed survey and printed survey.

Conclusions

It could be concluded from this study that group means of importance for job satisfaction topics show no significantly relationship by management – nonmanagement status. Prior to the study the researcher believed that managers would place greater importance on the topics than would nonmanagement employees. The data supported this belief in five of the seven topics. Nonmanagement rated Employee Development Opportunities and Work-life Balance higher than did management employees. However, none of the differences were statistically significant.

Rust et al. (1996) examined the job satisfaction of frontline workers. Topics addressed included work design, work conditions, benefits, and supervision. They found that a person’s overall satisfaction is driven by his or her satisfaction with the organization’s managerial process. The study also indicated that compensation was not a strong predictor of job satisfaction. The current study looks at these topics, but not from the aspect of asking “how satisfied the person is” but with “how important the topic is” to them.

This study also did not ask for the participants’ feelings toward their supervisors. Therefore, the findings from this study cannot directly compare with the study conducted by Rust et al. (1996); however, it can be noted that both management and nonmanagement participants in this study rated compensation as being most important of the seven topics, which may be seen as supporting the prior research.

Hackman and Oldham (1976), Hannay and Northam (2000), Locke (1976), and Rust et al. (1996) indicated that employees’ desires are perceived as being satisfied when the organization meets or exceeds their expectations. Employee interaction and organizational communication (in this research) are respectively the second and third highest rating topics of the seven addressed by this study. This supports earlier findings.

It could be concluded that considerable numbers of employees could experience an increased knowledge base as relates to the employee services addressed by their organizational policies and procedures. Over 40 years experience working for various organizations lead the researcher to believe that few employees at any level within the organization are actually aware of the benefits their organization provides them. The data strongly support this pre-study
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perception. A quick examination of the data analyzing employee percentage of agreement with human resources reveals some fairly small numbers for all three organizations. There is no item in which all participants are 100% in agreement with their respective organization.

Clearly, a large number of employees in the three organizations either have a misunderstanding as to what the organizational policies and procedures address or there is a considerable lack of knowledge. Thus the pre-study perception is supported.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are not listed in order of importance. Order of importance must be determined by the individual organizations and the situations they face.

This study provides a foundation for future research related to job satisfaction factors as perceived by employees at the start of the 1st decade of the 3rd millennium. However, the limited number of organizations and overall participants in this study prevents strong generalizations from being made. This study needs to be repeated several times, involving many types of organizations providing various products and services before generalizations of job satisfaction perceptions can be made.

The large influx of international students who remain in the United States and join the workforce and the increasing number of Internet-linked global organizations suggest additional paths for research. For example, what is the national residence of participants and thus the potential cultural impact on the perceived importance of various job satisfaction topics and items? Several years experience having internationals as employees, by this researcher, brought to light the fact that culture definitely impacts the individual’s perception of needs.

The researcher is not aware of any similar study that has investigated job satisfaction in the manner followed by this study. Thus, it serves to provide a starting point for future research that may help an organization to identify the direction that discussions could take to move the organization toward classification as a learning organization. Whether documented or not, every organization possesses a knowledge base. Whether an organization evolves and becomes an example for others to follow or whether it de-evolves into history to be one of the many organizations that is forgotten, the knowledge base continues to grow. The question for each organization is whether its knowledge base will be left to gather dust or will become a source of information that is analyzed and used to grow the organization and to make it a place where people want to work.

Handy (1995) stated that “the learning organization is built upon an assumption of competence that is supported by four other qualities or characteristics: curiosity, forgiveness, trust and togetherness” (p. 46). Handy also suggested that trust provides a foundation for the other qualities or characteristics.

A key component to developing and maintaining trust in an organization is communication, especially if it is unrestricted in nature. Participants in this study reported a mean importance level equal to 82% of the potential value for the topic of Organizational Communication. Study participants supported the idea that organizational communication is very important. This was further supported by a similar rating (82%) for Employee Interaction, a key requirement for both communication and trust. Equally important to trust between the management team and employees is the presence of trust among coworkers. Trust at both levels is not a constant. All employees at all levels must work at keeping and building trust. This goes along with Nonaka’s (1991) perception that an organization is a living organism, and, like any
living organism, the organization must continue to evolve, be it into something greater or into extinction.

Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, and Smith (1994) described the forward evolutionary process as one of creating new ideas (theories), putting them into action, and perceiving new ideas based on the learning experience. It is obvious to this researcher that, not only did the study participants indicate that the topics of Organizational Communication and Employee Interaction were important, but that they want to participate in the growth process.

Deming (1993) noted that all human beings possess an inner drive to learn and to improve. A learning organization takes advantage of this internal drive by providing opportunities for employees to develop their potential and therefore their value to the organization as a whole. Opportunity for Employee Development received a rating of 78% of potential. Clearly, personal development is as important to the employee as it is to the evolution of the organizational organism.

As suggested earlier, the workforce is becoming international. While many U. S.-based companies may not have locations scattered around the globe, they are becoming “inter-culturalized” through the employees they hire. This can result in distrust for the organization if open communication and interaction are not fostered among employees. Efforts should be made to educate all employees about the cultures that contribute to the organization. Only through mutual understanding can employees work as a team and achieve a high level of trust and job satisfaction needed for their own peace of mind.

Data collected for this study treated all employees as equals, regardless of their cultural background. If four employees make up a team and one is from Southeast Asia, one from the Mediterranean area, one from New York, and the fourth from Mississippi, the team must deal with four different cultures. A culture is not synonymous with the borders of a country. How does an organization provide culture-based training for its employees? By doing what this study did with three organizations, an organization can ask questions of its individual employees. An organization that does not ask questions of its employees is ignoring an important resource. However, as previously mentioned, this is only the first step. Action and experiential learning must follow if an organization is to realize the value of its internal potential.
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