

Determinants of Job Satisfaction of Municipal Government Employees

Mark C. Ellickson and Kay Logsdon

ORGANIZATIONAL SCHOLARS have long been interested in why some people report being very satisfied with their jobs and others express much lower levels of satisfaction (Locke 1976). The drive to understand and explain job satisfaction has been motivated by utilitarian reasons (e.g., to increase productivity and organizational commitment, lower absenteeism and turnover, and ultimately, increase organizational effectiveness) as well as humanitarian interests (i.e., the notion that employees deserve to be treated with respect and have their psychological and physical well-being maximized). Satisfied workers also tend to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors; that is, altruistic behaviors that exceed the formal requirements of a job (Schnake 1991; Organ and Ryan 1995). Dissatisfied workers show an increased propensity for counterproductive behaviors, including withdrawal, burnout, and workplace aggression (Spector 1997).

Despite researchers' and practitioners' interest in job satisfaction among workers generally, few studies have sought to explain variation in job satisfaction among government employees, especially municipal employees, one of the fastest-growing sectors of the U.S. workforce. Over 11 million people

are currently employed by local governments throughout the United States (Burns et al. 1998), an increase of over 20 percent in the past 10 years according to the 1999 *Statistical Abstract of the United States*. Moreover, the continued devolution of federal power to the state and local levels assures the continued growth of the municipal employee sector for years to come (Starling 1998).

Most studies assume that the work motivations and attitudes of those employed in the public sector are essentially the same as those of their private-sector counterparts (Perry and Wise 1990). Yet, public management scholars often make sharp distinctions between public- and private-sector employees in terms of their organizational behavior and motivational profiles (Vasu, Stewart, and Garson 1998).

In this article, we employ regression analysis to test the relative influence of 11 environmental variables and 3 demographic factors on variation in job satisfaction among local government employees. Job satisfaction was defined and measured as overall job satisfaction, not as satisfaction with various facets of the job. Over 50 percent of the variation in job satisfaction among municipal employees is explained using this model.

Literature Review and Research Expectations

Job satisfaction is commonly defined as the extent to which employees like their work (Agho, Mueller, and Price 1993), an attitude based on employee perceptions (negative or positive) of their job or work environment (Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell 1991; Pool 1997). Most efforts to explain job satisfaction have been dominated by the person-environment fit paradigm (Mottaz 1985; Kristof 1996; Brief 1998). Simply stated, the more a person's work environment fulfills his or her needs, values, or personal characteristics, the greater the degree of job satisfaction. In terms of job satisfaction, the person-environment fit approach has been applied to studies of need fulfillment (Maslow 1954; Herzberg 1968; Stone 1992), job characteristics (Hackman and Oldham 1980), met expectations (Wanous et al. 1992), value attainment (Locke 1976; 1984; Mottaz 1985), equity (Adams 1963; Vecchio 1982; Witt and Nye 1992; Mowday 1996), organizational justice (Greenberg 1990; McFarlin and Sweeney 1992; Sheppard, Lewicki, and Minton 1992; Trevino 1992; Cropanzano and Folger 1996), and personal traits (Brush, Mock, and Poo-yan 1987; Arvey et al. 1989; Watson and Slack 1993; Motowidlo 1996; Ganzach 1998).

Regardless of the theoretical approach used to study job satisfaction, most studies have identified at least two general categories of antecedent variables: environmental factors and personal characteristics (see Zeffane 1994, 61; Spector 1997, 30). Environmental antecedents of job satisfaction pertain to factors associated with the work itself or work environment. Personal factors focus on individual attributes and characteristics.

Environmental Antecedents

Previous studies of job satisfaction have identified a number of important environmental antecedents. An abundance of literature links extrinsic rewards such as promotional opportunities (Price and Mueller 1981; Blegen

and Mueller 1987; Ting 1997; Iverson and Maguire 2000) and pay (Liou, Sylvia, and Brunk 1990; Ting 1997; Blau 1999) to increased job satisfaction. The impact of fringe benefits on job satisfaction has been less frequently examined, although available research strongly suggests that a positive relationship exists (Barber, Dunham, and Formisano 1992).

Extrinsic rewards have sometimes been characterized as "investments" that an organization uses to help strengthen ties between itself and its employees (Behn 1995). According to Romzek (1990), "investments" in the public sector usually focus on opportunities for career development, performance bonuses and salary, and various benefits (e.g., vacation and sick leave, medical plan, and retirement benefits). Based on a review of the literature, we propose the following three hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Satisfaction with opportunities for promotions is positively related to overall job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2: Satisfaction with pay is positively related to overall job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3: Satisfaction with fringe benefits is positively related to overall job satisfaction.

Research by Peters, O'Connor, and Eulberg (1985) and Peters and O'Connor (1988) indicates that organizational obstacles or constraints such as inadequate tools and equipment, insufficient training, cramped workspaces, unsafe work environments, and uneven workload distributions among coworkers may be important predictor variables of employee attitudes, motivation, and performance. Most studies in this area have focused primarily on the adverse effect of constraints on organizational performance, but a few have examined the influence of organizational constraints on employee job satisfaction (Eulberg et al. 1984). In their study of bank employees, Brown and Mitchell (1993) documented numerous significant negative links between var-

ious organizational obstacles and employee job satisfaction. Furthermore, the literature concerning total quality management (TQM) is clear on the importance of removing all organizational obstacles to optimizing organizational performance and employee attitudes (Deming 1986; Walton 1986). Thus, we hypothesize that the perceived absence of organizational obstacles in the work environment will have a positive effect on job satisfaction. In other words, the fewer the obstacles, the higher the job satisfaction:

Hypothesis 4: Overall job satisfaction is positively influenced by employee perceptions of adequate work equipment and resources.

Hypothesis 5: Overall job satisfaction is positively influenced by employee perceptions of sufficient physical workspace.

Hypothesis 6: Overall job satisfaction is positively influenced by employee perceptions of a safe work environment.

Hypothesis 7: Overall job satisfaction is positively influenced by employee perceptions of adequate training or training opportunities.

Hypothesis 8: Overall job satisfaction is positively influenced by employee perceptions of an evenly distributed workload among coworkers.

As Hopkins (1983, 56) observes, "The nature of supervision in the workplace is defined by the relationship between the individual employee and the immediate supervisor." Numerous studies have shown that positive relationships between supervisors and subordinates contribute to higher levels of job satisfaction (Kahn 1972; Locke 1976; Daley 1986; Nachmias 1988; Emmert and Taher 1992). Recently, Ting (1997) reported that government employees who enjoyed a supportive relationship with their immediate supervisor experienced higher levels of job satisfaction than those who did not. For purposes of this study, we anticipate that as the quality of supervision increases, employee job satisfaction will also increase:

Hypothesis 9: Satisfaction with one's immediate supervisor is positively related to overall job satisfaction.

Although organizational scholars have long discussed the conditions necessary for maximizing an employee's sense of equity and fairness in the workplace (Adams 1963), rarely has this debate been extended to include the performance appraisal process and subsequent job satisfaction (Daley 1986). In a recent longitudinal study of medical technicians, Blau (1999) reexamines the importance of performance appraisal satisfaction on job satisfaction, presenting persuasive evidence of a significant, positive relationship between employee performance appraisal satisfaction and overall job satisfaction. We therefore propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 10: Satisfaction with employee performance appraisal is positively related to overall job satisfaction.

Work group esprit de corps is also a relatively new variable linked to job satisfaction. Sometimes categorized under the general heading of work group characteristics, work group esprit de corps refers specifically to the extent to which members take pride in their work group (Jones and James 1979). Work group esprit de corps has also been discussed as a vital component of an organization's psychological climate (James and James 1992), which in turn is thought to influence employee job satisfaction. Finally, the notion that interpersonal relations among workers may lead to certain group dynamics, which in turn affect organizational productivity and job satisfaction, can be traced to the human relations approach and its focus on the "human factor" in the workplace (Roethlisberger and Dickson 1939; Roethlisberger 1941). We anticipate that work group (or departmental) esprit de corps will be a significant determinant of employee job satisfaction:

Hypothesis 11: Employee feelings of departmental esprit de corps are positively related to overall job satisfaction.

Personal Characteristics

The second most commonly investigated source of variation in job satisfaction pertains to the demographic characteristics of the employees themselves. Many researchers also believe that individual attributes serve to moderate the relationship between environmental factors and job satisfaction and should therefore be included as control variables in any model of job satisfaction. Historically, it has generally been assumed that females express lower levels of job satisfaction than do males (Smith, Kendall, and Hulin 1969), but more recent research consistently reports no relationship of gender to overall job satisfaction (Murray and Atkinson 1981; Summers and DeCotiis 1988; Ting 1997; Ganzach 1998; Smith, Smits, and Hoy 1998). Tait, Padgett, and Baldwin (1989) used metanalysis techniques to trace the absence of gender differences in job satisfaction to the mid-1970s, when men and women began to approach parity in the types of organizational positions held (e.g., administrative and professional). Consequently, we hypothesize that there will be no differences in job satisfaction based on gender (i.e., null hypothesis):

Hypothesis 12: Employee gender is not associated with overall job satisfaction.

Employee age is another potential antecedent of job satisfaction that has been frequently analyzed in the literature. Bedeian, Ferris, and Kacmar (1992) argue that increased employee age is likely to be associated with enhanced positions of organizational authority, prestige, status, and confidence—all potential contributors to job satisfaction in and of themselves. Others believe that older employees are more likely than younger employees to have established a better person-environment fit resulting in higher job satisfaction (Lewis 1991). However, overall, previous research is inconsistent regarding the effects of age on job satisfaction. Although numerous studies have reported a positive relationship between age and job satisfaction (Blegen and Mueller 1987; Liou,

Sylvia, and Brunk 1990; Blau 1999), others have identified either no relationship (Ting 1997; Reiner and Zhao 1999) or a significant negative relationship (Ganzach 1998). Even though research results regarding the relationship between employee age and job satisfaction are inconsistent, we propose the following research hypothesis:

Hypothesis 13: Employee age is positively related to overall job satisfaction.

Finally, we include a variable in the model representing job level or status in the organization (i.e., nonsupervisory versus supervisory/management). Based on previous research, it appears that job level is positively correlated with job satisfaction (Cranny, Smith, and Stone 1992, 45–52). Higher-level positions are usually associated with higher pay, autonomy, responsibility, promotion prospects, and better overall working conditions. Recently, a metanalysis examining the relationship between job level and job satisfaction using data from 35 independent samples and over 18,000 respondents concluded that as job level increased, so did job satisfaction (Robie et al. 1998). Thus, we propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 14: Job level is positively related to overall job satisfaction.

Data and Measures

To test our hypotheses on factors influencing variation in job satisfaction, we used data collected from a survey of 1,227 full-time municipal employees representing 18 departments and serving an area population of approximately 200,000 in the midwestern region of the United States. The survey was administered by an outside research consultant to city employees during regular work hours. Employees unable to complete the survey during the scheduled time were allowed to complete the surveys at a later time in their offices (or at home) and were provided with a preaddressed, stamped envelope. The survey was conducted in 1999, and the overall response rate was 91 percent.

The questionnaire was designed to assess employee perceptions about 11 different aspects of the workplace, including equipment and resources, physical workspace, safe work environment, training, workload, departmental esprit de corps, pay, benefits, promotional opportunities, performance appraisal, and supervision. In addition, demographic information regarding employee gender, age, and job level (supervisory versus nonsupervisory) was also collected. Except for the demographic questions, research participants were asked to respond to survey questions using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (“strongly agree”) to 5 (“strongly disagree”) or 1 (“very satisfied”) to 5 (“very dissatisfied”), depending on the question. Gender and job level were dummy coded, and age was coded such that 1 = 18–29 years old, 2 = 30–49 years old, and 3 = 50 years old or older.

Two of the study variables were constructed from answers to multiple questions on the survey. Specifically, performance appraisal satisfaction was measured by asking employees about their satisfaction with five aspects of their most recent performance appraisal: timeliness, amount of feedback, perceived accuracy, perceived consequences, and usefulness. The reliability of this scale was assessed by Cronbach’s alpha, which yielded a reliability coefficient of .81. “Leader satisfaction” assessed the degree to which employees perceived their supervisor as motivating, providing clear work expectations, willing to listen, and willing to share authority and responsibility. Cronbach alpha produced a reliability coefficient of .90 for this scale. Measurement descriptions of the dependent and independent variables are presented in Table 1.

The measure of overall job satisfaction was derived from answers to the question, “What is your level of overall satisfaction with your job?” expressed on a five-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 (“very satisfied”) to 5 (“very dissatisfied”). Although we recognize that many job satisfaction measures incorporate multiple items, there is evidence that the con-

struct validity of a single-item measure may be higher than that of a multiple-item measure (Scarpello and Campbell 1983), with no serious loss in reliability (Wanous and Reichers 1996; Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy 1997). The distribution of responses on the job satisfaction scale were skewed somewhat in the positive direction (mean = 2.48), with 12 percent of respondents indicating they were “very satisfied”; 49 percent were “satisfied”; 22 percent said they were “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied”; 11 percent rated themselves as “dissatisfied”; and 6 percent of respondents were “very dissatisfied” with their job.

Results

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among study variables are presented in Table 2. Tests for multicollinearity revealed that no pair of independent variables was correlated above .60, and regression of each independent variable on all remaining independent variables revealed no coefficient of determination (R^2) stronger than .43. According to Lewis-Beck (1980) and Berry and Feldman (1985), such results indicate that multicollinearity was not a problem in this study.

Using ordinary least-squares regression, we included the dependent variable (i.e., overall job satisfaction) in an equation with the 11 independent variables and the 3 control variables (see Table 3). Both standardized (B) and unstandardized (b) regression coefficients are reported to show the relative contribution and predictive power of each factor. The overall model for job satisfaction has a strong R^2 value of .522 and an adjusted R^2 value of .516.

The analysis revealed that 9 of the 11 environmental variables were statistically significant factors of job satisfaction. Moreover, all 9 of these independent variables affected the dependent variable in the direction hypothesized. In contrast, only 1 of the 3 personal attributes emerged as a significant predictor of job satisfaction, although the

Table 1: Definitions of Variables Used to Measure Job Satisfaction

Variable	Question/Statement Used to Define Variable
Dependent	
Job satisfaction	"What is your level of overall satisfaction with your job?"
Environmental	
Equipment and resources	"I have the necessary equipment and resources to do my job well."
Physical space	"I have enough physical space to do my job well."
Safe environment	"The city takes proper precautions to ensure a safe workplace."
Training	"I receive the training I need to perform my job well."
Workload	"The workload in my department is evenly distributed."
Departmental esprit de corps	"I am proud to tell people that I work for my department."
Pay	"Overall, how satisfied are you with your pay?"
Benefits	"Overall, how satisfied are you with your benefits?"
Promotional opportunities	"What is your level of satisfaction with your promotion or career opportunities in your present position?"
Performance appraisal ^a	Index formed from responses to five Likert-scaled statements/question: "I get enough feedback about my performance." "The form my department uses accurately evaluates my performance." "My performance appraisal is conducted on time each year." "My job performance has improved as a result of the performance appraisal process." "How useful was the feedback you received at your most recent performance review?"
Supervisor ^b	Index formed from responses to four Likert-scaled statements: "Listens to employees' suggestions and ideas for improvement." "Allows employees the authority and responsibility to do their jobs well." "Motivates you to look for better ways to perform your job." "Provides clear expectations regarding your work."
Demographic	
Gender	1 = female; 2 = male
Job level	1 = nonsupervisory; 2 = supervisory/management
Age	1 = 18–29 years old; 2 = 30–49 years old; 3 = >50 years old

^a Cronbach alpha = .81. ^b Cronbach alpha = .90.

Note: All variables (except demographic factors) were measured using a five-point Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 ("strongly agree") to 5 ("strongly disagree") or 1 ("very satisfied") to 5 ("very dissatisfied"), depending on the question.

impact of gender was successfully stated in the null. All in all, 10 of the 14 independent variables in our model demonstrated significant effects on job satisfaction with respect to our sample of municipal government employees.

As hypothesized, the availability of promotional opportunities ($B = .20, p < .001$), satisfaction with pay ($B = .16, p < .001$), and satisfaction with benefits ($B = .09, p < .001$) exerted powerful effects on job satisfaction. Aside from departmental pride, these three factors were among the model's most important predictors of job satisfaction. The strength of these three factors lends strong support to

the importance of extrinsic rewards (or "investments") in the development of municipal employee job satisfaction.

Hypotheses 4 through 8 examined the relationship between various organizational obstacles/constraints and overall job satisfaction. Of the five obstacles/constraints tested, three were found to have moderately significant effects on job satisfaction: equipment and resources ($B = .07, p < .01$), training ($B = .06, p < .01$), and workload ($B = .05, p < .05$). In other words, as employee perceptions of work equipment and resources, training opportunities, and workload distribution improved, so did overall job satisfaction. On

Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations of Study Variables

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Equipment and resources	2.60	1.15	—														
2. Physical space	2.54	1.23	.41	—													
3. Safe environment	2.59	1.07	.46	.28	—												
4. Training	2.45	1.11	.34	.23	.36	—											
5. Workload	3.14	1.22	.23	.19	.26	.28	—										
6. Departmental pride	2.14	1.11	.26	.21	.37	.32	.31	—									
7. Pay	3.33	1.15	.28	.21	.30	.18	.21	.26	—								
8. Benefits	2.98	1.14	.35	.22	.40	.20	.21	.26	.58	—							
9. Promotional opportunities	3.25	1.18	.19	.14	.24	.25	.31	.45	.34	.25	—						
10. Performance appraisal	2.68	.83	.27	.18	.30	.35	.34	.43	.21	.25	.41	—					
11. Supervision	2.32	.99	.26	.17	.30	.41	.35	.49	.19	.36	.36	.59	—				
12. Gender	1.71	.45	.10	-.01	.11	.07	.02	.12	.22	.23	-.05	.06	.08	—			
13. Job level	1.23	.42	-.04	.01	-.11	-.07	-.02	-.14	-.10	-.09	-.12	.03	-.02	.08	—		
14. Age	2.02	.61	-.07	-.02	-.03	.09	-.02	.04	-.10	-.06	.14	.09	.12	-.04	.15	—	
15. Job satisfaction	2.48	1.03	.31	.22	.34	.35	.34	.59	.43	.39	.53	.46	.46	.13	-.12	.03	—

N = 1,227.

Note: Absolute values of correlations $\geq .06$ are significant at the .05 level or higher (two-tailed tests).

the other hand, job satisfaction decreased as employee perceptions regarding these three factors declined. However, the amount of physical workspace and perceptions of safety in the work environment did not reach levels of statistical significance in the model.

Hypothesis 9, regarding the impact of supervision on job satisfaction, was confirmed by our results ($B = .07$, $p < .01$). As satisfaction with one's immediate supervisor increased, so did job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with Ting's (1997) observation that good relations with one's immediate supervisor will have a significant effect on employee job satisfaction.

A strong positive relationship between performance appraisal satisfaction and job satisfaction ($B = .10$, $p < .001$) was also confirmed by our results (see Hypothesis 10). This finding provides additional evidence of the need for municipal governments to develop evaluation processes that are perceived

as fair and equitable by their employees (Roberts 1998). Because satisfaction is influenced by factors such as employee perceptions of the performance appraisal's timeliness, accuracy, usefulness, and feedback procedures (Dobbins, Cardy, and Platz-Vieno 1990), research focusing on rater appraisal training, accountability, and communications may provide clues about how government officials can develop a sense of fairness in this process (Bretz, Milkovich, and Read 1992; Mero and Motowidlo 1995; Roberts 1998; Kikoski 1999).

As predicted in Hypothesis 11, employee feelings of departmental esprit de corps were significantly (and positively) related to overall job satisfaction. However, the impact of departmental pride is notable, given that its influence on job satisfaction ($B = .32$, $p < .001$) was at least twice that of any other variable in the model, with the exception of promotional opportunities ($B = .20$). These results

Table 3: Summary of Multiple Regression Results: Effect of Environmental Antecedents and Personal Characteristics on Overall Job Satisfaction

Variables	B	b	Probability*
Promotional opportunities	.20	.172	.000
Pay	.16	.140	.000
Benefits	.09	.082	.000
Equipment and resources	.07	.057	.009
Physical space	-.01	-.003	.451
Safe environment	-.04	-.040	.063
Training	.06	.059	.007
Workload	.05	.044	.018
Supervision	.07	.072	.010
Performance appraisal	.10	.122	.000
Departmental pride	.32	.292	.000
Gender	.02	.043	.213
Age	-.01	-.008	.423
Job level	-.04	-.099	.037
Intercept		-.149	.358
R ²	.522		
Adjusted R ²	.516		
F	79.24		
Probability	.0001		

N = 1,227.

*One-tailed probability.

suggest that an organization's social environment can affect employee job satisfaction, especially coworker interaction (Salancik and Pfeffer 1978).

Finally, results from the regression analysis indicate that gender plays an insignificant role in explaining variation in the dependent variable (see Hypothesis 12). Contrary to expectations, age had no effect on job satisfaction levels of municipal employees (see Hypothesis 13); however, as projected in Hypothesis 14, job level was a significant predictor of job satisfaction ($B = -.04, p < .05$). Specifically, supervisors, managers, and department heads expressed higher levels of satisfaction than did nonsupervisory personnel, all other factors held constant. However, it should be noted that job level was the least powerful of the 10 antecedent variables that obtained significance in the model.

Discussion and Conclusion

Municipal employees' job satisfaction has not been examined as much as that of private- or other public-sector workers, but emerging political dynamics (such as the ongoing devolution of power from federal to local levels) indicate a need to redress this imbalance. Of the effects of environmental antecedent variables and personal attributes on job satisfaction hypothesized here, 11 were confirmed, including support for the null hypothesis of no gender differences in overall levels of job satisfaction (see Smith, Smits, and Hoy 1998). Just over 50 percent of the variation in job satisfaction among municipal employees was explained using this model.

Of the 14 independent variables entered into the model, departmental pride clearly emerged as the most powerful determinant of variation in overall job satisfaction among municipal employees. The significance of work group esprit de corps in this model reflects the importance that social relations in the workplace can have on employee attitudes such as job satisfaction. Although additional research will be needed to identify the determinants of departmental pride, preliminary research suggests that this factor is part of a larger psychological climate that includes cooperation and friendliness among work group members, a perception that group members produce work of a quality and quantity higher than that of other groups in the organization, and the existence of open lines of communication and trust among all members of the department (Jones and James 1979).

Consistent with previous research conducted in both the public and private sectors, job satisfaction of municipal government employees is significantly influenced by perceptions of employee satisfaction with promotional opportunities, pay, and fringe benefits. In particular, promotional opportunities—the second most powerful determinant of employee job satisfaction—played a major role in the model. This fact merits special attention, as opportunities for career advancement

within many local governments are limited because of the civil-service nature of personnel systems that rely heavily on rules of seniority for promotion and career advancement (Starling 1998).

Satisfaction with the performance appraisal process as well as good relationships with supervisors significantly affect overall job satisfaction of municipal government employees. These results suggest that local governments should strive to eliminate discomfort and distrust of the performance appraisal process and develop work environments that foster mutually trustworthy relationships with supervisors, perhaps through better communication and employee empowerment (e.g., delegation of power from supervisors to subordinates, power sharing, participative management).

Organizational factors—that is, having adequate work equipment, resources, and training opportunities and an equitable workload distribution—also significantly and positively affect employee job satisfaction. Removing organizational obstacles sends a message that management cares; not doing so reinforces employee beliefs that management is unwilling to improve the work environment, thereby contributing to reduced levels of employee satisfaction, motivation, and commitment to the organization (Brown and Mitchell 1993). Moreover, our study indicates that job satisfaction among municipal employees hinges predominately on environmental factors associated with the workplace rather than personal attributes (i.e., gender, age) that employees bring to the work place. Because the public sector is so labor intensive, any increases in job satisfaction and productivity will depend heavily on achieving a good employee-environment fit.

In conclusion, further research is required to assess the applicability of these findings to the general population of municipal employees. Longitudinal studies are needed to offset the disadvantages of cross-sectional designs. Future research should seek to expand the pool of potential explanatory variables

and apply additional control variables. To facilitate a more comprehensive understanding of job satisfaction within the municipal government context, causal models need to be constructed to examine the impact of job satisfaction on variables such as intent to resign, turnover, commitment, counterproductive behaviors, and organizational citizenship behaviors. The present study provides a starting point for additional research using multivariate models to predict and explain variation in job satisfaction among municipal employees.

Mark Ellickson is an associate professor in the MPA program at Southwest Missouri State University. He also serves as a consultant to local governments. His current research focuses on job satisfaction and motivation in the public sector. His work has appeared in the *Journal of Political Science*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, *Midsouth Political Science Journal*, *Midsouth Political Science Review*, *Political Research Quarterly*, *Southeastern Political Review*, and *Women & Politics*.

Kay Logsdon is public information director for the City of Springfield, Missouri. Her responsibilities include coordinating and planning the city's annual employee and citizen surveys. She has served on numerous state-wide and national committees focusing on local government management and communications.

References

- Adams, J. 1963. Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 67: 422–36.
- Agho, A., C. Mueller, and J. Price. 1993. Determinants of employee job satisfaction: An empirical test of a causal model. *Human Relations* 46: 1007–27.
- Arvey, R., T. Bouchard, N. Segal, and L. Abraham. 1989. Job satisfaction: Environmental and genetic components. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 74: 187–92.
- Barber, A., R. Dunham, and R. Formisano. 1992. The impact of flexible benefits on employee satisfaction: A field study. *Personnel Psychology* 45: 55–75.

- Bedeian, A., G. Ferris, and K. Kacmar. 1992. Age, tenure, and job satisfaction: A tale of two perspectives. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 40: 33–48.
- Behn, R. 1995. The big questions of public management. *Public Administration Review* 55: 313–24.
- Berry, W., and S. Feldman. 1985. *Understanding regression assumptions*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Blau, G. 1999. Testing the longitudinal impact of work variables and performance appraisal satisfaction on subsequent overall job satisfaction. *Human Relations* 52: 1099–113.
- Blegen, M., and C. Mueller. 1987. Nurses' job satisfaction: A longitudinal analysis. *Research in Nursing & Health* 10: 227–37.
- Bretz, R., G. Milkovich, and W. Read. 1992. The current state of performance appraisal research and practice: Concerns, directions and implications. *Journal of Management* 18: 321–52.
- Brief, A. 1998. *Attitudes in and around organizations*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Brown, K., and T. Mitchell. 1993. Organizational obstacles: Links with financial performance, customer satisfaction, and job satisfaction in a service environment. *Human Relations* 46: 725–57.
- Brush, D., M. Mock, and A. Pooyan. 1987. Individual demographic differences and job satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Behavior* 8: 139–55.
- Burns, J., J. Peltason, T. Cronin, and D. Magleby. 1998. *State and local politics*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Cranny, C., P. Smith, and E. Stone, eds. 1992. *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Cropanzano, R., and R. Folger. 1996. Procedural justice and worker motivation. In *Motivation and leadership at work*, 72–83. R. M. Steers, L. W. Porter, and G. A. Bigley, eds. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Daley, D. 1986. Humanistic management and organizational success: The effect of job and work environment characteristics on organizational effectiveness, public responsiveness, and job satisfaction. *Public Personnel Management* 15: 131–42.
- Deming, W. 1986. *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Study.
- Dobbins, G., R. Cardy, and S. Platz-Vieno. 1990. A contingency approach to appraisal satisfaction: An initial investigation of the joint effects of organizational and appraisal characteristics. *Journal of Management* 16: 619–32.
- Emmert, M., and W. Taher. 1992. Public sector professionals: The effects of public sector jobs on motivation, job satisfaction and work involvement. *American Review of Public Administration* 22: 37–48.
- Eulberg, J., E. O'Connor, L. Peters, and T. Watson. 1984. Performance constraints: A selective review of relevant literature. *Psychological Documents* (microfiche).
- Ganzach, Y. 1998. Intelligence and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal* 41: 526–39.
- Greenberg, J. 1990. Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management* 16: 399–432.
- Hackman, J., and G. Oldham. 1980. *Work redesign*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Herzberg, F. 1968. One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review* 46: 53–62.
- Hopkins, A. 1983. *Work and job satisfaction in the public sector*. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Allanheld.
- Iverson, R., and C. Maguire. 2000. The relationship between job and life satisfaction: Evidence from a remote mining community. *Human Relations* 53: 807–39.
- James, L., and L. James. 1992. Psychological climate and affect: Test of a hierarchical dynamic model. In *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*, 89–117. C. J. Cranny, P. C. Smith, and E. F. Stone, eds. New York: Lexington Books.
- Jones, A., and L. James. 1979. Psychological climate: Dimensions and relationships of individual and aggregated work environment perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 23: 201–50.
- Kahn, R. 1972. The meaning of work: Interpretation and proposals for measurement. In *The human meaning of social change*, 159–203. A. Campbell and P. E. Converse, eds. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kikoski, J. 1999. Effective communication in the performance appraisal interview. *Public Personnel Management* 28: 301–22.
- Kristof, A. 1996. Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology* 49: 1–49.
- Lewis, G. 1991. Turnover and the quiet crisis in the federal civil service. *Public Administration Review* 51: 145–55.
- Lewis-Beck, M. 1980. *Applied regression*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- Liou, K., R. Sylvia, and G. Brunk. 1990. Non-work factors and job satisfaction revisited. *Human Relations* 43: 77–86.
- Locke, E. 1976. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, 1297–349. M. D. Dunette, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- . 1984. Job satisfaction. In *Social psychology and organizational behavior*. M. Gruneberg and T. Wall, eds. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Maslow, A. 1954. *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McFarlin, D., and P. Sweeney. 1992. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal* 35: 626–37.
- Mero, N., and S. Motowidlo. 1995. Effects of rater accountability on the accuracy and the favorability of

- performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 80: 517–24.
- Motowidlo, S. 1996. Orientation toward the job and organization. In *Individual differences and behavior in organizations*, 175–208. K. R. Murphy, ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mottaz, C. 1985. The relative importance of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards as determinants of work satisfaction. *Sociological Quarterly* 26: 365–85.
- Mowday, R. 1996. Equity theory predictions of behavior in organizations. In *Motivation and leadership at work*, 53–71. R. M. Steers, L. W. Porter, and G. A. Bigley, eds. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Murray, M., and T. Atkinson. 1981. Gender differences in correlates of job satisfaction. *Canadian Journal of Behavior Science* 13: 44–52.
- Nachmias, D. 1988. The quality of work life in the federal bureaucracy: Conceptualization and measurement. *American Review of Public Administration* 18: 165–73.
- Organ, D., and K. Ryan. 1995. A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology* 48: 775–802.
- Perry, J., and L. Wise. 1990. The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review* 50: 367–73.
- Peters, L., and E. O'Connor. 1988. Measuring work obstacles: Procedures, issues, and implications. In *Facilitating work effectiveness*, 105–24. F. D. Schoorman and B. Schneider, eds. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.
- Peters, L., E. O'Connor, and J. Eulberg. 1985. Situational constraints: Sources, consequences, and future considerations. In *Research in personnel and human resources management*, 79–113. K. M. Rowland and G. R. Ferris, eds. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.
- Pool, S. 1997. The relationship of job satisfaction with substitutes of leadership, leadership behavior, and work motivation. *Journal of Psychology* 131: 271–83.
- Price, J., and C. Mueller. 1981. A causal model of turnover for nurses. *Academy of Management Journal* 24: 543–65.
- Reilly, C., J. Chatman, and D. Caldwell. 1991. People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organizational fit. *Academy of Management Journal* 34: 487–516.
- Reiner, M., and J. Zhao. 1999. The determinants of job satisfaction among United States Air Force security police. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* (summer): 5–18.
- Roberts, G. 1998. Perspectives on enduring and emerging issues in performance appraisal. *Public Personnel Management* 27: 301–20.
- Robie, C., A. Ryan, R. Schmieder, L. Parra, and P. Smith. 1998. The relation between job level and job satisfaction. *Group & Organizational Management* 23: 470–95.
- Roethlisberger, F. 1941. The Hawthorne experiments. In *Classics of organizational behavior*. W. E. Nattmeyer and J. S. Goldberg, eds. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers.
- Roethlisberger, F., and W. Dickson. 1939. *Management and the worker*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Romzek, B. 1990. Employee investment and commitment: The ties that bind. *Public Administration Review* 50: 374–82.
- Salancik, G., and J. Pfeffer. 1978. A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 23: 224–53.
- Scarpello, V., and J. Campbell. 1983. Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there? *Personnel Psychology* 36: 577–600.
- Schnake, M. 1991. Organizational citizenship: A review, proposed model, and research agenda. *Human Relations* 44: 735–59.
- Sheppard, B., R. Lewicki, and J. Minton. 1992. *Organizational justice: The search for fairness in the workplace*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Smith, P., L. Kendall, and C. Hulin. 1969. *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Smith, P., S. Smits, and F. Hoy. 1998. Employee work attitudes: The subtle influence of gender. *Human Relations* 51: 649–66.
- Spector, P. 1997. *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Starling, G. 1998. *Managing the public sector*. Fort Worth, Tex.: Harcourt Brace.
- Stone, E. 1992. A critical analysis of social information processing: Models of job perceptions and job attitudes. In *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*, 21–52. C. J. Cranny, P. C. Smith, and E. F. Stone, eds. New York: Lexington Books.
- Summers, T., and T. DeCotiis. 1988. An investigation of sex differences in job satisfaction. *Sex Roles* 18: 679–89.
- Tait, M., M. Padgett, and T. Baldwin. 1989. Job and life satisfaction: A reevaluation of the strength of the relationship and gender effects as a function of the date of the study. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 74: 502–7.
- Ting, Y. 1997. Determinants of job satisfaction of federal government employees. *Public Personnel Management* 26: 313–34.
- Trevino, L. 1992. The social effects of punishment in organizations: A justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review* 17: 647–76.
- Vasu, M., D. Stewart, and G. Garson. 1998. *Organizational behavior and public management*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Vecchio, R. 1982. Predicting worker performance in inequitable settings. *Academy of Management Review* 7: 103–10.

- Walton, M. 1986. *The Deming management method*. New York: Perigee.
- Wanous, J., and A. Reichers. 1996. Estimating the reliability of a single-item measure. *Psychological Reports* 78: 631–34.
- Wanous, J., A. Reichers, and M. Hudy. 1997. Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82: 247–52.
- Wanous, J., T. Poland, S. Premack, and G. Davis. 1992. The effects of met expectations and newcomer attitudes and behaviors: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 77: 288–97.
- Watson, D., and A. Slack. 1993. General factors of affective temperament and their relation to job satisfaction over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 54: 181–202.
- Witt, L., and L. Nye. 1992. Gender and the relationship between perceived fairness of pay or promotion and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 77: 910–17.
- Zeffane, R. 1994. Correlates of job satisfaction and their implications for work redesign. *Public Personnel Management* 23: 61–75.