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ABSTRACT
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There has been growing recognition among organizational behavior practitioners and researchers of the importance of the different types of fit in a work environment. Previous research established relationships between fit and job satisfaction in professional fields including education. However, fit research in the higher education context has tended to focus on students and faculty. An important and understudied stakeholder in higher education is administrative staff members. Higher education is going through substantial changes in the face of increased demand for accountability, increased diversity, and budget cuts among other issues. As such the responds by public universities like Midwestern universities affects not only academic programs, faculty, and students but also the administrative structure. The few research on perceived fit and job satisfaction among administrative staff members in higher education lack either breadth or depth. Therefore, the purpose of the study was to determine the relationship between perceived fit (Person-Job (P-J) Fit, Person-Organization (P-O) Fit) and Job satisfaction among administrative staff members in a Midwestern public university, as well as the subscales of the primary variables. The study used a correlational design to examine the relationship between the primary variables and their subscales. Accordingly, the research study addressed administrative staff members’ level of perceived fit with the university environment and job satisfaction; the ability of perceived person-environment fit to predict job satisfaction among administrative staff members; the relationships among characteristics of administrative staff members (e.g., level of education, age, gender, and years of service) with job satisfaction and perceived fit with the university environment.

The total number of participants in this study was 170. Perceived fit was measured using Saks and Ashforth’s (1997) measure of Global Perception of Fit. Job satisfaction was measured
with the 2009 abridged version of the Job Descriptive Index (aJDI) and the Job in General (aJIG) scale. Correlations, standard regression, analysis of variances (ANOVA), and t-test were used to analyze the data. Overall administrative staff members had average levels of satisfaction with their jobs. The satisfaction levels of administrative staff members was compared to the Job Satisfaction norms established based on a sample of 1400 participants who were obtained through E-Rewards, a company specializing in obtaining samples for marketing research. Stratified sampling by state population was used to ensure that the sample was representative of the US population. Of the five job satisfaction facets, administrative staff members level of satisfaction with the Co-worker (JDI 5), facet was comparable to the 60th percentile score of the US workforce, however, their satisfaction with the Work Itself (JDI 1), Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3), Supervision (JDI 4), and Pay (JDI 2) facets were below the 50th percentile score. Interestingly, however, in the education subsector the respondents had higher percentile scores, 47th and 60th in satisfaction with Pay (JDI 2) and Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) respectively, than in the US population, Administrative staff members were unsatisfied with Pay (JDI 2) facet. Pearson correlation results indicated significant relationships between the Perceived Fit (P-J, P-O) and Job Satisfaction, and their respective subscales. Person-Job (P-J) fit had the strongest correlation with the Work Itself (JDI 1) facet, and Overall Job Satisfaction. Person-Organization/University (P-O) fit had a moderately strong correlation with the Co-worker (JDI 5) and Work Itself (JDI 1) facets. Person-Organization/University fit had moderately positive relationships with all five facets of job satisfaction. However, the relationship between P-O fit and Pay (JDI 2) was the weakest. The results of the regression analysis revealed that Perceived P-J fit was the stronger predictor for Work Itself (JDI 1), Pay (JDI 2), Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3), and Job in General (JIG). ANOVA results showed that among the demographic variables age and years of service revealed statistically significant mean difference in satisfaction
with the Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) facet respectively. A \( t \)-test indicated significant mean difference between females and males with respect to Perceived Job fit. Male administrative staff members perceived to fit better than the females with their jobs.

The results of the study support the relationship between Perceived Fit and Job Satisfaction, and the notion that the different types of fit have unique impacts on Job Satisfaction. The findings have implications for leaders in post-secondary educational institutions as well as other organizations. Supervisors can increase the level of satisfaction among administrative staff members with a clear understanding of employee perceptions as well as the facets likely to influence overall job satisfaction. The implications for future research and leadership practice are discussed.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Background

How well one “fits” within a work environment has long held intuitive appeal. Person-environment fit theories suggest that positive outcomes occur when individuals fit or match the environment (Carless, 2005). According to Ostroff and Schulte (2007), the notion of fit or congruence within an organization has pervaded research and theory across organizational domains since the 1900s. Similar to other organizational phenomena, the application of fit to organizational domains has come to be characterized along a micro – macro continuum (Ostroff & Schulte, 2007). As noted by Kristoff (1996), the focus of organizational behavior researchers and practitioners has been at the micro-level such that the analysis of fit focuses on the relationship between the individual and the organizational environment in which the individual finds him or herself. The macro-level of fit focuses on the fit within the organizational system such as structures, strategies, goals, and culture (Ostroff & Schulte, 2007).

Organizational behavior practitioners and researchers have recognized the importance of person-organization fit and organizational outcomes (Ingle, Rutledge, & Bishop, 2011; Kristoff, 1996; Ostroff & Schulte, 2007; Schmitt, Oswald, Friede, Imus, & Merritt, 2008). Research indicates positive relationships between person-organization (P-O) fit and work attitudes (Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003), job selection decisions (Cable & Judge, 1996; Carless, 2005; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Lu, While, & Barriball, 2005; Song & Chathoth, 2011), job satisfaction (Smart, Elton, & McLaughlin, 1986; Gregory, Albritton, & Osmonbekov, 2010), and employee psychological withdrawal behavior (Tak, 2011).

However, much of the empirical study on the P-O fit began fifteen years ago (Verquer et al., 2003), and has been centered on the antecedents and consequences of compatibility between people and their organizations (Kristoff, 1996). Among the studies of fit, person-organization fit
and person-job fit are the two most researched (Chuang & Sackett, 2005). The implicit assumption of person-organization fit is that individuals develop a perception of their degree of fit within organizations (Cable & Judge, 1996), and therefore, the more people in an environment share the interest of those joining that environment, the more likely they will experience satisfaction and work adjustment (Schneider, 2001). As a result, emphasis has been placed on the match between personal characteristics of individuals and the characteristics of particular organization and the potential effects of the match (or a lack thereof) on employees’ behaviors and attitudes within the organization (Goodman & Svyantek, 1999).

Individuals seeking employment traditionally consider characteristics such as job descriptions, personal abilities, intelligence, and past work experience in selecting organizations they prefer to work (Sarris & Kirby, 2005). An implicit assumption of job seekers’ preference of organizations is that their personal characteristics align with the attributes of the organization, and the degree to which they perceive to fit with the organization (Cable, & Judge, 1996). Similarly, human resource selection practices are often focused on the identification and selection of individuals who best fit the existing organizational culture, and thus share the values and norms of the organization (Gregory, Albritton, & Osmonbekov, 2010). Therefore, people perceive themselves as fitting because they are similar to the existing employees who possess those values (Sekiguchi, 2004).

The concept of fit has been extensively applied to the interplay of person-organization, person-vocation, person-job, and person-group (e.g., Cable & Judge, 1996; Edwards, 1991; Kroeger, 1995; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). These different concepts of fit have been identified as components of the broader person-environment fit (Kristoff, 1996; Kristoff-Brown et al., 2001, Ostroff & Schulte, 2007; Sekiguchi, 2004). Verquer et al. (2003) noted in a meta-analysis that despite the issues associated with conceptualization, measurement, and calculation
of fit, it is an important determinant of employee attitudes. Moreover, studies on satisfaction have revealed a link between job satisfaction and organizational outcomes, such as work quality, organizational commitment, motivation, absenteeism, burnout, turnover intentions, and achievement (Amos & Weathington, 2008, Worrell, Skaggs, & Brown, 2006). Job satisfaction is one of the organizational outcomes of wide interest to both practitioners and researchers (Lu, While, & Barriball, 2005), because of the underlying assumption that satisfaction influences productivity (Mount & Muchinsky 1978), and that employees who find their job worthwhile and rewarding will be more likely to perform better and produce more than dissatisfied employees (Abdullah, Khalid, Shuib, Nor, Muhammed, & Jauhar, 2007; Samad, 2011). However, Mount and Muchinsky (1978) noted that the importance of this assumption has diminished over the years because many investigators have turned their interest to causal antecedents of job satisfaction instead.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between perceived person-environment fit and job satisfaction among administrative staff members in a Midwestern public university, as well as the subscales of the primary variables (perceived person-environment fit and job satisfaction). It was important to examine the subscales of variables because Edward and Bell (2008), for example, found different relationships between the facets of job satisfaction and task and contextual performance (dependent variables) whereas the relationships between overall job satisfaction and the dependent variables were the same. The study’s target population consisted of 643 administrative staff members at a Midwestern university in Ohio. The researcher used convenience sampling method, and the Environment Fit and Satisfaction Survey (EFSS), which is a combination of two existing instruments—Saks and Ashforth’s (1997) General Perceptions of Fit Measure, and the 2009 Abridged versions of the Job Descriptive
Index (aJDI), and Job In General scale (aJIG) (Brodke et al., 2009). The instrument was administered through an online survey of the participants.

Rationale for Study

In their meta-analysis of 21 P-O fit studies, Verquer, Beehr, and Wagner (2003) identified only four studies conducted in education, and out of the four studies only one focused on non-academic employees. However, the one study examined the political influence dimension of P-O fit. A notable gap in the study of fit in higher education is the lack of perceived environment fit and job satisfaction among administrative staff members. The few studies on fit in higher education tended to focus on students and faculty (e.g., Amos & Weathington, 2008; Gilbreath, Kim, & Nichols, 2011; Schmitt, Oswald, Friede, Imus, & Merritt, 2008; Smith, 2009). Although faculty and students are undoubtedly integral to the higher education enterprise, another relevant stakeholder group in high education is administrative staff members. It has been suggested that administrators’ roles in American universities is at the expense of full-time faculty (Stromquist, 2007).

Smerek and Peterson (2007) contend that the concept of job satisfaction among administrators in colleges and universities is still relevant, and this study will contribute to building an understanding of the phenomenon. Despite the important role of administrative staff members in institutions, research on administrative staff members, particularly in higher education, is not as rich in either breadth or depth as that on faculty (Gaziel, 2001; Volkwein, Malik, & Naperski-Prancl, 1998; Volkwein & Parmley, 2000; Volkwein & Zhou, 2003). Yet, the satisfaction of administrative staff members is essential to the vitality, effectiveness, and performance of colleges and universities (Volkwein, Malik, & Naperski-Prancl, 1998; Volkwein & Parmley, 2000; Volkwein & Zhou, 2003). Also, Gaziel (2001) noted that since an effective
administration is a primary concern of the educational community, a guide to choosing and motivating administrators is essential.

Higher education is undergoing substantial change in the face of globalization, demand for accountability, and increased diversity, which brings a greater emphasis on market forces to the decision making process. The response to these forces by public universities like Midwestern universities not only affects academic programs, faculty, and students, but also creates new administrative structures and privileges (Ewell, 2007; Stromquist, 2007). Furthermore, the Association of American Universities (AAU) endorses global education to prepare students for the global world of work and also bring about a shared future market by justice, security, equality, human rights, and economic sustainability. This requires universities to incorporate international/intercultural dimension into teaching, research and service functions (De Wit, 2011). As a result, there are significant trends towards decentralization, mergers, privatization, accountability among public universities (Stromquist, 2007). For instance, the commercialization of higher education has coincided with a substantial fall in standards of education at all levels including colleges/universities (Florea & Horvat, 2009). Moreover, in heavily regulated environments, public universities are treated like “state-owned agencies” and have less flexibility in personnel, financial, and academic matters (Volkwein et al., 1998).

According to Stromquist (2007) administration decision making has grown considerably while that of faculty has greatly reduced over the past 30 years. The author further makes the assertion that faculty assert most power resides with the public university board of trustees and the “Central administrators”. In addition, there is an increase in leadership role by administrators and their dominance of administrators in decision making processes has resulted in a tremendous growth in the number of mid-level management positions at public universities and its structure is becoming more complex (Stromquist, 2007). Coupled to these issues is the
reduction in funding for the higher education sector which further exacerbates the situation (Karim & Garret 2005).

Therefore, the study was aimed at examining the perception among administrative staff members in a Midwestern public university of the degree to which they fit their work environment and the relationship of this perceived fit to job satisfaction. Furthermore, to better understand the influence of the different types of fits on organizational outcomes, Ostroff and Schulte (2007) suggested the need for more research on the relative importance of the different types of fit and the possible synergistic effect from the interaction of these different types of fit. It is important to assess environment fit (P-O and P-J fit) in this study because according to Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) people interact with their jobs, co-workers, and organization on a daily basis; therefore assessing both P-O and P-J fit provides a more realistic picture of the influence and interaction of those interactions (Ehrhart, 2006). People apply for and work in specific jobs within organizations, therefore research on both types of fit is important (Ehrhart, 2006). Furthermore, the interaction of person and environment influences organizational outcomes (Livingston, Nelson, & Barr, 1997; Yang, Che, & Spector, 2008).

The issues of fit in relation to organizational outcomes are undoubtedly important. This study sought to contribute to the understanding of the impact of perceptions of fit among administrative staff members at a university on their job satisfaction. Job satisfaction among administrators in higher education has been sparsely examined and studies in the area suggest little consensus in understanding job satisfaction in colleges and universities context (Smerek & Peterson, 2007). For example, it was initially thought that simply increasing the salary, supervision or company policy would increase an employee towards greater job satisfaction (Smerek & Peterson, 2006). Therefore, by determining the administrative staff members’ perception of the degree to which they fit the work environment and job satisfaction, the present
study will assist in improving the understanding about how person-environment fit relates to work outcomes in a university setting. Moreover, several researchers and regional accrediting bodies focus on faculty, students, and administrative satisfaction as evidence of organizational effectiveness (Volkwein, Malik, Napierski-Prancl, 1998; Volkwein & Parmley, 2000; Volkwein & Zhou, 2003).

Research Questions

This study sought to address the following research questions:

1. What is administrative staff members’ level of perceived fit with the university environment and job satisfaction?

2. Does perceived person-environment fit predict job satisfaction among administrative staff members?

3. What characteristics of administrative staff members (e.g., level of education, age, years of employment, and gender) are related to job satisfaction and perceived fit with the university environment?

Scope of the Study

Data were collected from administrative staff members employed in the various colleges, schools, and departments within a Midwestern public university through a cross sectional survey. Information on perception of university environment fit and the degree of satisfaction of employees was collected. Each participant completed an online survey consisting of items measuring employees’ perception of fit, items measuring job satisfaction and items measuring demographic characteristics.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used in the context of this study:
Administrative staff is defined by the inter-University Council of Ohio as non-teaching positions in institutions. It excludes those positions that teach, conduct research, or are generally exempted from overtime earnings under the federal Fair Labor Standards Act.

Job Satisfaction is the “pleasurable emotional state resulting from appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values” (Locke, 1969, p 317).

Perceived fit is conceptualized as an “individual’s overall judgment about the extent to which he or she perceives a fit with the organization” (Van Vuuren, Velkamp, de Jong, & Seydel, 2007, p 1737).

Person-Environment Fit (P-E) is broadly defined as “the compatibility between an individual and a work environment that occurs when their characteristics are well matched” (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005, p.281). Person-environment fit encompasses Person-organization (P-O), Person-group (P-G), and Person-job (P-J).

Person-Job Fit (P-J) is the relationship between a person’s characteristics and those of the job or tasks that are performed at work (See Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

Person-Organization Fit (P-O) describes the congruence between individual and organizational goals or values; individual preferences or needs and organizational systems or structures; and individual personality and organizational climate (See Kristof, 1996)

Theoretical Framework

The concept of job satisfaction is one of the most researched areas across disciplines such as psychology, sociology, economics, and management sciences. Patricia and Locke are among the pioneer researchers of the concept of job satisfaction (Locke, 1969; Smith & Stanton, 1999). Job satisfaction is commonly described as a complex and multidimensional concept (Coomber & Barriball 2007; Locke, 1976). Locke (1976) described the concept as the positive emotional state resulting from attaining what one wants or values from a job (Locke, 1976). It is largely
determined by the ability of an organization to satisfy the needs, values, and expectations of employees (Zhang, DeMichele, & Connaughton, 2004). Accordingly, the interactionist theory of job satisfaction argues that job satisfaction should be viewed as the result of the interplay between the person and situation or work environment, and therefore jobs are perceived as satisfying when they provide the individual with important job values or rewards whereas jobs are dissatisfying when they thwart desired values or rewards (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997; Wood, 1981). Therefore, the assumption of the interactionist theory is that the job environment largely determines the satisfaction of employees (Lang & Johnson, 1994).

There are three approaches to the study of job satisfaction, the situational or job characteristics approach, the dispositional approach, and the interaction between the person and the environment approach (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997). Job satisfaction, according to the situational approach is driven from the nature of the job and the work environment. This model assumes therefore that people possess the same needs and will be satisfied by the same job attributes (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997).

Job satisfaction is the individuals’ affective experience formed through a process of evaluation (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997), and according to Locke (1969) the job satisfaction appraisal is a subjective process of making value judgments between an object, action, or condition and one or more of one’s values which happens consciously or unconsciously. Unlike cognitive judgments, value judgments are estimates of an existent or judged relationship to one’s value standards (Locke, 1969). Based on his value-precept theory, Locke (1976) argued that individuals’ values will determine what satisfied them or not on the job. The theory predicts that the differences between what is desired and what is received are a source of dissatisfaction only if the job facet is important to the individual. Therefore, satisfaction or dissatisfaction and other emotions are value responses representing the experiences of individuals’ appraisal of an object
or situation in relation to a standard he or she considers to be beneficial (Locke, 1970; Lu, While, & Barriball, 2005). However, what makes a job satisfying or dissatisfying is not solely dependent on the nature of the job but the expectations that individuals have of what their job should provide (Lu, While, & Barriball, 2005).

Therefore, as individuals’ needs are being met at work, resulting positive attitudes may mitigate strain, facilitate higher performance, and reduce turnover (Kristof-Brown, 2005). In furtherance, the theory of adjustments emphasizes that adjustments and satisfaction are as a result of employees needs being met by their occupational environment (Kristof-Brown, 2005). This study draws from the Locke’s value-precept theory to explore the satisfaction among administrative staff members in the Midwestern University.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

The evaluation of person-group fit in a university environment is challenging because administrators tend to belong to a variety of groups within the university, including colleges, schools and/or departments within the colleges, and even programs within the school/department level. Therefore, the difficulty in defining the group context limited the inclusion of P-G fit in the study.

The use of simple linear and standard multiple regressions as the statistical analysis technique reveal the extent and direction of the relationship among the variables. However, it does not indicate causation, hence limits the interpretation of the results. Furthermore, the study results have limited generalizability because it is only generalizable to the one institution and uses convenience sampling procedure. The findings of the study is based on a sample of 170, the small sample size limited the detection of statistical significance mean difference. Despite the appropriateness of the research design for the study, the lack of randomization and the inability
to manipulate the independent variable by the researcher are weaknesses that threaten the internal validity of the study (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012).

**Organization of the Study**

The study is organized as follow: Chapter 1 includes the introduction, purpose of the study, statement of research questions, rational for the study, scope of the study, definition of terms, theoretical framework, and limitations and delimitation. Chapter 2 presents a review of literature of person-environment (P-O, P-J, and P-G) fit and job satisfaction. Chapter 3 details the methodologies used, data collection and procedures of the study. Chapter 4 presents data analysis and the descriptive narrative of the results of the study. Chapter 5 presents summary and conclusions of the study’s major findings, and includes recommendations for organizational behavior practitioners, leaders, and policy makers based upon the study conclusions, and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

This study sought to determine the extent to which administrative staff members’ perceived fit within their work environment (a Midwestern university) and how their perceived fit relates to job satisfaction. In addition, this study determined whether years of employment, level of educational attainment, age, and gender predict job satisfaction of the administrative staff members in the university.

This chapter presents the literature review of the variables and relevant concepts related to the study. The review of the literature is organized into five sections:

1. The concept and measurement of job satisfaction
2. Facets of job satisfaction
3. Job satisfaction and organizational outcomes
4. Person-Environment fit
5. Fits and job satisfaction

The Concept and Measurement of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a widely studied concept in disciplines such as psychology, management science, nursing, and sociology (e.g., Furnham, Petrides, Tsaousis, Pappas, & Garrod, 2005; Gregory, Albritton, & Osmonbekov, 2010; Hurlbert, 1991; Maglino & Ravlin, 1998; Nickerson, Schwarz, & Diener, 2007; Smart, Elton, & Mclaughlin, 1986). The topic of job satisfaction is important because the management literature has found significant connections between employee satisfaction and important outcomes such as productivity and turnover (Volkwein & Zhou, 2003). It is perhaps easy to confuse the concept of “job” and “work” because they can be similar. However, according to Alekseev (1975) the concept of “job” is more concrete, more closely linked to the specific features of the branch of work in which an individual’s production activity occurs. As a complex and multifaceted concept, job satisfaction
represents an overall attitude as well as feelings about particular aspects of an individual’s job (Koehler, 1988; Okediji, Etuk, & Anthony, 2011). For example, an individuals’ job satisfaction could be associated with a personal feeling of achievement either quantitatively or qualitatively (Okediji, Etuk, & Anthony, 2011).

As early as the 1970s, differences were noted in the facets to include in a study, and the ways of measuring the facets of job satisfaction and approaches in combining the scores from the facets to determine overall job satisfaction (see Jackson & Corr, 2002; Locke, 1976; Nagy, 2002; Wanous & Lawler, 1972). For example, one way of measuring job satisfaction is by asking people to rate the job or facets of the job on Likert-type scales (Brodke et al., 2009; Locke, 1976; Tziner & Vardi, 1984). However, in the review of nine different operational definitions of job satisfaction, Wanous and Lawler (1972) concluded that there was no one particular way to measure job satisfaction. Moreover, Nagy (2002) empirically demonstrated a favorable comparison between single-item measures of facets of job satisfaction and multiple-item measures of the concept in a study using a single-item approach to measure facet job satisfaction among full time employees across a variety of organizations.

In some instances, researchers used work satisfaction or job satisfaction interchangeably. For example, to determine school psychologists’ job satisfaction in the USA, participants completed a modified version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) consisting of 20 subscales by indicating their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction on specific characteristics of their job. Higher scores indicated a higher level of job satisfaction (Worrel, Skaggs, & Brown, 2006). A similar approach was adopted by Tziner and Vardi (1984) in measuring work satisfaction among social workers to determine the role of altruistic values in work satisfaction and absenteeism. However, unlike the earlier study, the authors created a two factor structure of the work satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic) with a five-point scale to evaluate the items.
In a study among business operations employees at a large public university, job satisfaction was measured by requiring participants to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement on a 10-point Likert scale with statements related to training and development, recognition and praise, collaboration and team work, communication, alignment with mission and goals, and feelings about one’s job (Smerek & Peterson, 2007). In another study, Stone (1976) used five one-item instruments to measure satisfaction with pay, promotions, co-workers, working conditions, and supervision facets.

The number of items used in measuring job satisfaction ranges from one through 90 (see Brodke et al., 2009; Edwards, Bell, Arthur, & Decuir, 2008). For example, Hinkle and Choi (2009) measured overall satisfaction using an eight-item instrument to evaluate the job in general among faculty and employees of a business school in a western US university. However, the Robbins Job Satisfaction Questionnaire used by Hamidi and Eivazi (2010) in their study of the relationship between job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational performance among nurses in Hamadan urban health centers consisted of five facets (supervisor, co-workers, pay, work promotion, and tasks involved in work), and participants rated the items with a five point scale.

The operationalization of job satisfaction has traditionally focused on all the feelings that an individual has about his/her job. However, it has been observed that what makes a job satisfying or dissatisfying does not only depend on the nature of the job or characteristics, but also the perceptions and/or expectations individuals have of what their job should provide (Lu, While, & Barriball, 2005, Smerek & Peterson, 2007). For instance, a high level of satisfaction with job (86%) was reported among Portuguese health professionals in a study to examine the correlates and validation of the Job Satisfaction Index and the Job in General scale (McIntyre & McIntyre, 2010).
In a review of the most commonly used instruments of job satisfaction, Spector (1997) identified the following as components of job satisfaction: appreciation, communication, coworkers, fringe benefits, job conditions, nature of the work itself, the nature of the organization itself, an organizations’ policies and procedures, pay, personal growth, promotion opportunities, recognition, security and supervision. Herzberg (1968) further identified achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement, and professional advancement as contributing motivators to job satisfaction while policy, administration, interpersonal relations, working conditions, salary, status, job security, and personal life as hygiene factors to job dissatisfaction. Volkwein and Parmley (2000) found no significant difference between administrative staff members in US public and private universities on four out of five dimensions of satisfaction. In both types of universities the administrative staff members were most satisfied with intrinsic rewards and least satisfied with extrinsic rewards and work conditions. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the groups on salary, benefits, and promotions, with the private university group significantly more satisfied than the public university group. Similarly, Downey (2008) examined the influence of emotion on administrative job satisfaction and reported that intrinsic factors had the greatest influence on overall job satisfaction across community college administrators.

According to Wanous and Lawler (1972), job satisfaction can be measured validly with facets of job satisfaction. For example, Hamidi and Eivazi (2010) found a direct and significant relationship between Hamadan health centers employees’ level of job satisfaction and their satisfaction with each of the job satisfaction facets, an indication that an increase in satisfaction within each of the individual facets leads to a total increase in the overall employee satisfaction.

In summary, then, the concepts of job or work satisfaction has been applied by researchers in different studies, and despite the differences in conceptualization and
measurement, the facets of job satisfaction assessed in the studies reviewed include the work itself, the relations with co-workers, the supervision, the pay, and the promotion opportunities. Therefore, the next section will review the facets of job satisfaction and the influence of each facet on overall job satisfaction.

**Facets/Components of Job Satisfaction**

This section presents a review of literature on the components associated with job satisfaction. The components include the nature/context of the organization, the work itself, relations with co-workers, supervision, pay, and promotion opportunities (advancement).

**Nature of the organization.** Organizational or system policies have been known to influence satisfaction with work (e.g., Worrell, Skaggs, & Brown, 2006). For example, Morris and Bloom (2002) examined the contextual factors affecting job satisfaction and organizational commitment in Community Mental Health Centers (CMHC) undergoing system changes in the financing of care. They found that individuals with positive aggregate perceptions of organizational culture and climate were positively and significantly associated with higher levels of job satisfaction. However, the authors found that aggregate levels of the link between organizational culture and climate to individual levels of job satisfaction was over and above individual perceptions of culture and climate, suggesting the importance of work environment in promoting job satisfaction among administrators and staff on the front line of mental health care.

In a study to test Hollands’ (1973) theory in person-environment congruence and employee job satisfaction Mount and Muchinsky (1978) found that the main effect of the work environment was significant and indicated that satisfaction with the work is influenced by the type of environment in which the subject works. More recently, (1976) found that the degree to which work environment allows the attainment of values affects job satisfaction. In addition, Cable and Judge (1996) suggested in their study of the subjective fit perceptions of job seekers
and new employees that value congruence should indirectly influence organizational attractiveness.

According to the theory of motivation, individuals develop preferences for certain activities over others whether by temperament or through socialization, and such preferences grow into strong interests of needs that, when aroused, compel action, especially when the individuals have the opportunity to develop competences in the area (Kroeger, 1995). The best-fit situation therefore locates individuals with a particular set of needs, values, and competences in an environment in which their own preferences are in congruence with their task assignments and the expectations and values of persons with whom they interact (Kroeger, 1995). However, when the fit is not congruent, person-environment theory predicts that individuals will experience stress, dissatisfaction, and conflict (Kroeger, 1995). For example, most individuals in American society use an array of values in their choice of jobs. Some of those values express personality needs, whereas others reflect external considerations such as pay, prestige, ambiance of the workplace, congenial workmates, and convenience, which equally reflect a hierarchy of values. Therefore, Kroeger (1995) argues that if the position or the environment is not a good match, the individual involved may try to modify or change either the position or the environment.

Lyons and O’Brian (2006) identified compensation, independence, variety, opportunity for advancement/ recognition, perceptions of organization policies and procedures, and safety and security as contributors to job satisfaction among African American employees. Furthermore, Zhang, DeMichele, and Connaughton (2004) studied job satisfaction among mid-level administrators in US colleges and universities, finding that the administrators were satisfied with the organizational work environment such as organization structure, internal communication, political climate, professional development policies, evaluation procedures,
promotion and advancement opportunities, and caring for personal concerns. According to Smerek and Peterson (2007) perceived work environment variables such as the compensation, the opportunity for advancement, the work itself, and the supervision are more important in predicting job satisfaction than personal or job characteristics. For example, Murray and Murray (1998) reported that college chairpersons reported being most satisfied with the work itself, interpersonal relations, achievement, and responsibility, and were least satisfied with salary, supervision, and opportunity for growth in a study to explore their job satisfaction and propensity to leave the institution.

**Work itself.** In examining the interrelationship of social factors that determines work attitudes in collective fisheries, Alekseev (1975) concluded that the fisher folk who valued fairness in the distribution of the returns on their contribution to the total catch were highly satisfied with the daily work, which was a direct result from the satisfaction of the fisher folk with their respective activities in productive process. Smerek and Peterson (2007) noted that the job itself is the most significant predictor of job satisfaction in their study examining Herzberg’s theory to improve job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. For example, Snarr and Krochalk (1996) reported that baccalaureate nursing faculty members were satisfied with the dimensions of their job in a nationwide survey in the US to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational characteristics.

In a study of the relationship between job characteristics and attitudes among temporary employees, Slattery, Selvarajan, Anderson, and Sardessai (2010) found the job characteristics of skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback to be positively and significantly related to job satisfaction as well as organizational commitment to client and agency organization. Mclyntyre and Mclyntyre (2010) reported that 77.2 percent of Portuguese health professionals were satisfied with “work on the present job”. In addition, employees in
more complex jobs reported higher levels of job satisfaction among non-academic employees from 12 departments of a large university (Crede, Chernynshenko, Stark, Dalal, & Bashshur, 2007). Furthermore, Nadeem (2011) found that the job itself was one of two factors accounting for 64 percent of the variance in overall job satisfaction among faculty members at a Pakistani university.

In summary, the work itself is widely viewed as the predictor of job satisfaction. However, relationship with co-workers is equally important to determine overall job satisfaction. The next section presents a review of literature on the co-workers facet of job satisfaction.

Co-workers. A work environment conducive to mutual respect among coworkers promotes positive outcome in almost every organization (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Yang, Che, & Spector, 2008). In a study involving employees across different professions (firefighters, security guards, aviation mechanics, engineers, chemists, extension home economists, professional nurses, among others, Mount and Muchinsky (1978) found that extension home economists and professional nurses were more satisfied than salesmen, farm and business managers (an enterprising work environment). More recently, Schroder (2008) undertook a study of job satisfaction among employees in a Christian university, finding that the university employees were particularly satisfied with the relations with their peers and students. The author notes that with the exception of faculty, university employees were more satisfied with their relations with students and peers. Additionally, Okedigi, Etuk, and Anthony (2011) concluded that workers are dissatisfied in a work environment where co-workers exhibit unconcerned attitude, and the dissatisfaction often manifest in negative behaviors such as low productivity, high level of absenteeism and turnover, lateness to duty, and lack of organizational commitment.

Similarly, Snarr and Krochalk (1996) found that 86 to 90 percent of faculty (n = 576) were satisfied with co-workers in a baccalaureate nursing program in the US. In another study,
Sharp (2008) reported that 67 percent of respondents indicated they were satisfied with their co-workers. Correlational analysis revealed a low correlation ($r = .54$) between co-workers and job satisfaction. Sharp suggests that job satisfaction among psychiatric nurses is related to the actions and attitudes of hospital managers and immediate supervisors with less influence from relationship with co-workers. In contrast however, among 1,314 Portuguese health professionals 75.4 percent of the respondents reported being satisfied with co-workers (Mclntyre & Mclntyre, 2010).

Dimotakis, Scott, and Koopman (2011) noted that employees reported higher levels of job satisfaction on days they experienced more positive interpersonal interactions at work (standardized $\gamma = 0.12$, $p < .05$) and lower levels of job satisfaction on days they experienced more negative interpersonal interactions (standardized $\gamma = -0.19$, $p < .05$) (Dimotakis, Scott, Koopman, 2011). A further analysis by the authors using the Sobel test revealed a significant indirect effect of workplace interpersonal interactions on job satisfaction through positive affect and a significant effect of negative workplace interpersonal interactions through negative affect. Therefore, characteristics of employees’ workplace interactions are associated with affective reactions at work and job satisfaction (Dimotakis et al., 2011; Morrison, 2004). Similarly, interpersonal relationships with colleagues emerged as the second most important factor contributing to job satisfaction among academic staff at Malaysian universities which suggests that internal relationships with colleagues are fundamental contributors to job satisfaction (Hashim & Mahmood, 2011). In a study of 13 Turkish universities, Saygi, Tolon and Tekogul (2011) identified co-workers as the most important factor in job satisfaction. They concluded that while working with responsible co-workers has a positive effect on job satisfaction while not getting the necessary support had a negative effect on performance of academics.
In a study similar to that of Saygi et al. (2011), Ssesanga and Garrett (2005) found that 82% (n = 138) academic staff in two Ugandan universities mentioned relationship with co-workers as one of the main factors influencing the level of their job satisfaction. Research (e.g. Briones, Tabernero, & Arenas, 2010; Okediji, Etuk, & Anthony, 2011; Volkwein, Malik, & Napierski-Prancl, 1998; Volkwein & Parmley, 2000) indicates a significant and positive relationship between relationships with co-workers and level of job satisfaction. As such employee job satisfaction is higher when actual and preferred relationship at work are both high (Yang, Che, & Spector, 2008).

Admittedly, the nature of the relationship with co-workers influences employees’ level of job satisfaction. A closely related facet is employee-supervisor relations, thus employee supervision. The next section presents a review of literature related to the supervision facet of job satisfaction.

**Supervision.** Supervision is yet another factor of job satisfaction. Supervisors are important in the daily job experiences because they ideally possess the ability to influence the structure of the work environment, provide valuable information and feedback to employees (Okediji, Etuk, & Anthony, 2011). Hui, Wong, and Tjosvold (2007) argue that the effectiveness with which supervisors deal with disagreements and conflicts in the work place affects employee satisfaction which, in turn, willingness to stay or leave the organization. For example, Okediji et al. (2011) suggest that by maintaining a good supervisor—employee relationship through respect, building a trust based relationship, providing support, establishing open communication, instilling confidence in employees, supervisors can remove barriers that can potentially prevent employees from achieving individual job satisfaction. Similarly, there was general agreement among academicians in Turkish universities that satisfaction with their supervisors is affected by the managers who back up and support employees (Saygi, Tolon, & Tokegul, 2011). These
studies suggest that, a high quality supervisor-employee relationship significantly contributes to employee job and career satisfaction (Okediji, Etuk, & Anthony, 2011).

McIntyre and McIntyre (2010) reported that 65.3 percent of 1,314 Portuguese health professionals were satisfied with their supervisor. In contrast, Spillane (1973) indicated that lower than expected number of responses were attributed to supervision in a study job satisfaction among managers in Australia, and concluded that supervision was less an important extrinsic factor to the middle level managers. Similarly, in a study of job satisfaction among fitness managers, Koehler (1988) found that supervision was among the facets with lowest mean scores (17.48).

However, as a result of the important role of supervision in job satisfaction of employees, Bos, Donders, Bouwman-Brouwer, and Van der Gulden (2009) recommended that attention be given to supervisor support in future studies. Hence, Mudor and Tooksoon (2011) concluded that supervision is positively related to job satisfaction, and that employees tend to be satisfied with their job when they have effective and close supervision (Mudor & Tooksoon, 2011). Otherwise, according to the authors, employees have the tendency to leave their job when there is poor supervision.

**Wages and benefits.** Pay is one of the means through which employees are rewarded by management in an organization. Accordingly, Bokermeier, Bokeimer, and Lacy (1987), contend that income which includes pay is the relative standard through which employees assess the gains from investment of time, work, and skills in a job. For instance, Zhang, DeMichele, and Connaughton (2004) indicated that pay and benefits were among individual work factors that contributed to job satisfaction among mid-level administrators in colleges and universities. However, among nursing baccalaureate program faculty in the US, Snarr and Krochalk (1996) reported between 60-70 percent of the job satisfaction scores ranged from neutral to satisfied
feelings to their pay. In a study of work satisfaction as a function of person-environment interaction, Seybolt (1976) found that pay ($F = 46.43$, $p<.0001$) had significant main effect on job satisfaction, and concluded that individuals with college education were statistically less satisfied with work in less paid jobs than individuals with lower level of education in the same job.

Furthermore, Schroder (2008) found that employees in a small Christian university were least satisfied with their salaries. Interestingly, Koehler (1988) reported compensation as one of the factors significantly dissatisfying among fitness managers in the state of California. In a further analysis of components of pay (pay structure, benefits, pay raises), Currall, Towler, Judge, and Kohn (2005) observed in their study of pay satisfaction and organizational outcome that teachers’ satisfaction with their pay was positively related to district level academic performance but negatively related to intention to quit. Similar to earlier findings, McIntyre and McIntyre (2010) reported that about 73 percent of participants among Portuguese health professionals were dissatisfied with the pay associated with their work. Not surprising, pay/salary was among the lowest ranked factors contributing to job satisfaction among academic faculty at Malaysian universities (Hashim & Mahmood, 2011). Furthermore, in a study to determine the extent regulatory climate differences influence the level of satisfaction of administrative managers at US public universities, Volkwein, Malik, and Napierski-Pranel (1998) found that the highest paid employees were the least satisfied with their salaries and benefits. Therefore, the higher ranked administrative managers were less extrinsically satisfied. Overall, pay practices are positively associated with job satisfaction, because employees tend to be satisfied with their job when they have good pay (Mudor & Tooksoon, 2011). While some studies revealed positive and significant influence on job satisfaction other studies suggest less satisfaction with pay among employees of some organizations. Hence, pay and non-pecuniary
factors of the job influence job satisfaction. A review of literature related to opportunities for advancement or promotion in an organization is presented in the next section.

**Promotion opportunities (advancement).** As previously indicated, research suggests that pay is a significant factor in job satisfaction. Relatedly, the opportunity for higher pay that comes with promotion is another factor to consider. In a study of the job satisfaction among school psychologists, Worrell, Skaggs and Brown (2006) observed that despite the high level of job satisfaction among school psychologists in three national surveys, there were areas of job dissatisfaction. The authors noted that the lack of career advancement was a source of dissatisfaction among the school psychologists. Similarly, in a study of job satisfaction and corporate fitness managers’ use of organizational approach to sports management Koehler (1988) found advancement was significantly more dissatisfying than other factors.

An earlier comparative study of satisfaction among catalogers and reference librarians in university libraries by Chwe (1978) revealed that both categories of librarians were least satisfied with the opportunities for the advancement component of their job, however, there was no difference in overall satisfaction between the two groups of workers. However, in a study on job satisfaction factors of faculty members at a Pakistani university, advancement accounted for 63 percent of the variance in overall level of job satisfaction among faculty members (Nadeem, 2011). Snarr and Krochalk (1996) reported that between 60-70 percent of job satisfaction scores revealed neutral to satisfied feelings with opportunities for advancement among US baccalaureate nursing faculty in a study of the job satisfaction and organization characteristics.

With respect to job achievement and job satisfaction among nurses, Sharp (2008) concluded that nurses identify their environment (external to the self) as the top cause for job dissatisfaction. For example, about 73 percent of health care professionals in selected Portuguese health centers and hospitals indicated their dissatisfaction with opportunities for promotions
(McIntyre & McIntyre, 2010). However, as reported by Rowden (2002), employees in small to midsize business in the US were generally satisfied with their job and that opportunities to advance contributed largely to their satisfaction. More importantly, among Turkish academics effects of opportunities for advancement on job satisfaction is a matter of promotion, and therefore they reported less satisfaction because of infrequent and unequal promotion (Saygi, Tolon, & Tokegul, 2011). Although the literature findings consistently points to the impact of the various facets on job satisfaction, the suggestion by Schroder (2008) and Edwards, Bell, Arthur, and Decuir (2008) for further investigations of the impact of the facets on organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction is still relevant.

In summary, job satisfaction is facet specific. For example, job satisfaction includes the work itself, the relation with co-workers, the supervision, the pay/remuneration, and the promotion opportunities. This suggests that an employee could be satisfied with some aspects of the job, but not with others (Ladebo, 2005). However, factors such as demographic characteristics may equally influence the level of job satisfaction. Therefore, the next section presents a review of job satisfaction and demographic characteristics such as age, years of employment, gender, and educational attainment.

**Job Satisfaction and Demographic Characteristics**

Consistent with studies of managers in organizations including colleges and universities, research suggests that a variety of demographic variables (e.g., age, gender, education, and years of employment) are related to job satisfaction (Volkwein & Zhou, 2003). For instance, Zhang, DeMichele, and Connaughton (2004) suggested that future research should examine the relationship between demographics and job satisfaction among mid-level administrators in higher education. Although the recommendation was based on mid-level administrators, it is relevant for this study because of its’ focus on administrators in higher education. Therefore,
age, education, gender, and years of employment are the selected demographic characteristics reviewed in this section.

**Job satisfaction and age.** Age is a critical variable that can predict varying behaviors in a work environment (Malik, Danish, & Ghafoor, 2009). In a study of factors affecting job satisfaction, Bokemeier, Bokeimer and Lacy (1987), found a strong positive association between age and job satisfaction. The authors concluded that age was a critical predictor of job satisfaction, with older workers reporting higher levels of job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. Similarly, Smerek and Peterson, (2007) found a strong positive association between age and job satisfaction. The authors further suggested that the strong positive association between age and job satisfaction is because older employees are well-adjusted to their job and obtain more intrinsic rewards from it. For instance, Tsai and Hu (2010) found that among nurses those who were 31 and above years rated highly than those who were below 31 years of age with respect to the influence of age on job satisfaction.

Despite the reported positive association between age and job satisfaction, Worrell, Skaggs, and Brown (2006) found no statistically significant relationship between age and job satisfaction among school psychologist. In contrast, Furnham, Petrides, Jackson, and Cotter (2002), found a significant relationship between age and job satisfaction, with younger employees being more satisfied with their job. However, the authors indicated that the results should be interpreted with caution given the size and composition of the sample (only 8 out of 82 participants were over 46 years). Martin and Shehan (1989) further notes that age taps into a generalized dimension of work experience that reflects job tenure, seniority, or social relationship with authority that can be traded for higher levels of material reward.

In a study of job satisfaction among employees of a Christian university, Schroder (2008) found significant ($F = 3.99, p = .008$) differences among four age groups (20-30, 31-40, 41-50,
and > 50) of employees with respect to job satisfaction. A further analysis using student
Newman Keuls test revealed that employees older than 50 years showed statistically significant
overall job satisfaction than their younger counterparts between the ages of 20 and 40.
Schroder’s finding was confirmed by Bos, Donders, Bouwman-Brouwer, and Van der Gulden
(2009) in a study to explore work characteristics and determinants of job satisfaction from the
point of view of university employees among four age groups. The authors found a statistically
significant relationship between age and job satisfaction, and concluded that job satisfaction
increased with age. Similarly, Brown and Sargeant (2007) explored job satisfaction,
organizational commitment, religious commitment of full time university employees reported
that employees aged 46 years and older had a higher level of overall job satisfaction than those
employees between the ages of 26 and 35 years. In contrast, Malik, Danis, and Ghafoor (2009)
found a negative association between age and job satisfaction, and that as age increases job
satisfaction decreases and vice versa although the relationship was not significant. Similar to
earlier studies reported, a facet level analysis of job satisfaction revealed a statistically
significant difference in satisfaction with the job itself with respect to age among academics in
Turkish universities (Saygi, Tolon, & Tekogul, 2011).

**Job satisfaction and years of employment.** In a study to examine the dual factor theory
of job satisfaction in an educational setting using analysis of variance (ANOVA) based on 120
Israeli elementary school principals, (Gaziel, 2001) found that demographic characteristics such
as seniority on the job positively related to job satisfaction among principals in school systems.
However, Smerek and Peterson, 2007 found no significant relationship between length of service
and job satisfaction among non-academic staff at a university. The authors concluded that as the
length of service increases, employees’ perceptions of recognition, professional growth and
opportunity, effective supervision, satisfaction with benefits, and presence of core values decreases.

Similarly, Schroder (2008) found no significant difference in levels of job satisfaction and years of employment among employees in a Christian university, and concluded that length of employment had no impact on levels of job satisfaction at the institution. In contrast, among Portuguese health professionals, the length of service was a significant correlate for pay. Thus, the longer participants were in the profession they reported higher satisfaction (McIntyre & McIntyre, 2010). For example, Brown and Sargeant (2007) found significant differences in overall and extrinsic job satisfaction as well as organizational commitment among university employees. The authors reported that employees with 11 to 14 years of service had higher extrinsic job satisfaction than those with 5 to 10 years of tenure. Furthermore, clerical nurses who had 6 years or more of service reported higher levels of job satisfaction than those who had worked for 1-5 years (Tsai & Wu, 2010).

In summary, the literature findings highlight the kinds of relationship between age, gender, educational level, and length of employment and job satisfaction, as well as the influence of these demographic characteristics on job satisfaction. The relationship between some demographic characteristics and job satisfaction, there were no associations found with others.

**Job satisfaction and educational attainment level.** Educational attainment is one of the characteristics that have been examined in relation to job satisfaction. According to Barli, Kurt, and Cabuk (2005) educational level adversely affects job satisfaction if working conditions are inferior or below expectation. For example, in a study to examine the dual factor theory of job satisfaction in an educational setting using analysis of variance (ANOVA) based on 120 Israeli elementary school principals, (Gaziel, 2001) found that formal education was positively related to job satisfaction among principals in school systems. There was statistically significant
difference between teachers with higher formal education than those with less formal education. The author concluded that formally educated teachers were more satisfied than teachers with less education, although the difference was not statistically significant (Bokemeier, Bokeimer, & Lacy, 1987; Smerek & Peterson, 2007).

However, in a study involving public sector employees findings indicated that the highly educated individual will be less satisfied if the job and work environment do not meet the expectations of that individual, and the less educated individual will be more satisfied because his or her lower expectations are met (Peiro, Agut & Grau, 2010; Seybolt, 1976). A similar conclusion was drawn by Mora, Garcia-Aracil, and Vila (2007) in their study of job satisfaction among young European higher education graduates. On the contrary, Martin and Shehan (1989) found no evidence that education leads to reduction in employee satisfaction, and concluded that though not significantly education generally increases worker satisfaction.

Specifically, Schroder (2008) found significant differences among educational levels of university employees with respect to job satisfaction, and that employees with a doctoral degree reported significantly higher levels of overall job satisfaction than their counterparts with a bachelor, professional or associate degree. Similarly, Brown and Sargeant (2007) found significant differences in overall and extrinsic job satisfaction among educational level of university employees, and reported specifically that employees with doctoral degree, master’s degree, bachelor/professional certificate/ associate degree, a certificate, and primary level education had higher levels of over job satisfaction than employees with just high school diploma. Furthermore the authors examined the data by occupational areas and found that administrators and sector managers reported a higher level of intrinsic (students, work itself, achievement, responsibility, and advancement) job satisfaction than employees in other areas.
In contrast, to the earlier findings by Schroder (2008) and Brown and Sargeant (2007), Slattery, Selvarajan, Anderson, and Sardessai (2010) found out in a study of the relationship between job characteristics and attitudes among temporary employees that highly educated temporary employees were less satisfied with their job and therefore more likely to quit their job than relatively less educated employees because of the negative relationship observed between job satisfaction and education. For example, level of education was a significant correlate with pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and overall job satisfaction among Portuguese healthcare professions, and therefore the higher the level of education the lower the satisfaction with supervision and overall job satisfaction but the higher the satisfaction with pay and opportunities for promotion (McIntyre & McIntyre, 2010).

**Job satisfaction and gender.** According to Bokemeier, Bokeime, and Lacy (1987), the gender of a worker is a source of systematic difference in work conditions and individual traits. However the authors noted the inconsistent and inconclusive results on the relationship between gender and job satisfaction. For example a study to examine the dual factor theory of job satisfaction in an educational setting using analysis of variance (ANOVA) based on 120 Israeli elementary school principals, (Gaziel, 2001) found that gender was not related to job satisfaction. Empirically, research (eg. Bokemeier, Bokeimer & Lacy, 1987; Mason, 2001; Worrell, Skaggs, & Brown, 2006; Saygi, Tolon, & Tekogul, 2011; Schroder, 2008; Smerek & Peterson, 2007) indicates no statistically significant relationship between gender and job satisfaction.

Hinkle and Choi (2009) found that gender was not a significant moderator of the relationship between jobs fit and job satisfaction. Similarly, Volkwein and Zhou, (2003) suggested that the effect of gender is indirect. According to the authors gender is mediated by variables such as perception of job stress and pressure, and indirectly and negatively influences
one’s overall job satisfaction. With only education and other personal characteristics included in a regression analysis, the results revealed that men were happier than comparable women among higher education graduates, however, when regression analysis included labor status variables, women were happier than men of comparable jobs (Mora, Garcia-Aracil & Vila, 2007).

Krumboltz, Blando, Kim, and Reikowski (1994) confirmed that gender differences in job satisfaction tend to show that men place greater emphasis on factors such as pay, job security, advancement, and freedom on the job than women. In contrast, Martin and Shehan (1989) argue that only men who have the advantage of obtaining financially rewarding jobs are able to seek nonmaterial rewards on the job and therefore less concerned with levels of pay, security, and fringe benefits. Bokemeier, Bokeime, and Lacy (1987) further note that employment status and hierarchy of supervision are significantly related to job satisfaction among the men in the study whereas for women, work conditions are not related to job satisfaction. Economic responsibility rather than gender, according to Martin and Shehan (1989), were critical in the education-job rewards job satisfaction relationship among employees. However, gender significantly correlated with work satisfaction on the present job and global job satisfaction, with male health professionals reporting higher job satisfaction than females (Mclntyre & Mclntyre, 2010).

Brown and Sargeant (2007) reported that male employees were intrinsically more satisfied than their female counterparts. However, the authors also reported no significant difference in overall and extrinsic job satisfaction among employees at the university by gender. In contrast, Smith (2009) concluded in a study of gender, pay, and work satisfaction among academic and administrative staff members in a UK university that as a group, women expressed higher level of satisfaction with their pay and work conditions than their male colleagues, despite women receiving less pay and in less senior positions than their male colleagues.
Job Satisfaction and Organizational Outcomes

Key organizational outcomes explored by researchers include job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job stress, turnover, and performance (Miller, Rutherford, & Kolodinsky, 2008). Literature reveals the use of 1 – 7 point Likert-type scales in the measurement of organizational outcomes (Gaither, Kahaleh, Doucette, Mott, Pederson, Schommer, 2008, Somech, 2005; Steers, 1977). For example, Gaither et al. (2008) measured job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job stress with 4-7 point Likert-type scales in a study of the role of organizational, extra-role, and individual factors and work related outcomes among pharmacists. Specifically, Somech (2005) measured teachers’ organizational commitment with a 20-item Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) and the teachers used a 7-point Likert-type scale to indicate their agreement with the items in the scale. In addition, the author used 23-item Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) scale to measure the teachers’ performance. The teachers indicated their level of agreement or disagreement on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Tsai, Chuang, and Hsieh (2009) measured job performance and turnover intentions among service industries’ employees with the Job Performance and Turnover Intention Scales in a study of communication satisfaction and organizational outcomes, and participants indicated their levels of agreement or disagreement on a 7-point Likert-type scale.

Evidence abounds in the literature on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational outcomes (Edwards, Bell, Arthur, & Decuir, 2008; Hamidi, & Eivazi, 2010; Locke, 1970; Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid, & Siralo, 1998; Samad, 2011; Shore & Martin, 1989). Job satisfaction has been linked to work quality, performance, commitment, motivation, absenteeism, turn over, burnout and achievement (Worrell, Skaggs, & Brown, 2006; Samad, 2011). The level of job satisfaction that individuals experience can affect their emotions, behaviors, and performance at work (Chiu & Kosinski, 1999). Therefore, individuals who do not
like their job are not likely to experience complete satisfaction from their work no matter how pleasant and favorable the situation in which it takes place (Alekseev, 1975). This next section is a review of literature on job satisfaction and organizational outcomes subdivided into job satisfaction and performance, commitment, and turnover.

**Job satisfaction and performance.** The relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance has been reported in previous literature. However, the empirical support of the nature of the relationship has been mixed (Crede, Chernyshenko, Stark, Dalal, & Bashshur, 2007; Edwards, Bell, Arthur, & Decuir, 2008; Locke, 1970; Samad, 2011, Saari & Judge, 2004). A plausible explanation for the inclusiveness of the relationship between job satisfaction and performance may be the different conceptualization and operationalization of job satisfaction and job performance (Edwards, Bell, Arthur, & Decuir, 2008).

Despite, the inconclusive nature of the job satisfaction and performance relationship, Zhang, DeMichele, and Connaughton (2004) noted that satisfied employees are more likely to remain committed to the organization, set higher performance goals, maintain a better performance level, accept more responsibilities, and take leadership roles. However, if employees have low levels of job satisfaction, they are less likely to engage in extra duties, endorse, support or defend the organizations’ objectives, or engage in any contextual behaviors (Edwards, Bell, Arthur, & Decuir, 2008).

In a study to determine the effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between commitment and job performance among managers of manufacturing companies in Malaysia, Samad (2011) found that both the motivator factors (work itself, achievement, possibility for growth, responsibility, advancement, and recognition for advancement) and hygiene factors (job security, working condition, policy and administration, quality of supervision, relationship with peers, relationship with supervisors and status) facets of job satisfaction have significant and
positive effect on job performance. Chiu and Kosinski (1999) points out that moral values and the opportunity to do something for others showed to be significantly more satisfying than all other factors.

Given, the motivator and hygiene factors significantly accounted (p < .05) for the incremental variance of 12% and 21% respectively in job performance (Samad, 2011). This suggests that when committed employees are made happy by improving the job satisfaction in the workplace they will give the best of their services to the management and increase their job performance (Samad, 2011). A further examination of the facets of job satisfaction and performance, Edwards, Bell, Arthur, and Decuir (2008) found statistically significant positive relationship between satisfaction with work and task performance, non-significant relationship between satisfaction with pay and task performance, and finally they found a statistically significant but negative relationship between promotion and task performance. The authors did not find a statistically significant relationship between satisfaction with co-workers and task performance. Interestingly, Crede et al. (2007) suggested in their assessment of job satisfactions’ position within the nomological network that job satisfaction bears little influence on job performance when considering the importance of factors such as motivation, procedural, and declarative knowledge. On the contrary, Saari and Judge (2004) indicated in a study of employee attitude and job satisfaction that job satisfaction is a predictive of performance, with a stronger relationship for professional jobs.

**Job satisfaction and organizational commitment.** Organizational commitment is defined as the relative strength of an individuals’ identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Steers, 1977). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment has become an important topic in the study of work-related attitudes (Testa, 2001). However, the nature of the relation between job satisfaction and commitment is inconclusive. For instance,
Testa (2001) concluded that job satisfaction is an antecedent of organizational commitment. Similarly, Feather and Rauter (2004) reported finding a statistically significant relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. In furtherance, Feunnd (2005) found a significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment predictors of turnover intentions among welfare workers. However, the author indicated that it is organizational commitment that affects job satisfaction and not the other way round. In contrast, Huang and Hsiao (2007) employed a nonrecursive model, finding that both job satisfaction and organizational commitment had significant and positive effect on each other. The authors therefore concluded that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are reciprocally related.

In a comparative study of satisfaction and commitment between American and Japanese collegiate coaches, Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) found that although Japanese coaches reported significantly lower satisfaction than their American colleagues, they were significantly more committed to their organizations that the American coaches who were more committed to their occupation. Using logistic regression Eker, Eker, and Pala (2008) found that among health care staff job satisfaction was a significant predictor of organizational commitment. The authors specifically identified satisfaction factors such as job qualifications, administrative structure and working environment, job security and social utility, career improvement facilities, working conditions, and payments as having important effects on organizational commitment. Similarly, job satisfaction had a significant independent effect on organizational commitment (beta coefficient = .34) as one of the pathways identified in a study of pathways to organizational commitment (Landsman, 2008).

**Job satisfaction and turnover.** Existing literature reveals a relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. Turnover refers to voluntarily leaving an organization (Tsai & Wu, 2010). For instance, out of 19 studies that examined job satisfaction among caregivers in
long term care settings, in six of the studies lower job satisfaction was associated with turnover or absenteeism (Castle, 2006). Moreover, Tsai and Wu (2010) found a significantly negative correlation between job satisfaction and turnover intentions among hospital nurses in Taiwan, and concluded that hospital administrators can reduce turnover by meeting the needs of the nurses.

In general, differences between managers in eight Australian industrial organizations who resigned from their jobs and those who stayed were not significantly different from each other on intrinsic and extrinsic factors of job satisfaction (Spillane, 1973). Interestingly salary provided the least satisfaction for both managers who resigned their jobs and those who stayed with their organization (Spillane, 1973). Spillane asserts that for employees in the sector salary does not serve as a motivating factor on the decision to quit or stay with their organization.

Furthermore, in the study of the role of pay satisfaction and commitment on employee turnover intentions, Vandenberghe and Tremblay (2008) found in sample one of the study that satisfaction with pay correlated more strongly with turnover intentions ($r = -0.40, p < .01$) whereas in sample two of the same study satisfaction with pay structure and administration correlated strongly with turnover intentions ($r = -0.37, p < .01$) than pay satisfaction ($r = -0.37, p < .01$). Therefore, the authors concluded that pay satisfaction is a salient predictor of turnover intentions than its particular components. Moreover, job satisfaction has a greater direct impact on intent to leave than organizational commitment (Clugston, 2000).

Chairpersons of two-year college institutions identified policy and administration, supervision, salary, and the work itself as factors that influence the propensity to leave their present institution (Murray & Murray, 1998). According to Valedz and Anthony (2001) two-year College part time faculty members indicated higher salary, tenured positions, and opportunities for advancement among others as the factors that will influence their decision to leave the
organization. In a related study of job satisfaction, Crede et al. (2007) found strong negative path coefficients between job satisfaction and job withdrawal (-.62) and counterproductive behavior (-.50). Moreover, a study of the effects of work-related attitudes on the intention to leave the profession among school teachers in Nigeria, Ladebo (2005) found that teachers with higher levels of satisfaction were strongly committed to the profession and less likely to leave. Job satisfaction significantly predicted the intent to stay or leave (De Gieter, Hofmans, & Pepermans, 2011; Wang, Tao, Ellenbecker, & Liu, 2011).

Terranova and Henning (2011) found a strong relationship between various facets of job satisfaction and intent to leave among athletic trainers, although the relationship was negative. For example, the nature of the work subscale emerged as the greatest predictor of intent to leave. Freund (2005) concluded in a study of commitment and job satisfaction as predictors of turnover intentions, that in an organization where employees feel that the organization is treating them fairly and they are properly rewarded with interest in the job, appreciation, and financial rewards, or employees feels that the organizational goals reflect their personal aspirations, such employees will tend to stay in the organization and will contribute to achieving the organizational aims and goals. However, results from a study explaining nursing turnover intent suggests that job satisfaction has only an indirect influence on the intention to quite whereas organizational commitment has the strongest and most direct impact on turnover intentions among nurses (Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid, & Sirola, 1998).

In summary, job satisfaction is an important factor in organizational outcomes. The evidence in the literature reveals the existence of relationships between job satisfaction and organizational outcomes such as performance, turnover intentions, and commitment among others. Despite the inconclusive nature of relationships, that job satisfaction greatly matters in terms of organizational outcomes.
Person-Environment Fit

The concept of person-environment fit, the primary independent variable in this study, is primarily based on the interactionist theory of behavior (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). According to this theory, the greatest variance in behavior and attitudes is due to the interaction between personal and situational variables (Livingston, Nelson, & Barr, 1997; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). More so, individual employees who perceive fit with their work environment are better off than those who do not perceive fit (Van Vianen, Shen, & Chuang, 2011). Therefore, person-environment fit occurs when the characteristics of the individual and the work environment are matched (Ehrhart, 2006; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Compatibility may take one of either form. Supplementary fit is achieved when the personal characteristics of the individual matched the characteristics of the organization. Complementary fit is achieved when individuals’ personal characteristics fill gaps not addressed by other members (demands-ability) or a match between individual needs and organizational supplies (needs-supply fit) (Kristoff, 1996; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Another equally important distinction in the fit literature is between objective and perceived forms of fit. Objective fit involves gathering information about the individual and organization separately, and assessing the congruence between them (e.g., Cable & Parsons, 2001; O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Resick, Baltes, & Shantz, 2007), while perceived fit is asking individuals directly whether or not they fit better with the organization and its members (e.g., Cable & Parsons, 2001; Lauver, & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Resick & Baltes, Shantz, 2007).

The basic premise of the theory of person-environment fit is that a match or fit in characteristics between people and their environments results in positive outcomes such as satisfaction, commitment, performance, and low turnover for both individuals and organizations (e.g., Gilbreath, Kim, & Nichols, 2011; Kristoff, 1996; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Ostroff &
Schulte 2007; Sekiguchi, 2004b; Schneider, 2001). For example, Cable and Judge (1996) found that employees perceived P-O fit significantly predict their organizational commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and willingness to recommend their organization to others. Similarly, the authors found that PJ fit perceptions significantly predict employees’ job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Moreover, Ostroff, Shin, and Kinicki (2005) indicated the existence of a relationship between person-environment fit and job satisfaction, commitment, and turn over intentions. The authors confirmed that fit between individuals’ characteristics and their work environment are important for attitudes. Furthermore, in an empirical study of reconceptualization of person-environment fit models, Hesketh and Gardner (1993) found out that person-environment fit improved the prediction of job satisfaction for 13 out of 21 attributes after controlling for the influence of direct relations of job preferences and perceptions.

As a result of the growing interest among organizational behavior practitioners and researchers of person-environment fit issues, other domains such as person-organization fit, person-job fit, person-group fit, person-vocation fit, person-supervisor fit have emerged (Kristoff-Brown et al., 2001; Kristoff, 1996; Ostroff & Schulte, 2007;). However, the two most commonly researched either separately or together are person-organization (P-O) fit and person-job (P-J) fit (Carless, 2005; Hinkel & Choi, 2009). Accordingly, Sekiguchi (2004b) noted that person-environment fit is a complex and multidimensional concept. Specifically, what constitute P-E fit perceptions and how to measure them are critical issues because of the important role employees’ perceptions play in work related decisions such as stay or leave a job (Hinkle & Choi, 2009).

In a meta-analysis of 172 studies on P-E fit, Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) examined 836 effect sizes and the data show differences in the magnitudes of relationships between different fit measures and outcomes as well as intercorrelations among fit measures that suggest they are
highly related, but one cannot be substitute of the other (Herdman & Carlson, 2009). In addition, controlling for person-job fit, O’Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) found that person-job fit did not affect the results of the person-culture fit as assessed through a profile approach. These studies give credence to the uniqueness of the person-environment fit domains. Furthermore, Wood (1981) noted that satisfied employees portray a higher person-job setting fit when they independently assess their work values and environment, those who place high importance on attitudinal referents tend to perceive the organization as highly reciprocating in those areas, and finally those who perceive a less accommodating work environment usually express a low value orientation. Thus, particular kinds of people are attracted to particular settings and those who do not fit in that setting perhaps leave and those who remain are similar and more homogenous than those initially attracted to that setting (Schneider 1987). As mentioned earlier in the section, research domains such as person-organization, person-job, and person-group fit have emerged in the person-environment discourse, and according to Kristof (2000), these different domains of the environment have unique impacts on outcomes.

Piasentin and Chapman (2007) have suggested that in order to capture a wide domain of possible antecedents of perceived person-environment fit, there is the need to use a variety of different items to assess different types of perceived similarity or complementarity (values, personality, and knowledge, skills and attitudes). In addition, specification of proximal work environments provides a more salient measure of person-environment fit than more distal environmental measures (Spokane, 1985; Spokane, Meir, & Catalano, 2000). For example, a simple focus on the macro environment of a university might be useful for a particular purpose, however, the individual’s behavior can be affected by several layers of congruence and therefore these different layers will operate synergistically to influence work related behaviors (Spokane, 1985; Spokane et al., 2000).
The different types of fit within a work environment include person-organization, person-supervisor, person-job, and person-group fit each of which has unique impacts on organizational outcomes. For instance, employees distinguished between their person-organization fit and person-supervisor fit perceptions in an empirical study and both fits were independently related to organizational commitment (Van Vianen et al., 2011).

**Person-organization (P-O) fit.** Person-organization fit has emerged as an important topic in organizational behavior and personnel management because of the strong effect of the degree of fit on employees’ attitudes and behavior in an organization (Liu, Liu, & Hu, 2010). For example, Posner (1992) found out that person-organization value congruence was directly related to positive work attitudes among over 1600 professionals and management personal from a large multinational manufacturing firm. Although researchers agree on the importance of person-organization fit, there is increasing debate regarding the operationalization of the construct (Sekiguchi, 2004a). Person-organization is broadly defined as the compatibility between individuals and organizations (Kristof, 1996). Kristof (1996) contends that compatibility can be conceptualized in a variety of ways. As a result person-organization fit is multidimensional, and includes components such as personality, skills, needs, goals, climate, culture, and values (Amos & Weathington, 2008; Cable & Judge, 1996; Caldwell & O’Reilly, 1990; De Clercq, Fontaine & Anseel, 2008; Da Silva, Hutcheson, & Wahl, 2010; Holland, 1997; Kristoff-Brown et al., 2001; Kristoff, 1996; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Schneider, 2001; Westerman & Cyr, 2004).

The study of P-O fit has become a key factor for increasing the understanding of employee attitudes and behavior in organizations (De Clercq, Fontaine, & Anseel, 2008). In an organizational context, the person-environment theory is referred to as person-organization fit, and the most common operationalization of the P-O fit perspective is the values congruence
between individuals and organizations (Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown, 2000; Verquer et al., 2003). This is because individuals use values to make choices, including their participation in organizations, and organizations also use values to develop a culture that maintains guidelines for acceptable beliefs and behaviors (Da Silva, Hutcheson, & Wahl, 2010; Waterman & Cyr, 2004). Cheverton (2007) suggested that commitment to organizational values is a means of attracting staff and also to maintaining and improving organizational performance. Therefore, values have important effects on the functioning of both organizations and employees (Macy, 2006), and as noted by Rokeach (1968) values have a strong motivational component as well as cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. In a study of person-culture fit, Sarris and Kirby (2005) concluded that subjective organizational fit perceptions are related to the congruence between an individual’s perceived organizational values and their ideal organizational values. In a meta-analysis of 15 P-O fit studies conducted by Verquer et al. (2001) they found that values congruence consistently had stronger relations with outcomes such as job satisfaction. There is however, the argument for the relevance of personality fit on employee outcomes (see Piasentin & Chapman, 2007; Wang, Zhan, Mccune, & Truxillo, 2011).

The P-O fit theory suggests that if people fit well with an organization, they are likely to exhibit more positive attitudes and behaviors (Amos & Weathington, 2008, Cohen, 2010). For example, the results of a study of 151 undergraduate and graduate students revealed that employees who fit well or perceived themselves as fitting well in an their organization were more satisfied with their job and more committed to remaining with the organization (Amos & Weathington, 2008). Individual-organizational similarity is therefore the crux of P-O fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). In furtherance, Cable and Judge (1996) found out that P-O fit perceptions share a strong relationship with employees’ work attitudes after controlling for the direct effects of job characteristics.
Person-job (P-J) fit. The compatibility of individuals with specific jobs is one of the most researched of the P-E fit types (Kristof, 1996). P-J fit is defined as the fit between the abilities of a person and the demands of a job or the desires of a person and the attributes of a job (Edwards, 1991). Edwards’ definition is based on two conceptualizations labeled as needs-supplies or supplies-values fit (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). However, Kristof (1996) defined P-J fit as the task a person is expected to accomplish in exchange for employment, as well as the characteristics of those task, Kristof suggested that P-J fit should be judged by the task performed and not relative to the organization in which the job exist. Though many job requirements are likely to reflect the characteristics of the organization, Kristof (1996) contended that they are conceptually distinct elements of the work environment. Whereas person-organization fit focuses on the relationship between the individual and the organization, person-group fit focuses on the individual and membership at the group level.

Person-group (P-G) fit. Person-group fit is an increasingly relevant construct in study of fit, and according to Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) P-G research is the most nascent among all the fits. Person-group fit is defined as the compatibility between individuals and their work groups (Kristof, 1996). However, the work group can range from a small group of immediate co-workers to any identifiable subunit of an organization, such as functional department or geographic division (Kristof, 1996). In addition, the work group in which an individual functions is a relevant and distinct type of person-environment fit. Therefore, the degree of fit between an individual and group perhaps differ radically from the fit between the person and the organization (Kristof, 1996). Kristof (1996) makes the argument that P-G fit will be appropriate and meaningful to investigate in situations where there is disagreement on values at the organizational level, however, there must be agreement at the group or unit level to evaluate the P-G fit. The challenge associated with the evaluation of person-group fit in a university
environment is that administrators tend to belong to a variety of groups within the university, including colleges, schools and/or departments within the colleges and even programs within the school/department level. Due to the difficulty in defining the group context, the P-G fit was excluded in this study.

**Fit and Job Satisfaction**

People are more likely satisfied with most aspects of their jobs when they work among people whose taste, talents and values are similar to their own and when they are performing tasks which they like to do (Mount & Muchinsky, 1978). Using policy capturing methodology Kristof-Brown et al. (2002) found from a three way interaction between P-J, P-G and P-O fit that higher levels of fit across all fit domains was related to higher satisfaction for individuals with more years of organizational experience. The findings suggested that the different types of fit may be less or more important to some individuals within the work environment (Ostroff & Schulte, 2007). According to the authors this notion further suggests that not only should multiple types of fit be considered simultaneously in studies but also analysis that take into consideration the configuration across types of fit and the importance of types of fit.

Empirical evidence has shown that a high level of person-organization fit is related to organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction and organization commitment (O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). When employees’ values match those of the organization, according to Amos and Weathington (2008) they are likely to report higher levels of satisfaction. Westerman and Cyr (2004) found that values congruence was a direct and significant predictor of job satisfaction. Similarly, Karakurum (2006) in a study of the effects of person-organization fit on employee job satisfaction, performance and organization commitment in a Turkish public organization, found a strong positive relationship between person-organization fit and job satisfaction even with the effects of control variables. The author concluded that a higher level of
value congruence between employees and the organization is associated with higher levels of job satisfaction.

In addition, a meta-analysis of 21 studies revealed support for a positive relation between value congruence and job satisfaction (Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). A recent study by Amos and Weathington (2008) involving 151 graduate and undergraduate students in a midsized university in the southern United States noted that when employees reported high level of value congruence, they were generally more satisfied with their jobs. Furthermore, the authors hypothesized a positive relation for value congruence and organizational satisfaction, which was supported and therefore concluded that not only is congruence of values related to this satisfaction but also significantly relates to their job satisfaction. Similarly, the results of a study of incoming undergraduate students’ perceived fit with the academic environment indicated that academic fit leads to academic satisfaction (Schmitt, Oswald, Friede, Imus, & Merritt, 2008).

In their study of person-organization fit using the profile comparison approach, O’Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) found a positive correlation between person-organization fit and job satisfaction ($r = .35, p < .01$). The authors further concluded from a regression analysis that person-organization fit was a significant predictor of job satisfaction and independent of age, gender, and tenure among MBA students and employees of government agencies and public accounting firms. Similarly, the results of a survey of 259 MPA students revealed a significantly positive effect of person-organization fit on job satisfaction (Liu, Liu, & Hu, 2010).

**Summary of Literature Review Findings**

In summary, the issue of fit has been recognized by both researchers and practitioners in organizational behavior to have an influence on work attitudes of employees, and subsequently its impact on organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, commitment, turn over intentions,
and employee selection decisions among many other outcomes. Consistently, studies identified five facets of job satisfaction, these include co-worker, pay, supervision, job itself, and promotion opportunities, and further highlighted the impact of demographic factors such as age, gender, educational level, and length service on the job satisfaction of employees. Although some of the findings of the impact of these demographic factors on job satisfaction have been inconsistent.

Not only the demographic factors influence job satisfaction but evidence in the literature suggests the important role of the work environment in determining the satisfaction of employees. Therefore, an understanding of the perceived fit and the influence on job satisfaction can guide the employee selection process as well as ways to meet the expectations of employees to make them satisfied with their job, and subsequently lead to positive organizational outcomes. There are recommendations in the literature on how to improve the satisfaction of employees in various professions.

The literature has also highlighted on the different types of fit within work environments and the likely impact of each type of fit on organizational outcomes. In addition, the evidence in the extant literature reveals the challenges association with the conceptualization and measurement of fit. At the same time many of the studies acknowledged the challenges associated with conceptualization, and measurement of the fit (Kristof, 1996; Ostroff & Schulte, 2007).

Despite the recognition and documentation of the importance of fit and job satisfaction, the evidence from existing literature reveals a gap in the studies of person-environment fit and job satisfaction; particularly in higher education. The few studies in education focused more on students and faculty to the neglect of the administrative aspect of the institutions (See Amos & Weathington, 2008). Consequently, there is just the thinnest evidence that makes the link
between job satisfaction and organizational outcomes in higher education particularly among administrative staff (Volkwein & Zhou, 2003).

Gaziel (2001) asserts that, despite the increasing importance of job satisfaction to leadership in educational administration, surprisingly little attention has been paid to administrators in higher education. Out of three studies in education, only one study focused on non-academic staff in a university—much less one from the Midwestern United States (Verquer et al., 2003). Moreover, evidence in the literature indicates that the research on fit and job satisfaction has been on person-organization fit. However, assessing P-E fit (P-O and P-J fit) will provide a more realistic account of the relative influence of different fits (Carless, 2005). Hence the study aims to explore the relationship between P-O fit and P-J fit of the work environment and job satisfaction. This study examined a sample of administrative staff members to contribute to the understanding of the relationship between university environment and job satisfaction in higher education. The methodological approach used in this study will be described in detail in Chapter Three.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

This study sought to determine the extent to which administrative staff member’s perceived fit with their work environment and how level of perceived fit relates to job satisfaction in a mid-sized Midwestern public university. In addition, the researcher examined the ability of length of service, level of education, age, and gender, to predict job satisfaction among administrative staff members in the university. This chapter describes and explains the research design, the participants, the instrumentations used, the data collection process and analysis, and the assumptions of the study.

Research Design

The study used a correlational design to examine the relationship between two quantitative variables: perceived person-environment fit, and job satisfaction. The independent variable is the perception of environment fit (Person-Organization fit, Person-Job fit), and the dependent variable is Job Satisfaction. The researcher’s aim was to determine the degree of the relationship between perceived fit among participants and job satisfaction as well as other characteristics. Therefore, the correlational design was appropriate for the study because the study examined the degree of relationship between two quantitative variables (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010).

Participants

The participants for the study were administrative staff members in schools, colleges and departments within a mid-sized Midwestern public university located in the state of Ohio. The administrative staff members provide support to the academic environment of the university. The university has approximately 643 administrative staff members providing services in areas such as student academic advising and support, athletics/recreation sports, institutional support, and technology within the university environment. The researcher extended the invitation to all
administrative staff members. Therefore, the researcher adopted convenience sampling technique in selecting participants for the study. The participants were selected because of the feasibility of obtaining access to them, as administrators of the school of the researcher. Moreover, the researcher utilized the student relationship with the institution to access the participants in the schools, colleges and departments.

Administrative staff members are non-teaching staff of the university, responsible for promoting a healthy environment for learning and professional development. In addition, they are responsible for asserting the leadership and support essential to enhancing the University’s programs and services. Administrative staff members are specifically engaged in function areas that include academic departments, academic support, athletics and recreational sports, institutional support, student support, and technology. Within these functional areas the administrative staff members hold positions such as unit or section directors, academic advisors, coordinators of student admissions, financial managers and accountants, marketing coordinators, coaching officials of soccer, football, and basketball, systems analysts, server managers and administrators, financial aid specialists, residence hall directors, clinic directors, and transfer advisor among many others.

To access the participants and collect the data, the researcher sought approval from the Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB) of the institution. The researcher discussed the study with the Executive Committee of the Administrative Council to inform its members of the study and encourage them to participate. The online survey was developed and sent to the administrative staff members through the email distribution system of the Administrative Staff Council (ASC) for completion.
**Instrumentation**

In order to collect the data, the researcher utilized the Environment Fit and Satisfaction Survey (EFSS), which is a combination of two existing instruments—Saks and Ashforth’s (1997) General Perceptions of Fit Measure and the 2009 Revision of the Abridged Job Descriptive Index (aJDI) and abridged Job in General scale (aJIG) (Brodke et al., 2009). The EFSS consists of 103 items and is divided into three sections. Section I is the aJDI; Section II is the Environment Fit Questionnaire; and Section III measures demographics. Each section is discussed with more detail below.

**Section I: Job satisfaction.** Job satisfaction is defined as “the feelings workers have about their job” (Brodke et al., 2009, p. 1). Job satisfaction of employees measured using the *Abridged* Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Brodke et al., 2009). This 90 item instrument is among the most widely used measures of job satisfaction and has data supporting its validity and reliability (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Henkle & Choi, 2009; McIntyre & McIntyre, 2010; Nagy, 2002; Seybort, 1976; Zhang, DeMichele, & Connaughton, 2004; Perdue, Reardon, & Peterson, 2007). The instrument was designed to measure employees’ job satisfaction. The JDI has been continually used in research for more than 50 years. With this instrument, participants are asked to reflect on specific aspects of their job and then rate their satisfaction accordingly.

The Abridged JDI is composed of five subscales and the abridged Job in General measure: (1) Work on Present Job (6 items), which measures satisfaction with work; (2) Pay (6 items), which measures satisfaction with extent of monetary reward; (3) Opportunities for Promotion (6 items), which measures perceived prospects for advancement within the organization; (4) Supervision (6 items), which measures satisfaction with performance of immediate supervisors; (5) People in your present job (6 items), which measures satisfaction with coworkers; and Job in General (8 items), which measures overall subjective impression of
the job. The instrument consisted of a list of short phrases or adjectives that describe the different job facets, and participants responded to each word or phrase by selecting “Yes”, “No” or “?”. Thus, if participants agreed with the word or phrase, they answered yes and if they disagreed the answer was no, and when they were not sure they placed a question mark “?”. The responses were numerically coded as “Yes” = 3, “No” = 0, and “?” = 1. Each of the subscales was calculated separately, and the Job in General (JIG) score provided an overall job satisfaction measure. High scores were indicative of high levels of satisfaction. The inclusion of the aJIG component to measure overall job satisfaction of participants addressed the shortcomings of multiple-item scales suggested in some studies (Nagy, 2002; Jackson & Corr, 2002).

The reliability of the JDI was established by determining the correlations among the facets of job satisfaction. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were calculated for each facet, which ranged from .88 to .92. The validity of the JDI was determined by the correlations of the facets with selected outcome measures such as intent to quit, job stress, and single item measure of overall job satisfaction.

Section II: Perceived fit. The General Perceptions of Fit Measure (GPFM) (Saks & Ashforth, 2007) was used to measure the perception of fit between administrative staff members and their work environment. The GPFM consists of eight items (See Appendix A). The instrument is described as a global measure of employees’ perceptions of fit consisting of two sub-scales with four questions each: Person–Job (P-J) fit and Person-Organization (P-O) fit. On a specific to general continuum, the conceptualization of person-environment fit is the domain dimension. The domain level isolates the broad areas of comparison but does not distinguish dimensions within each area (Edwards & Shipp, 2007). Such areas of comparison include values, personality, goals, and demographic characteristics (Cable & Judge, 1996; Lyons & O’Brien, 2006; Piasentin & Chapman, 2007; Saks & Asforth, 1997). Four items (items 39 - 42) measure
Person-Job fit and address the extent to which one meets the job requirements and the degree to which the job fulfills one’s needs, is a good match, and enables the kind of work one wants to do. The next four items (items 43-46) address the Person-Organization fit and measure the extent to which one’s values and personality match the organization as well as the organization fulfilling one’s needs and being a match.

These items apply a 5-point Likert-type scale indicating one’s level of agreement: 1 = To a very little extent, and 5 = To a very large extent. Scores for the subscales were calculated by determining the sum of items within each subscale. High scores indicated that participants had a more favorable perception of fit. In the original study of Saks and Ashforth (1997), the internal consistency of the two subscales were person-job fit coefficient $\alpha = .89$ and person-organization fit coefficient $\alpha = .92$. The construct validity of Saks and Ashforth (1997) measures of fit was confirmed by a two-factor (person-organization, person-job) confirmatory factor analysis.

**Section III: Demographics.** Previous studies suggest that a variety of demographic characteristics exert potential influence on job satisfaction (Malik, Danish, & Ghafoor, 2009; Volkwein & Zhou, 2003; Zhang, DeMichele, & Connaughton, 2004). In order to examine the relationship between perceived environment fit and job satisfaction a variety of demographics will be examined. Therefore, the demographic section of the survey includes five questions concerning participants’ demographics, gender, highest level of education, length of service, and age.

**Research Questions**

This study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is administrative staff members’ level of perceived fit with the university environment and job satisfaction?
2. Does perceived environment fit predict job satisfaction among administrative staff members?

3. Does job satisfaction and perceived fit with the university environment differ by demographic group membership (e.g., level of education, age, gender, and years of employment)?

**Data Collection Procedure**

Participants completed the Environment Fit Satisfaction Survey (EFSS) consisting of the Saks and Ashforth (1997) General Perceptions Fit Measure (GPFM) and Abridged Job Descriptive Index (aJDI). The EFSS survey was divided into three sections: aJDI to measure participants’ job satisfaction GPFM measuring the perceived environment fit of participants, and demographic characteristics. The survey was administered through Qualtrics, online survey system and sent through email system of the Administrative Staff Counsel for completion by the participants. The researcher contacted the Administrative Staff Advisory Council to communicate to their members about the study and encourage them to participate. Completion of the survey was indicative of consent to participate in the study. To further encourage administrative staff members to participate in the study, participants were included in a lottery draw for a $20 gift certificate to the university bookstore for merchandise of their choice. For the purposes of anonymity and confidentiality, the survey did not ask participants for their names. For the gift card lottery, participant’s names were collected and stored separately so that no connection could be made between their completed survey questions and their names. Finally, their anonymity was assured through numeric coding. Three reminders were sent to participants who had not yet completed the survey at two weeks intervals from the date the surveys were sent out.
Pre-Analysis Data Screening

The pre-analysis data screening followed the steps outlined by Mertler and Vannatta (2010). A total of 67 cases were removed through the screening and the remaining 170 questionnaires used in the analysis. Although normality tests (i.e., Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk) indicated some non-normal distributions of the data, these distributions were not extreme (Mertler and Vannatta, 2010). Furthermore, a visual inspection of the histograms and normal Q-Q plots indicated the distributions were sufficiently normal for the analysis to be conducted.

The score of each subscale was determined by summing the values of the responses to the items. Subscale scores for Job Satisfaction was calculated for each participant after the negatively worded items on each subscale were reversed coded to ensure that the high scores reflected high satisfaction. The scores for Work itself, Supervision, Co-worker, Pay and Promotion facets and Job in General were calculated by summing values of the items of each subscale and the Job in General scale. This yielded a range of scores between 0 and 18 for the subscales and 0-24 for the aJIG. The scores of the subscales and the total score for the participants on the aJIG scale was used for the analysis in this study. The scores for Person-Job fit and Person-Organization fit were calculated by summing the response to the General Perceptions of Fit items. This yielded a range of scores between 4 and 20.

Data Analysis

Variables. The primary variables for this study are Perceived Environment Fit, Job Satisfaction, and the subscales of General Perceptions of Fit Measure (Person-Job (P-J) fit (4 items), Person-Organization (P-O) fit (4items), and Abridged Job Descriptive Index (JDI), (1)Work on Present Job (6 items), (2) Pay (6 items), (3) Opportunities for Promotion (6items), (4) Supervision (6items), (5) People in your present job (6 items), and abridged Job in General
The secondary variables are demographic characteristics of participants (gender, educational level, length of service, and age). These demographic characteristics were treated as ordinal variables.

**Score Computation.** The data from the survey will be downloaded in excel file and converted for use in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. Responses from the Saks and Ashforth (1997) General Perception of Fit Measure for each participant were calculated. First the score of each subscale was determined by summing the values of the responses to the items as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

*Subscale Score Computation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale/variable</th>
<th>Computation and Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction (aJDI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work itself (JDI 1)</td>
<td>Sum (JDI items 1-6)</td>
<td>0 – 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>Sum (JDI items 7-12)</td>
<td>0 – 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion opportunities (JDI 3)</td>
<td>Sum (JDI items 13-18)</td>
<td>0 – 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>Sum (JDI items 19-24)</td>
<td>0 – 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers (JDI 5)</td>
<td>Sum (JDI items 25-30)</td>
<td>0 – 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>Sum (JIG items 31-38)</td>
<td>0 – 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Perception Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job (P-J) Fit</td>
<td>Sum (GPFM items 39-42)</td>
<td>4 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization (P-O) Fit</td>
<td>Sum (GPFM items 43-46)</td>
<td>4 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Fit</td>
<td>Sum (GPFM items 39-46)</td>
<td>8 – 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores from the aJDI and General Perception of Fit Measure (GPFM) were used for the analysis. The responses to the JDI were coded based on the revised reference guide by
Brodke, Sliter, Balzer, Gillespie, Gillespie, Gopalkrishnan, Lake, Oyer, Withrow, and Yankelevich (2009). An aJDI facet score and aJIG score was calculated for each respondent by summing up the values of aJDI subscale and the aJIG. However, to ensure that the high scores reflected high satisfaction, the negatively worded items on each subscale were reversed coded. Thus, scores of negatively worded items scored 3s were changed to 0s, scores of 0s changed to 3s, and maintained items scored 1. aJDI facet and aJIG items to be reversed coded are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

*Items to Reverse Score in the aJDI Facets and aJIG*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>aJDI Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>• JDI66 Uninteresting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>• JDI7 Barely live on Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• JDI8 Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• JDI10 Underpaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>• JDI14 Opportunities somewhat limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• JDI15 Dead-end job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>• JDI23 Annoying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker</td>
<td>• JDI25 Boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• JDI26 Slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• JDI29 Lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• JDI30 Frustrating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in general (JIG)</td>
<td>• JIG32 Undesirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• JIG34 Disagreeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• JIG38 Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example a “Yes” score for boring was assigned a value of 0. This scoring will be consistent with lower rather than a higher level of satisfaction. The scores for Work itself, Supervision, Co-worker, Pay and Promotion facets and Job in General were calculated by summing values of the items of each subscale and the Job in General scale. This yielded a range of scores between 0 and 18 for the subscales and 0-24 for the aJIG. The scores of the subscales and the total score for the participants on the JIG scale were used for the analysis in this study.
The researcher then cleaned the data by running frequency distributions and inspected for missing data and outliers. Appropriate corrective measures were adopted by the researcher to eliminate the impact of missing data and/or outliers on the analysis. Specifically, frequencies were run for each of the survey items and visually inspected to identify any anomalies. Furthermore, the guidelines in the JDI reference manual were used in dealing with missing responses for each of the JDI facet and the JIG. Two or fewer missing responses for an individual were made values of “1” before the facet score was computed. Following the data screening, the researcher used descriptive statistics to analyze the measures of central tendency (the mean, median, mode), and variability (standard deviation) of the participants’ perception of fit and job satisfaction (Q1). The job satisfaction scores were represented by items 1 to 38 and scores for perception of environment fit were represented by items 39 to 46.

**Inferential Statistics.** Table 3 presents the inferential statistics used for each research question. To determine the prediction of job satisfaction by perceived environment fit, (Question 2), Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated. The Pearson coefficient is an index of the strength of relationship between two variables and it is appropriate to use when both variables are quantitative (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). Forward a multiple regression analysis was then conducted with perceived environment fit and its subscales entered as independent variables and job satisfaction subscales entered as dependent variables separately. Multiple regression is an extension of simple linear regression involving more than one independent variable, and it is a technique used to predict the value of a dependent variable from a combination of independent variables (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996).
Table 3

Research Questions, Variables, and Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Data Analysis Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What is administrative staff members’ level of perceived fit with the university environment and job satisfaction? | Perceived Environment (P-E) Fit  
  • Person-Organization (P-O) Fit  
  • Person-Job (P-J) Fit  
  Job Satisfaction  
  • Work Itself (JDI 1)  
  • Pay (JDI 2)  
  • Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3)  
  • Supervision (JDI 4)  
  • Co-workers (JDI 5)  
  • Job in General (JIG) | Job satisfaction  
  • JDI 1  
  • JDI 2  
  • JDI 3  
  • JDI 4  
  • JDI 5  
  • JIG | • Descriptive Statistics |
| 2. Does perceived environment fit predict job satisfaction among administrative staff members? | Perceived Environment Fit  
  • P-O  
  • P-J | Job satisfaction  
  • JDI 1  
  • JDI 2  
  • JDI 3  
  • JDI 4  
  • JDI 5  
  • JIG | • Pearson Correlation  
  • Multiple Regression |
| 3. Does job satisfaction and perceived fit with the university environment differ by demographic group membership (e.g., level of education, age, gender, and years of service /employment)? | Gender  
  • Level of education  
  • Age  
  • Years of service | Perceived Environment Fit  
  • P-O  
  • P-J  
  Job satisfaction  
  • JDI 1  
  • JDI 2  
  • JDI 3  
  • JDI 4  
  • JDI 5  
  • JIG | • T- test of independent samples  
  • ANOVA |
For the analysis of Question 3, a series of independent sample t-tests were conducted to determine any significant group differences in job satisfaction and perceived environment (P-E) fit with respect to each of the demographic variables (gender, educational level, age, and years of service). Independent sample t-test was used to compare the mean scores of groups (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012, p. 234). In addition, a series of univariate Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to detect any significant differences in group means (Fraenkel, & Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). In each ANOVA series, the variables perceived environment fit and job satisfactions were entered as dependent variables, and demographic characteristics as independent variables, which are categorical. The results of the analysis of Question 3 was used to identify which demographic characteristics had an influence on the relationship between perceived environment fit and job satisfaction among administrative staff members in the university.

**Interpretation of Multiple Regression**

Simple linear or bivariate regression involves a single independent variable and a single dependent variable, with a goal to obtain a linear equation so that the value of the dependent variable can be predicted given the value of the dependent variable (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). The basic equation for simple linear regression is presented in the form:

\[ Y = B_0 + B_1X_1 + e \]

Where:

- \( Y \) = value for the dependent variable;
- \( X \) = raw score value on the independent variable;
- \( B_1 \) = slope of the regression line, \( B_0 \) = Y-intercept, and
- \( e \) = residuals or errors of prediction.
Multiple regression involves more than one independent variable, and it is a technique used to predict the value of a dependent variable from a combination of independent variables (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). The equation of multiple regression has more coefficients in the equation. Thus, one coefficient for the Y-intercept and one for each of the independent variables:

\[ Y = \beta + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \ldots + \beta_k X_k + e \]

There is a corresponding \( \beta \) coefficient for each independent variable \( (X_k) \) in the equation and the best linear combination of weights and raw score \( X \) values minimizes the total squared error in the equation (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). These methods of estimation are appropriate for this study because the objective is to test the existence of a predictable relationship between the variables (perception of fit (IV), job satisfaction (DV) subscales).

Multiple regression results produce several correlation indices to interpret: Pearson correlation (\( R \)), squared multiple correlation (\( R^2 \)), and adjusted squared multiple correlation (\( R^2_{adj} \)). All the correlation coefficients indicate how the independent variable predicts the criterion variable. Thus, the Pearson correlation coefficient ranges between -1 through 0 to +1. For example, a perfect correlation is \( r = \pm 1 \) which means the independent variable has all the information about the dependent variable and the value of one variable can perfectly be predicted from the other (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). The squared multiple correlation (\( R^2 \)) indicate the degree of variance accounted for by the independent variable, and adjusted squared multiple correlation (\( R^2_{adj} \)) is calculated to account for bias.

The second output of regression analysis is ANOVA summary, the \( F \) – test examines the degree of linearity between the dependent variable and independent variable(s). A significant \( F \) test indicates a linear relation, thus the model significantly predicts the dependent variable. Lastly, the unstandardized regression coefficient (\( B \)) represents the slope weight for each
variable, a positive $B$ specifies a positive change in the DV when the IV increases and a negative $B$ indicates a negative change in DV when the IV increases (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010).

**Assumptions of the Study**

The fundamental assumption of the study was that the researcher would have access to all administrative staff members of the university, and that the participants would complete the data collection instruments and return to the researcher. Secondly, the researcher assumed that the participants would be able to perceive objectively how well they fit with their work environment. The researcher anticipated a 50% response rate in order to meet the statistical power. Attempts to address this limitation were made through sending reminders to participants, and more importantly the researcher used an instrument developed by the university and the potential benefits to the institution might mitigate this limitation. The results and related narrative are presented in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

This chapter will present the results of the perception of fit and job satisfaction completed by participants of the study. The chapter will present the results for the following: demographics of the participants, descriptive statistics of subscales for perceived fit and job satisfaction, and the inferential statistics by RQ.

Demographics

A total of 237 responses were received from the participants representing a 30.6% responds rate. However, an initial cleaning of the data revealed 67 questionnaires were incomplete and were excluded from the entire data analysis. The final number of completed questionnaires used for the analysis was 170. Of the 170 participants, majority (69.8%) were females. With regards to education, the majority (62.4%) of participants completed some postgraduate or had a Master’s degree, and 7.6% having their Doctorate degrees and only 4.7% of the participants having completed some college education or had Associate degrees.

Out of the 170 of participants, 154 participants reported their age. The age distribution of the participants ranged from 23 to 69 years, with a mean and standard deviation of 43.59 and 10.77 respectively. For the number of years participants provided service to the university, the minimum was one year, with 33 years as the maximum. The mean and standard deviation of years of service was 10.34 and 7.50 respectively.

Reliability Statistics

As indicated in Chapter Three, the Environment Fit and Job Satisfaction Survey (EFSS) measured the two primary variables in this study; Job Satisfaction and General Perceptions of Fit. The Abridged Job Descriptive Index comprised the following subscales; (1) Work on Present Job (6 items), (2) Pay (6 items), (3) Opportunities for Promotion (6 items), (4) Supervision (6 items), (5) People in your present job (6 items), and Job in General (8 items). The General
Perceptions of Fit scale comprised of Person-Job (P-J) fit (4 items) and Person-Organization (P-O) fit (4 items). Table 4 presents the reliability statistics and item numbers for each scale and subscale, and Table 5 presents the correlations among subscales. All the scales and subscales had high reliabilities, with reliability coefficients ranging from .72 to .86.

Table 4

*Reliability Statistics of Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Conbach α</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>JDI 1-JDI 30</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>54.89</td>
<td>15.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself (JDI 1)</td>
<td>JDI 1-JDI 6</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>JDI 7-JDI 12</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3)</td>
<td>JDI 13-JDI 18</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>JDI 19-JDI 24</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker (JDI 5)</td>
<td>JDI 25-JDI 30</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General (JIG)</td>
<td>JIG 31-JIG 38</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Perceptions of Fit</td>
<td>GPFM39-GPFM46</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>29.79</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job (P-J) Fit</td>
<td>GPFM39-GPFM42</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization (P-O) Fit</td>
<td>GPFM43-GPFM46</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlations among the subscales presented in Table 5 reveals that each JDI facet and JIG measure distinct aspects of job satisfaction (Brodke et al., 2009). More so, no facet of the JDI correlates above .50. Also the Job in General correlated highly with the Work Itself (JDI 1) facet and the correlation is well below .80. These statistics according to Brodke et al. (2009) suggest that the JDI facets are distinct from each other and from the JIG.
Table 5

**Correlations among the Subscales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Work (JDI 1)</th>
<th>Pay (JDI 2)</th>
<th>Promotion (JDI 3)</th>
<th>Supervision (JDI 4)</th>
<th>Co-worker (JDI 5)</th>
<th>Job in General (JIG)</th>
<th>P-J</th>
<th>P-O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work (JDI 1)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (JDI 3)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker (JDI 5)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General (JIG)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All correlations are significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)*

**Research Question 1. Job Satisfaction and Perception of Fit**

What is administrative staff members’ level of perceived fit with the university environment and job satisfaction? Descriptive statistics were computed for the primary variables and their respective subscales. Table 6 presents the descriptive statistics of the subscales of the Perception of Fit and Job Satisfaction measures, and Job in General measure.
### Table 6

*Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction (aJDI) and General Perceptions of Fit Subscales (n = 170)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Min – Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Percentile in US workforce</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself (JDI 1)</td>
<td>0 -18</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>48&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>0 -18</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>32&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (JDI 3)</td>
<td>0 -18</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>49&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>0 -18</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>45&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers (JDI 5)</td>
<td>1 -18</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>60&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General (aJIG)</td>
<td>0 -24</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>50&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Perception of Fit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale Mid-Point Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person- Job (P-J) Fit</td>
<td>4 -20</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization(P-O) Fit</td>
<td>4 - 20</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals respondents level of satisfaction compared to the US work force. The Job Satisfaction norms were established based on a sample of 1400 participants who were obtained through E-Rewards, a company specializing in obtaining samples for marketing research. The sampling technique used was stratified sampling by state population to ensure the sample was representative of the US populations. The stratified sampling method ensured that the sample and the Job Satisfaction norms were representative of the US work force, and the norms were updated following five revisions of the JDI scale since it was originally developed in 1969 (Guidroz, Yankelevich, Barger, Gillespie, & Zickar, 1997).

Of the five job satisfaction facets, administrative staff members were within the 45<sup>th</sup> and upper 40<sup>th</sup> percentile of the general US work force in satisfaction with the Work Itself (JDI 1), Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3), and Supervision (JDI 4) facets. Respondents were in the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile with respect to satisfaction with the Co-worker (JDI 5) facet. Comparatively, administrative staff members were highly satisfied with their Co-workers (JDI 5) than the other
facets of job satisfaction. With respect to overall job satisfaction, administrative staff members were at the 50th percentile, indicating an average level of satisfaction. Of the five facets administrative staff members were within the 32nd percentile in satisfaction with Pay (JDI 2) indicating the low level of satisfaction. However, comparing respondents’ level of satisfaction to the JS norms in the education subsector, respondents had above average percentile score (60th) with the Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) facet, and a higher percentile score (47th) with Satisfaction with Pay (JDI 2) facet than the respondents percentile scores in the US work force. The percentile scores for satisfaction with Work Itself (JDI 1) (38th), Supervision (JDI 4) (44th), Co-workers (JDI 5) (56th), and Job in General (JIG) (47th) were slightly lower than respondents’ percentile scores in the US work force. On Perception of Fit, administrative staff members perceived to fit highly with their job and the organization/university. The mean score of Perception of Fit for both subscales (P-J, M = 15.46, P-O, M = 14.00) were greater than the mid-point score (12) on the perception of fit scale.

**Research Question 2. Primary Variables Relationships**

Does perceived environment fit predict job satisfaction among administrative staff members? Pearson (r) correlation was first computed to determine the relationships between Job Satisfaction and General Perceptions of Fit Subscales. The results are presented in Table 7. All the correlations were positive and statistically significant ranged between .18 and .65.
Strong positive relationships were found between Person-Job (P-J) Fit and Satisfaction with Work Itself (JDI 1) \((r = .66)\) facet and Job in General \((r = .64)\) measure. Modest relationships were found for Person-Job Fit with Pay (JDI 2) \((r = .22)\), Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) \((r = .27)\), and Supervision (JDI 4) \((r = .31)\) facets. Person-Organization/University (P-O) fit had moderately positive relationships with all five facets of job satisfaction, and the overall job satisfaction as measured by Job in General measure, with the exception of Pay (JDI 2), which had a weak positive relationship with Person-Organization/University fit.

In comparing the correlations between PJ, and PO and the job satisfaction subscales, the weakest relationship was with the Pay facet \((r = .23, r = .18)\). A further analysis was conducted to determine the predictors of job satisfaction; six multiple regression analyses (using the Enter method) were conducted for each job satisfaction subscale - Work Itself (JDI 1), Pay (JDI 2), Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3), Supervision (JDI 4), and Co-worker (JDI 5)—as a dependent variable and Person-Job and Person-Organization as the independent variables. Regression results are presented in Tables 8 and 9.

### Table 7

*Correlation between Perceived Environment Fit and Job Satisfaction \((n = 170)\)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facet</th>
<th>Person-Job (P-J) Fit</th>
<th>Person-Organization (P-O) Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself (JDI 1)</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (JDI 3)</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker (JDI 5)</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General (JIG)</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*\(p \leq .05\), **\(p \leq .01\)
Table 8

Regression Models using Person-Job and Person-Organization Fit to Predict JDI facets, and Job in General (JIG) (n = 172)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facet</th>
<th>ANOVA Results</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{adj}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work itself (JDI 1)</td>
<td>$F(1, 170) = 73.24, p &lt; .0001$</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>$F(1, 170) = 5.36, p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (JDI 3)</td>
<td>$F(1, 170) = 10.49, p &lt; .0001$</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>$F(1, 170) = 14.20 p &lt; .0001$</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker (JDI 5)</td>
<td>$F(1, 170) = 33.11, p &lt; .0001$</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General (JIG)</td>
<td>$F(1, 170) = 64.81, p &lt; .0001$</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicate that the two factor (PJ, PO) model significantly predicted each of the five facets (Work Itself (JDI 1), Pay (JDI 2), Promotion opportunities (JDI 3), Supervision (JDI 4), and Co-worker (JDI 5)) of job satisfaction, and satisfaction with the Job in General. The F-ratios of the models ranged from 5.36 to 73.24. The strongest prediction was for Work Itself (JDI 1), in which Person-Job and Person-Organization Fit accounted for 46% of variance in Work Itself (JDI 1). The next strongest prediction using the two factor model (P-J, P-O) was for Job in General, in which the two predictors account for 43% of variance in the dependent variable.

Of the six regression analyses, the Pay (JDI 2) facet showed the weakest prediction with only 6% of variance being explained by the two factors. A summary of the regression coefficients is presented in Table 9, and indicates the degree to which the independent variables significantly contributed to the respective models. The results in Table 8 indicate that each of the two predictors (P-J, P-O) significantly contributed to each of the regression models, except the model predicting Pay (JDI 2). Only Person-Job fit contributed significantly to Pay (JDI 2) facet ($\beta = .18, p = .032$). Therefore, the 5% of variance explained in Pay (JDI 2) facet (see Table 7) can be attributed solely to Person-Job fit. For the remaining regression models, P-J fit was the stronger predictor for Work Itself (JDI1), Pay (JDI 2), Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3), and Job in General (JIG).
Table 9

Regression Coefficients for Models Using Person-Job and Person-Organization Fit to Predict
Job Satisfaction Subscales and Job in General (n = 172)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Bivariate</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself (JDI 1)</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.15</td>
<td>-2.86</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-J</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-J</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (JDI 3)</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-J</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-J</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker (JDI 5)</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-J</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General (JIG)</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-J</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3. Demographic Differences

What characteristics of administrative staff members (e.g. level of education, age, gender, and years of service) are related to job satisfaction and perceived fit with the university environment? Three series of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with level of education, age, and years of service entered separately as the independent variables. Independent samples t-test was conducted with gender as the independent variable.

**Level of Education.** ANOVA was conducted with education as the independent variable. Level of Education was originally divided into six categories; however, due to the extremely low number of individuals who had “completed some high school” or “completed high school,” these two categories were eliminated. Therefore, ANOVA was conducted with the following
categories and codes, 1 = “Completed some College/Associate Degree”, 2 = “Bachelor’s Degree”, 3 = “Completed some Postgraduate/Master’s Degree”, and 4 = “Doctorate”. Prior to conducting the ANOVA, descriptive statistics were conducted for education group and job satisfaction subscales, and Job in General (JIG) (see Table 10). ANOVA results are presented in Table 11 and indicate no statistically significant mean difference in satisfaction with all subscales of job satisfaction, and Job in General scale with respect to level of education.

Table 10

*Education Group Comparison for Job Satisfaction Subscales and Job in General (n = 170)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Some College/Associate Degree (n = 8)</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree (n = 43)</th>
<th>Some postgraduate/Master’s Degree (n = 106)</th>
<th>Doctorate (n = 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself (JDI 1)</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (JDI 3)</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker (JDI 5)</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General (JIG)</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job (P-J) Fit</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization (P-O) Fit</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

ANOVA Results for Education Comparison for Subscales and Job in General (n = 170)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>ANOVA Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself (JDI 1)</td>
<td>$F(3, 166) = 2.40, p = .070$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>$F(3, 166) = .423, p = .737$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (JDI 3)</td>
<td>$F(3, 166) = .063, p = .979$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>$F(3, 166) = 1.07, p = .366$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker (JDI 5)</td>
<td>$F(3, 166) = .253, p = .859$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General (JIG)</td>
<td>$F(3, 166) = 1.70, p = .168$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-job fit</td>
<td>$F(3, 166) = 1.34, p = .263$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-organization fit</td>
<td>$F(3, 166) = 0.65, p = .586$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age.** Before the ANOVA was conducted for age, three categories were created and coded as follows, 1 = 20 – 34.9 years, 2 = 35 – 49.9 years, and 3 = 50 + years. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Age Group Comparison for Subscales, and Job in General (n = 170)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>20 – 34.9 Years (N = 35)</th>
<th>35 – 49.9 Years (N = 72)</th>
<th>50+ Years (N = 47)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself (JDI 1)</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>12.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>10.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (JDI 3)</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>12.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker (JDI 5)</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>15.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General (JIG)</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>19.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job (P-J) Fit</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>15.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization (P-O) Fit</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>13.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine group differences by age for all job satisfaction and perceived fit subscales (see Table 13). Results indicate a statistically
significant, $F(2, 152) = 3.96, p = .021$ mean difference in satisfaction with the Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) by age. Mean difference in all other subscales was not statistically significant. A further analysis using Scheffe Post hoc test revealed satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) facet for administrative staff aged 50 years and over was statistically significant and higher than the 20 – 34.5 and 35 – 49.9 year groups.

Table 13

**ANOVA Results for Age Comparison for Subscales, and Job in General (n = 170)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>ANOVA Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself (JDI 1)</td>
<td>$F(2, 151) = .925, p = .399$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>$F(2, 151) = .198, p = .821$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (JDI 3)</td>
<td>$F(2, 151) = 3.96, p = .021$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>$F(2, 151) = .775, p = .463$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker (JDI 5)</td>
<td>$F(2, 151) = .498, p = .609$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General (JIG)</td>
<td>$F(2, 151) = .436, p = .647$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job (P-J) Fit</td>
<td>$F(2, 151) = .962, p = .384$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-organization (P-O) Fit</td>
<td>$F(2, 151) = .442, p = .643$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Years of Service.** ANOVA was conducted with the years of service of administrative staff members as the independent variable. Before the analysis was conducted the raw data recorded was categorized into three groups and coded as follows, 1 = 0 – 9.9 years, 10 – 19.9 years, and 20+ years. Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results are presented in Tables 14 and 15. The results reveals statistically significant, $F(2, 167) = 3.33, p = .038$ mean difference in satisfaction with the Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) facet, but no statistically significant mean difference with all other subscales by years of service among administrative staff members. A further analysis conducted using Scheffe Post hoc test reveal that administrative staff members who served the university for 20 and over years had a significant and higher level of satisfaction.
than those who had served less than 20 years with respect to the Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) facet.

Table 14

*Years of Service Group Comparison for Subscales, and Job in General (n = 170)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>0 – 9.9 Years (N = 84)</th>
<th>10 – 19.9 Years (N = 60)</th>
<th>20+ Years (N = 26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself (JDI 1)</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>10.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (JDI 3)</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>13.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker (JDI 5)</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>16.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General (JIG)</td>
<td>18.88</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>20.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job (P-J) Fit</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization (P-O) Fit</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>14.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

*ANOVA Results for Years of Service Group Comparison for Subscales, and Job in General (n = 170)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>ANOVA Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself (JDI 1)</td>
<td>F(2, 167) = .60, p = .549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>F(2, 167) = .67, p = .513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (JDI 3)</td>
<td>F(2, 167) = .33, p = .538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>F(2, 167) = 1.74, p = .178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker (JDI 5)</td>
<td>F(2, 167) = 3.16, p = .045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General (JIG)</td>
<td>F(2, 167) = 1.44, p = .239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job (P-J) Fit</td>
<td>F(2, 167) = 2.09, p = .127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization (P-O) Fit</td>
<td>F(2, 167) = 1.53, p = .220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender.** Independent sample *t*-test was conducted to determine any significant mean difference in perceived fit and job satisfaction subscales with respect to the gender of administrative staff member. The results of the independent sample *t*-test show no statistically
significant mean difference in satisfaction with Work Itself (JDI 1), Pay (JDI 2), Promotion (JDI 3), Supervision (JDI 4), and Co-worker (JDI 5) facets of job satisfaction, as well as the Job in General between female and male administrative staff members. There was, however, a statistically significant mean difference between females and males with respect to Person-Job (P-J) fit, \( t(168, 137.61) = 2.068, p = .040 \). The males perceived to fit higher than the females with respect to their jobs.

Table 16

*T-test Results of Gender Group Comparison for Subscales, and Job in General (n = 170)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Males (n = 52)</th>
<th>Females (n = 118)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself (JDI 1)</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (JDI 2)</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (JDI 3)</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.232</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI 4)</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>-0.461</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker (JDI 5)</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>1.990</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General (JIG)</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>1.527</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job (P-J) Fit</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization (P-O) Fit</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>-.840</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

This section presents the summary of the results for each research question. Table 18 also presents a summary of the results related to each research question. Research Question 1 determined the level of perceived fit with the university environment and job satisfaction among administrative staff members. The results revealed relatively high levels of satisfaction with Work Itself (JDI 1), Supervision (JDI 4) facets, and a higher level of satisfaction with Co-worker (JDI 5) facet. Overall administrative staff members were satisfied with their job. However, satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) and Pay (JDI 2) was low among the staff. The
results also indicated high levels of perception of fit with the job and the organization/university among administrative staff members.

Research Question 2 examined the ability of Perceived Environment Fit and its subscales to predict Job Satisfaction and its subscales between Perception of Fit and Job Satisfaction. First the relationship between Perceived Environment Fit, Job Satisfaction, and their subscales were examined. Pearson $r$ coefficients indicated that strong positive relationships exits between the two primary variables and their subscales, with five out of six of the correlations being significant at $p \leq .01$ and one being significant at $p \leq .05$. The regression results indicated that P-J and P-O together explained 46% and 43% of variance in Work Itself (JDI 1) facet, and Overall Job Satisfaction respectively, however, P-J fit was the stronger predictor for Work Itself (JDI 1), Pay (JDI 2), Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3), and Job in General (JIG).

Finally, Research Question 3 examined demographic differences in job satisfaction and perceived fit with the university environment, and their subscales. Mean difference in Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) among administrative staff members with respect to age and years of service to the university was statistically significant. The difference in means of satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) facet for administrative staff members aged 50 years and over was statistically different and higher than those in the 20 – 34.9 and 2 = 35 – 49.9 year groups. Similarly, the difference in satisfaction with the Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) facet for administrative staff members who served the university for 20 years and over was significantly different and higher than 0 – 9.9 and 10 – 19.9 year groups. Finally, $t$-test indicated statistically significant difference exits between female and male administrative staff members with respect to their Perception of Fit with their job. The males perceive to fit their jobs better than their female colleagues.
Findings from this study strongly support the existence of a relationship between perception of fit and job satisfaction, and that job satisfaction can be predicted by perceived fit.

Chapter 5 will discuss the meaning, implications, and importance of these results.

Table 17

*Summary of Key Findings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What is administrative staff member’s level of perceived fit with the university environment and job satisfaction? | • Above average and average levels of satisfaction with the Co-workers (JDI 5), and overall Job Satisfaction (JIG) among administrative staff members.  
• Low level of satisfaction with Pay (JDI 2) facet among administrative staff members.  
• High level of perception of fit with the job and the organization/university among administrative staff members |
| 2. Does perceived environment fit predict Job satisfaction among administrative staff members? | • Correlations between perception of fit and job satisfaction, and subscales were statistically significant and positive  
• Strong positive relationship was found between Person-Job (P-J) Fit and satisfaction with Work Itself (JDI 1) facet and Job in General (JIG).  
• P-J and P-O together explained 46% and 43% of variance in Work Itself (JDI 1) facet, and overall job satisfaction respectively, however, P-J was the strongest predictor of the Work Itself and overall job satisfaction |
| 3. What characteristics of administrative staff members (level of education, age, gender, and years of service) are related to job satisfaction and perceived fit with the university environment? | • Statistically significant mean difference in satisfaction with the Promotion opportunities (JDI 3) facet by age, and years of service among administrative staff members  
• Administrative staff members who aged 50 years and over were more satisfied with the Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) facet than those who were below 50 years. Also administrative staff members who served the university 20 years and over were more satisfied with the Promotion opportunities (JDI 3) than those who served less than 20 years  
• Statistically significant mean difference between females and males, and the males perceive to fit better with their job (P-J) than the females. |
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was conducted to examine the relationship between perceived person-environment fit and job satisfaction among administrative staff members in a Midwestern public university, as well as the relationships between the subscales of the primary variables. Whereas the study recognizes that previous studies exist on various dimensions of the concept of fit and job satisfaction, very few studies (only four) were conducted in higher education settings. Higher education is undergoing substantial change as a response to the forces of globalization, demand for post-secondary accountability, and increased diversity, which not only affects academic programs, faculty, and students but also leadership creating new administrative structures and privileges. However, previous studies focused on students and faculty. Meanwhile, decision-making by administrators has grown considerably over the past 30 years in higher education while that of faculty has reduced. The dominance of administrators in the decision-making process has often resulted in the prioritization of managerial over intellectual interest with budgetary and profit-seeking rationales prevailing over academic considerations. Furthermore, the increased leadership role by administrators has resulted in a tremendous growth in the number of mid-level management positions at public universities and its structure is becoming more complex.

Despite the important role of administrative staff members in the current situation of higher education, research on these stakeholders in higher education lacks richness in either breadth or depth. Yet the satisfaction of administrative staff members is essential to the effective performance of universities and colleges. In addition, previous studies on perceived fit tended not to examine the different types of fit in a single study. Examining perceived Person-Job fit (P-J) as well as the Person-Organization (P-O) fit in a single study is essential because individuals
apply for specific jobs in organizations. Therefore, this study makes a vital contribution to the literature by addressing this gap.

Discussion of Findings

This study will assist in improving the understanding of person-environment fit and work outcomes in a university setting. Moreover, researchers and regional accrediting bodies focus on faculty, student, and administrative staff members’ satisfaction as evidence of organizational effectiveness. The study can assist present and future leaders in post-secondary education on how to motivate administrative staff members to give their best effort and contribute to the achievement of university objectives and goals.

This section will first discuss the findings associated with the level of job satisfaction and perceived fit among administrative staff members, the relationship between the primary variables and their respective subscales, and the predictability of job satisfaction by perceived fit. Lastly, this section discusses the influence of demographics on the primary variables (perceived environment fit and job satisfaction).

Level of Perceived Fit and Job Satisfaction

The study found that administrative staff members had a high level of perceived fit with their jobs (P-J) as well as the organization/university (P-O). The use of survey norms improves the interpretability of survey results and permits more valid and interpretable comparisons of survey items and scales (Guidroz et al., 2009). In comparison to the established Job Satisfaction (JS) norms (Balzer et al., 1997), administrative staff members were as satisfied with their job as 50% of the US work force. Furthermore, at the facet level administrative staff members’ level of satisfaction with their Co-workers was above the average level of satisfaction among the US work force. They belong to the 60th percentile of the established Job Satisfaction norm.
However, satisfaction with the Work Itself (JDI 1), Supervision (JDI 4), Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3), and Pay (JDI 2) facets was below the satisfaction of half the US workforce. The administrative staff members were in the 48th, 45th, 49th, and 32nd percentile respectively, and they were unsatisfied with Pay (JDI 2) facet as 32% of the US workforce. This study supports findings by Schroder (2008). The study’s finding further confirms the survey results of the Administrative Staff Council (ASC, 2012), which found that administrative staff members were most dissatisfied with salary and promotion opportunities, and made comments that suggested their dissatisfaction with the quality of supervision among others. Interestingly, however, in the education subsector the respondents had percentile scores of 47th and 60th in satisfaction with Pay (JDI 2) and Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) respectively. Their scores in the education subsector were higher than their scores in the US workforce. The differences in level of satisfaction at the facet level are not a surprise, because employees may be satisfied with some aspects of their responsibilities but not others (Volkwein, Malik, & Napierski-Prancl, 1998). Furthermore, an organization’s regulatory climate has less influence on the overall job satisfaction than on the facets (Volkwein et al., 1998).

**Perceived Fit and Job Satisfaction**

In the last two decades, organizational behavior researchers and practitioners have recognized the importance of P-O fit as related to the traditional conception of P-J fit (Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Not surprisingly, the findings of this study are consistent with findings of previous research exploring the relationship between perceptions of fit and Job Satisfaction (Kristof-Brown, 2005; O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Person-Job fit and Person-Organization fit yielded significant and positive relationships with all five facets of job satisfaction, and with overall job satisfaction. Though some relationships were modest, Person-Job fit yielded a strong positive relationship with satisfaction with the Work
Itself (JDI 1) \( (r = .66) \) facet and Job in General \( (r = .64) \) measure. Even though the relative contribution of the different facets to overall Job Satisfaction was not the focus of this study, the findings suggest that the Work Itself (JDI1) \( (r = .66) \) facet might be contributing more than the other facets to the relationship between Person-Job fit and Overall Job Satisfaction. Sekine and Tatsuse (2011) concluded that intrinsic aspects of the job contributed more to overall satisfaction than any other facet of job satisfaction. This finding was not surprising because participants evaluated satisfaction in relation to the work and tasks they perform, which are key components of P-J fit (Lauver & Kristy-Brown, 2001). Thus, an increase in the level of perceived P-J fit among administrative staff members can lead to an increase in their level of satisfaction with the work itself, and overall job satisfaction. Though P-O fit had significant relationships with all five facets of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction, it had only moderately strong relationships with the Co-worker and Work Itself facets, and with overall job satisfaction. Of particular interest is the weak relationship between P-J, P-O fit and the Pay facet. This is because pay is among the lowest ranked factors contributing to job satisfaction (Hashim & Mahmood, 2011). The results suggest that pay increase might in practical terms not have much influence in the perception of fit among administrative staff members, and vice versa. University leaders should therefore not assume that an increase in pay will compensate for poor job or organization/university fit.

**Perceived Person-Job (P-J) and Person-Organization (P-O) fit as Predictors of Job Satisfaction**

This study is one of few studies that examined the two constructs, P-J and P-O fit in a single study. Moreover, the few previous studies focused on job applicants. In the determination of P-J and P-O fit as predictors of job satisfaction, this study is consistent with findings of
previous research (see Cable & Judge, 1996; Kristof-Brown, 2005; Liu, Liu, & Hu, 2010; O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Saks & Ashforth, 1997).

The present study found that Person-Job and Person-Organization fit significantly predicted each of the five facets of job satisfaction (Work Itself (JDI 1), Pay (JDI 2), Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3), Supervision (JDI 4), and Co-worker (JDI 5), and overall Job Satisfaction as measured by the Job in General scale. The predictors (P-J, P-O) explained 46% and 43% of variance in the Work Itself facet, and overall Job Satisfaction respectively. However, the regression coefficients revealed P-J fit was the stronger predictor for Work Itself (JDI 1), Pay (JDI 2), Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3), and Job in General (aJIG). P-J fit is the stronger predictor because, as suggested by previous research, job satisfaction is strongly influenced by employees’ evaluations of the work and tasks they perform, which are found to be key components of P-J fit. For instance, Smerek and Peterson (2007) found that in a perceived work environment work itself was the most significant and strongest predictor of job satisfaction. P-O fit, on the other hand, is not linked to the daily task and activities, and therefore less likely influence employees’ job satisfaction (Laever & Kristof-Brown, 2005). The findings of this study further supports Lauver and Kristof-Brown’s (2005) assertion that employees can possess the skills and competence required for a job and yet not share the values of the organization and vice versa. Furthermore, an employee’s fit with one aspect of the organization’s environment does not necessarily mean a fit with other environmental aspects. In addition, the results revealed that P-J and P-O fit significantly contributed to the models except in the prediction of pay, where only P-J was the significant contributor. The results of the study further reveals the unique impacts of P-J and P-O fit on Job Satisfaction. According to the need press theory, organizational/institutional environments have characteristics that can either facilitate or inhibit
the needs of individuals, it thus emphasizes the importance of the match between the individual’s needs and the actual environment’s ability to satisfy those needs (Murray, 1938).

With respect to the facets of Supervision (JDI 4) and Co-worker (JDI 5), P-O fit has a slightly stronger impact than P-J fit. According to Herzberg’s two factor theory of motivation, promotion, supervision, and co-workers are identified as extrinsic facets of job satisfaction. The finding of the study lends support to recognition of the independent relationship and unique impacts of the different types of fit on organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction (Kristof-Brown, 2005; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Ostroff, Shin, & Kinicki, 2005; Van Vianen et al., 2011). Moreover, the results of this study also support the notion that employees are able to distinguish fit between their jobs and organization (Kristof-Brown, 2005; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001).

Demographics and Perceived Fit, and Job Satisfaction

Not surprising, among the demographics used in the analysis age and years of service to the university related significantly to job satisfaction, similar to the findings by Toker (2011). Age showed a significant mean difference in satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) among administrative staff members. The difference in means of satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) facet for administrative staff members was statistically significant. Administrative staff members 50 years and over were more satisfied with the Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) facet than those aged below 50 years. Similarly, Toker (2011) found that among academic staff the mean difference of job satisfaction for 61 years and over was statistically significant and higher than those aged below 61 years. This finding supports the conclusion by Bokemeier, Bokemeier, and Lacy (1987) and Smerek and Peterson (2007) who reported a strong and positive relationship between age and job satisfaction, with older workers reporting higher levels of job satisfaction than their younger counterparts among non-academic
employees at a university. According to Ng and Feldman (2010), older employees generally have positive job attitudes than younger employees. However, the authors found that despite the generally positive job attitudes of older employees, age was negatively (-31) related to satisfaction with promotion opportunities. This is in contrast to findings of the present study with respect to the Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) facet. Smerek and Peterson (2007) further contend that the significant mean difference is due to declined expectations on the part of the older and long service employees, and that age and length of service are negatively correlated to professional growth opportunities.

The mean difference in satisfaction with the Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) facet was statistically significant among administrative staff members with respect to the years of service to the university. A further analysis using Scheffe Post Hoc test revealed that those who served the university for 20 and over years were more satisfied with the Promotion Opportunities (JDI 3) facet than those administrative members who served the university for less than 20 years. This is similar to Toker’s (2011) findings among university academic staff who served for 21 years and over.

No statistically significant mean difference in job satisfaction with respect to the education and gender of the participants. This can be explained by the lack of significant association between education, gender, and job satisfaction (Bokemeier, Bokeimer & Lacy, 1987; Hinkle & Choi, 2009; Mason, 2001; Saygi, Tolon, & Tekogul, 2011; Schroder, 2008; Smerek & Peterson, 2007; Worrell, Skaggs, & Brown, 2006). Interestingly, however, results of t-test indicated a statistically significant difference exits between female and male administrative staff members with respect to their perception of fit with their job. The male administrative staff members perceived to have a better fit with the job than their female counterparts.
The findings from the study indicate that demographics (level of education, age, years of service, gender) of administrative staff members were not significant moderators of overall job satisfaction. The finding revealed that gender influenced perceived job fit among administrative staff members. Despite the growing work force of women, the enforcement of anti-discrimination laws policies, and ever changing social norms, gender is apparently still a significant distinguishing variable in the university environment (Brandon, 2011).

Implications for Practice, Policy and Future Research

This study has some potential implications for human resource managers, leadership practice, and institutional policy decision makers based on the study’s finding of a direct relationship between perceived fit and job satisfaction.

Practice. Job satisfaction is important not only because of the desire to improve the quality of work life but also its potential impact on organizational variables such as performance, productivity, and turn over (Edwards, Bell, Arthur, & Decuir, 2008; Samad, 2011). Therefore, administrators concerned with the effectiveness and vitality of their institution, will equally be concerned with this phenomenon, and given the limited resources at every college and university, wisely using the resources available to impact job satisfaction will aid in the overall functioning of the institution (Smerek & Peterson, 2007). The present study found that perceived Person-Job fit emerged as the stronger predictor of the Work Itself facet, and overall Job Satisfaction. Given the limited resources, administrators can focus on the work itself factor, although difficult to directly impact (Smerek & Peterson, 2007), improving the Work Itself (JDI 3) facet is essential since research has shown that it has the greatest impact on job satisfaction. A job redesign offers a viable framework for this endeavor (Hackman, Oldham, Janson, & Purdy, 1975). An understanding of the process by which P-J perceptions are formed could allow institutions to attract applicants who are likely to perceive higher level of fit, and in turn, to be
satisfied and committed to their jobs (Ehrhart, 2006). Thus, middle management leaders can potentially increase the level of employee job satisfaction through improvement in the match between employees and their respective jobs. To this end, supervisors of administrative staff can employ Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman et al., 1975) to assess the extent to which administrative staff members’ skills/competency are in congruence with the requirements of their responsibilities. Where there is a mismatch in knowledge or skills, then training presents a straightforward strategy to improve fit (Kulick, Oldham, & Hackman, 1987; Mount & Muchinsky, 1978).

Based on this finding, supervisors of educational institutions should seek to maximize the fit of applicants to the positions in which they are applying through the use of assessment tools such as realistic job previews, work samples, and assessment centers during the hiring process and may be able to determine the fit and likely satisfaction levels of new hires (Popovich & Wanous, 1982). For example, supervisors can use a realistic job preview during the hiring process to prevent newcomer dissatisfaction or likely turnover because the realistic job preview allows potential employees to better match their own needs to the needs-fulfilling characteristics of the organization or institution (Wanous, 1973; Popovich & Wanous, 1982). According to the expectancy theory, individuals are attracted to jobs or organizations they perceive to meet their valued needs (Vroom, 1964). It is therefore essential to provide accurate job descriptions in the recruitment process because according to the generalizable decision processing model, individuals choose their most preferred jobs or organizations based on their perception of the environment characteristics that are important to them (e.g., location, organization size, work/family policy) (Ehrhart & Ziegert, 2005). The present study supports the recommendation that organizations/universities consider the potential benefits from selecting applicants on the basis of fit because better fit leads to higher levels of job satisfaction, and subsequently higher
performance (Bretz & Judge, 1994). As Amos and Weathington (2008) noted those employees whose values match those of the organization are likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction. As such, providing valid information about jobs and the organizations/institutions’ values and culture will likely improve the accuracy of the applicant’s fit perceptions (Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Doing so could potentially mitigate newcomer attrition (Popovich & Wanous, 1982). Although attrition can potentially lead to hiring a replacement that is better fit, it does incur costs (Ingle, 2009).

Equally important to leaders of educational institutions is the present study’s finding of a significant difference in perception of fit with respect to the gender of the administrative staff members. The women administrative staff members perceived less fit with their job than men. Despite the enforcement of laws of gender discrimination, the social perception and association of particular gender to certain professions seemed to influence the perception of job fit among female administrative staff members. Institutional leaders such as supervisors can address this gender perception through educational programs that emphasizes the neutrality of gender in the job responsibilities of administrative staff members in university environments.

Policy. Although this study was conducted in a post-secondary environment the results are applicable to organizations such as not-for profit, and business entities, because the issues of fit and job satisfaction are relevant to employee and institutional/organizational level outcomes in all types of organizations – outcomes such as performance, commitment, absenteeism, and turnover intent. O’Reilly, Chartman, and Caldwell (1991) noted that high person-organization fit is associated with high positive affect and low intent to quit. With specific information about employees’ level of satisfaction with each facet of job satisfaction, policy makers at both the local (e.g., boards of education) and state level (e.g., state legislators, the Ohio State Board of education, etc.), may institute policies or programs to recognize and reward teachers and
administrators, and increase their overall job satisfaction. Similarly, policy makers could carry over the implications from institutional level to the state level for state institutions of higher learning.

**Future Research.** This section presents the limitations of this study and recommendations for future research. Despite the contribution of this study to the organizational behavior literature, the study has some limitations. First, the study examined administrative staff members in only one Midwestern public university, and therefore the generalizability of the findings is limited to that one institution. Future research should extend to other institutions in the study region and/or universities from other regions across the United States. Second, the study used convenience sampling, relied on self-reported data, and used standard multiple regressions. All these factors constrain the ability to make causal statements about the examined relationships, and the exclusive use of self-reported data may create the potential for common-method biases (Kim, 2012). Future studies should increase the sample size, the diversity, and the use of other methods of sampling and data analysis. In addition, qualitative data could be collected to provide further explanations for the findings from the aJDI instrument. Finally, though the study did not examine the Person-Group fit dimension, future studies should endeavor to investigate the compatibility between individuals and their work groups (Person-Group fit dimension) (Kristof, 1996), because a super ordinate perception of person-group fit may underlie the more specific types of fit (Seong, Kristof-Brown, Park, Hong, & Shin, 2012). The work group can range from a small group of immediate co-workers to any identifiable sub-unit of an organization, such as functional department or geographic division (Kristof, 1996).

**Conclusions**

This study is one addition to the growing body of research studies highlighting the importance of the relationship between perceptions of fit and job satisfaction (see Cable &
Judge, 1996; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Kristof-Brown, 2005; Liu, Liu, & Hu, 2010; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). This study not only highlighted the relationship between perception of fit and job satisfaction, but it is among the few studies that investigated recommendations by organizational practitioners of the need to examine the influence of the different types of fit on job satisfaction in a single study (see Kristof-Brown, 2005; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Ostroff, Shin, & Kinicki, 2005; Van Vianen et al., 2011). For example, Ostroff and Schulte (2007) argued that not only should multiple types of fit be considered simultaneously in studies, but that analysis should also take into consideration the configuration across types of fit, and the importance of types of fit as well.

As recommended, if organizational/institutional leadership is interested in increasing the level of job satisfaction among employees, then they first need to understand and appreciate the issues that significantly contribute to employee job satisfaction. More so, the existence of a relationship between the level of employee job satisfaction and other organizational outcomes such as performance, commitment, and intent to quit makes the efforts to improve the levels of employee job satisfaction a major management decision. As important as the role of administrative staff members in higher education is, a clear understanding of issues related to administrative level of satisfaction can significantly contribute to the effectiveness and performance of colleges and universities (Volkwein, Malik, & Napierski-Prancl, 1998; Volkwein & Parmley, 2000; Volkwein & Zhou, 2003. Therefore, a guide to choosing and motivating administrative staff members is essential (Gaziel, 2001), because an increase in the job satisfaction of administrative staff members leads to administrative staff giving of their best services to management and job performance (Samad, 2011)

In view of the recognition of the essential role of administrative staff members in the effective functioning of educational institutions, particularly higher education, one might ask if
administrative staff member’s perception of fit and their level of job satisfaction should be an issue of concern to leadership of educational institutions. As the findings of this study revealed, the answer is in the affirmative, and the perception of fit between individual employees and their work environment is central to the overall level of satisfaction of administrative staff members. Interestingly, the use of pay as the source of motivation to increase the level of job satisfaction among administrative staff members might not be effective since this study found out that the Person-Job and Person-Organization fit together explained the least amount of variance (5%) in satisfaction with the pay facet.

With the understanding of the influence of fit on job satisfaction, leadership of post-secondary and higher education can effectively improve administrative employee fit through the communication of critical institutional values, needs, and expectations to the employees, and the provision of specific information on how these institutional values, needs, and expectations align with that of the employees’. As this study found perceived fit as a predictor of job satisfaction, a higher level of fit leads to a high level of job satisfaction, which in turns contribute to individual and organizational performance/outcomes (Samad, 2011; Zhang, DeMichele, & Connaughton, 2004).
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APPENDIX A: INSTRUMENT

ENVIRONMENT FIT SATISFACTION SURVEY

SECTION I

Job Satisfaction

Work on Present Job

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

Y for “Yes” if it describes your work
N for “No” if it does not describe it
? for “?” if you cannot decide

1. __ Fascinating
2. __ Satisfying
3. __ Good
4. __ Exciting
5. - Rewarding
6. __ Uninteresting

Pay

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

Y for “Yes” if it describes your pay
N for “No” if it does not describe it
? for “?” if you cannot decide

7. __ Barely live on income
8. __ Bad
9. __ Comfortable
10. __ Well paid
11. __ Enough to live on
12. __ Underpaid

**Opportunities for Promotion**

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

Y for “Yes” if it describes your opportunities for promotion

N for “No” if it does not describe them

? for “?” if you cannot decide

13. __ Good opportunities for promotion
14. __ Opportunities somewhat limited
15. __ Dead-end job
16. __ Good chance for promotion
17. __ Regular promotions
18. __ Fairly good chance for Promotion

**Supervision**

Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe this? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

Y for “Yes” if it describes the supervision you get on the job

N for “No” if it does not describe it

? for “?” if you cannot decide
19. ___ Praises good work
20. ___ Tactful
21. ___ Influential
22. ___ Up-to-date
23. ___ Annoying
24. ___ Knows job well

People on Your Present Job

Think of the majority of people with whom you work or meet in connection with your work.

How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these people? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

Y for “Yes” if it describes the people with whom you work

N for “No” if it does not describe them

? for “?” if you cannot decide

25. ___ Boring
26. ___ Slow
27. ___ Responsible
28. ___ Smart
29. ___ Lazy
30. ___ Frustrating

Job in General

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

Y for “Yes” if it describes your job
N for “No” if it does not describe it
?
for “?” if you cannot decide

31. __ Good
32. __ Undesirable
33. __ Better than most
34. __ Disagreeable
35. __ Makes me content
36. __ Excellent
37. __ Enjoyable
38. __ Poor
SECTION II

General Perception of Environment Fit

Please respond to the following questions by rating your agreement using a 5 – point Likert scale, 1 = To a very little extent, 2 = To a little extent, 3 = To no extent, 4 = To a large extent, 5 = To a very large extent.

39. To what extent do your knowledge, skills, and abilities meet the requirement of the job?
   1 = To a very little extent, 2 = To a little extent, 3 = To no extent, 4 = To a large extent, 5 = To a very large extent

40. To what extent does the job fulfill your needs?
   1 = To a very little extent, 2 = To a little extent, 3 = To no extent, 4 = To a large extent, 5 = To a very large extent

41. To what extent is the job a good match for you?
   1 = To a very little extent, 2 = To a little extent, 3 = To no extent, 4 = To a large extent, 5 = To a very large extent

42. To what extent does the job enable you to do the kind of work you want to do?
   1 = To a very little extent, 2 = To a little extent, 3 = To no extent, 4 = To a large extent, 5 = To a very large extent

The person-organization fit scale consists of the following items;

43. To what extent are the values of the organization similar to your own values?
   1 = To a very little extent, 2 = To a little extent, 3 = To no extent, 4 = To a large extent, 5 = To a very large extent
44. To what extent does your personality match the personality or image of the organization (university)?

1 = To a very little extent, 2 = To a little extent, 3 = To no extent, 4 = To a large extent, 5 = To a very large extent

45. To what extent does the organization (university) fulfill your needs?

1 = To a very little extent 2 = To a little extent, 3 = To no extent, 4 = To a large extent, 5 = To a very large extent

46. To what extent is the organization (university) a match?

1 = To a very little extent, 2 = To a little extent, 3 = To no extent, 4 = To a large extent, 5 = To a very large extent
SECTION III

Demographic Characteristics

Please respond to the questions below,

47. Which of the following functional areas do you belong?

(Please type the name)

48. What is your gender? (1) – female  (2) – Male   (3) – Transgender

49. What is your highest educational level? (1) Completed some high school (2) High school

graduate (3) Completed some college/associate degree

(4) Bachelor’s degree (5) Completed some postgraduate/masters’ degree (6) Doctorate

50. How long have you provided service to the university?

(Please write the number) ………………………………

51. What is your age? (Please write number)……………………..
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All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others and SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must also be reported promptly to this office.

This approval expires on January 3, 2013. You will receive a continuing review notice before your project expires. If you wish to continue your work after the expiration date, your documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and continued approval before the expiration date.

Good luck with your work. If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Research Compliance at 419-372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence regarding this project.
Perceived fit: Person-environment fit and job satisfaction among administrative staff in a Mid-western university

Consent Form

I am a graduate student at Bowling Green State University pursuing a Doctorate in the College of Education and Human Development. I am conducting a study for my dissertation as part of the requirements for my program. The study will explore the relationship between the perception of environment fit of university administrative staff members and the extent to which they are satisfied with the job they do. Human resource department of universities and other organizations will find this information useful. More importantly, human resource managers will be informed of the factors to consider in the selection of potential employees.

Please should you decide to participate in the survey after reading, please consent to participate by clicking the next button. And respond to the questions by filling out the questionnaire. With the exception of a chance for participants to win a $20 gift card, there are no incentives for completing the questionnaire; it is purely for academic purposes. The only criterion for participation is being an administrative staff in Bowling Green State University. Your contribution to this study is highly appreciated towards highlighting the issue of person-environment fit. The survey will take approximately between 20 – 30 minutes of your time. There is no risk associated with this study apart from those encountered in daily life. The information you provide will remain confidential. Your responses will not be traced to your name. Instead of names, numbers will be used to identify questionnaires. The data will be stored on a computer in the researchers’ office and the file password protected. Access to the office and the computer is limited. Moreover the data file will be password protected and only the principal researcher will have access to the data. In addition, survey responses will be disseminated in aggregate form and therefore individual responses cannot be identified. To ensure that nobody traces your responses on the computer, please, clear your internet browser and page history after completing the survey.

Your participation in this project is voluntary and your decision to participate or not will not impact on grades/class standing and relationship with the institution. You must be 18 years and above to participate in this study. You have the right to withdraw your participation if you do not want to continue; however, completing the questionnaire will be deemed consent to participate in this study. You equally have the right to have all your questions about the study addressed by me before you proceed, and you may request a summary of the results of the study. If you are satisfied with the information you may proceed to complete the questionnaire to the best of your ability. If you have questions about the study you can contact me or my advisor through the information provided below.

If you have any questions about your right as participants you may contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB) at 419-372-7716, hrsb@bgsu.edu with questions about participant rights.

Thank you,

Mohammed Issah (Graduate Student)  
College of Education & Human Development  
BGSU, missah@bgsu.edu, 419-494-5564

Dr. William K. Ingle (Advisor)  
College of Education & Human Development  
BGSU, wingle@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7313
Attention: Completion of the survey indicates consent to participate in the study.