

Fall 2017

The Correlation Between Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction in the Social Security Administration

Courtney Lynn Barden
Governors State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://opus.govst.edu/capstones>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Barden, Courtney Lynn, "The Correlation Between Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction in the Social Security Administration" (2017). *All Capstone Projects*. 365.
<https://opus.govst.edu/capstones/365>

For more information about the academic degree, extended learning, and certificate programs of Governors State University, go to http://www.govst.edu/Academics/Degree_Programs_and_Certifications/

Visit the [Governors State Education Department](#)

This Project Summary is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Capstone Projects at OPUS Open Portal to University Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of OPUS Open Portal to University Scholarship. For more information, please contact opus@govst.edu.

**The Relationship Between Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction in the
Social Security Administration**

**A Capstone Project Presented to the
College of Education
Governors State University**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education**

**By
Courtney Lynn Barden, MPA**

May 2018

DEDICATION

I dedicate this capstone to the memory of my grandmother, Delta Lee (Noochie) Barden, who passed away just a few months ago. Her role in my life was, and remains, immense.

I promised her that I would make her proud by achieving this academic goal and I hope that I have fulfilled that promise. I want nothing more than for her to be here to share in this celebration, but I know that she is with me in spirit. For it is her determined mind, strength, perseverance, discipline and courage that lives within me and guided me through.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation and thanks to my capstone chair Dr. Natalia Ermasova. I would like to thank you for encouraging my research and for being there whenever I needed you. Your advice on my research as well as on my career have been invaluable. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Mary Bruce, and Dr. Carmen Armstrong. I also want to thank you for letting my defense be an enjoyable moment, and for your brilliant comments and suggestions. I also want to thank you for your support and encouragement during the most devastating time of my life.

I would especially like to thank my parents because without your love, nurturing, and support I wouldn't have made it this far. You both were my first teachers and I am forever grateful for all the lessons you taught me. A special thanks to my friends, family and my love. Words cannot express how grateful I am to for all of your support and understanding. You all kept me going when I was on the brink of giving up. Your prayers were what got me through. Finally, I thank God, for letting me get through it all. I have experienced His guidance day by day through this journey. HE is the one who let me finish this degree and I will keep on trusting Him as I walk into my future.

SSA Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction

Abstract

In today's environment, one way to retain people is to have fully engaged employees. A correlation study was conducted to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement among Social Security Administration (SSA) employees. The Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS) is a tool that measures employees' perceptions their agencies. Pre-existing data was collected from the FEVS provided by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). The purpose of this quantitative correlational research study is to determine the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction at SSA. The outcomes of this study provides knowledge regarding job satisfaction, which leaders can integrate into recruitment, training, and development processes. Correlation results showed that job satisfaction and employee engagement were positively related.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	1
PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	5
RATIONALE	5
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	7
SIGNIFICANCE.....	8
LIMITATIONS	8
HYPOTHESES	8
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	11
EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION	11
VROOM’S EXPECTANCY THEORY	12
MASLOW’S HIERARCHY OF NEEDS	13
FIGURE 1	12
SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY	13
SOCIAL-EXCHANGE THEORY.....	15
FREDERICK HERZBERG'S TWO-FACTOR THEORY	16
EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT	18
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND MOTIVATION	21
JOB SATISFACTION	22
FACTORS INFLUENCING JOB SATISFACTION	23
SATISFACTION-ENGAGEMENT APPROACH.....	28
ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE.....	29
CONCLUSION.....	30
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	31
RESEARCH DESIGN	31
VARIABLES.....	32
DATA COLLECTION	32
LIMITATIONS	35
ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	35

SSA Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	36
PURPOSE.....	36
RESULTS.....	36
TABLE 1	40
CONCLUSION	41
CHAPTER 5	42
INTRODUCTION.....	42
FINDINGS.....	42
IMPLICATIONS	43
LIMITATIONS	44
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	45
REFERENCES.....	48
APPENDIX A	59
APPENDIX B	68

Chapter 1

Background

Social Security benefits have an integral part of so many lives of U.S. citizens. These benefits are one of the most important sources of retirement income. The need for social insurance started with the coming of the Industrial Revolution. In preindustrial America, most people lived on the land (and could thus provide their own subsistence); they were self-employed as farmers, laborers, or craftsmen, and they lived in extended families that provided the main form of economic security for family members who could not work. The Social Security Act of 1935 is one of the most important pieces of legislation in American history. Passed during the depth of the Great Depression, it created a variety of programs to serve citizens. Social Security provides a form of income for workers. The Social Security Administration (SSA) is an agency of the federal government that administers retirement, disability, auxiliary, and survivor benefits. Social Security is more than just a retirement program. The Social Security Administration (SSA) is headed by a Commissioner, followed by Deputy Commissioners, then Regional Commissioners, Area Directors, Section Chiefs, and first-line supervisors. It has a staff of almost 60,000 employees. SSA's central office is located in Baltimore, Maryland. The agency is spread out throughout the country to provide services at the local level, including ten regional offices, six processing centers, and approximately 1,230 field offices. There are two additional processing centers in the central office.

With the increase of beneficiaries and applicants for Social Security benefits, the agency has to have the staff to serve the public. SSA has a centralized organizational structure. Centralized organizational structures rely on one individual to make decisions and provide direction for the organization. Centralized organizations like SSA can suffer from the negative

effects of several layers of bureaucracy. These organizations often have multiple management layers stretching from the top down to frontline supervisors. One of the objectives in SSA's Strategic Plan is to provide an environment where employees feel empowered, safe, included, and engaged in the shared direction of the agency. According to the U.S. Government Accountability Office, a significant amount of SSA employees are in the baby boomer generation, which means they are near retirement age. Staff retirement will become a growing issue for the agency because it can affect the efficiency of programs, goods, and services provided by SSA. The importance of embracing employee engagement and job satisfaction within federal agencies such as SSA has been widely recognized in the "people and culture" portion of the President Obama's Management Agenda which emphasized the need to develop and sustain an engaged, innovative, and productive federal workforce.

Organizational leaders and human resources specialists within the federal government face challenges with employee engagement and job satisfaction. These challenges usually originate from organizational changes internally and externally. Although change is constant and continuous within organizations, leaders must be able to manage change to minimize decreases in employee motivation. The federal government's role is to implement programs that support the public by providing needed goods and services, therefore it is essential that the programs are operated by engaged and knowledgeable federal employees.

Office of Personnel Management's Definition of Employee Engagement

A common definition of employee engagement is a necessity to establish a common understanding of what employee engagement is and determining what the Federal Government can do to foster, increase, and measure employee engagement in its workforce. The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) established a group to formulate a definition of employee

engagement. The group used a process that incorporated research and feedback from stakeholders and technical experts. OPM's definition of employee engagement is: "The employee's sense of purpose that is evident in their display of dedication, persistence, and effort in their work or overall attachment to their organization and its mission." The implementation and use of this definition help ensure agencies such as SSA are consistently promoting, fostering, and measuring employee engagement. Employee engagement is related to many important individuals and organizational outcomes including retention, motivation, and productivity. It is also a strong predictor of both job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Office of Personnel Management's Definition of Job Satisfaction

OPM's definition of satisfaction is a combination of employees' satisfaction with their job, their pay, and their organization, plus their willingness to recommend their organization as a good place to work (Office of Personnel Management, 2011).

Employee engagement has taken a significant role in organizations as an important topic for better employee and organizational success (Robinson et al. 2004: 8). Employees are the backbone of an organization. Studies have shown that employee engagement is a key indicator of organizational performance and productivity. Employee engagement is also a key factor in determining organizational success and failure. It also has a significant impact on work performance.

In recent years, the importance of fostering employee engagement within the federal government has been recognized among researchers and agencies like SSA. For example, one study found that engaged public sector employees are: (1) twice as likely to stay in their current jobs, (2) two-and-a-half times more likely to feel they can make a difference, and (3) three times as likely to report being satisfied in their jobs (Taylor, 2012). Also, as highlighted in the "people

and culture” portion of the President Obama’s Management Agenda, the need to unlock the talent of today’s workforce and building a workforce needed for the future is of utmost importance. To address this goal, it is important that SSA make employee engagement and job satisfaction a priority.

Senior leaders are continually in need of methods to retain high potential employees and improve employee morale and productivity. Factors such as disengagement may occur because of the increased demands placed on SSA employees. Disengaged employees may not be as committed and motivated. These behaviors can result in employees being less productive and only working to complete the minimum requirements for acceptable job performance (Bakker et al. 2008; Towers Perrin 2009). Although employee engagement may not be the only predictor of turnover, engagement may help in identifying and predicting long-term successes including employee job satisfaction.

Problem Statement

This study focuses on the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction in the Social Security Administration. There is limited research regarding a connection between employee engagement and job satisfaction within specific federal agencies such as SSA. It will analyze whether SSA finds its employees to be better satisfied with their jobs when they are engaged. One of the goals of the Strategic Management of Human Capital (SMHC) initiative was to increase job satisfaction among federal employees (U.S. Office of Management and Budget, 2002). This research aims to find the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction in the Social Security Administration. The results from this study can be used to develop policy, programs, and initiatives to increase employee engagement and job satisfaction.

Drawing on academic literature, I hypothesize that employee engagement has a positive effect on the job satisfaction of SSA employees.

Rationale for the Study

There is significant research regarding the study of job satisfaction and employee engagement. However, there is limited research regarding the correlation between employee engagement and job satisfaction within specific federal agencies such as SSA. Several research studies revealed a positive correlation between employee engagement and achieving positive business outcomes (Gallup, 2013; Goel, Gupta, & Rastogi, 2013; Harter, Schmidt, & Killham, 2003; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Musgrove, Ellinger, & Ellinger, 2014; Quantum Workplace, 2009; Rana, Ardichvili, & Tkachenko, 2014; Shuck & Reio, 2011). Highly engaged employees result in an 87% decrease in turnover (Houlihan & Harvey, 2014). However, despite research highlighting organizational activities designed to support employee engagement, 70% of employees in the United States are either only partially engaged or fully disengaged (White, 2014). Additionally, disengaged employees cost organizations over \$300 billion per year in lost productivity (Strom, Sears, & Kelly, 2014).

In 2006, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (2006) projected that 60% of federal employees would be eligible to retire within ten years, including 90% of senior leaders. The U.S. Office of Personnel Management estimated that 40% of federal employees would retire at the first opportunity. In 2008, the Government Accountability Office estimated that 33% of 2007 federal employees and over 60% of leaders would be eligible to retire before 2013 (Bovbjerg & Goldenkoff, 2008). Bovbjerg and Goldenkoff (2008) predicted the labor force growth rate would decline by 80% by the year 2025. Agency officials must retain critical knowledge, and skills and

the federal government must have engaged employees (Rutzick, 2006; U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2006). Due to the large number of the current workforce going into retirement, it is important that federal agencies focus on employee retention by engaged ensuring employees are satisfied with their jobs.

The purpose of this research is to study the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction. This study evaluates the degree to which the employees' engagement was influenced by job satisfaction working within a government structure. An understanding of this relationship would make it possible to provide organizational leaders with knowledge that may assist in developing better job designs, higher motivation, and job satisfaction. Additionally, little data has been produced in researching SSA employees and their level of job satisfaction. The proposed research examined job satisfaction in SSA and the factors related to employee engagement. The findings enabled the agency not only to identify the existing strategies that have succeeded in promoting employee engagement but also to formulate new strategies to improve engagement. The findings are of value to the organization and will also contribute to the existing literature on employee engagement in federal agencies overall.

Theoretical Framework

Scholars suggest that employee engagement does not occur or operate independently. Some concluded that engagement acts as the end goal, while the other end is a means to a goal. However, some conclusions draw on engagement as more of a means to a goal such as job satisfaction. Therefore, with engagement, the employee must be committed to the work. The concept of engagement started with Kahn (1990). He assumes that employees become engaged when three psychological conditions or needs are met: meaningfulness, psychological safety, and availability. Kahn's approach to employee engagement assumes that when the job is challenging

and meaningful, the environment at work is safe, and resources are available, their needs are satisfied and engagement is likely to occur. The concept of employee engagement was re-developed later on by the Gallup Organization (2002). The Gallup Organization's definition incorporates the concept of job satisfaction (Locke, 1976).

Significance to the Field

The main benefit and significance of this research is for SSA to determine the variances of employee engagement and job satisfaction and using it to assist in formulating policies, building systems and structure, and sustaining an appropriate organizational culture. Additionally, organizations will gain knowledge about levels of engagement and how it affects job satisfaction. Leaders and employees will become more aware of themselves and their responsibilities toward organizational success while creating a culture that motivates. A significant influence on employees is the nature of leadership style they experience which requires a transformational leadership style. Therefore, the study is of real significance to every leader within SSA. It will provide a blueprint for engaging employees to attain heightened job satisfaction. According to Don Wicker (2011) "To the worker, job satisfaction brings a pleasurable emotional state that often leads to a positive work attitude and improved performance."

The data from this study provides employees and SSA leaders with information that may contribute to the engagement of workers. SSA leaders can use the results of this study to develop resources, programs, and techniques designed specifically to increase employee engagement. The data from this research advances the body of knowledge regarding the role of employee engagement as a contributor of job satisfaction within federal agencies such as SSA.

Limitations

Although there is a significant amount of research regarding employee engagement, there are few studies investigating the connection between the independent variable, employee engagement, and the dependent variable, job satisfaction. The study evaluates the relationships between variables utilizing the following conditions: work experience, agency, work unit, supervisor, work/life balance, and job satisfaction.

This study examines the following research question:

What is the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction within SSA?

The research question yields the following hypotheses:

H1: If the perception of the employee's work experience is high then job satisfaction will be high.

H2: If the perception of the employee's agency is high then job satisfaction will be high.

H3: If the perception of the employee's work unit is high then job satisfaction will be high.

H4: If the perception of the employee's supervisor is high then job satisfaction will be high.

H5: If the perception of the employee's work/life balance is high then job satisfaction will be high.

The purpose of this study was to identify if there is any significant relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction in the organization. The independent variable in this

research is the working environment in which the employees are working within an organization (employee engagement), and the dependent variable is the job satisfaction of employees.

Working environment includes the working hours, job safety, job security, the relationship among employees, esteem needs of employees and the influence of top management on the work of employees.

Literature Review

This literature review explores more in-depth the concepts of employee engagement, job satisfaction, Social Exchange Theory (SET), Self-Determination Theory, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, and Kahn's theory. The literature review examines the various definitions, theories, establishing the relationships between employee engagement, and job satisfaction by determining how the results will promote understanding of how employee engagement effects job satisfaction.

Employee Motivation

People have different needs and are regularly competing. Everyone has a different combination of needs because people are driven by different motivators. If organizational leaders can understand and predict employee behavior, it is important for them to know what their employees want. Employees used to be considered just another stimulus of the production of services or goods. What possibly changed this mindset about employees was research conducted by Elton Mayo called the Hawthorne Studies (Dickson, 1973). The study found employees are not motivated by money alone and that employee behavior is linked to their attitudes (Dickson, 1973). The Hawthorne Studies initiated the research into the needs and motivation of employees (Bedeian, 1993). Motivation has been defined as: the psychological process that gives behavior purpose and direction (Kreitner, 1995); a tendency to behave in a manner to achieve specific, unmet needs (Buford, Bedeian, & Lindner, 1995); an internal drive to satisfy an unsatisfied need (Higgins, 1994); and the will to achieve (Bedeian, 1993). Five major approaches that have led to our understanding of motivation are Vroom's expectancy motivation theory, Adams' equity

theory, Maslow's need-hierarchy theory, self-determination theory, social exchange theory, and Herzberg's two-factor theory.

One of the earliest researchers in the area of job redesign as it affected motivation was Frederick Herzberg. Based on his survey, Herzberg found that employees usually described satisfying experiences as factors that were intrinsic to the job itself (Pepe, 2010). These factors were called motivators and included variables such as achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth (Pepe, 2010). On the other hand, dissatisfying experiences, called hygiene factors, stems from extrinsic factors, such as policies, salary, coworker relations, and leadership styles (Steers, 1983). Vroom's expectancy motivation theory (1964) is based on the belief that employee effort will lead to performance may be either positive or negative. The more positive the reward, the more likely the employee will be highly motivated. Conversely, the more negative the reward, the less likely the employee will be motivated. Adams' equity theory (1963) states that employees strive for equity between themselves and other workers. Equity is achieved when the ratio of employee outcomes over inputs is equal to other employee outcomes over inputs (Adams, 1963). Motivation is defined as a “psychological process that causes the arousal, direction, and persistence of voluntary actions that are goal oriented (Mitchell, 1982, p.81). Motivation as defined by Robbins, 1993 (as cited by Ramlall, 2004), is the “willingness to exert high levels of effort toward organizational goals, conditioned by the effort’s ability to satisfy some individual need.”

Vroom’s Expectancy Theory

The expectancy theory argues that the strength of a tendency to act in a certain way depends on the strength of an expectation that the act will be followed by a given outcome and on the attractiveness of that outcome to the individual (Robbins, 1993). Expectancy theory also

states that motivation is a combined task of the individual's perception that effort will lead to performance and of the desirability of outcomes that may result from the performance (Steers, 1983). Although there are several forms of this model, Vroom in 1964 developed the formal model of work motivation drawing on the work of other researchers. Vroom's expectancy theory assumes that the "choices made by a person among alternative courses of action are lawfully related to psychological events occurring contemporaneously with the behavior" (Vroom, 1964, p. 15).

Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory

According to Maslow (1943), employees have five levels of needs: physiological, safety, social, ego, and self-actualizing. Maslow argued that lower level needs had to be satisfied before the next higher-level need would motivate employees. Maslow's defining work was the development of the hierarchy of needs.



Figure 1 Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Model

Maslow believed that there are at least five sets of goals which can be referred to as basic needs and are physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization which can be seen in Figure 1. Maslow (1943) stated that people, including employees at organizations, are motivated by the desire to achieve or maintain the various conditions upon which these basic satisfactions rest and by specific intellectual desires and that humans are a perpetually wanting group. Usually the satisfaction of these wants is not mutually exclusive. The average person is most often partially satisfied and partially unsatisfied in all their wants (Maslow, 1943). The implications of this theory provide useful insights for managers and leaders into how to meet employees needs.

Maslow's theory of the hierarchy of needs is one of the most highly recognized motivation theories. Maslow developed his theory based on people reaching self-actualization through completion of each of the five stages corresponding to human needs (Maslow, 1943). Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory assumes that all people behave in the same way. Maslow led the way for further scholarly study in various fields including psychology (Jackson, et al., 2014). In a study of salespeople conducted by Issa, Almad, and Gelaidan (2013), the results supported Maslow's theory of an employee's need to meet physiological needs before seeking other needs such as acceptance, love, and self-esteem.

Self-Determination Theory

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) is a theory of motivation developed by researchers Edward L. Deci and Richard M. Ryan. Self-determination theory suggests that people are motivated to grow and change by innate psychological needs. Miles (2012) states that when people satisfy their basic needs, then they tend to have higher levels of performance, health, and well-being. People are usually concerned with motivation and want to know how to motivate themselves or others to behave or act. The hypothesis is that people have three basic

psychological needs that are necessary to have optimal growth in performance which includes competence, relatedness, and autonomy. Competence is the ability to use skills to do a job efficiently and effectively. Relatedness is the connection between two or multiple subjects. Autonomy is described as being free or independent of external factors.

Self-determination theory explains that there are two basic types of motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation suggests that people engage in a certain activities or behaviors because of internal factors and are more likely to sustain the behavior. Extrinsic motivation is driven by external forces that motivate individuals with a reward. Once the opportunity of reward is taken away the motivation is gone.

One weakness of the theory is that there are only three psychological needs. There possibly needs to be more based on other theorist's needs such as Maslow's hierarchy of needs. A strength of the theory is that it considers that there are different motivators for behavior and it brings light to the fact that they do not affect individuals in the same way. According to Miles (2012), the theory has been criticized for focusing on too much on the positive side of life rather than incorporating the negatives. It has also been criticized for assuming that the theory can be applied to everyone. The theory does not consider how people prioritize their needs and it suggests that human behavior is independent of external factors. A manager will need to consider the outcome of which type of motivator they use with their employees to keep them engaged when facing challenging goals.

Social Exchange Theory

According to Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) in the Social Exchange Theory (SET), engagement stems from a series of interaction between two parties that depend on each other to

achieve a goal. A basic concept of SET is that relationships evolve over time into trusting, loyal and mutual commitments as long as the parties abide by certain rules of exchange. Most notably, SET examines exchanges in the workplace that occur between employees and employers in the organization. SET explains relationships in the organization between managers, employees, customers, and suppliers (Musgrove, Ellinger, & Ellinger, 2014). The premise here is employees repay their organizations by engaging. Employees will engage on different levels according to the volume of resources they receive, which indicates a two-way transaction. As individuals receive benefits that meet their needs or satisfaction, individuals feel obliged to reciprocate through intangible actions (Alfes, Shantz, Truss, & Soane, 2013). Employees work harder, have higher levels of commitment, increased motivation, and improved performance when they feel that the employer cares about their welfare, values their feedback, and is supportive (Jacobsen & Andersen, 2013; Slack, Corlett & Morris, 2015). The exchange of obligations and interactions go further than the leader and follower but also from peer to peer.

Social exchanges are the foundation of productive relationships within the organization (Casimir et al., 2014). Positive exchanges between members of an organization may support an individual's employee engagement levels. Increased interactions result in higher levels of trust the longer individuals remain in the reciprocal interdependent relationships (Musgrove et al., 2014). The Social Exchange Theory does not distinguish or limit interactions only between individuals but also includes groups and formal organizations (Jacobsen & Anderson, 2013; Musgrove et al., 2014). The theory further explains it is difficult for employees to vary their levels of performance when performance is used as the basis for payment and other administrative decisions. Employees are more likely to exchange their engagement for resources provided by the organization, which shows the variation of engagement between employees. In

these contexts, this study seeks to understand the relationships or employee engagement factors influenced by job satisfaction.

Studies of employee engagement use the Social Exchange Theory to highlight the relationship between employees and employers. The two major interactions of SET are economic and social. Financial transactions are more contractual with explicit terms and monetary rewards (Agarwal, 2014; Casimir et al., 2014; Slack et al., 2015). Research suggests that a varied range of positive behavioral work-related outcomes results from employee engagement (Alfes et al., 2013; Musgrove et al., 2014). Becoming emotionally, cognitively, and physically bonded to the organization is an outcome of employees engaged in their work. Workers with higher levels of emotional intelligence may have frequent positive exchanges that may improve employee engagement.

Frederick Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory

Herzberg (1964) identified two different categories of needs: hygiene factors and motivators, which are independent and influence behavior in different ways. Motivators or intrinsic factors, such as achieving goals, produce job satisfaction. Intrinsic factors that involve feelings of achievement, professional growth and recognition not only have a positive effect on job satisfaction, but they also increase an employee's output capacity. Hygiene or extrinsic factors, such as salary, can produce job dissatisfaction. People that are dissatisfied with their jobs are more concerned about their work environment than satisfied individuals that tend to feel comfortable with their jobs. Hygiene factor refers to organizational policies, supervision, working conditions, money security or interpersonal relations. When hygiene factors are satisfied, they will eliminate dissatisfaction, but they have no impact on achieving superior

performance (Herzberg, 1964). On the other hand, enhancing the motivators will help an employee grow and develop. Therefore, hygiene factors influence an employee's willingness and motivators affect an employee's ability.

Psychological capital is a theory developed by Fred Luthans (2007) which can be defined as: "An individual's positive psychological state of development that is characterized by having confidence (self-efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; persevering toward goals, and when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed; and when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond resiliency to attain success" (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007 p. 3). Each of these components of psychological capital has a background in theory and research; can be measured; can be developed over time and has a positive impact on performance (Luthans, 2002; Luthans & Youssef, 2004). Higher levels of psychological capital are associated with higher levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and well-being at work.

Employee Engagement

There is a wide unanimity among scholars that the concept of employee engagement was first introduced by Kahn (1990) in his article "Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work" published in a 1990 edition of the *Academy of Management Journal*. Kahn conducted a study to understand the psychological conditions that lead to employee's engagement in the workplace. Data were collected by interviewing 32 employees, 16 summer camp counselors, and 16 financial professionals to explore how certain job variables, such as manager satisfaction, role clarity, and availability of resources affected employee engagement. Grounded theory was used to analyze data collected from the interviews and

“articulate the complexity of influences on people’s personal engagements and disengagements in particular moments of role performances” (p. 717). Kahn’s framework has been used widely as a foundation for studies on employee engagement (Luthans & Peterson, 2002; Shuck, 2011).

Kahn (1990) described employee engagement as being “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances” (p. 694). For psychological engagement, there are two significant dimensions; emotional and cognitive engagement. Emotional engagement means having good relations with superiors and peers and experiencing empathy for others. Those who are cognitively engaged are aware of their mission and role in their work environment. According to Kahn (1990), an employee can experience engagement on any one of the dimensions at a point of time.

After Khan (1990) introduced the concept of employee engagement, there were no significant research initiatives to study employee engagement until researchers decided to re-introduce the concept of engagement. Of the numerous attempts to study employee engagement through rigorous testing, some other approaches emerged: Maslach and Leiter’s (1997) job engagement and Schaufeli’s work engagement (2002). Schaufeli et al. (2002) proposed a new definition of work engagement: “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (p. 74). Vigor is characterized by high levels of energy and resilience. Dedication is characterized by an employee being highly involved in their work. Absorption is described as having high levels of concentration.

In their best-selling book *First, break all the rules*, Buckingham and Coffman (1999) summarized survey results that Gallup had obtained since 1988 on “strong work places” of over 100,000 employees. Employees’ perceptions of such workplaces were assessed with a

“measuring stick” consisting of 12 questions. The research study (Buckingham and Coffman, 1999) revealed some of the critical factors which determine the employee engagement are: the employee empowerment, image, equal opportunities and fair treatment, performance appraisal, pay and benefits, health and safety, job satisfaction, communication, family friendliness, co-operation, career development, leadership, clarity of company values, respectful treatment of employees and company’s standards of ethical behavior. The term engagement is only occasionally used in the book by Buckingham and Coffman (1999) that was basically about leadership.

Although employee engagement and work engagement are used interchangeably, this study prefers to use employee engagement because it is inclusive of the relationship between the employee and the organization. Work engagement refers to the relationship of the employee with his or her work, while employee engagement includes the relationship with the organization. Employee engagement is related to an employee’s satisfaction and commitment to their work and the influences on an employee’s willingness to work (The Corporate Leadership Council, 2004; Blessing White; and Smythe, 2005 cited in IJCRM, 2013, p.8). In Bates (2004) study on employee engagement, engagement is defined as a human desire to contribute something of value in the workplace, which is heightened by the emotional attachment to one’s work, organization, manager, or co-workers.

According to Maslach et al. (2001), engagement is characterized by energy, involvement, and efficacy, and is the direct opposite of the three burnout dimensions of exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy. Additionally, Macey, Schneider, Barbera, and Young (2009), defined engagement as “an individual’s purpose and focused energy, evident to others in the display of personal initiative, adaptability, effort, and persistence directed towards organizational goals” (p.

7). Employee engagement also refers to the extent to which individuals invest themselves fully in the performance of their work (Christian et al., 2011). Thaliath & Thomas (2012) described employee engagement as “a heightened connection between employees and their work, their organization, or the people they work for or with” (p. 1). Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002) define employee engagement as “an individual’s involvement and satisfaction with as well as enthusiasm for work. Within the literature, employee engagement is also referred to as work engagement or workplace engagement (Shuck, 2011).

An implication of employee engagement is that there should be a two-way relationship between employees and their work environment. To drive engagement, employers will need to provide the right environment. However, it is not only important for the organization to create conditions for organizational performance regarding productivity and profitability. The conditions must also contribute to employees’ overall sense of well-being (Schmidt, 2004).

Difference Between Motivation and Engagement

Motivation is different from engagement. An employee can be engaged in something but not absorbed in it because they are feeling a sense of having to do something rather than wanting to. Motivation is the reason we act; engagement is what we do. Employee motivation is about an employee getting something in return for their efforts. Employees are motivated by the possibility of getting a cash reward, PTO, or recognition. They can even be motivated to take on more responsibilities to get a promotion. Employee engagement is a completely different attitude. It measures two basic things: an employee’s connection to their work and their effort.

An engaged employee is going to work toward moving the business to the next level and achieving organizational goals rather than just personal goals. Employee motivation is the level of energy and enthusiasm an employee brings to his/her workplace. The motivation factors can

be intrinsic or extrinsic and vary from one person to the other (Herzberg, 1963). Unfortunately, there is no exact science of employee engagement or employee motivation. It is widely concluded that engagement involves the extent to which employees are emotionally attached or passionate about their work and their loyalty to the organization.

When we think about encouraging motivation in employees, we often hit upon engagement as a solution. Engagement and motivation are different things; an engaged employee is not necessarily a motivated employee. That is not to say that motivation and engagement are not related: an individual's motivation influences how easily they can be engaged. For example, intrinsically motivated employees are more easily engaged because of the connection they have to their work. Extrinsically motivated individuals may be more easily engaged if the motivator aligns with their own goals.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as the extent to which employees like their work. Locke (1976) defines job satisfaction as a positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal the job or job experiences. Based on perceptions, an employee develops a positive or negative attitude towards their job and environment (Ellickson & Logsdon, 2002). The more a person's work environment fulfills his or her needs, values or personal characteristics, the greater the degree of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is one of the most studied variables of organizational research because researchers often theorize that there is a connection between job satisfaction and job performance, an idea that is important to employers (McCue and Gianakis, 1997).

Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction

According to the 2012 Employee Job Satisfaction Survey results published by SHRM, the factors that has the most influence are shown below.

Exhibit 1: Factors of Job satisfaction (Source: 2012 Job satisfaction survey by SHRM)

Rank	Factor
1	Job security (63%)
2	Opportunities to use skills and abilities (62%)
3	Organisation's financial stability (55%)
3	Relationship with immediate superior (55%)
4	Compensation/pay (54%)
5	Communication between employees and senior management (53%)
5	Benefits (53%)
5	The work itself (53%)
6	Autonomy and independence (52%)
7	Management's recognition of employee job performance (49%)
8	Feeling safe in the work environment (48%)
9	Overall corporate culture (46%)
10	Flexibility to balance life and work issue (38%)
10	Relationship with co-workers (38%)

To further explain the association of job satisfaction with employee engagement, the results of the 2012 Employee Job satisfaction and Engagement published by SHRM showing the conditions for employee engagement is listed in the table below.

Exhibit 2: Satisfaction with conditions of employee engagement (Source: 2012 Employee job satisfaction and engagement by SHRM)

Rank	Satisfaction with conditions of engagement
1	Relationship with coworkers (76%)
1	The work itself (76%)
2	Opportunities to use skills and abilities (74%)
3	Relationship with immediate superior (73%)
4	Contribution of work to organisation's business goals (71%)
5	Meaningfulness of job (69%)
5	Autonomy and independence (69%)
6	Variety of work (68%)
7	Organisation's financial stability (63%)
8	Overall corporate culture (60%)
9	Management recognition of employee job performance (57%)
10	Job specific training (55%)
11	Organisation's commitment to professional development (54%)
11	Communication between employees and senior management (54%)
12	Organisation's commitment to CSR (49%)
12	Networking (49%)
13	Career development opportunities (48%)
14	Career advancement opportunities (42%)

Job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction is an attitude that describes the level of an employee's satisfaction to perfect their work (Griffin & Pustay, 2007). Job satisfaction refers to "the positive or negative evaluative judgment about one's job or job situation" (Motowidlo,

1996). Advocates of engagement claim that, although both job satisfaction and employee engagement are concerned about the employee-job relationship, these two constructs have differences. Maslach et al. (2001) stated that “job satisfaction is the extent to which work is a source of need fulfillment and contentment, or a means offering employees from hassles or dissatisfiers; it does not encompass the person’s relationship with the work itself” (p. 416). Macey and Schneider (2009) pointed out that engagement implies passion, enthusiasm, and activation while satisfaction might have a sense of fulfillment. Also, job satisfaction is described as “an evaluative description of job conditions or characteristics, whereas work engagement is a description of an individual’s experiences resulting from the work” (Christian, 2011, p. 97). Another study by Castillo & Cano (2004) on the job satisfaction level among faculty members of colleges showed that if proper attention is given towards interpersonal relationships, recognition, and supervision, the level of job satisfaction will rise.

Chandrasekar (2011) argued that an organization need to pay attention to create a work environment that enhances the ability of employees to become more productive to increase profits for the organization. He also argued that human to human interactions and relations are playing a more dominant role in the overall job satisfaction rather than money whereas management skills, time and energy, all are needed for improving the overall performance of the organization in the current era.

Job satisfaction is how the worker feels about the job, co-worker, the work itself, and the work environment. It is further viewed as an important dimension of the motivational process reflecting the degree to which the individual perceives his needs and wants are being met. Churchill et al, (1974) and Smith et al, (1969) modeled the definition of job satisfaction as the work-related affection states covering five aspects: the supervisors, the jobs, the work

colleagues, the compensation, and the promotion opportunities. Kim (2002) found that managers who engaged in a participative management style had employees with higher levels of job satisfaction. In the study, participative management style, participative strategic planning processes, and effective supervisory communications all correlated positively with high levels of job satisfaction. Kim also found that agencies can benefit from considering employee and management development programs that include training on participative management and empowerment.

Job satisfaction is closely linked to an employee's attitude towards work or engagement. The higher the job satisfaction levels, then the more favorable the employee's attitude towards work. On the other hand, dissatisfaction creates a negative attitude in an employee (Miharty, 2013, p.2). In explaining drivers of job satisfaction and engagement, Schneider et al. (2009) suggested that job satisfaction is primarily driven by job security and benefits whereas the drivers of engagement behaviors are the "quality of relationships with coworkers, (b) feeling trusted and respected, and (c) supervisor credibility. Further, front-line supervisors have little control of the drivers of job satisfaction (job security and benefits) whereas drivers of engagement can be controlled more locally: "assignment to jobs that utilize skills and abilities, encouragement to innovate, being treated with trust and respect and working for a credible supervisor." (p. 23)

Daley (1986) studied job satisfaction from the perspective of humanistic management, which focuses on human motivation and the organization-human relationship. Daley stated that "the attitudes or perceptions of employees about the organization are in themselves important factors contributing to its ultimate success (1986)." His study focused on factors in three groups:

factors within the job environment, factors within the workplace environment, and factors within the perceptions of organizational success.

Ting (1997) stated that there are three determinants of federal employee job satisfaction. They are job characteristics, organizational characteristics, and individual characteristics. He states that some factors affecting satisfaction will overlap these three characteristics but, for the most part, they are distinct categories. Job characteristics have to do with the specific functions associated with doing the actual job. They include all the tasks associated with the job function as well as pay rate and skill development. Organizational characteristics include those factors that describe the work environment in which the work is performed. Lastly, the individual characteristics are those factors unique to the individual performing the work such as their specialized ability or knowledge. Ting's research indicates that job and organization characteristics have the greatest impact on federal employee job satisfaction.

Garg and Kumar (2012) have reported in their research paper that job satisfaction is an important driver of employee engagement. Their research measured employee engagement levels based on certain parameters such as a career path that offers opportunities for advancement, fair pay and benefits, the perception that organization offers good value to customers, and a satisfactory work environment, good relations with immediate supervisor, effective internal communication, good relationship with colleagues, and smooth functioning organizational dynamics. It concluded that job satisfaction and compensation are two such important parameters that are the key drivers of employee engagement in an organization. Job satisfaction can broadly be defined as the result of organizational factors such as job enrichment, incentives, rewards, pay, job design, organizational climate, job rotation, organizational culture, supervisor and co-worker relations (employee engagement). These elements are proposed to be positive correlates

of job satisfaction. According to researchers (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Liden et al., 1997), “when there is a harmonious social exchange relationship among leaders, subordinates, and the organization, this results in better performance, greater job satisfaction, with a higher level of organizational commitment, and much more positive role cognition compared to organizations lacking these harmonious relationships.” Satisfaction really refers to the fulfillment received by performing a job and being rewarded for it.

Most attempts to measure job satisfaction involve studying wants through questionnaires and interviews. Many organizations develop their specialized questionnaires for evaluating employee’s job satisfaction while others use questionnaires produced by recognized research organizations such as Gallup and UWES. Some of the items most frequently aligned with satisfaction are the type of work and the tasks performed; supervision; and working conditions.

Satisfaction-Engagement Approach

Job satisfaction has been viewed as one of the important elements of employee engagement. Developing from this idea, Harter et al. (2002) defined employee engagement as “individual’s involvement and satisfaction with as well as enthusiasm for work” (p. 269). Using Gallup Work Audit (GWA), a well-recognized and proprietary 12-item questionnaire (the Q12), Harter et al. (2002) analyzed almost 200,000 responses from 7,939 business units in 36 companies. Results suggested that employee engagement had a significant positive correlation with key organizational performance. Harter et al.’s (2002) work was the first to establish the linkage between employee engagement and job satisfaction and the business outcomes (e.g., customer satisfaction, safety, productivity, and profitability). Harter et al. (2002) also suggested

that employee engagement positively affected employee's well-being, "one of the first publications to suggest health benefits as a function of being engaged" (Shuck, 2011, p. 314).

Some practitioners have established the link between the emotional component of engagement and job satisfaction. Towers Perrin (2009) suggested that "the emotional factors tie to people's satisfaction and the sense of inspiration and affirmation they get from their work and being part of their organization" (p. 5). However, some scholars disagreed with the satisfaction-engagement approach. Macey and Schneider (2009) concluded that being satisfied with the job does not necessarily mean the employee has an emotional engagement with their job, nor does it lead to his or her engagement. Macey and Schneider further pointed out that, in some situations, satisfaction may have the connotation of fulfillment where engagement means the feelings of energy and enthusiasm, in addition to job satisfaction.

Organizational Change

Organizational change means changing an organization's routine way of doing business when accomplishing societal tasks (Becker, Lazaric, Nelson, & Winter, 2005). The purpose of organizational change is to take advantage of opportunities that can lead to improving the profits or output of organizations (Becker et al., 2005). Nadina (2011) found that organizations needed to change when problems existed in the organization; however, change to remedy situations was more reactive than proactive. Additionally, Khalid (2011) argued that change is a necessary component in the longevity of any organization and some organizations make organizational change a positive event. For instance, when leaders accept organizational change as a challenge, others react with a positive response. Nadina (2011) argued that proactive change is the best

method when organizations launch new products, services, or technology, to influence consumer behavior and create a competitive advantage.

When organizational leaders treat organizational change as a challenge, employees become motivated and their level of commitment to the organization increases (Khalid, 2011). Researchers indicated that when organizational change is considered a threat in organizations, employees might feel their jobs are in jeopardy and become depressed and anxious (Khalid, 2011). The management of organizational change can affect employees' level of job satisfaction and the organization's competitive advantage. Organizational change can then affect the organization in areas of growth (Khalid, 2011). When organizational leaders embrace change, they increase their competitiveness (Gilley et al., 2009) by taking on more projects, clients, production, and work than they would have taken before the change. Organizational change could force businesses to make structural changes to accommodate the new workload. Organizational change affects the quality of work-life, as professionals struggle to support business changes with their interests.

Conclusion

The literature review demonstrated evidence that the formative elements of needs satisfaction can be linked to employee engagement. A common theme that emerged from the literature review was that employees are simply human beings with increasing levels of needs. These needs must be met to achieve their highest potential and job satisfaction. The literature review demonstrated that when employers are successful in meeting employee needs, employee engagement is positively affected. The relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement have been studied and reported by many researchers. Additionally, job satisfaction can be an antecedent and a consequence of employee engagement. An attempt is made here to

highlight a few of the studies to support the present study. Through a literature review, these formative elements of job satisfaction can be linked to employee engagement.

Chapter 3 Methodology

Employee engagement involves the emotional, cognitive and physical aspects of work. Fostering employee engagement within an organization is a long-term process, and its success can be linked to job satisfaction. This study is attempting to dig into the topic of employee engagement and job satisfaction within the Social Security Administration. The importance of employee engagement is highlighted in relation to the concept of social exchange theory and human capital management. The researcher seeks to understand aspects of SSA employees' engagement and to find if there is a relationship between engagement and job satisfaction. The study aims to measure engagement and job satisfaction while looking at the areas where management interventions can be implemented to increase the overall level of employee engagement and job satisfaction. In the present competitive world, an employee's level of engagement and his quality of work are important to growth. So, managers should always try to identify ways to boost morale and increase productivity. To support this view, Towers Perrin (2009) found that companies with engaged employees boosted operating income by 19%.

Research Design

This quantitative research study uses a correlational design on the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction in SSA and takes the opportunity to describe the relationships among the quantitative variables. The aim of quantitative research is to investigate and explain the nature of the relationship between two variables in the real world. For this study, the variables involved were factors of employee engagement and job satisfaction. Correlational research studies go beyond describing what exists and concern systematically investigating relationships between two or more variables of interest (Porter & Carter, 2000). A correlational

design is appropriate to examine relationships between two or more variables while using quantitative data to test theories (Gelo, Braakman, & Benetka, 2008).

Quantitative research provides tangible numerical measurements. A mixed methods methodology can help to bridge the gap between quantitative and qualitative methodologies and involves data analysis of both approaches to drawing inferences (Harwell, 2011). However, due to time constraints and limited access to participants, the use of a mixed methods methodology or qualitative methodology in this study was limited.

Variables

The independent variables associated with employee engagement are the employee's work experience, employee's work unit, employee's agency, employee's experience with supervisors, and the employee's work-life balance. The dependent variable is job satisfaction. In a 2010 study, Bailey et al. stated that a descriptive correlational design was very useful in relating relationships among variables. Choosing a quantitative methodology will require engaging standard statistical operations using SPSS to understand the relationship, patterns, and influences of employee engagement on job satisfaction for SSA employees.

Data Collection

This research concentrates on critical facts and results from surveys conducted by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) pertaining strictly to SSA. It is the analysis of the relevant pre-existing data from OPM being used differently to answer the research question that makes the study necessary. Common sources of secondary data are social science surveys, previous researchers, and data from government agencies (McCaston, 1998). Secondary data analysis can be described as "second-hand" analysis. It is the analysis of data or information that

was either gathered by someone else or for some other purpose than the one currently being considered, or often a combination of the two (Cnossen 1997).

Data was collected from the Office of Personnel Management which conducts surveys for all federal agencies. The benefit of using this design is that all the information needed is easily accessible and relatable to the researcher. The Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS) is a tool that measures employees' perceptions of whether, and to what extent, conditions that characterize successful organizations are present in their agencies (OPM, 2011). This survey was administered for the first time in 2002 and then repeated in 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017. The survey serves as a tool for OPM to assess individual agencies and their progress on the strategic management of human capital (OPM, 2011). The sample was designed to produce results by supervisory status. Because of the differing response rates among the different demographic groups completing the survey, the data was weighted to ensure that the results are statistically unbiased.

The Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey was administered to a sample of full-time and part-time, permanent, non-seasonal employees of departments and/large agencies and the small/independent agencies. SSA usually has a response rate exceeding 45%. The survey was conducted electronically on the Internet, with employees notified by email of their selection for the sample. Electronic administration facilitated the distribution, completion, and collection of the survey. To encourage higher response rates, OPM sent multiple follow-up emails to sample participants. OPM's current measure of employee engagement is the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS) Employee Engagement Index. The FEVS survey uses the Likert scale with possible responses ranging from "strongly disagree" which is coded as a 1 to "strongly agree" which is coded as a 5. The FEVS is administered each year and measures employee

engagement through individual work experiences, work units, experiences with supervisors, experience with the agency, and work/life balance. The FEVS survey questions changed starting in 2016 and exclude the work/life balance questions. Therefore, the results for 2016 and 2017 will need include an analysis for work/life balance.

The FEVS participants include executives, managers, supervisors, team leaders, and non-supervisory employees (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2008e). Precautions are necessary to avoid the differences in employee status acting as outliers. An outlier is “a subject or other unit of analysis that has extreme values on a variable because they can distort the interpretation of data or make misleading a statistic that summarizes values” (Vogt, 2005, p. 223).

The sample involved in this research is composed of SSA employees only. The sample members have high school diplomas, bachelor’s degrees, master’s degrees, and doctoral degrees. The data from SSA employees was separated from the all-inclusive list of federal agencies. To examine the hypotheses, a Pearson product-moment r correlation was conducted to assess the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction for SSA employees. Analyzing agency documentation was selected as the main source of evidence because it provides information on the status of employee engagement and job satisfaction specifically at the Social Security Administration. Documents that were reviewed include the agency’s employee engagement plan and OPM’s FEVS survey questions and data. Located in Appendices A and B are the survey questions and datasets from the 2004-2017 FEVS.

Acquiring the documentation needed will not cause an issue because the data is public record. All the documentation used are the most up to date data that the agency has. The

documentation collected includes all existing documentation related to employee engagement and job satisfaction within SSA. Although getting access to the data was not difficult, there is limited documentation on what practices are currently being implemented to date. After reviewing existing literature, agency documents, this study will offer suggestions for best employee engagement practices to increase job satisfaction in the agency.

Ethical Considerations

This research is focused specifically on secondary data available for public use. All the survey participants were anonymous. There were no foreseeable risks to the participants. Although the individual's perspective is shared, it is confidential: their identity and any information that would permit personal identification are withheld in publicly released reports regarding the survey. Survey participation is voluntary, and all responses are confidential and anonymous. When OPM delivers the survey results, no information was provided to tie responses to individual employees. There is no data available that put the subjects at risk now or in the future and there is no way for me to identify individual participants.

Chapter 4 Data Analysis

Purpose

This chapter describes the results of the data analysis of the research study. The results of the analysis seek to answer the study's focus of the investigation of employee engagement and job satisfaction. The central hypothesis states there is a relationship between the two variables, job satisfaction, and employee engagement. The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction at the Social Security Administration. This chapter presents the results of the statistical analyses used to make these determinations. The study hypotheses were tested using the Pearson r correlation test. Survey responses for the employee engagement surveys were analyzed using SPSS. Pearson r correlation is a measurement of the strength of a relationship between two variables. Given that all the variables are continuous, and the hypotheses seek to assess the relationships, Pearson r correlations are the appropriate statistical test to utilize for the study. Correlation coefficients, r , vary from no relationship (0); to a perfect linear relationship (1); or a perfect negative linear relationship (-1). Positive correlation coefficients show a direct relationship which indicates that as one variable increases, the other variable also increases. Negative correlation coefficients show an indirect relationship, which indicates that as one variable increases, the other variable decreases.

Results

H1: The relationship between employee work experience and job satisfaction is significantly positively correlated.

H2: The relationship between the employee's agency and job satisfaction is significantly positively correlated.

H3: The relationship between the employee's work unit and job satisfaction is significantly positively correlated.

H4: The relationship between the employee's supervisor and job satisfaction is significantly positively correlated.

H5: The relationship between the employee's work/life balance and job satisfaction was not significant therefore this hypothesis is rejected.

In 2004, my work experience, my work unit, my experience with supervisor and my agency were all significantly positively correlated with my satisfaction. That is, high scores on my work experience, my work unit, my experience with supervisor and my agency were related to high satisfaction. All effect sizes were medium to large. Work-life balance (i.e. the number of work-life balance programs engaged with) was negatively correlated with satisfaction with a small effect size (more engagement with work-life programs was related to lower satisfaction). Coefficients and significance levels are presented in Table 1.

In 2006, my work experience, my work unit, my experience with supervisor and my agency were all significantly positively correlated with my satisfaction. All effect sizes were large. Work-life balance was negatively correlated with satisfaction with a small effect size.

Looking only at the data from 2008, there were significant, large positive correlations between my work experience, my work unit, my agency, my experience with supervisor, and my satisfaction. Work-life balance was negatively correlated with my satisfaction with a small effect size.

Large positive correlations were found in 2010 between my work experience, my work unit, my agency, my experience with supervisor and my satisfaction. Work-life balance was negatively correlated with my satisfaction, with a small effect size.

In 2011, my work experience, my work unit, my agency and my experience with supervisor were all significantly positively correlated with job satisfaction with large effect sizes. Work-life balance was not related to satisfaction in 2011.

Looking only at the data from 2012, there were significant, positive correlations between my work experience, my work unit, my agency and my experience with a supervisor, and my satisfaction, with large effect sizes. Work-life balance was positively correlated with my satisfaction with a small effect size.

There were significant, large positive correlations between my work experience, my work unit, my agency, my experience with supervisor and my satisfaction in 2013. There was a small, but statistically significant positive correlation between work-life balance and my satisfaction.

In 2014 there were significant positive correlations between my work experience, my work unit, my agency, my experience with supervisor and my satisfaction. All effect sizes were large. Engagement with work-life programs was not related to satisfaction.

My work experience, my work unit, my agency, my experience with supervisor and work-life balance was significantly positively correlated with my satisfaction in 2015. All effect sizes were large, with the exception of the correlation between work-life balance and my satisfaction, which was small.

The survey items did not include measures of work-life balance in 2016 and 2017. In 2016 and 2017, my work experience, my work unit, my agency and my experience with

supervisor were significantly positively correlated with my satisfaction, all with large effect sizes.

Between the five subscales of job satisfaction from 2004 through 2017; my work experience, my work unit, my agency, my experience with the supervisor, and work-life balance, the Pearson Correlation results proved levels of significance in all subscale variables, however only four were statistically correlated and significant to confirm the hypotheses. The work-life balance variable correlation figures were marginal and non-significant to conclude the hypotheses.

To study the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement, correlation analysis was done, and the results are given below.

Table 1. Coefficients and significance levels for correlations between all variables and my satisfaction.

		Job Satisfaction										
		2004	2006	2008	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
My Work	Pearson	.509	.846*	.845**	.819**	.812**	.808**	.810**	.809**	.816**	.830**	.827**
Experience	Correlation (r)	**	*									
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
My Work	Pearson	.481	.696*	.724**	.684**	.684**	.686**	.705**	.690**	.688**	.706**	.703**
Unit	Correlation (r)	**	*									
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
My Agency	Pearson	.515	.758*	.770**	.765**	.773**	.781**	.794**	.791**	.784**	.805**	.799**
	Correlation (r)	**	*									
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
My	Pearson	.576	.829*	.830**	.824**	.822**	.807**	.810**	.805**	.813**	.822**	.812**
Experience	Correlation (r)	**	*									
with												
Supervisor	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Work-life	Pearson	-	-	-.197**	-.214**	.019	.030**	.079**	.020	.051**	-	-
Balance	Correlation (r)	.223	.195*									
		**	*									
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.117	.000	.000	.060	.000	-	-

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Conclusion

Four hypotheses were confirmed, and one was rejected using the Pearson r correlation. For hypothesis H1, a statistically significant relationship was found between the employee's work experience and job satisfaction. For hypothesis H2, the employee's agency did appear to be statistically significant as a predictor of job satisfaction. For hypothesis H3, the employee's perception of their work unit became a significant contributor to job satisfaction. For hypothesis H4, the perception of the employee's supervisor is a statistically significant predictor of job satisfaction. For hypothesis H5, the perception of the employee's work-life balance was not a statistically significant predictor of job satisfaction for SSA employees.

Chapter 5 Discussion and Conclusion

More and more organizations are recognizing the importance of employee job satisfaction and engagement. An engaged employee is enthusiastic and committed towards organizational goals, mission, and values. Moreover, is thus motivated to go the extra mile for their employer. Employee engagement is being considered an essential retention strategy because engaged employees devoted towards the goals assigned to them. Employees form an emotional connection with their organizations when they are effectively engaged and motivated. It indicates the association of an employee with the organization and building the passion among employees to let them go beyond the call of duty.

This study was performed as an examination of the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction in the Social Security Administration. It was performed using archival data collected from 2004 to 2017. Employee engagement was projected to be the predictor of job satisfaction. To address the purpose of the study, the research question related to the topics of employee engagement and job satisfaction was analyzed. The sample population for the study included SSA employees that completed the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey from 2004 to 2017. Using bivariate correlation statistical model, the answers to the research question were revealed.

Findings

The correlation test found a significant relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction. Thus, satisfied employees are usually engaged at work. Work-life balance, on the other hand, was found not to have a significant effect on employee engagement. Between the five subscales of job satisfaction from 2004 through 2017; my work experience, my work unit, my agency, my experience with supervisor, and work-life balance, the Pearson Correlation

results proved levels of significance in all subscale variables. However, four hypotheses were statistically correlated and significant to confirm the hypotheses. Only the work-life balance variable correlation figures were marginal and non-significant to conclude the hypotheses. The findings indicate that employee engagement is closely linked with job satisfaction at SSA.

This study provides analysis of impact different types of employee engagement on job satisfaction at SSA.

Researchers and scholars in public administration, human resource management, and public policy fields can benefit from this study as it provides more empirical results in understanding the impact of employee engagement on job satisfaction at SSA. This study fills the gap within the literature and offers a unique analysis of the human resource management at SSA and the level of job satisfaction from 2004 to 2017. Determining the types of employee engagement that are the most effective at SSA would be beneficial to researchers and practitioners.

Implications

The study gives a view that employee engagement has a significant impact on job satisfaction. Therefore, leaders and managers need to realize that while job satisfaction and employee engagement are both vital to uphold productive and happy workforce, attaining satisfaction without engagement will have a significantly less impact on employees. After all, engaged employees demonstrate initiative and are usually emotionally committed to their work. They align strategic priorities to take the organization forward. Higher workforce productivity, customer satisfaction, lower absenteeism, and turnover are all associated with enhanced employee engagement (Harter, Schmidt and Hayes, 2002). However, it should be noted that the

results of the present study represent a sample of one federal agency, so they should be carefully interpreted.

The social-change implications from the results of this study may help improve the quality of work and better the work-life of SSA employees. SSA leaders can use this research to guide leadership style changes which can help create opportunities for SSA employees to reach their highest potential. Additionally, SSA leaders could create an opportunity for employees to acquire new knowledge that can improve efficiencies, increase responsibilities, and enhance job satisfaction. These qualities can lead to positive social change in the work-life of SSA employees and the federal government overall. Additionally, this study can help increase employee retention and productivity in the federal government.

The information from this research can be used to develop an employee engagement plan which can be incorporated into the strategic planning process. The employee engagement plan can help SSA identify how the agency has embraced employee engagement, what the agency can do better, and how to efficiently incorporate new and improved engagement practices. Employee engagement and job satisfaction are concepts that can also be better integrated into the agency's strategic planning process. Successful engagement initiatives should be strategic. This approach elevates engagement to be more than a program.

Limitations

Limitations are factors over which the researcher has little or no control that may inhibit the full data collection or analysis processes (Creswell, 2014). Due to the quantitative nature of the data, this research could lack the insight and richness that could have been derived from a qualitative method. One of the limitations of conducting a correlational research design only

measure the existence of relationships between two or more variables. No other information can be inferred such as for cause and effect between the variables. It is possible that this study did not consider other factors that could influence one's job satisfaction and political engagement. The limitation of this study is that it did not analyze how leadership styles moderate the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction. This study did not analyze how grade levels (from GS 1 to GS 14) of employee moderate the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study focused only on one segment of a larger entity which is the federal government overall. A future study of the entire federal workforce should be conducted as well as a cost-benefit analysis. There is a need to study the cost-benefit aspect of employee engagement decisions. This will allow the data to be sorted by the entire group and allow leaders to see the value. The results will help leaders determine if an agency needs change or if an issue is prevalent throughout all agencies in the federal government.

The study can also be used to do a more exhaustive examination of different federal agencies to determine best practices for engagement and the effects of organizational culture on job satisfaction and engagement. Future studies could analyze how grade levels (from GS 1 to GS 14) of employee moderate the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction. SSA can also conduct pilot projects to measure employment in specific regions. There may also be a need to further examine the cultural effects of employee engagement and satisfaction and determine the role of the environment.

There is no one-size-fits-all solution to improving employee engagement. Instead, each agency should assess its own level of engagement, analyze the results to determine what areas to

focus on, and then take action. This should be followed by periodic re-surveys to see if the engagement is moving in the right direction. In other words, agencies shouldn't administer the solution before figuring out the problem.

There should also be further research into how leadership styles affect employee engagement and job satisfaction. Leadership is a critical driver of improved employee engagement. Therefore, senior leaders need to make employee engagement an organizational priority. Future studies could analyze how leadership styles moderate the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction.

The study establishes a relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction. Results gathered conclude that employee engagement is a predictor of the level to which employees are satisfied. The findings of this study may offer organizational leaders the opportunity to evaluate why employees may not be satisfied with their job or organization. Organizational leaders may want to look at pay, supervisors, work environment, policies, and benefits to ensure employees are satisfied with their job.

The literature affirms that satisfied employees perform better and contribute to the success of an organization. On the other hand, employees who are not satisfied do not perform well and hinder success. The research suggests that by focusing on improving engagement, organizations like SSA can be more successful through meeting the needs of employees. Therefore, it is in the best interest of SSA and other organizations to determine ways to improve employee satisfaction. Engaged employees find personal meaning, pride, and value in their work. In return, they deliver what is known as discretionary effort. They go beyond their individual role to do what it takes to help the organization succeed.

Employee engagement contributes to organizational success. Having satisfied employees helps promote employee engagement. Engaged employees want to have good communication with their supervisors, work that motivates them, and good relationships within their work units. It makes sense to foster employee engagement and job satisfaction in the federal government. Employee engagement efforts and planning will take time and preparation. It is a process and cannot be developed in a day. Developing an employee engagement plan will also take employee input and an understanding of what employees need. Successful organizations understand the benefits of satisfied employees and employees being engaged. The literature contained in this study clearly underscores these concepts and gives the reader a sense of the importance of fostering employees engagement and job satisfaction.

Improving employee engagement can be a powerful tool to improve individual and organizational performance if it's done strategically. However, there is no magic bullet to improve employee engagement and job satisfaction. What's needed is a systematic assessment of employee engagement level by using a carefully constructed approach to dealing with the issues the data reveals, and then a strategy to develop engagement over time. Therefore, improving employee engagement and job satisfaction is a marathon and not a sprint.

References

- Adams, J.S. (1963) Towards an Understanding of Inequality. *Journal of Abnormal and Normal Social Psychology*. (67), pp. 422-436.
- Alfes, K., Shantz, A., Truss, C., & Soane, E.C. (2013). The Link Between Perceived Human Resource Management Practices, Engagement and Employee Behavior: A Moderated Mediation Model. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24, 330-351. doi:10.1080/09585192.2012.679950.
- Bailey, J., Sabbagh, M., Loisel, C. G., Boileau, J., & McVey, L. (2010). Supporting families in the ICU: A Descriptive Correlational Study of Informational Support, Anxiety, and Satisfaction with Care. *Intensive and Critical Care Nursing*, 26, 114– 122. doi:10.1016/j.iccn.2009.12.006.
- Bates S (2004), 'Getting engaged', *HR Magazine*, 49(2), 44–51.
- Bakker, A. B. and Schaufeli, W. B. 2008. Positive Organizational Behavior: Engaged Employees in Flourishing Organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(2), 147-154.
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W.B., Leiter, M.P. and Taris, T.W. 2008. Work Engagement: An Emerging Concept in Occupational Health Psychology. *Work and Stress*, 22(3), 187-200.
- Bedeian, A. G. (1993). *Management* (3rd ed.). New York: Dryden Press.
- Becker, M.C., 2005. The Concept of Routines: Some Clarifications, *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 29(2).
- Blessing White (2008), *The State of Employee Engagement*, Blessing White.
- Bryman, A. 1992. *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations*. London: Sage.
- Buckingham, M., & Coffman, C. (1999). *First, Break All the Rules: What the World's Greatest Managers do Differently*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Buford, J. A., Jr., Bedeian, A. G., & Lindner, J. R. (1995). *Management in Extension* (3rd ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Extension.
- Bovbjerg, B. and Goldenkoff, R. (2008). Federal Agencies Face Challenges, But Have Opportunities to Hire and Retain Experienced Employees. Testimony Before the Senate Special Committee on Aging, United States Government Accountability Office, Seattle, WA.
- Casimir, G., Ngee Keith Ng, Y., Yuan Wang, K., & Ooi, G. (2014). The Relationships Amongst Leader-Member Exchange, Perceived Organizational Support, Affective Commitment, and In-Role Performance: A Social Exchange Perspective. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 35(5), 366-385.
- Chandrasekar, K. (2011, January). Workplace Environment and Its Impact Organizational Performance in Public Sector organizations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems*, 1(1), 1-19.
- Castillo, J. Cano. Factors Explaining Job Satisfaction Among Faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45 (3) (2004), pp. 65-74.
- Christian, M.S., Garza, A.S., & Slaughter, J.E. (2011). Work Engagement: A Quantitative Review a Test of Its Relations with Task and Contextual Performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89-136. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203>.
- Churchill, G.A., Jr., Ford, N., & Walker, O.C., Jr. (1974). Measuring the Job Satisfaction of Industrial Salesmen. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 11(3). 254-260.
- Cnossen, Christine., (1997) Secondary Research: Learning Paper 7, School of Public Administration and Law, the Robert Gordon University, January 1997. <http://jura2.eee.rgu.ac.uk/dsk5/research/material/resmeth>.

Corporate Leadership Council. (2004). Driving Performance and Retention Through Employee Engagement.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. 2005. Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management*, 31: 874-900.

Daley, D.M. (1986). "Humanistic Management and Organizational Success: The Effect of Job and Work Environment Characteristics on Organizational Effectiveness, Public Responsiveness, and Job Satisfaction." *Public Personnel Management* 15 (Summer): 131-142.

Dickson, W. J. (1973). Hawthorne Experiments. In C. Heyel (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Management*, 2nd ed. (pp. 298-302). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Ellickson, M.C., & Logsdon, K. (2002). Determinants of Job Satisfaction of Municipal Government Employees [Electronic version]. *Public Personnel Management*, Vol.31(3), 343-358.

Fleming J., Coffman C., Harter J.K. (2005). Manage your Human Sigma. *Harvard Business Review*, 8(7):106–114.

Garg, Anshul, and Kumar, Vinod., (2012), A Study of Employee Engagement in Pharmaceutical Sector, *International Journal of Research in IT and Management*, 2(5), pp. 85 – 98.

Gallup. (2013). State of the American Workplace: Employee Engagement Insights for U.S. Business Leaders. Washington, DC: Author. Gallup Institute for Campus Engagement. (2006). Enhancing institutional performance. Princeton, NJ: The Gallup Organization.

- Gelo, O., Braakmann, D., & Benetka, G. (2008). Quantitative and Qualitative Research: Beyond the Debate. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 42(3), 266- 290.
doi:10.1007/s12124-008-9078-3
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic Review of Leader– Member Exchange Theory: Correlates and Construct Issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 827– 844.
- Gerstner C. R., Day D. V. Meta-analytic Review of Leader-member Exchange Theory: Correlates and Construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1997,82(6): 827-844
- Gilley, A., McMillan, H. S., & Gilley, J. W. (2009). Organizational Change and Characteristics of Leadership Effectiveness. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 16, 38–47.
doi:10.1177/1548051809334191
- Goel, A. K., Gupta, N., & Rastogi, R. (2013). Measuring the Level of Employee Engagement: A Study from an Indian Automobile Sector. *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management*, 6(1), 5-21.
- Griffin, R.W., & Pustay, M.W. (2007). *International Business: A Managerial Perspective* (5th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Harter J.K., Schmidt F.L., Hayes T.L. (2002). Business-unit-level Relationship Between Employee Satisfaction, Employee Engagement, and Business Outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 268–279.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Killham, E. (2003). Employee Engagement, Satisfaction, and Business-unit-level Outcomes: A meta-analysis. Princeton, NJ: The Gallup Organization.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Killham, E. A. & Agrawal, S., T. L. (2009). Meta-Analysis: The Relationship Between Engagement at Work and Organizational Outcomes. Retrieved 5

June 2011, from

www.gallup.com/consulting/File/126806/MetaAnalysis_Q12_WhitePaper_2009.pdf

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*. Cleveland: World Publishing Company.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Higgins, J. M. (1994). *The Management Challenge* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Houlihan, M. & Harvey, B. (2014). Growing the Greenest Pasture: How to Create Real Employee Engagement. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 37(1), 23-26.

Retrieved from <http://asq.org/pub/jqp/>

Jacobsen, C.B. & L.B. Andersen (2013). Performance Management in the Public Sector. Does it Decrease or Increase Innovation and Performance? *International Journal of Public Administration*.

Kahn, W.A., (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 33, Issue.4, pp.692-724.

Luthans, Fred, Peterson, Suzanne P. (2002) "Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 21 Issue: 5, pp.376-387,

Khalid, R. (2011). Changing World, Challenges and the China Model. *Policy Perspectives*, 8(2), 52-62.

Kim, Soohee. (2002). Participative Management and Job Satisfaction: Lessons for Management Leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2), 231-241.

Kreitner, R. (1995). *Management* (6th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 15, 47–119.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B.J., Avey, J.B. and Norman, S. M. (2007), Positive Psychological Capital: Measurement and Relationship with Performance and Satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60: 541–572. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007. 00083.x.
- McCaston, K. 1998. *Tips for Collecting, Reviewing, and Analyzing Secondary Data*. Atlanta: CARE.
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The Meaning of Employee Engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 3-30. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x.
- Macey, W.H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K., & Young, S.A. (2009). *Employee Engagement: Tools for Analysis, Practice, and Competitive Advantage*. London, England: Blackwell.
- Mccue, Clifford & A. Gianakis, Gerasimos. (1997). The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Performance: The Case of Local Government Finance Officers in Ohio. *Public Productivity & Management Review*.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B. and Leiter, M.P. (2001), “Job Burnout”, *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 52, pp. 397-422.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396.
- Miharty, M. (2013). The Influence of Organizational Culture on Job Satisfaction Towards Improving the Quality of Education in University of Riau. Faculty of Education, University of Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia. *Asian Social Science*, 9 (12); ISSN 1911- 2017 E-ISSN 1911-2025. Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education.

- Miles, J. A. (2012). *Management and Organization Theory*. Jossey-Bass Reader. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mitchell, T.R. (1982). *Motivation: New Direction for Theory, Research and Practice*. *Academy of Management Review*, 81.
- Mohamad, Issa, D. A Rahim, Ahmad, Fais, and Gelaidan, Hamid M. (2013). "Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention Based on Sales Person Standpoint." *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*. 14 (4): 525-531.
- Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). *Orientation Toward the Job and Organization*. In K. R. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual differences and behavior in organizations*, (pp. 175-208). San Francisco: JosseyBass.
- Reukauf, J. A. (2017). *The Correlation Between Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention in Small Business* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- Musgrove, C. F., Ellinger, A. E., & Ellinger, A. D. (2014). Examining the Influence of Strategic Profit Emphases on Employee Engagement and Service Climate. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 26, 152-171. doi:10.1108/JWL-08-2013-0057.
- Office of Personnel Management. (n.d.). 2011 Office of Personnel Management Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. Retrieved October 12, 2017, from <https://www.scribd.com/document/67892439/2011-Office-of-Personnel-Management-Federal-Employee-Viewpoint-Survey>
- Pepe, M. (2010). The Impact of Extrinsic Motivational Dis-satisfiers On Employee Level Of Job Satisfaction And Commitment Resulting In The Intent To Turnover. *Journal of Business & Economics Research* (JBER), 8(9).

- Porter, S., Carter, DE (2000) Common Terms and Concepts in Research. In Cormack, D. (Ed.) *The Research Process in Nursing* (4th Ed.). Oxford, Blackwell Science (pp. 17-28).
- Quantum Workplace. (n.d.). Employee engagement tools: About Quantum Workplace. Retrieved from <http://www.quantumworkplace.com/about-us/>
- Quantum Workplace. (2009). *The Predictive Wisdom of Employees: A Look at Employee Engagement as a Predictor of Stock Market Activity*. Omaha, NE.
- Rana, S., Ardichvili, A., & Tkachenko, O. (2014). A Theoretical Model of the Antecedents and Outcomes of Employee Engagement. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 26, 249- 266. doi:10.1108/JWL-09-2013-0063.
- Ramlall, S. (2004). A Review of Employee Motivation Theories and Their Implications for Employee Retention within Organizations. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, Cambridge, 5 (1/2), 52-63.
- Robinson D., Perryman S., and Hayday S. (2004). *The Drivers of Employee Engagement Report*, Institute for Employment Studies, UK
- Rutzick, K. (2006). *Agencies Ordered to Probe Employee Satisfaction*. Government Executive. Retrieved from <http://www.govexec.com>
- Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., and Bakker, A.B. 'The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout and: A Confirmative Analytic Approach', *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 2002, 71-92.
- Schmidt, F (2004) *Workplace Well-being in the Public Sector – A Review of the Literature and the Road Ahead for the Public Service Human Resources Management Agency of Canada*. Ottawa: PSHRMA. Available online at <http://www.hrma-agrh.gc.ca/hr-rh/wlbpseeoppfps/documents/WorkplaceWell-Being.pdf>.

- Schneider, B., W.H. Macey, K.M. Barbara and N. Martin. 2009. Driving Customer Satisfaction and Financial Success through Employee Engagement. *People and Strategy*. 32(2): 22-27.
- Slack, Richard, Corlett, Sandra and Morris, Rachael (2015) Exploring Employee Engagement with (Corporate) Social Responsibility: A Social Exchange Perspective on Organizational Participation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 127 (3). pp. 537-548. ISSN 1573- 0697.
- Shuck, B. (2011). Four Emerging Perspectives of Employee Engagement: An Integrative Literature Review. *Human Resource Development*, 10, 304-328. doi:10.1177 /1534484311410840 6.
- Shuck, B., & Reio, T. (2011). The Employee Engagement Landscape and HRD: How Do We Link Theory and Scholarship to Current Practice? *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13, 419-428.
- Shuck, M. Brad, Rocco, Tonette S., Albornoz, Carlos A. (2011) "Exploring Employee Engagement from the Employee Perspective: Implications for HRD", *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 35 Issue: 4, pp.300-325, <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090591111128306>
- Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C.L. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1983a). *Motivation & Work Behavior* (3 ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Strom, D. L., Sears, K. L., & Kelly, K.M. (2014). *Work Engagement: The Roles of Organizational Justice and Leadership Style in Predicting Engagement Among*

- Employees. *Journal of Leadership Organizational Studies*, 21(1), 71-82.
doi:10.1177/1548051813485437.
- Taylor, P.W. (2012). Georgia Attracts Unlikely Students to Government Jobs. *Governing Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.governing.com/columns/dispatch/col-ga-attracts-unlikely-students-to-govtjobs.html>.
- Thaliath, A., & Thomas, R. (2012). Motivation and its Impact on Work Behavior of the Employees of the IT industry in Bangalore. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, 1(1), 60-67.
- Ting, Y. (1997). Determinants of Job Satisfaction of Federal Government Employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 26, 313-334.
- Towers Perrin. 2009. Employee Engagement Underpins Business Transformation, viewed 10 December 2018,
<http://www.towersperrin.com/tp/getwebcachedoc?country=gbr&webc=GBR/2008/200807/TP_ISR_July08.pdf>.
- U.S. Office of Management and Budget. (2002). The President's Management Agenda. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/omb/budget/fy2002/mgmt.pdf>.
- U.S. Office of Personnel Management. (2006). Federal Human Capital Survey 2006. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.fhcs2006.opm.gov/Published/>.
- Vogt, W. P. (2005). *Dictionary of Statistics & Methodology: An Nontechnical Guide for the Social Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.

White, P. (2014). Improving Staff Morale through Authentic Appreciation. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, (28)5, 17-20.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/DLO-05-2014-0034> .

Wicker, D. (2011). *Job Satisfaction: Fact or Fiction*. Bloomington, IN: Author House.

Appendix A

FEVS Survey Questions 2004 to 2015

Item Number and Text		Data Value and Label					
	My Work Experience	5	4	3	2	1	X
1	I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills in my organization.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
2	I have enough information to do my job well.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
3	I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
4	My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
5	I like the kind of work I do.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
6	I know what is expected of me on the job.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
7	When needed I am willing to put in the extra effort to get a job done.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
8	I am constantly looking for ways to do my job better.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
9	I have sufficient resources (for example, people, materials, budget) to get my job done.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
10	My workload is reasonable.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
11	My talents are used well in the workplace.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
12	I know how my work relates to the agency's goals and priorities.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know

13	The work I do is important.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
14	Physical conditions (for example, noise level, temperature, lighting, cleanliness in the workplace) allow employees to perform their jobs well.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
15	My performance appraisal is a fair reflection of my performance.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
16	I am held accountable for achieving results.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
17	I can disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
18	My training needs are assessed.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
19	In my most recent performance appraisal, I understood what I had to do to be rated at different performance levels (for example, Fully Successful, Outstanding).	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Basis to Judge

Item Number and Text		Data Value and Label					
My Work Unit		5	4	3	2	1	X
20	The people I work with cooperate to get the job done.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
21	My work unit is able to recruit people with the right skills.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
22	Promotions in my work unit are based on merit.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
23	In my work unit, steps are taken to deal with a	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not

	poor performer who cannot or will not improve.			Disagree			Know
24	In my work unit, differences in performance are recognized in a meaningful way.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
25	Awards in my work unit depend on how well employees perform their jobs.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
26	Employees in my work unit share job knowledge with each other.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
27	The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
28	How would you rate the overall quality of work done by your work unit?	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	

Item Number and Text		Data Value and Label					
My Agency		5	4	3	2	1	X
29	The workforce has the job-relevant knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish organizational goals.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
30	Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
31	Employees are recognized for providing high quality products and services.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
32	Creativity and innovation are rewarded.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
33	Pay raises depend on how well employees perform their jobs.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know

34	Policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace (for example, recruiting minorities and women, training in awareness of diversity issues, mentoring).	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
35	Employees are protected from health and safety hazards on the job.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
36	My organization has prepared employees for potential security threats.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
37	Arbitrary action, personal favoritism and coercion for partisan political purposes are not tolerated.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
38	Prohibited Personnel Practices (for example, illegally discriminating for or against any employee/applicant, obstructing a person's right to compete for employment, knowingly violating veterans' preference requirements) are not tolerated.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
39	My agency is successful at accomplishing its mission.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
40	I recommend my organization as a good place to work.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
41	I believe the results of this survey will be used to make my agency a better place to work.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know

Item Number and Text		Data Value and Label				
My Work Experience	5	4	3	2	1	X

42	My supervisor supports my need to balance work and other life issues.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
43	My supervisor provides me with opportunities to demonstrate my leadership skills.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
44	Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
45	My supervisor is committed to a workforce representative of all segments of society.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
46	My supervisor provides me with constructive suggestions to improve my job performance.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
47	Supervisors in my work unit support employee development.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
48	My supervisor listens to what I have to say.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
49	My supervisor treats me with respect.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
50	In the last six months, my supervisor has talked with me about my performance.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
51	I have trust and confidence in my supervisor.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
52	Overall, how good a job do you feel is being done by your immediate supervisor?	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	Do Not Know
53	In my organization, senior leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know

54	My organization's senior leaders maintain high standards of honesty and integrity.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
55	Supervisors work well with employees of different backgrounds.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
56	Managers communicate the goals and priorities of the organization.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
57	Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
58	Managers promote communication among different work units (for example, about projects, goals, needed resources).	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
59	Managers support collaboration across work units to accomplish work objectives.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
60	Overall, how good a job do you feel is being done by the manager directly above your immediate supervisor?	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	
61	I have a high level of respect for my organization's senior leaders.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
62	Senior leaders demonstrate support for Work/Life programs.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know

Item Number and Text		Data Value and Label				
My Satisfaction		5	4	3	2	1
63	How satisfied are you with your involvement in decisions that affect your work?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied

64	How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
65	How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
66	How satisfied are you with the policies and practices of your senior leaders?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
67	How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
68	How satisfied are you with the training you receive for your present job?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
69	Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
70	Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your pay?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
71	Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your organization?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied

Item Number and Text		Data Value and Label			
Work/Life		1	2	3	4
72	Have you been notified whether or not you are eligible to telework?	Yes, I was notified that I was eligible to telework.	Yes, I was notified that I was not eligible to telework.	No, I was not notified of my telework eligibility.	Not sure if I was notified of my telework eligibility.
		1	2	3	

73	Please select the response below that BEST describes your current teleworking situation.	I telework	I do not telework because I am unable	I do not telework because I choose not to
----	--	------------	---------------------------------------	---

		1	2	3
	Do you participate in the following Work/Life programs?			
74	74. Alternative Work Schedules (AWS)	Yes	No	Not Available to Me
75	75. Health and Wellness Programs (for example, exercise, medical screening, quit smoking programs)	Yes	No	Not Available to Me
76	76. Employee Assistance Program (EAP)	Yes	No	Not Available to Me
77	77. Child Care Programs (for example, daycare, parenting classes, parenting support groups)	Yes	No	Not Available to Me
78	78. Elder Care Programs (for example, support groups, speakers)	Yes	No	Not Available to Me

		5	4	3	2	1	X
	How satisfied are you with the following Work/Life programs in your agency?						
79	79. Telework	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No Basis to Judge
80	80. Alternative Work Schedules (AWS)	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No Basis to Judge
81	81. Health and Wellness Programs (for example, exercise,	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No Basis to

	medical screening, quit smoking programs)			Dissatisfied			Judge
82	82. Employee Assistance Program (EAP)	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No Basis to Judge
83	83. Child Care Programs (for example, daycare, parenting classes, parenting support groups)	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No Basis to Judge
84	84. Elder Care Programs (for example, support groups, speakers)	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No Basis to Judge

Appendix B

FEVS Survey Questions 2016-2017

Item Number and Text		Data Value and Label					
My Work Experience		5	4	3	2	1	X
1	I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills in my organization.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
2	I have enough information to do my job well.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
3	I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
4	My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
5	I like the kind of work I do.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
6	I know what is expected of me on the job.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
7	When needed I am willing to put in the extra effort to get a job done.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
8	I am constantly looking for ways to do my job better.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
9	I have sufficient resources (for example, people, materials, budget) to get my job done.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
10	My workload is reasonable.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
11	My talents are used well in the workplace.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
12	I know how my work relates to the agency's goals and priorities.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
13	The work I do is important.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know

14	Physical conditions (for example, noise level, temperature, lighting, cleanliness in the workplace) allow employees to perform their jobs well.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
15	My performance appraisal is a fair reflection of my performance.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
16	I am held accountable for achieving results.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
17	I can disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
18	My training needs are assessed.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
19	In my most recent performance appraisal, I understood what I had to do to be rated at different performance levels (for example, Fully Successful, Outstanding).	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Basis to Judge

Item Number and Text		Data Value and Label					
My Work Unit		5	4	3	2	1	X
20	The people I work with cooperate to get the job done.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
21	My work unit is able to recruit people with the right skills.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
22	Promotions in my work unit are based on merit.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
23	In my work unit, steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
24	In my work unit, differences in performance are recognized in a meaningful	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know

	way.						
25	Awards in my work unit depend on how well employees perform their jobs.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
26	Employees in my work unit share job knowledge with each other.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
27	The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
28	How would you rate the overall quality of work done by your work unit?	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	

Item Number and Text		Data Value and Label					
My Agency		5	4	3	2	1	X
29	The workforce has the job-relevant knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish organizational goals.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
30	Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
31	Employees are recognized for providing high quality products and services.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
32	Creativity and innovation are rewarded.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
33	Pay raises depend on how well employees perform their jobs.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
34	Policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace (for example, recruiting minorities and women, training in awareness of diversity issues, mentoring).	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
35	Employees are protected from health and safety hazards on the job.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know

36	My organization has prepared employees for potential security threats.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
37	Arbitrary action, personal favoritism and coercion for partisan political purposes are not tolerated.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
38	Prohibited Personnel Practices (for example, illegally discriminating for or against any employee/applicant, obstructing a person's right to compete for employment, knowingly violating veterans' preference requirements) are not tolerated.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
39	My agency is successful at accomplishing its mission.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
40	I recommend my organization as a good place to work.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
41	I believe the results of this survey will be used to make my agency a better place to work.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know

Item Number and Text		Data Value and Label					
My Work Experience		5	4	3	2	1	X
42	My supervisor supports my need to balance work and other life issues.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
43	My supervisor provides me with opportunities to demonstrate my leadership skills.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
44	Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
45	My supervisor is committed to a workforce representative of all segments of society.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know

46	My supervisor provides me with constructive suggestions to improve my job performance.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
47	Supervisors in my work unit support employee development.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
48	My supervisor listens to what I have to say.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
49	My supervisor treats me with respect.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
50	In the last six months, my supervisor has talked with me about my performance.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
51	I have trust and confidence in my supervisor.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
52	Overall, how good a job do you feel is being done by your immediate supervisor?	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	
53	In my organization, senior leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
54	My organization's senior leaders maintain high standards of honesty and integrity.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
55	Supervisors work well with employees of different backgrounds.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
56	Managers communicate the goals and priorities of the organization.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
57	Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
58	Managers promote communication among different work units (for example, about projects, goals, needed resources).	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know

59	Managers support collaboration across work units to accomplish work objectives.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
60	Overall, how good a job do you feel is being done by the manager directly above your immediate supervisor?	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	
61	I have a high level of respect for my organization's senior leaders.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
62	Senior leaders demonstrate support for Work/Life programs.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know

Item Number and Text		Data Value and Label				
My Satisfaction		5	4	3	2	1
63	How satisfied are you with your involvement in decisions that affect your work?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
64	How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
65	How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
66	How satisfied are you with the policies and practices of your senior leaders?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
67	How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
68	How satisfied are you with the training you receive for your present job?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
69	Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied

			Dissatisfied		
70	Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your pay?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied
71	Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your organization?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied