2012

Job Satisfaction Determinants: A Study Across 48 Nations

Jeanine K. Andreassi
Sacred Heart University, andreassij@sacredheart.edu

Leanna Lawter
Sacred Heart University, lawterl@sacredheart.edu

Martin Brockerhoff
Sirota Consulting, mbrockerhoff@sirota.com

Peter Rutigliano
Sirota Consulting

Recommended Citation

JOB SATISFACTION DETERMINANTS: A GLOBAL STUDY ACROSS 48 COUNTRIES

Jeanine Andreassi
&
Leanna Lawter
Sacred Heart University

Martin Brockerhoff
Independent Consultant

Peter J. Rutigliano
Sirota Survey Intelligence

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the drivers of job satisfaction across four cultural regions—Asia, Europe, North America, and Latin America. Using Hofstede's theory, determinants were used to predict job satisfaction for each region and then compared to determine significant differences. Data was collected from a proprietary industry survey on employee work attitudes. The sample consisted of over 70,000 employees from 4 large multinational organizations. Data was analyzed using regression analysis and comparison testing across models. There are significant relationships between job characteristics and job satisfaction across all regions of the world, with a sense of achievement universally the most important driver. Although job characteristics impact job satisfaction across all regions, there are significant differences in the relative importance of job characteristics on job satisfaction, consistent with Hofstede's cultural dimensions. The findings have implications for tailoring human resource management practices across locations within multinationals.This research is believed to be the first cross-cultural study of the job determinants affecting job satisfaction using multiple organizations and industries.

Keywords – Job satisfaction, culture, job characteristics, employee attitudes

INTRODUCTION

In the past few decades, there has been an explosion of businesses moving operations overseas, setting up international joint ventures, and establishing multinational enterprises. This trend has led organizational researchers and corporations to explore the implications of cultural differences in managing a workforce. An important question is whether Western management practices can be used as effectively with employees in Asia, Europe, and Latin America, as in North America, and whether the application of Western management principles affects satisfaction in non-Western countries. The prevailing view, largely inspired by the work of Hofstede (1980), is that differences in national cultures and value systems call for different management practices (Newman and Nollen, 1996). Similarly, the GLOBE Study of 62 societies (House, 2004) found that cultural differences strongly influence how employees view their leaders and organizations (Grove, 2005).

This study examines employee attitudinal survey responses across 48 countries in four global regions: Asia, North America, Europe, and Latin America. Specifically, we examined proprietary survey data from three large multinational companies, each of which had a physical location in all four global regions. The three companies represented three major industries: financial services, manufacturing, and oil & gas production. The current research compares the relative importance of seven job characteristics on overall job satisfaction across four global regions. The current study posits that significant differences exist across global regions with regard to how employee attitudes on job characteristics influence job satisfaction. The basis of the hypothesized differences are Hofstede's four primary cultural dimensions: power distance (social inequality), individualism/collectivism (relationship between the individual and the group), masculinity/femininity (social implications of gender roles) and uncertainty avoidance (extent to which cultural members are threatened by ambiguity).

The implications for the current study are significant for practitioners. This information can help multinational organizations better understand how key job characteristics considered important in North American culture influence job satisfaction differently among other global regions. In particular, this information can be used by managers to tailor job practices based on cultural differences. Additionally, the size of the database used in the current research and the broad cross section of corporations across the four global regions increases the generalizability and relevance of the current findings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Determinants of Job Satisfaction

A number of different theories have been used to explain job satisfaction. One of the most prominent explanations of job satisfaction is the job characteristics model (Hackman & Lawler, 1971), which suggests that task identity, task significance, skill variety, autonomy and feedback relate to job satisfaction. Need theories have also been used to predict job satisfaction.

Maslow (1943) maintains that people are motivated by unfulfilled needs, which include physiological (thirst, hunger), safety (shelter), social (sense of belonging), esteem (achievement, recognition) and self-actualization (reaching one's fullest potential). Similarly McClelland (1961) posits that all people have a need for achievement, power and affiliation, which differ depending on the individual. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1987, 1959) characterizes work factors as either motivating factors, which can increase job satisfaction, or hygiene factors, which can increase dissatisfaction. Factors which are associated with job satisfaction are achievement, recognition, characteristics of the job, level of responsibility, and growth opportunities. Likert (1961) and McGregor (1960) were among the first researchers to theorize that employee satisfaction has important implications for organizational productivity and effectiveness. They expressed that job satisfaction influences the extent to which one works to their fullest potential towards organizational goals and cooperates with colleagues. A number of studies have examined the relationship between job characteristics and job satisfaction (Blegen, 1993; Brown & Peterson, 1993; Loher, Noe, Moeller, & Fitzgerald, 1985), and have shown that job satisfaction is related to job performance (Harrison, Newman, & Roth, 2006; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; Riketta, 2008), retention (Tett & Meyer, 1993), and organizational commitment (Riketta, 2002). For the purposes of the current study, seven job characteristics were selected as possible determinants of job satisfaction—perception of equal opportunities in the workplace, feeling of personal accomplishment, perception of teamwork and cooperation within one's work team, level of training received, communication from management on key issues, recognition for good performance, and work-life balance. These seven job determinants were chosen as predictors in the analysis because for each there is a theoretical reason why they would be related to job satisfaction. Another criterion used to analyze these seven was that data needed to be available for the dimension for each of the regions in the comparison analysis in the proprietary databases used in the study.

There is little research on job satisfaction across cultures, and the authors know of no study which uses data from multiple countries in multiple regions to investigate job satisfaction and its determinants across different cultures. Based on differences among cultures and societies in terms of what is valued it is likely in the workplace (Hofstede, 1980; House, 2004), we posit that the determinants of job satisfaction will not be universal across cultures, but, instead will vary in their level of importance based on differences in Hofstede's cultural dimensions. We have used Hofstede's theoretical model to hypothesize how cultural dimensions will influence the degree to which the job characteristics-- teamwork, work-life balance, communication from management, training received, recognition, feeling a sense of accomplishment, and perceptions of equal opportunity in the workplace—drive job satisfaction. In the literature review below, we will describe theory and past research as it relates to Hofstede's cultural dimensions, and propose how culture might influence the relationship between workplace variables and job satisfaction.

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

Individualism/Collectivism . Cultures with lower levels of collectivism (and higher levels of individualism) are less likely to value working together as a team and more likely to prefer working independently. On the other hand, cultures with higher levels of collectivism are more likely to prefer close working relationships with co-workers. Kirkman and Shapiro (2001) studied the impact of cultural values on job satisfaction among 461 self-managing teams in four countries (Belgium, Finland, Philippines and the United States). They found that higher levels of collectivism are associated with higher levels of job satisfaction and commitment within teams. Loh, Restubog, and Gallois (2010) found that eastern cultures (higher in collectivism) have a higher level of work-group identification than western cultures (higher in individualism). Therefore, it is expected that the degree to which cultures are more collectivistic will affect the extent to which teamwork is an important driver of job satisfaction such that:

> Hypothesis 1: Teamwork will be a more important determinant of job satisfaction in collectivistic cultures than individualistic cultures.

Recent models on cross cultural differences in work-family posit that both cultural and sociocontextual factors impact the experience of work-family conflict (Joplin, Schafer, Francesco, & Lau, 2003; Korabik, Lero & Ayman, 2003). A cultural factor is individualism/collectivism, described previously, as the extent to which there is a focus on the individual versus the group (Hofstede, 1984). Work-family conflict is less likely in collectivistic cultures because hard work is seen as a means to increase the well-being of the family (Aryee, Luk, Lueng, & Lo, 1999; Grzywacz, Arcury, Marin, Carillo, Burke, Coates & Quandt, 2007; Yang, Chen, Choi and Zou, 2000). Because hard work is seen as integral to family well-being, experiencing work-family conflict is less likely to be perceived as stressful (Hassan, Dollard, and Winefield, 2010; Spector, Cooper, Poelmans and Allen, 2004). Research studies have supported the notion that in collectivistic societies, females perceive that work activities are in support of family activities leading to less conflict. For example, Thein, Auste, Currie and Lewin (2010) found that women in Hong Kong and Singapore perceived the domains of work and family as interdependent whereas Westerners conceptualized the two domains as separate and therefore in opposition to one another. Yang et al. (2000) found that in collectivistic China, sacrificing time with one's family was viewed as a self-sacrifice; whereas, American women with an individualistic orientation perceived time spent at work away from one's family as a failure to care for significant others. Because individuals from collectivistic societies view work activities as enhancing the family, and therefore do not see work as an impediment to family life, it is predicted that:

> Hypothesis 2: The ability to balance one's work and personal lives will be a more important determinant of job satisfaction in individualistic cultures than in collectivistic cultures.

Uncertainty Avoidance

Uncertainty avoidance refers to the degree to which a culture tolerates uncertainty concerning the future. Cultures high in uncertainty avoidance have a low tolerance for uncertainty and attempt to plan for and predict the future. Cultures high in uncertainty avoidance, desire to follow rules and have strict codes of behavior (Hofstede, 1984), and therefore, often have organizations marked by a high degree of formalization (Shackleton & Ali, 1990). A high degree of formalization has been observed to be related to communication inflexibility in organizations leading to a reduced interdependency between a manager and subordinate (Crozier, 1964). It has been found that in highly formalized work groups, managers rely more on procedures and rules to exert control as opposed to using tools such as open communication (Huang & Van de Vliert, 2006). Open communication from management is perceived as undermining formalization in the organization and increasing the degree of uncertainty and ambiguity and by increasing information flow between management and employees (Sriussadaporn, 2006). Therefore, based on a theoretical understanding of uncertainty avoidance and past research it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 3: Communication from management on key issues will be less important in cultures that are high on uncertainty avoidance than those low on uncertainty avoidance.

High uncertainty avoidance cultures also value security, so that individuals within these cultures likely have a tendency to prefer jobs that offer stability. Because training increases the flexibility and adaptability of the workforce, it would serve to increase uncertainty and has a low level of desirability or worth in high uncertainty avoidance cultures. Burke, Chan-Serafin, Salvador, Smith and Sarpy (2008) argued that in an effort to avoid ambiguity in workforce training, trainers in a high uncertainty avoidance culture would focus more on providing a highly structured training session and be less interested in engaging the participants. They also argued that attempting to decrease ambiguity in training would lead to standardized structured educational approaches such as use of lecturing in high uncertainty avoidance cultures and greater usage of experiential methods that are more engaging in low uncertainty avoidance cultures. In support of their theoretical suppositions, they found that higher uncertainty avoidance reduced the effectiveness of safety training and was related to lower levels of engagement in training, suggesting usage of less engaging training methods in high uncertainty avoidance cultures (Burke et al., 2008). In high uncertainty avoidance culture, we would expect that training would be deemed to be less important because people would like stability as opposed to having to change jobs or engage in new types of skills. Training in high uncertainty avoidance cultures would also be less engaging, and therefore, not impact job satisfaction to the same extent as in a low uncertainty avoidance culture. Therefore, it is expected that in high uncertainty avoidance cultures, level of training will be less important as a driver of job satisfaction than in low uncertainty avoidance cultures such that:

Hypothesis 4: Level of training received will be a more important determinant of job satisfaction in low uncertainty avoidance cultures than in high uncertainty avoidance cultures.

Masculinity / Femininity

Masculinity/femininity refers to how well established gender roles are within a culture. These roles directly relate to how males and females are perceived within the culture. Another facet of the masculinity/femininity dimension is how a culture generalizes concepts of success. Cultures which are characterized as masculine measures success in terms of personal success as measured by material wealth and financial rewards, as compared to feminine cultures which place less emphasis on material success and place more value on personal relationships and quality of life (Hofstede, 1980b).

Level of personal recognition is an externally focused event which involves an interchange between two people where one person acknowledges another's performance. This type of extrinsic reward is relationship dependent and can be characterized as a socioemotional career satisfier. Feminine gender-based self-schemas place more importance on socioemotional career satisfiers, such as recognition (Eddleston, Veiga, & Powell, 2006). Feminine cultures place more emphasis an individual's contribution to society and value other's recognition of work well done (Arrindell & Veenhoven, 2002). As individuals in a feminine culture are more concerned with their relationships with their managers in the organization (Hofstede, 1991), and would value recognition, it is predicted that:

Hypothesis 5: Level of recognition received for doing a good job will be a more important determinant of job satisfaction in feminine cultures than in masculine cultures.

Sense of accomplishment is internally focused and closely aligned with an individual's need for achievement (Maslow, 1943). Masculine cultures place an emphasis on personal drive and ambition (Hofstede 1980b), both also internally focused. Schuler & Rogovsky (1998) found that high masculinity was associated with greater use of an individual bonus system. In Japan, Jakofsky and Slocum (1988) found that high masculinity was reflected in a great interest in work and achievement. Because masculinity is related to competitiveness and individual achievement, it is expected that countries that are higher in masculinity place more value on achievement needs being met than those that are lower in masculinity. Therefore it is expected that:

Hypothesis 6: Work leading to a sense of accomplishment will be a more important determinant of job satisfaction in masculine cultures than in feminine cultures.

Power Distance

Power distance is the degree to which members of a society without power accept the inequality in power (Hofstede, 1980a). In high power distance cultures, such as Latin American cultures, inequality among social classes is accepted by both the higher social levels and the lower social levels with an underlying expectation that wealth and social status are fairly static within the culture (Varela et al., 2010). On the other hand, cultures in low power distant countries are generally considered to be equals regardless of inequities in characteristics such as wealth and an underlying assumption is that there is mobility to levels of wealth and status within the culture (Hofstede 1980b). In high power distance societies, subordinates expect superiors to behave in an

autocratic, non-consultative manner and seek more guidance from supervisors (Agarwal, 1993). Western cultures (low power distance) espouse egalitarianism as a key cultural value in the workplace; eastern cultures (high power distance) expect a high degree of hierarchy and vertical distance among managerial levels (Pan et al., 2010). One could argue that within high power distance cultures, inequality is expected to be part of all organizational structures, such that if an employee is accustomed to experiencing social inequality in general, but experiences a perception of equality in the workplace, they will be more likely to value that equality, which, in turn, will increase job satisfaction. Conversely, if equality in an underlying assumption in a culture, the impact of equality in the workforce will not be a motivating factor to increasing job satisfaction.

Therefore, it is expected that:

Hypothesis 7: Perception of equal opportunities in the workplace will be a more important determinant of job satisfaction in high power distance cultures than in low power distance cultures.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

Employees from three large multinational companies in financial services, manufacturing, and oil & gas production participated in a proprietary industry survey on job attitudes/characteristics and job satisfaction. Each company had physical locations in at least four countries in each of the four global regions: Asia, Europe, North America, and Latin America. There were ten or more full-time employees in each location. A total of 75,813 employees participated in the survey.

Five demographic characteristics—gender, age, race, tenure, and job function—were also collected. These were used as control variables in the regional regression models.

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Number of Respondents	75813
Gender	
Female	45.6%
Male	54.4%
Race	
White	68.7%
Black	8.0%
Hispanic	6.6%
Asian	9.3%

Native American			0.7%				
Other			6.7%				

Tenure
0-2 years	32.3%
2-5 years	21.0%
5-10 years	20.8%
10+ years	25.9%

Type of Position
| Management | 19.8% |
| Non-management | 80.2% |

Demographic distributions within each company across the four geographic regions were fairly similar. Respondents were 45.6% female and 54.6% male. As would be expected from the large number of respondents from North America and Europe, 68.7% of respondents identified themselves as white. Approximately 20% of respondents were in managerial positions, and tenure was evenly represented across categories.

Measures

The proprietary survey was comprised of a number of work-related measures including the seven job satisfaction determinants used in this study. Employees were asked how they perceived each of the attitudinal measures using one item per measure. Responses were measured on a scale 5-point scale, with 1 indicating very dissatisfied and 5 indicating very satisfied.

Analysis

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelation analyses were completed for each of the four global regions.

Table 2
Asia: Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Overall Satisfaction	3.69	0.82								
2. Equal Opportunity	3.62	1.06	0.47							
3. Teamwork	3.91	0.86	0.49	0.36						
4. Recognition	3.54	0.88	0.62	0.40	0.45	0.45				
5. Communication	3.66	0.92	0.52	0.40	0.47	0.35	0.48			

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6. Accomplishment	3.82	0.87	0.48	0.37	0.42	0.30	0.41	0.43	0.37	
7. Training	3.42	0.93	0.46	0.36	0.38	0.45	0.46	0.39	0.37	0.35
8. Work-Life Balance	3.62	0.99	0.38	0.27	0.26	0.30	0.31	0.26	0.27	0.26

All correlations significant at p<.0001

Table 3
North America: Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Overall Satisfaction	3.77	0.90								
2. Equal Opportunity	3.58	1.13	0.46							
3. Teamwork	3.94	0.99	0.45	0.34						
4. Recognition	3.52	1.02	0.59	0.39	0.48	0.43				
5. Communication	3.60	1.04	0.50	0.38	0.47	0.28	0.50			
6. Accomplishment	3.91	0.94	0.51	0.35	0.40	0.24	0.42	0.38	0.38	
7. Training	3.57	0.94	0.40	0.31	0.30	0.38	0.40	0.35	0.28	0.33
8. Work-Life Balance	3.62	1.07	0.38	0.21	0.23	0.24	0.29	0.26	0.28	0.25

All correlations significant at p<.0001

Table 4
Europe: Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Overall Satisfaction	3.71	0.83								
2. Equal Opportunity	3.45	1.07	0.43							
3. Teamwork	3.94	0.93	0.40	0.29						
4. Recognition	3.49	0.94	0.61	0.36	0.43	0.40				
5. Communication	3.55	1.00	0.48	0.33	0.42	0.24	0.48			
6. Accomplishment	3.78	0.93	0.51	0.33	0.41	0.23	0.43	0.39	0.35	
7. Training	3.43	0.95	0.42	0.29	0.30	0.29	0.39	0.34	0.28	0.33
8. Work-Life Balance	3.43	1.09	0.35	0.19	0.20	0.24	0.28	0.23	0.22	0.21

All correlations significant at p<.0001

Table 5
Latin America: Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Overall Satisfaction	4.05	0.82								
2. Equal Opportunity	3.64	1.09	0.47							
3. Teamwork	4.10	0.84	0.50	0.37						
4. Recognition	3.68	0.97	0.61	0.39	0.47	0.41				
5. Communication	3.77	0.99	0.51	0.43	0.45	0.35	0.51			
6. Accomplishment	4.21	0.86	0.51	0.39	0.42	0.28	0.44	0.44	0.31	
7. Training	3.62	0.96	0.47	0.32	0.38	0.38	0.47	0.37	0.33	0.38
8. Work-Life Balance	3.69	1.12	0.39	0.30	0.29	0.19	0.32	0.25	0.29	0.31

All correlations significant at p<.0001

Prior to any regression analysis or hypothesis testing, Hofstede's cultural dimensions were calculated for each of the four regions in order to group regions with similar ranges of scores together for hypothesis testing. Within each region a single score was calculated for each of Hofstede's cultural dimensions – power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity and collectivism. Each of the four regional scores was computed using a weighted average based on the number of participants in each country within a region multiplied by each country's cultural dimension score divided by the total number of participants in that region. The countries that are included in each region are indicated in Appendix A. The resulting regional score would be an aggregate measure of a cultural dimension averaged across all the countries in that region in

which participants in the study were located. Regions were then categorized for each dimension as either "high" or "low" in the following manner. The highest and lowest values for a dimension were used as the initial basis of categorization, and the difference had to be at least 10 points in order to create separate groupings. In addition, "high" scores were above the median value of 60 on the scale; "low" scores were below the median. In the current study, the differences between the highest value and the lowest value ranged from fourteen to sixty-three.

The remaining two regions were grouped into "high" and "low" based on whether they were closer in proximity to the highest or lowest value in the dimension. See Appendix B for Hofstede's values and the categorization of high versus low.

Regression equations were then developed for each of the four global regions. The five demographic characteristics were entered into the model as control variables. The seven job determinant measures were used to predict overall job satisfaction. Hypotheses were tested by comparing standardized regression coefficients across the four global regions based on hypothesized difference between high and low values of Hofstede's dimension. An analysis of variance with planned comparisons was used to test the hypothesized differences across models. The planned comparisons were based on comparing the "high" and "low" grouping of regions for each of the seven job characteristics as it relates to overall job satisfaction

RESULTS

The regression analyses for each region showed almost all of the seven job determinants were significant in each of the four regions. In Asia, North America, and Europe, all seven job characteristics were significant in predicting job satisfaction. In Latin America, equal opportunity, accomplishment, teamwork, recognition, and work-life balance were significant in predicting job satisfaction. However, neither training nor communication from management was significant in the model.

Table 6
Regression Analysis by Region

	Asia			North America			Europe			Latin America		
	β	t		β	t		β	T		β	t	
Equal Opportunity	0.11	8.14	*	0.09	13.82	*	0.07	6.70	*	0.08	5.02	*
Accomplishment	0.12	8.80	*	0.21	33.45	*	0.18	16.59	*	0.23	12.91	*
Teamwork	0.11	5.52	*	0.05	7.55	*	0.03	2.87	*	0.11	4.46	*
Training	0.05	5.28	*	0.05	8.26	*	0.04	4.39	*	0.02	0.22	
Communication	0.05	3.24	*	0.05	7.25	*	0.05	4.15	*	0.02	0.18	
Recognition	0.12	8.18	*	0.10	15.98	*	0.15	13.61	*	0.10	6.13	*

Work-Life Balance	0.04	2.90	*	0.11	18.16	*	0.11	11.89	*	0.04	2.45	*
N	5348			45933			15063			5348	

* p < .01
** p < .001

When comparing the standardized regression coefficients within each region, there were notable differences in what had the strongest effect in each of the regional models. For Asia, accomplishment (β= 0.12), personal recognition (β=0.12), and equal opportunity (β=0.11) were the strongest predictors of job satisfaction. For North America, accomplishment (β=.21) was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction, followed by work-life balance (β=0.11). For Europe, accomplishment (β=0.18) and personal recognition (β=0.15) were the strongest predictors of job satisfaction. For Latin America, accomplishment (β=0.23) was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction, followed by teamwork (β=0.11).

Table 7
Hypothesis Testing by Hofstede's Dimensions

	Collective		Individualistic		
	Asia	Latin America	Europe	North America	
H1: Teamwork					
β	0.11	0.11	0.03	0.05	**
H2: Work Life Balance					
β	0.04	0.04	0.11	0.11	**

	High Uncertainty Avoidance	Low Uncertainty Avoidance			
	Latin America	Asia	North America	Europe	
H3: Communication					
β	0.11	0.05	0.05	0.03	**
H4: Training					
β	0.04	0.05	0.11	0.11	**

	Masculine		Feminine		
	North America	Latin America	Asia	Europe	
H5: Recognition					
β	0.10	0.10	0.12	0.15	**

204

H6:
Accomplishment

β	0.21	0.23	0.12	0.18	**

	High Power Distance		Low Power Distance	
	Asia	Latin America	North America	Europe
H7: Equal Opportunity				
β	0.11	0.08	0.09	0.07

* p < .01
** p < .001

The standardized regression coefficients can then be compared across regions: Equal opportunity was most important in Asia (β=0.11). Accomplishment was most important in Latin America (β= 0.23) and North America (β=0.21). Teamwork was most important in Asia (β=0.11) and Latin America (β=0.11). Training and communication were least important in Latin America (β=0.02 for both). Personal recognition was most important in Europe (0.15). Work-life balance was most important in North America (β=0.11) and Europe (β=0.11). Six of the seven hypotheses tested were significant at $p < 0.001$. For hypotheses 1 and 2, Asia (individual/collective = 27) and Latin America (individual/collective = 32), which both are highly collective cultures, were compared to Europe (individual/collective = 76) and North America (individual/collective =90), which are both highly individualistic cultures. Hypothesis 1 which hypothesized that teamwork is a more important determinant of job satisfaction in collectivistic cultures than individualistic cultures was significant. Hypothesis 2 which predicted that the ability to balance one's work and personal lives is a more important determinant of job satisfaction in individualistic cultures than in collectivistic cultures was also significant.

For hypotheses 3 and 4, Latin American (uncertainty= 80), which is considered high on uncertainty avoidance, was compared to Asia (uncertainty= 40), North America (uncertainty= 46), and Europe (uncertainty= 52), which have relatively low values on uncertainty avoidance. Both hypotheses were supported. Hypothesis 3 predicted that communication from management on key issues is less important in cultures that are high on uncertainty avoidance than those low on uncertainty avoidance was significant. Hypothesis 4 which predicted that level of training received is a more important determinant of job satisfaction in low uncertainty avoidance cultures than in high uncertainty avoidance cultures was also significant.

For hypotheses 5 and 6, North America (masculinity= 61) and Latin America (masculinity = 61), which have higher values of masculinity, were compared to Asia (masculinity = 50) and Europe (masculinity = 47), which had lower values of masculinity. Hypothesis 5 which predicted that level of recognition received for doing a good job will be a more important determinant of

job satisfaction in feminine (low masculinity) cultures than in high masculine cultures was found to be significant. Hypothesis 6 which predicted that work leading to a sense of accomplishment will be a more important determinant of job satisfaction in high masculine cultures than in feminine (low masculine) cultures is also significant.

For hypothesis 7, Asia (power distance = 79) and Latin America (power distance = 74), cultures with high values of power distance, were compared to North America (power distance = 40) and Europe (power distance = 41), cultures with low values of power distance. Hypothesis 7 predicted that perception of equal opportunities in the workplace is a more important determinant of job satisfaction in high power distance cultures than in low power distance cultures and was not significant.

DISCUSSION

Overall, most of the attitudes studied were significant predictors of job satisfaction. However, there were significant differences in the degree to which they impacted job satisfaction, supporting the notion that managerial practices should be tailored to meet the different values of employees in varying cultures. This study is particularly important in light of the fact that today's corporations are largely multinational in nature due to fewer trade barriers, growing international economies, fast communication and outsourcing.

The regression analyses for each region showed almost all of the seven job determinants were significant in each of the four regions. In particular, sense of accomplishment from ones' work, recognition received from doing a good job, teamwork, and ability to balance one's work and personal lives were significant predictors of overall job satisfaction across all four regions. One of the key takeaways from this study is that although there are differences in the degree to which job attitudes impact job satisfaction, the basic needs appear to be similar across cultures as demonstrated by the fact that the most significant drivers of job satisfaction are accomplishment and recognition regardless of cultures. This reinforces the fact that current organizations need to address both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards which enhance employee motivation and increase job satisfaction. Regardless of the cultural context, employees respond positively to intrinsic and extrinsic motivators and achievement is a universal concept. Employees want to personally feel that they are performing their job well and also value being recognized by their managers for performing a job well.

Our results for the first four hypotheses were similar to others found in the literature. Teamwork has a stronger relationship to job satisfaction in collectivistic cultures than in individualistic cultures. This is supported by theory since cultures that are collectivistic in nature are more likely to value working together as a team and therefore, teamwork should lead to a more satisfying job experience if this need is being met. This finding supports research by Kirkman and Shapiro (2001) who found that higher levels of collectivism were associated with higher levels of job satisfaction and commitment within teams. Teamwork is an important social component where employees can feel a sense of contribution to the group. Organizations operating in more collectivistic cultures should use teams as a means of not only getting work

done, but of also increasing employees' sense of job satisfaction through their feeling that they are contributing to the organization.

The ability to balance one's work and family lives is a more important determinant of job satisfaction in individualistic cultures than in collectivistic cultures. This is consistent with prior literature which has posited that work-family conflict is less likely in collectivistic cultures because hard work is seen as a means to increase the well-being of the family (Aryee et al., 1999; Grzywacz, et al., 2007; Yang et al., 2000). Because hard work is seen as integral to family well-being, experiencing work-family conflict is less likely to be perceived as stressful (Spector et al., 2004). Research studies have supported the notion that in collectivistic societies, females perceive that work activities are in support of family activities leading to less conflict. Individuals in individualistic cultures might benefit from this knowledge. In particular, if individuals are able to alter their own perceptions of work-life balance and instead adopt a more collectivistic approach to work-family conflict by viewing work as contributing to the well-being of the family, it may reduce the incidence of work-family conflict. In addition, organizations operating in highly individualistic countries, like the United States, could use a more collective approach to help American workers better manage work-family conflict. For instance, corporations could have workshops where men and women are asked to examine what their work means in terms of supporting and assisting their family. If men and women come to realize that their work is indeed helping their families, they might experience less guilt, especially in the case of working mothers, a common phenomenon in North America.

Communication from management on key issues is less important in cultures high on uncertainty avoidance than those low on uncertainty avoidance. Cultures high in uncertainty avoidance often adopt rules and strict codes of behavior in the workplace (Hofstede, 1984), leading to greater formalization (Shackleton & Ali, 1990) and less communication flexibility (Crozier, 1964). Our finding that communication was less important in high uncertainty avoidance cultures is supported by Huang & van de Vliert (2006), who found that, in highly formalized work groups, managers rely more on procedures and rules to exert control as opposed to using tools such as open communication (Huang & Van de Vliert, 2006). Managers who are in low uncertainty avoidance cultures such as Asia, North America and Europe should emphasize communication with their employees. Communications can be viewed as providing information about the organization, but also making employees feel that they are part of the decision making process, whereas formalized rules and procedures do not allow for employee decision making outside of the established guidelines. These findings are important for managers who are accustomed to engaging in open communication with employees, but are working in a high uncertainty avoidance culture. Open communication policies in high uncertainty avoidance cultures can actually negatively impact overall job satisfaction. A better tactic would be to make sure there are clear rules and policies in place to increase employees comfort levels in these cultures. Recent research conducted in the United States found that managers who communicate with employees through multiple media channels get projects completed more quickly (Neeley, Leonardi, & Gerber, 2011). This type of communication would likely be less effective in a high uncertainty avoidance cultures.

Level of training received is a more important determinant of job satisfaction in low uncertainty avoidance cultures than in high uncertainty avoidance cultures. This finding was expected based on a theoretical understanding of uncertainty avoidance. High uncertainty avoidance cultures value security, so that individuals within these cultures likely have a tendency to prefer jobs that offer stability. Because training increases the flexibility and adaptability of the workforce, it would serve to increase uncertainty and not be desirable in high uncertainty avoidance cultures. Our finding bolsters findings by Burke, Chan-Serafin, Salvador, Smith and Sarpy (2008), who found that higher uncertainty avoidance reduced the effectiveness of safety training and was related to lower levels of engagement in training, suggesting usage of less engaging training methods in high uncertainty avoidance cultures (Burke et al., 2008). Our research enhances these findings, because we understand now that not only is training effectiveness and engagement during training reduced, but overall job satisfaction is impacted by training to a different degree depending on culture. For corporations and managers in cultures that are high on uncertainty avoidance, voluntary training will be perceived less positively by the work force. In higher uncertainty avoidance cultures, because training a workforce is still advantageous and not doing so may be detrimental to the survival of a firm, it is advisable for corporations to communicate to employees that their job is secure when training employees.

In line with a preference for formalized rules and procedures, training should be presented to the employees as a requirement that is part of the organization's rule. For example, all employees must have computer training once a year—i.e., it is a box to check off. This differs from how training should be positioned in low uncertainty avoidance culture where training is viewed as a means of advancement and increased job marketability, which implies increased likelihood of a job change and increase uncertainty.

The distinction between level of personal recognition and sense of accomplishment is significant and represents a new direction in cross-cultural research. Recognition is an extrinsic reward as well as an important social interaction; sense of accomplishment is an intrinsic reward and is likely strongly related to worker self-efficacy. Workers need both types of rewards in order to feel satisfied with their jobs. As evidenced by our findings, all cultures value accomplishment and recognition. However, level of personal recognition received is more important in feminine cultures, whereas sense of accomplishment for a job well done is more important in masculine cultures. This is an important finding because of the strong implications for how human resource practices should be tailored in order to optimally motivate individuals based on cultural differences. In masculine cultures, where competition and individual performance is highly valued it is important that employees be able to develop a feeling of accomplishment. In feminine cultures, on the other hand, it is particularly important for employees to receive personal recognition, such as social rewards and managerial praise. Recognition involves interaction with others and is a social affirmation of one's performance. Within feminine cultures, this connectivity to others is an important facet to the value of the social connection of work. Masculine cultures value competitiveness where personal accomplishment is reinforcement of the "macho" stereotype of an individual being "the best".

Hypothesis 7 was the only prediction not supported. Perception of equal opportunities in the workplace is not a more important determinant of job satisfaction in high power distance cultures than in low power distance cultures. It was posited that if an employee is accustomed to experiencing social inequality in general, but experiences a perception of equality in the workplace, they will be more likely to value that equality, which, in turn, will increase job satisfaction. When looking at the results, perceptions of equality opportunity in North America, Europe, and Latin America are significantly related to job satisfaction and do not differ in terms of importance. Yet, in comparison to the other job determinants, they were not the most important determinant of overall job satisfaction. On the other hand, in Asia, one's perception of equal opportunity is a more important determinant of job satisfaction than in the other regions of the world and overall for Asia is one of the most important determinants of job satisfaction. We attribute this to the recently changing social structure in China and other countries in Asia, which has received an enormous amount of press. Within the last 10 years, many Asian countries have seen the rise of a middle class due to rapid economic growth. Social mobility as a result of education and new wealth is more accepted (Goodman & Robinson, 1996). Asian organizations which embrace this new social mobility and offer equal opportunities for advancement may have more satisfied employees.

CONTRIBUTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The primary contribution of this study is the breadth of countries and cultures which are included in the study. This is the only study on cross-cultural job satisfaction that the authors know of which includes over 70,000 employees in the study, and represents 48 countries and four geographical regions giving greater weight to the significant findings of this study. In addition, the generalizability of the findings is extremely strong due to the number of physical locations of the multinational corporations across three different industries.

The implications for this study are significant for theory and practice. From a theoretical perspective, this study furthers our understanding of how job characteristics impact job satisfaction differently across regional cultures. The degree to which the seven job characteristics are determinants of employee job satisfaction is not universal across cultures. There are significant differences across cultures in the relative importance of each of these job characteristics as relates to job satisfaction. Secondly, the findings of the current study reinforce that a sense of achievement is universal and is a vital component of work across all cultures.

The practical implication is that multinational organizations need to help managers address employee needs with cultural sensitivity. The results of this study strongly show that different job characteristics are valued differently for each culture, and the successful manager will be able to recognize that one's own culture is not directly transferable to another culture in the workplace. Another implication for organizations is that within a cultural context, both extrinsic rewards (recognition) and intrinsic rewards (accomplishment) need to be incorporated into the organization's reward systems to increase employee motivation and employee job satisfaction.

Limitations

No research is without limitations including the current research. The largest limitation of the current research is that the cross-sectional nature of the data prevents any conclusions about causality. There is also the possibility of common-method bias because of the self-report nature of the study. However, because the survey was administered in different locations and at different points in time, the threat is minimized.

Future Research

Future research needs to examine how the social changes in Asian countries, such as China and India, are changing the value systems within the culture and how these changes in values directly relate to work. As the social fabric of the Asian countries change, we as researchers have a unique opportunity to study the relationship between cultural values and work values and how changes in culture possibly lead to a change in work values. Another interesting direction for future research would be to investigate achievement needs as they relate to organizational rewards across different cultures. This study has shown that while achievement and reward are an important determinant in job satisfaction, cultural differences exists in the types of rewards which are important to employees.

Appendix A

Countries Included in the Study by Region

Asia
China
Hong Kong
India
Indonesia
Japan
Korea
Malaysia
Philippines
Singapore
Taiwan
Thailand
Vietnam

North America
Canada
USA

Latin America
Argentina
Brazil
Chile
Colombia
Costa Rica
Ecuador
Mexico
Peru
Uruguay
Venezuela

Europe
Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Czech Republic
Denmark
Eire
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Italy
Luxembourg
Norway
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Russia
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
The Netherlands
Turkey
United Kingdom

Appendix B

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

Weighted Values by Region*

	Power Distance	Individualism/ Collectivisim	Masculinity/ Femininity	Uncertainty Avoidance
Asia	79	27	50	40
North America	40	90	61	46
Europe	41	76	47	52
Latin America	74	32	61	80

*Values are weighted averages calculated by multiplying the number of employees in each country by the country's cultural dimension score and dividing by total number of employees in that region

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

Categorized by High/Low

	High		Low		
Power Distance	Asia	Latin America	Europe	North America	
	79	74	41	40	
Individualism/ Collectivism	North America	Europe	Latin America	Asia	
	90	76	32	27	
Masculinity/ Femininity	North America	Latin America	Asia	Europe	
	61	61	50	47	
Uncertainty Avoidance	Latin America		Europe	North America	Asia
	80		52	46	40

REFERENCES

Agarwal, S. (1993), " Influence of formalization on role stress, organizational commitment, and work alienation of salespersons: A cross-national comparative study", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 24, pp. 715-735.

Arrindell, W. A. and Veenhoven, R. (2002), "Feminine values and happy life-expectancy in nations", Personality and Individual Differences, Vol. 33, pp. 803-813.

Aryee, S., Luk, V., Leung, A., and Lo, S. (1999), "Role stressors, inter-role conflict, and well-being: The moderating influence of spousal support and coping behaviors among employed parents in Hong Kong", Journal of Vocational Behavior, Vol. 54, pp. 259-278.

Brown, S. P. and Peterson, R. A. (1993), "Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: Meta-analysis and assessment of causal effects", Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 30, pp. 63-77.

Burke, M. J., Salvador, R., Smith-Crowe, K., Chan-Serafin, S., Smith, A. N., and Sonesh, S. C. (2011), "The dread factor: How hazards and safety training influence learning and performance", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 96, pp. 46-70.

Crozier, M. (1964), The Bureaucratic Phenomenon, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Eddleston, K. A., Veiga, J. F., and Powell, G. N. (2006), "Explaining sex differences in managerial career satisfier preferences: The role of gender self-schema", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 91, pp. 437-445.

Goodman, D. S. G. and Robinson, R. (1996), The new rich in Asia: Mobile phones, McDonalds, and a middle class revolution, Routledge, New York.

Grove, C. N. (2005), Introduction to the GLOBE Research Project on Leadership Worldwide [Online]. Available: www.grovewell.com/pub-GLOBE-intro.html [Accessed 2011].

Grzywacz, J. G., Arcury, T. A., Marin, A., Carillo, L., Burke, B., Coates, M. L., and Quandt, S. A. (2007), "Work-family conflict: Experiences and health implications among immigrant Latinos", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 92, pp. 1119-1130.

Hackman, J. R. and Lawler, E. E. (1971), "Employee reactions to job characteristics", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 55, pp. 259-286.

Harrison, D. A., Newman, D. A., and Roth, P. L. (2006), "How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative outcomes and time sequences", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 49, pp. 305-325.

Hassan, Z., Dollard, M. F., and Winefield, A. H. (2010), "Work-family conflict in East vs Western countries", Cross Cultural Management, Vol. 17, pp. 30.

Herzberg, F. (1959), The Motivation to Work, John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Herzberg, F. I. (1987), "One more time: How do you motivate employees?", Harvard Business Review, Vol. 65, pp. 109-120.

Hofstede, G. National Cultural Dimensions [Online]. Available: http: geert-hofstede.com/national-culture.html [Accessed 2011].

Hofstede, G. (1980a), Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values, Sage, London.

Hofstede, G. (1980b), "Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do American theories apply abroad?", Organizational Dynamics, Vol. 5, pp. 42-63.

Hofstede, G. (1984), "The cultural relativity of the quality of life concept", The Academy of Management Review, Vol. 9, pp. 389-398.

Hofstede, G. (1991), Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind, McGraw-Hill, London, U.K.

Hofstede, G. (1999), "Problems remain, but theories will change: The universal and the specific in 21st-century global management", Organizational Dynamics, Vol. 24, pp. 34-44.

Huang, X. and Van De Vliert, E. (2006), "Job Formalization and Cultural Individualism as Barriers to Trust in Management", International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, Vol. 6, pp. 221-242.

Hundley, G. and Kim, J. (1997), "National culture and the factors affecting perceptions of pay fairness in Korea and the United States", The International Journal of Organizational Analysis, Vol. 5, pp. 325-341.

Jakofsky, E. F. and Slocum, J. W., Jr. (1988), CEO roles across cultures. In The executive effect: Concepts and methods for studying top managers, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.

Joplin, J. R. W., Shaffer, M. A., Francesco, A. M., and Lau, T. (2003), "The macro-environment and work-family conflict.", International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, Vol. 3, pp. 305-328.

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., and Patton, G. K. (2001), "The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review", Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 127, pp. 376-407.

Karasek, R. A. and Theorell, T. (1990), Healthy work: Stress, productivity and the reconstruction of working life, Basic Books, New York.

Kirkman, B. I. and Shapiro, D. L. (2001), "The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams: the mediating role of employee resistance", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 44, pp. 557-589.

Korabik, K., Lero, D., and Ayman, R. (2003), "A multi-level approach to cross-cultural work-family research: A micro- and macro-level perspective", International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, Vol. 3, pp. 289-303.

Likert, R. (1961), New patterns of management, McGraw Hill, New York.

Loh, J., Restubog, S. L. D., and Gallois, C. (2010), "Attitudinal outcomes of boundary permeability", Cross Cultural Management, Vol. 17, pp. 118.

Loher, B. T., Noe, R. A., Moeller, N. L., and Fitzgerald, M. P. (1985), "A meta-analysis of the relation of job characteristics to job satisfaction", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 70, pp. 280-289.

Maslow, A. H. (1943), "A theory of human motivation", Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 50, pp. 370-396.

McClelland, D. C. (1961), The Achieving Society, Van Nostrand, Princeton, NJ.

McGregor, D. (1960), The human side of enterprise, McGraw Hill, New York.

Neeley, T. B., Leonardi, P. M., and Gerber, E. M. (2011), "It's not nagging: Why persistent, redundant communication works", Harvard Business School Working Knowledge Newsletter.

Newman, K. L. and Nollen, S. D. (1996), "Culture and congruence: The fit between management practices and national culture", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 27, pp. 753-779.

Pan, Y., Song, X., Goldschmidt, A., and French, W. (2010), "A cross-cultural investigation of work values among young executives in China and the USA", Cross Cultural Management, Vol. 17, pp. 283.

Ramamoorthy, N., and Carroll, S. (1998), "Individualism/collectivism orientations and reactions toward alternative human resource management practices", Human Relations, Vol. 51, pp. 571-588.

Riketta, M. (2002), "Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis", Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 23, pp. 257-266.

Riketta, M. (2008), "The causal relation between job attitudes and performance: A meta-analysis of panel studies", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 93, pp. 472-481.

Schuler, R. and Rogovsky, N. (1998), "Understanding compensation practice variations across firms: The impact of national culture", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 29, pp. 159-177.

Shacketon, V. J. and Ali, A. H. (1990), "Work-related values of managers: A test of the Hofstede model", Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, Vol. 21, pp. 109-119.

Sirota, D. and Greenwood, M. J. (1971), "Understanding your overseas work force", Harvard Business Review, Vol. 49, pp. 53-60.

Sparrow, P. and Wu, P. (1998), "Does national culture really matter? Predicting HRM preferences of Taiwanese employees", Employee Relations, Vol. 20, pp. 26-40.

Spector, P. E., Cooper, C. L., Poelmans, S., and Allen, T.D. (2004), "A cross-national comparative study of work-family stressors, working hours, and well-being: China and Latin America versus the Anglo world", Personnel Psychology, Vol. 57, pp. 119-142.

Sriussadaporn, R. (2006), "Managing international business communication problems at work: a pilot study in foreign companies in Thailand", Cross Cultural Management, Vol. 13, pp. 330.

Tett, R. P. and Meyer, J. P. (1993), "Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analysis based on meta-analytic findings", Personnel Psychology, Vol. 46, pp. 259-293.

Thein, H. H., Auste, S., Currie, J., and Lewin, E. (2010), "The impact of cultural context on the perception of work-family balance by professional women in Singapore and Hong Kong", International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, Vol. 10, pp. 303-320.

Varela, O. E., Salgado, E. I., and Lasio, M. V. (2010), "The meaning of job performance in collectivistic and high power distance cultures", Cross Cultural Management, Vol. 17, pp. 407.

Yang, N., Chen, C., Choi, J., and Zou, Y. (2000), "Sources of work-family conflict: A sino-U.S. comparison of the effects of work and family demands", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 43, pp. 113-123.