

What drives job satisfaction in IT companies?

Sérgio Moro (Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), Lisbon, Portugal)

Ricardo F. Ramos (Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), Lisbon, Portugal) (CICEE, Universidade Autónoma de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal)

Paulo Rita (NOVA Information Management School (NOVA IMS), Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal)

This is the author accepted manuscript version of the article published by EMERALD as:

Moro, S., Ramos, R. F., & Rita, P. (2020). What drives job satisfaction in IT companies? *International Journal Of Productivity And Performance Management*. [Advanced online publication on 19 March 2020]. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-03-2019-0124>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).



What drives job satisfaction in IT companies?

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management</i> |
| Manuscript ID | IJPPM-03-2019-0124.R1 |
| Manuscript Type: | Standard Paper |
| Keywords: | Information Technology, employee satisfaction, IT companies, Glassdoor, Job satisfaction, Human resource management |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Title:** What drives job satisfaction in IT companies?
4
5

6 **Abstract**
7
8

9 **Purpose:** Strategic goal achievement in every sector of a company relies fundamentally
10 on the firm's employees. This study aims to disclose the factors that spur employees of
11 major Information Technology (IT) in the United States (US).
12
13

14 **Design/methodology/approach:** In this paper, 15.000 reviews from the top 15 United
15 States IT companies were collected from the social media platform Glassdoor to
16 uncover the factors that satisfy IT employees. To learn the most meaningful features
17 that influence the scores, positive and negative remarks, as well as advice to the
18 management team, were analyzed through a support vector machine.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Findings:** Results highlight a positive attitude of coworkers, contributing to a positive
29 environment and job satisfaction. However, unsatisfied IT employees reveal that work
30 exhaustion is the main reason for their job dissatisfaction.
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Practical implications:** IT human resource departments can use these valuable insights
37 to align their strategies in accordance with their employees' desires and expectations in
38 order to thrive.
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Originality:** The study highlights the relevance of IT companies to understand the
45 reasons behind their employees' satisfaction. Up until now, little is known concerning
46 the variants of job satisfaction among IT employees, enriching the understanding in this
47 particular professional area.
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Keywords:** Human resource management; information technology; employee
54 satisfaction; job satisfaction; IT companies; Glassdoor.
55
56
57
58

59 **Article Classification:** Research paper
60

1. Introduction

Managing human resources is a critical managerial dimension in any type of company (Zheng and Lamond, 2009). Today's competitive environment driven by new information and communication technologies leverages the relevance of keeping employees satisfied and aligned with the corporate strategy (Holland and Bardoel, 2016). Thus, human resource departments are driven by the need to fulfill employees' expectations to keep them motivated and reduce turnover (Tam and Chiu, 2010).

Both scholars and practitioners acknowledge the relevance of satisfaction factors to increase workers' productivity, helping in achieving an organization's goals (Wood and Wall, 2007). After all, employees are paramount in assisting in the building of a corporation's reputation and culture, leveraging its position in the market where it operates. Employee satisfaction is a key construct to which scholars have devoted attention within the organizational behavior scope (Zhou and George, 2001). Such a construct measures how satisfied employees are with their jobs, and it also influences turnover (Gregory, 2011). Specifically, the information technology (IT) sector is known to have high turnover rates due to the need for a very dynamic set of skills that are constantly changing, which leads to a high demand for highly skilled professionals (Thatcher et al., 2002). Thus, keeping employees satisfied is essential for talent retention in IT companies. Several factors affect employee satisfaction, including working conditions, working time, company reputation, employee relationships, salary, benefits, promotion, training, and organizational culture (Auer Antoncic and Antoncic, 2011). Therefore, companies must rigorously manage such factors to improve employee satisfaction, which leads to business success (Gregory, 2011).

Social media is a disruptive set of communication platforms built on the Web 2.0 technology with the goal of making the Internet a user-generated content media where

1
2
3 users express their opinions through text, images, and videos, among others (Ramos et
4 al., 2019). There are several types of social media, including blogs, wikis, discussion
5 forums, online review platforms, and media sharing sites. Nevertheless, the most
6 popular are social networks (Moro et al., 2018). These come in two categories: generic-
7 purpose (e.g., Facebook, Twitter); and specialized ones (e.g., ResearchGate).
8 Professional social networks specifically focused on the market labor and offering a
9 range of interesting services for connecting employers and employees have emerged,
10 and nowadays, both companies and prospective professionals cannot afford to neglect
11 the dissemination effect of networks such as LinkedIn and Glassdoor (Chen et al.,
12 2017).

13
14 This study aims to unveil the factors that satisfy employees of major IT companies in
15 the United States (US). The text written about positive and negative remarks, and advice
16 to the management team published on the Glassdoor network is analyzed together with
17 other features through machine learning, specifically a support vector machine (SVM),
18 to show which are the most meaningful features that justify the granted scores. The
19 discovered knowledge helps company managers to understand the key factors of
20 employee satisfaction, shedding additional light on such a dynamic and vibrant labor
21 market as is the case of the IT sector.

2. Background

2.1. IT companies in the US and their working models

22
23 The United States (US) is a relatively recent country when compared to large countries
24 in Europe and Asia, grown from a mix of immigrants flocking into the new world to
25 take advantage of a resource-rich and unexplored land (Gabaccia, 1999). Technology
26 companies, especially in the Western region of the US, started to emerge and flourish in
27 the XX century benefiting from skilled workers, some of them immigrants (e.g., Sergey

1
2
3 Brin, co-founder of Google), prospering from an open environment that fosters
4 innovation (Kuz, 2010). Especially in California, and partially fueled by renowned
5 private and public universities such as Stanford, California Institute of Technology
6 (Caltech), and University of California, among others, “Silicon Valley” has nurtured
7 worldwide leading companies such as Hewlett-Packard, Google, Apple, and Facebook
8 (Adams, 2005). These mega-large companies provide important benefits, including
9 schools for workers’ children, health units, and others only at the reach of global-scale
10 companies (Garon, 2018). Therefore, it is not surprising that such companies make the
11 dream job of any worker, receiving very large numbers of applications (Di Meglio,
12 2011).

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 The organizational culture of companies such as Google is key for their success (Urbach
28 and Ahlemann, 2019). Employees are encouraged to share their thoughts in an open-
29 minded culture where communication is valued. For example, Eric Schmidt, former
30 Google CEO adopted a transparency approach in Google’s board meetings by
31 recognizing that he did not have a solution for the difficult problems of the previous
32 quarter (Schmidt and Rosenberg, 2014). This initiative opened the debate to share
33 opinions on the recognized problems. Likewise, talent retention has been at the core of
34 Microsoft’s strategy since the 1990s. Also, by developing “a broader range of
35 leadership talent, and implementing a career model framework”, Microsoft moved
36 human resource strategies to the forefront (Olesen et al., 2007).

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 Nevertheless, the seemingly paradisiacal environment for workers in Silicon Valley
52 overshadows well-known problems of high-performing organizations such as
53 management bullying (Walsh et al., 2019). Additionally, as Hyde (2015) pointed out,
54 the high-velocity labor market of the “Valley” still requires social safety nets that
55 provide backup for employees, releasing the day-to-day pressure imposed by flexible
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 yet not free of constraints labor in a competitive human resources market. Therefore, the
4
5 IT companies in the US provide an important setup needing further research.
6
7

8 2.2. *Job Satisfaction*

9

10
11 A large body of literature has pointed to numerous factors involved in stress and
12
13 burnout among employees from the result of a combination of organizational stressors
14
15 and individual characteristics. To contradict the dissatisfaction of employees and
16
17 understand their behaviors, one of the most studied variables is job satisfaction (Frenkel
18
19 et al., 2013; Lewis et al., 2017; Zou, 2015). The definition of job satisfaction can be the
20
21 reaction of people who enjoy their work and do it well, revealing characteristics of
22
23 fulfillment and pride based on a range of elements (Castaneda and Scanlan, 2014). In
24
25 this scenario, there are two main stakeholders interested in this subject: managers and
26
27 employees. From the managers' point of view, they expect to find satisfied workers
28
29 that, in turn, will have a positive attitude towards the job being dedicated and
30
31 emotionally involved with their activity. Moreover, employees create their own
32
33 expectations and attitudes, expecting to be dealt with reasonably and respectfully. Thus,
34
35 a positive dynamic will reveal to be a key factor in accomplishing competitive
36
37 advantage, while a negative outcome will have a negative impact on the general
38
39 achievement of organizational effectiveness and performance (Melián-González, 2016).
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 In 2016, 13% of US IT professionals revealed dissatisfaction with their job (Statista,
47
48 2016), which could be the result of a variety of factors such as: (i) role ambiguity and
49
50 conflict; (ii) supervisory behavior; (iii) job design; (iv) compensation; (v) training and
51
52 development (Bakotić and Tomislav, 2013; Bowling et al., 2017; Lewis et al., 2017;
53
54 Zou, 2015). In order to highlight the most relevant features concerning job satisfaction,
55
56 each are dissected and first discussed, followed by an explanation of the data collection
57
58 and method of analysis used to conduct this research paper, described by the extensive
59
60

1
2
3 volume of textual data that legitimizes an automated approach. The results are then
4
5 discussed, followed by the conclusion and considerations for future research.
6
7

8 2.2.1. *Role ambiguity and conflict*

10
11 The variables role ambiguity and role conflict, collectively, are referred to as role
12 stressors. Both are predictors of employee health, job attitudes, and employee behavior
13 (Bowling et al., 2017). Role ambiguity is associated with disorientation and confusion
14 due to a lack of information and clarity concerning an employee's job functions, which
15 can be translated into a stressful experience while role conflict involves conflicting or
16 opposing expectations from coworkers that influence role performance (Madera et al.,
17 2013). The constraints associated with role stressors occur due to difficulty of the
18 employee in completing the job tasks that are associated with him. The conflicts and
19 obstructions are found when employees are performing their job tasks and suffer from
20 anxiety, work exhaustion and negative emotions (Schmidt et al., 2014; Shih et al., 2013)
21 that in turn will have a negative impact on overall job performance and satisfaction, thus
22 harming the company. There is a positive relationship between role conflict/ambiguity
23 and job-related tension (Baroudi, 1985), and in US IT companies, role ambiguity and
24 conflict have a direct impact on the employees' turnover intention (Lo, 2015).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 2.1.2. *Supervisory behavior*

46
47 In 2016 and 2017, Canada and US IT decision-makers revealed that 71% of their teams
48 had a lack of necessary skills to meet the companies' objectives (Statista, 2018a). This
49 factor may lead to supervisory pressure towards their employees to perform a better job.
50 Leadership style has an impact on the employees' job satisfaction (Mathieu et al.,
51 2015), and when employees perceive support from their supervisor they tend to respond
52 in the same way towards their supervisor, showing their commitment towards the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 company's objectives, enhancing the satisfaction towards family, job, and career and
4
5 reducing the level of employee stress (Kang et al., 2015). On the other hand, employees
6
7 have reported a higher level of stress and lower job satisfaction when being monitored
8
9 by supervisors (Carpenter et al., 2018). Furthermore, abusive leadership has a positive
10
11 impact on employee turnover intention, a negative correlation with job performance,
12
13 satisfaction, low commitment, higher work-family conflict, and burnout. In the end, the
14
15 employee tends to attribute the responsibility to the company (Mathieu and Babiak,
16
17 2016).
18
19
20
21

22 2.1.3. Job Design

23
24
25 Job design is developed by organizations as a strategy for improving both productivity
26
27 and quality of work experience to reduce employee problems such as grievances and
28
29 absenteeism (Cullinane et al., 2013). It is related to the work specifications of contents,
30
31 methods, and relationships, and their outcomes are job satisfaction, engagement,
32
33 resilience, and thriving at work (Taylor, 2014). Hackman and Oldmans (1976) assert
34
35 that their job characteristics model highlights five key elements (skill variety, task
36
37 identity, task significance, autonomy, and work feedback) for effective performance,
38
39 expecting at the same time to increase job satisfaction. Nonetheless, to increase job
40
41 satisfaction, organizations tend to motivate employees to become job crafters, i.e., to
42
43 create their own job design by creating enjoyable social relationships with co-workers,
44
45 changing the work methods and/or specification of contents to meet the employees'
46
47 demands and expectations (Petrou et al., 2018). Job crafting has an impact on
48
49 organizational performance since the employee determines what and how the tasks are
50
51 completed and the interpersonal dynamics of the workplace. This impact can be positive
52
53 or negative, creating a challenge for organizations while avoiding negative crafting
54
55 (Bruning and Campion, 2018). For IT employees, job design influences morale, quality
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of working life, high involvement work processes, reduces employee turnover, and is
4 considered to be more important than employees' base salary (Korunka et al., 2008).
5
6
7

8 *2.1.4. Compensation*

9

10
11 Compensation is an organizational variable that influences job satisfaction, which in
12 turn will impact employee retention, dedication, loyalty, performance, cooperation,
13 motivation, and turnover intention, heightening the employee/organization relationship
14 (Misra et al., 2013). Employees who perceive the compensation plan as positive will
15 have a favorable view of the organizations' support (Demerouti et al., 2014). Various
16 types of compensations are employed by companies, such as pay increments or bonuses
17 (extrinsic), promotion opportunities or job security (intrinsic) in exchange for
18 employees' performance (Huang et al., 2015). The compensation plan should meet the
19 expectation of the employee by being fair and equitable. It provides tangible rewards
20 aligned with the talent and recognition. The employees' satisfaction is influenced by the
21 perceptions of their own value versus the company perception, among the coworkers
22 overall compensation plans (Williams et al., 2008). A wronged employee outcome is
23 associated with a low commitment level and turnover intention (Misra et al., 2013). In
24 the context of IT companies, compensation is used as an important factor to recruit and
25 retain skilled IT employees, and compensation tends to increase with organizational
26 tenure (Slaughter et al., 2007).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *2.1.5. Training and development*

49

50
51 Research shows that job satisfaction is positively associated with employees' training
52 and development (Zumrah and Boyle, 2015). Employees are an important company
53 asset and success or failure highly depends on the performance of employees.
54 Consequently, organizations are obligated to finance training and development
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 programs, which in turn will strengthen knowledge, expertise, and the ability of
4
5 employees, thus boosting the company's competitiveness (Jehanzeb and Bashir, 2013).
6
7

8 Training and development involve providing the basic knowledge and skills according
9
10 to employees' needs to conduct their duties within company standards and growth
11
12 opportunities (Costen and Salazar, 2011). Employees who felt good opportunities to
13
14 grow within the company demonstrated a strong emotional connection to their
15
16 organization (Costen and Salazar, 2011). Standard organizations provide training and
17
18 development programs to keep their employees' highly satisfied, decrease the level of
19
20 employee turnover, and increase their loyalty. Young professionals with low experience
21
22 recognize the effort spent on their future career and perceive organization support (Sung
23
24 and Choi, 2014).
25
26
27
28

29 IT decision-makers worldwide highlighted that one of the main reasons for the lack of
30
31 skills of their teams was low investment in training programs (Statista, 2018b). IT
32
33 companies are constantly affected by the high degree of exposure to changes and
34
35 demands due to frequent changes in technology and working methods. Therefore,
36
37 employees are pressured to be constantly updated.
38
39
40

41
42 The current study considers job satisfaction as the general attitude towards work and
43
44 depends on several psychosocial factors that include role ambiguity and conflict,
45
46 supervisor behavior, job design features, compensation plan, and training and
47
48 development. Such characteristics have an impact on motivation, leading to a favorable
49
50 emotional state and job performance among employees, which in turn have an impact
51
52 on the overall performance of an IT company.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3. Materials and methods

This empirical study uses data collected from Glassdoor, a professional social network designed to allow professionals to rate and give feedback on their employers (Ehlers, 2015). Glassdoor offers important insights through an information rich platform to which workers can contribute using both quantitative scores and textual opinions. Luo et al. (2016) adopted a text mining approach to analyze 274k opinions of Fortune 500 companies and assess the relation between workers' opinions and companies' performance. Jung and Suh (2019) adopted a South Korean online platform similar to Glassdoor to assess job satisfaction factors using the latent Dirichlet allocation algorithm, a topic modeling technique. Thus, analyzing the information provided online on social media platforms can render interesting results from both the companies and the employees' perspectives.

We adopted the Forbes 2017 world ranking (Stoller, 2017) to select the major IT companies in the US. This ranking includes the 25 biggest technology companies worldwide in market value. From those, the 2017 edition includes 15 US-based companies, shown in gray lines in Table 1. The total dataset compiled from the Glassdoor website consists of 15 thousand reviews, 1,000 for each of the 15 companies, and 14 features highlighted in Table 2 (the US regions and divisions are detailed in Table 3).

Insert Table 1 about here

Insert Table 2 about here

1
2
3 Insert Table 3 about here
4
5
6
7
8
9

10 The approach followed is based on the studies by Silva et al. (2018) and Guerreiro and
11 Moro (2017). It consists of building a model based on advanced machine learning
12 techniques and extracting the hidden knowledge from it in the form of each features'
13 relevance. In this case, the support vector machine (SVM) was chosen to train the
14 model, since this modeling technique enables the transformation of the input features
15 into a high m-dimensional feature space, using a nonlinear mapping. Thus, it divides the
16 search space through the best linear separating hyperplane connected through the
17 distributed set of support vector points (Moro et al., 2017). The data-based sensitivity
18 analysis (DSA) was used to extract features' relevance. By varying the list of inputs
19 through their possible range of values, it is possible to provide a reliable measure for
20 each feature's influence, i.e., the Glassdoor granted score. Hence, we aim at explaining
21 how each feature contributes to the granted score.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The free input text where employees write about positive and negative remarks or give
39 advice cannot be directly used as inputs to the SVM. Accordingly, we followed an
40 approach similar to Guerreiro and Moro's (2017) study and obtained word frequency
41 for every noun contained in each of three textual features. Verbs and adjectives were
42 excluded since we intended to study the main items/constructs and not the intentions
43 (verbs) or sentiments (adjectives) transmitted. Table 4 shows the words with the highest
44 frequency for three features. Specifically, the ten most frequent words were chosen by
45 quantifying each occurrence and also used as 30 additional features to the SVM (using
46 the prefixes "rv.pros," "rv.cons," and "rv.advice" for each of the three original features).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The result was a total of 40 features to characterize the scores granted by a company's
4
5 employee.
6
7
8
9

10
11 Insert Table 4 about here
12
13
14
15

16 **4. Results and discussion**

17
18

19 Before extracting knowledge from the model, it is necessary to measure its performance
20
21 in modeling the Glassdoor score based on the 40 input features. We adopted the k-fold
22
23 cross-validation [scheme](#), which provides a robust and realistic evaluation procedure
24
25 (Refaeilzadeh et al., 2009) by dividing the dataset into k folds of equal size and running
26
27 k times by using all folds for training the model except one, which is used for testing its
28
29 accuracy (in each run the fold for testing is rotated, assuring that every instance is used
30
31 for the validation procedure). K was set to 10, as recommended by Refaeilzadeh et al.
32
33 (2009). Two metrics were chosen [to evaluate the results](#), the mean absolute error
34
35 (MAE), which measures the absolute deviation between the real value and the predicted
36
37 [one, and the other is mean](#) absolute percentage error (MAPE), which computes a
38
39 percentage based on the real [value](#) in a similar computation as MAE. The obtained
40
41 values were: MAE=0.700; MAPE=26.85%. These are similar to what Moro, et al.
42
43 (2016) obtained, supporting our claim that the model is valid for proceeding with
44
45 knowledge extraction. [We chose](#) the 2017 top 15 US based technology companies [for](#)
46
47 [our study](#) (Table 1).
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 The analysis of Figure 1 brings interesting findings. [The](#) aggregation of the terms
55
56 “cons” has a relevance of 31.3%, while the “pros” terms have a relevance of 30.06%,
57
58 meaning that, although there is a small difference between both comments, “cons” have
59
60

1
2
3 more influence in the rating provided by the employees than “pros.” However, the
4
5 relevance of terms from the comment box “advice” has a greater impact on the rating
6
7 with a relevance of 32.29%, higher than the terms “pros” and “cons,” revealing their
8
9 influence in the output variable.
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 Insert Figure 1 about here
17
18
19
20
21

22 The term with the highest contribution for the overall rating (cons.work) had an
23
24 influence of 3.99% while the lowest contributor (pros.benefit) had an influence of
25
26 1.81%.
27
28

29 The term “work” from the “cons” comment box is the most relevant feature that
30
31 characterizes the score granted by an IT company employee in all three comment boxes.
32
33 From the analysis of Figure 2, when the term “work” is mentioned six times, the rating
34
35 rises to 4.06. However, every time it is mentioned more than six times, the rating tends
36
37 to decrease until the point when it is mentioned 18 times and reaches the lowest rating
38
39 (3.49). Data reveals that when an employee mentions the term “work” with too much
40
41 emphasis, (s)he is not experiencing job satisfaction. Shih et al. (2013) reported that
42
43 when an IT worker is dissatisfied due to work exhaustion, this feeling is highly
44
45 associated to a low level of satisfaction, high level of turnover intention, lack of
46
47 autonomy, role ambiguity and role conflict (Shih et al., 2013). To contradict this feeling
48
49 of work exhaustion, human resource departments should give liberty and motivate
50
51 employees to redesign their own job to fit their motives, strengths, and passions by
52
53 changing their tasks and interactions at work. A company that provides a high degree of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 autonomy and discretion leads to greater opportunities of job crafting influencing the
4
5 overall job satisfaction of the employees (Cullinane et al., 2013).
6
7
8
9

10
11 Insert Figure 2 about here
12
13
14
15
16

17 The term “manag” from the “advice” comment box is the second most important feature
18 (Figure 3). The more focus on management in the advice comment box, the better is the
19 rating. Employees who only mention the term management a few times (less than 4.5
20 times) tend to rate the company less positively way. Advice to improve the management
21 system reveals to be important for employees and employees feel satisfied by giving
22 their opinions to line and senior management if the leadership style has a positive
23 impact on employees (Mathieu et al., 2015). Supervisor behavior has an important
24 relevance at this level since it can build a voice-supported environment that generates a
25 positive climate for employees to feel protected, secured, and challenged to express
26 problems and ideas (Janssen and Gao, 2015). Managers and supervisors are moderators
27 of advice-seeking and should suggest and motivate IT employees to share opinions
28 regarding the management style since they influence the organizational outcome, job
29 performance, and impact over the company innovativeness (Alexiev et al., 2010).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Insert Figure 3 about here
52
53
54
55

56 The third most relevant feature is the term “learn” from the positive remarks comment
57 box (Figure 4). When the term is mentioned between 0.75 and 2 times, the rating
58
59
60

1
2
3 increases. The best result is, in fact, when “learn” is mentioned twice. After this point,
4
5 the rating starts to decrease until 3.47, revealing a negative impact for the IT companies.
6

7
8 Previous studies suggest that, regarding training and development, employees reveal
9
10 propensity to acquire new knowledge, develop skills and [learn new working dynamics](#)
11
12 (Billett and Choy, 2013). However, since IT companies have a high degree of exposure
13
14 to changes and market demands, there might be a tendency to overload employees with
15
16 an environment of higher learning intensity, creating dissatisfaction [with](#) employees.
17
18 High learning intensity depends [on](#) work organization and [how responsibilities are](#)
19
20 [delegated](#) by managers and supervisors (Skule, 2004). The creation of a successful
21
22 training and development strategy [has the](#) potential to deliver positive outcomes to IT
23
24 companies as their success heavily depends on having their employees satisfied
25
26 (Jehanzeb and Bashir, 2013; Zumrah and Boyle, 2015).
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Insert Figure 4 about here
34
35
36
37

38 Figure 5 highlights the terms with the most negative results in each [of the](#) three box
39
40 comments analyzed. [In the](#) “advice” comment box, if the term “employee” is mentioned
41
42 4 times, the rating will reach the lowest rating (3.05). Additionally, when the term
43
44 “employee” is mentioned more than 4 times, findings reveal the interest of employees to
45
46 share positive advice through the “advice” comment box on how to create and stimulate
47
48 a good relationship between coworkers. A good relationship between peers has been
49
50 cited as a predictor of collaboration, trust, empowerment, and responsibility among
51
52 colleagues (Zayas-ortiz et al., 2015). [When](#) companies motivate their employees to
53
54 become job crafters, there is a positive impact on the relational outcome between
55
56 workers (Petrou et al., 2018). [In the](#) “pros” comment box, the term that [leads](#) rating to a
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 lower level is “work.” When it is mentioned 5 times it decreases the rating to 3.37.
4
5 Nevertheless, this is the term with the highest rating. The more times it is mentioned,
6
7 the more inferior the rating is, showing an increasingly negative impact of the number
8
9 of times the term is used by IT employees. If employees give too much emphasis to the
10
11 term “work” in their positive comments, there is less positive satisfaction towards
12
13 different aspects of work, such as working conditions, working time, working
14
15 environment, or work-family balance. This is consistent with previous research (Anitha,
16
17 2014; Bakotić and Tomislav, 2013; Galea et al., 2014; Raziq and Maulabakhsh, 2015).
18
19 Thus, IT organizations need to create conditions in the workplace that make employees
20
21 motivated, satisfied, committed to strategic goals, and loyal (Misra et al., 2013). A
22
23 positive business environment within the organization results in a positive effect on
24
25 performance of employees. As expected, these data depict that the terms from the
26
27 “cons” comment box are those with more negative impact for the rating, followed by
28
29 the “advice” and “pros” terms. Companies need to be aware of the opinions placed in
30
31 this comment box, analyze and consider them to increase their employees’ satisfaction
32
33 by turning negative aspects into internal strengths.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Insert Figure 5 about here
44
45
46
47

48 Figure 6 uncovers the terms associated with the highest ranking. When the term “keep”
49
50 from the “advice” comment box is mentioned twice, the rating increases up to 4.29,
51
52 revealing to be the best result among the three best terms. The term from the “cons”
53
54 comment box that discloses the highest rating is “environ,” which after being mentioned
55
56 twice, raises the rating to 4.25. It is interesting to observe that the more emphasis given
57
58 to the term “environ,” the higher the rating is, revealing the positive impact that this
59
60

1
2
3 term has for a company's score, although it is in the "cons" comment box. Other studies
4
5 suggested that employees are sensitive to the overall working environment, such as job
6
7 design, supervisory behavior, role ambiguity and role conflict, and compensation plans
8
9 (Raziq and Maulabakhsh, 2015). Since the rating is continuously rising as is mentioned,
10
11 more advice for positive work environment leads to a better rating. Social interactions
12
13 and relationships are crucial for work environment and consequently job satisfaction
14
15 (Freney and Fellenz, 2013). The design of a reward system contributes to
16
17 organizational effectiveness and motivates IT employees' to work with satisfaction
18
19 (Misra et al., 2013). Employees satisfaction has an influence on their behavior and
20
21 impact on their productivity (Kim and de Dear, 2013; Raziq and Maulabakhsh, 2015).
22
23 From this perspective, employees give relevance and feel satisfied to contribute to a
24
25 better environment of the IT companies. In the "pros" comment box, the term
26
27 "employee" mentioned twice makes the rating increase up to 4.26, revealing that they
28
29 find coworkers with a positive attitude in general, meaning to be respectful, friendly in
30
31 terms of personal relationships, helpful, knowledgeable and resourceful colleagues (Hau
32
33 et al., 2013; Zayas-ortiz et al., 2015). Satisfied employees are willing to transfer
34
35 knowledge and skills with more enthusiasm than employees who are dissatisfied with
36
37 their job (Zumrah and Boyle, 2015). It is interesting to observe that the three most
38
39 positive terms reach their highest rating after being mentioned twice.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Insert Figure 6 about here
50
51
52
53

54 Surprisingly, there is not a significant difference between the highest ratings of three
55
56 comment boxes, when it would be expected to find differences between the "pros" and
57
58 "cons" ratings. These results might be the consequence of emotional attachment
59
60

1
2
3 between employees and IT companies that influence the negative rating towards a nicer
4 rating (Derks et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2013).
5
6
7

8 **5. Conclusions**

9
10
11 Employees are a valuable resource for an IT company to survive and thrive. An IT
12 company needs their employees to feel satisfied to achieve the overall objectives and to
13 remain loyal to the company in order to achieve company success (Jehanzeb and Bashir,
14 2013). The employees' satisfaction is the premise of this commitment and dedication.
15 Providing the necessary conditions for an employee to feel satisfied, employees can
16 become a priceless asset. They can contribute in so many ways for a company to
17 achieve competitive advantage in a globalized world (Bakotić and Tomislav, 2013).
18 Employee satisfaction can help in reducing turnover, which is high in the dynamic IT
19 sector (Thatcher et al., 2002).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 In this paper, 15,000 reviews were extracted from Glassdoor, a social media platform
34 developed for professionals to rate and provide feedback about companies they work
35 for, from the top 15 IT companies in the US, according to Forbes 2017 world ranking,
36 using support vector machine to understand which are the most meaningful features that
37 justify the granted scores.
38
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 The achieved findings characterize the most important features that satisfy IT workers,
46 providing IT human resource departments valuable insights to align their strategies in
47 accordance with their employees' desires and expectations. Specifically, the results
48 highlight that IT managers should listen to their staff's advice on their needs,
49 management issues, and team. By also highlighting workload as negative, employees
50 are signaling the need for further attention to improve teamwork and work balance to
51 increase satisfaction. Hence, human resource departments can take team-building
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 initiatives to address such challenges. Regarding the positive items, learning is clearly
4
5 outlined, with the company's brand and environment also playing a role in employee
6
7 satisfaction. Thus, workers appreciate working under pivotal brands. Also, interesting to
8
9 note is the fact that words related to salary such as "payment" did not emerge among the
10
11 most relevant ones, neither in the positive nor in the negative comments. This result
12
13 corroborates the findings by Korunka et al. (2008), who analyzed IT employees and
14
15 unveiled that other factors play a more significant role to employee satisfaction when
16
17 compared to the base salary. This outcome is also aligned with the meta-analysis of the
18
19 literature study conducted by Judge et al. (2010) who found that salary is only
20
21 marginally related to satisfaction. Therefore, human resource departments should focus
22
23 more on tuning their benefits strategy instead of salaries.
24
25
26
27
28

29 The contribution of this paper is expected to be significant. The outcome of this study
30
31 makes a conceptual addition to academia and management. Scholars can use this
32
33 valuable knowledge as an immediate reference to conduct research, considering the
34
35 opinion of IT employees in terms of job satisfaction while IT human resource
36
37 departments can redirect their strategies toward the identified characteristics that
38
39 enhance job satisfaction to meet the organizational objectives and mitigate less
40
41 satisfactory expectations, behaviors and turnover intentions of actual and future
42
43 employees. This paper can help IT human resource departments to understand the
44
45 wishes of employees and take advantage of various actions highlighted that can be taken
46
47 to prevent negative outcomes. The work of a satisfied employee can benefit both
48
49 employees and IT companies.
50
51
52
53

54
55 Despite the insights and contributions of this paper, there are limitations that need to be
56
57 addressed and considered for future research. The collected data refers to the general
58
59 employees of the 15 most important American IT companies, and not to specific
60

1
2
3 departments of those companies. Therefore, in future research, data should be separated
4
5 by departments to perceive the most meaningful variables of job satisfaction of each IT
6
7 company department. It would be interesting to understand the reasons that make top
8
9 managers satisfied with their position at an IT company and which factors have the
10
11 most relevance to their satisfaction.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Adams, S.B. (2005), "Stanford and Silicon Valley: Lessons on becoming a high-tech region", *California Management Review*, Vol. 63 No. 1, pp. 29–51.
- Alexiev, A.S., Jansen, J.J.P., Van den Bosch, F.A.J. and Volberda, H.W. (2010), "Top management team advice seeking and exploratory innovation: The moderating role of TMT heterogeneity", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 47 No. 7, pp. 1343–1364.
- Anitha, J. (2014), "Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance", *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol. 63 No. 3, pp. 308–323.
- Auer Antoncic, J. and Antoncic, B. (2011), "Employee satisfaction, intrapreneurship and firm growth: a model", *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 111 No. 4, pp. 589–607.
- Bakotić, D. and Tomislav, B. (2013), "Relationship between Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction : The Case of Croatian Shipbuilding Company", *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 206–213.
- Baroudi, J.J. (1985), "The impact of role variables on IS personnel work attitudes and intentions", *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 341–356.
- Billett, S. and Choy, S. (2013), "Learning through work: Emerging perspectives and new challenges", *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 264–276.
- Bowling, N.A., Khazon, S., Alarcon, G.M., Blackmore, C.E., Bragg, C.B., Hoepf, M.R., Barelka, A., et al. (2017), "Building better measures of role ambiguity and role conflict: The validation of new role stressor scales", *Work and Stress*, Taylor &

Francis, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 1–23.

Bruning, P.F. and Campion, M.A. (2018), “A role-resource approach-avoidance model of job crafting: A multimethod integration and extension of job crafting theory”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 61 No. 2, pp. 499–522.

Carpenter, D., McLeod, A., Hicks, C. and Maasberg, M. (2018), “Privacy and biometrics: An empirical examination of employee concerns”, *Information Systems Frontiers*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 91–110.

Castaneda, G.A. and Scanlan, J.M. (2014), “Job Satisfaction in Nursing : A Concept Analysis”, *Nursing Forum an Independentvoice for Nursing*, Vol. 49 No. 2.

Chen, J.-H., Lee, T.-L. and Ting, I.-H. (2017), “A Study of Headhunter’s Recruiting on Social Network Sites: Take LinkedIn as an Example”, *Proceedings of the 4th Multidisciplinary International Social Networks Conference on ZZZ - MISNC '17*, pp. 1–6.

Costen, W.M. and Salazar, J. (2011), “The Impact of Training and Development on Employee Job Satisfaction, Loyalty, and Intent to Stay in the Lodging Industry”, *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 273–284.

Cullinane, S.-J., Bosak, J., Flood, P.C. and Demerouti, E. (2013), “Job design under lean manufacturing and its impact on employee outcomes”, *Organizational Psychology Review*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 41–61.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B. and Leiter, M. (2014), “Burnout and job performance: The moderating role of selection, optimization, and compensation strategies”, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 96–107.

- 1
2
3 Derks, D., Fischer, A.H. and Bos, A.E.R. (2008), “The role of emotion in computer-
4 mediated communication: A review”, *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 24 No.
5
6 3, pp. 766–785.
7
8
9
10 Ehlers, J. (2015), “Socialness in the recruiting of software engineers”, *Proceedings of*
11
12 *the 12th ACM International Conference on Computing Frontiers - CF '15*, pp. 1–5.
13
14
15
16 Freeney, Y. and Fellenz, M.R. (2013), “Work engagement, job design and the role of
17
18 the social context at work: Exploring antecedents from a relational perspective”,
19
20 *Human Relations*, Vol. 66 No. 11, pp. 1427–1445.
21
22
23
24 Frenkel, S., Sanders, K. and Bednall, T. (2013), “Employee perceptions of management
25
26 relations as influences on job satisfaction and quit intentions”, *Asia Pacific Journal*
27
28 *of Management*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 7–29.
29
30
31
32 Gabaccia, D.R. (1999), “Is Everywhere Nowhere? Nomads, Nations, and the Immigrant
33
34 Paradigm of United States History”, *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 86 No.
35
36 3, p. 1115.
37
38
39 Galea, C., Houkes, I. and De Rijk, A. (2014), “An insider’s point of view: How a
40
41 system of flexible working hours helps employees to strike a proper balance
42
43 between work and personal life”, *International Journal of Human Resource*
44
45 *Management*, Taylor & Francis.
46
47
48
49 Garon, J.M. (2018), “Business Models of the Digital Economy”, *The Entrepreneur ’s*
50
51 *Intellectual Property & Business Handbook*.
52
53
54 Gregory, K. (2011), “The Importance of Employee Satisfaction”, *The Journal of the*
55
56 *Division of Business & Information Management*, Vol. 5, pp. 29–37.
57
58
59
60 Guerreiro, J. and Moro, S. (2017), “Are Yelp’s tips helpful in building influential

1
2
3 consumers?”, *Tourism Management Perspectives*, Elsevier, Vol. 24, pp. 151–154.

4
5
6 Hackman, J.R. and Oldham, G.R. (1976), “Motivation through the design of work: test
7
8 of a theory”, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 16 No. 2,
9
10 pp. 250–279.

11
12
13 Hau, Y.S., Kim, B., Lee, H. and Kim, Y.G. (2013), “The effects of individual
14
15 motivations and social capital on employees’ tacit and explicit knowledge sharing
16
17 intentions”, *International Journal of Information Management*, Elsevier Ltd, Vol.
18
19 33 No. 2, pp. 356–366.

20
21
22
23 Holland, P. and Bardoel, A. (2016), “The impact of technology on work in the twenty-
24
25 first century: exploring the smart and dark side”, *International Journal of Human
26
27 Resource Management*, Routledge, Vol. 27 No. 21, pp. 2579–2581.

28
29
30
31 Huang, S.Y., Lee, C.H., Chiu, A.A. and Yen, D.C. (2015), “How business process
32
33 reengineering affects information technology investment and employee
34
35 performance under different performance measurement”, *Information Systems
36
37 Frontiers*, Vol. 17 No. 5, pp. 1133–1144.

38
39
40
41 Hyde, A. (2015), *Working in Silicon Valley: Economic and Legal Analysis of a High-
42
43 Velocity Labor Market*, Routledge, available
44
45 at:<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315698052>.

46
47
48
49 Janssen, O. and Gao, L. (2015), “Supervisory Responsiveness and Employee Self-
50
51 Perceived Status and Voice Behavior”, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 41 No. 7, pp.
52
53 1854–1872.

54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Jehanzeb, K. and Bashir, N. (2013), “Training and Development Program and its
Benefits to Employee and Organization: A Conceptual Study”, *European Journal*

1
2
3 *of Business and Management*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 2222–2839.

4
5
6 Judge, T.A., Piccolo, R.F., Podsakoff, N.P., Shaw, J.C. and Rich, B.L. (2010), “The
7
8 relationship between pay and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the literature”,
9
10
11 *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 77 No. 2, pp. 157–167.

12
13
14 Jung, Y. and Suh, Y. (2019), “Mining the voice of employees: A text mining approach
15
16 to identifying and analyzing job satisfaction factors from online employee
17
18 reviews”, *Decision Support Systems*, Vol. 123, p. 113074.

19
20
21 Kang, H.J. (Annette), Gatling, A. and Kim, J. (Sunny). (2015), “The Impact of
22
23 Supervisory Support on Organizational Commitment, Career Satisfaction, and
24
25 Turnover Intention for Hospitality Frontline Employees”, *Journal of Human
26
27 Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 68–89.

28
29
30
31 Kim, J. and de Dear, R. (2013), “Workspace satisfaction: The privacy-communication
32
33 trade-off in open-plan offices”, *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, Vol. 36, pp.
34
35 18–26.

36
37
38
39 Korunka, C., Hoonakker, P. and Carayon, P. (2008), “Quality of Working Life and
40
41 Turnover Intention in Information Technology Work”, *Human Factors and
42
43 Ergonomics in Manufacturing*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 409–423.

44
45
46 Kuz, D.S. (2010), *Exploration of Intrapreneurship and Innovation in Advanced
47
48 Technology Organizations in the Western United States*, University of Phoenix.

49
50
51 Lee, K., Oh, W.Y. and Kim, N. (2013), “Social Media for Socially Responsible Firms:
52
53 Analysis of Fortune 500’s Twitter Profiles and their CSR/CSIR Ratings”, *Journal
54
55 of Business Ethics*, Vol. 118 No. 4, pp. 791–806.

56
57
58
59 Lewis, D., Megicks, P. and Jones, P. (2017), “Bullying and harassment and work-
60

1
2
3 related stressors: Evidence from British small and medium enterprises”,
4
5 *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 35 No.
6
7 1, pp. 116–137.
8
9

10
11 Lo, J. (2015), “The information technology workforce: A review and assessment of
12
13 voluntary turnover research”, *Information Systems Frontiers*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp.
14
15 387–411.
16
17

18
19 Luo, N., Zhou, Y. and Shon, J.J. (2016), “Employee satisfaction and corporate
20
21 performance: Mining employee reviews on glassdoor.com”, *2016 International
22
23 Conference on Information Systems, ICIS 2016*, No. 2015, pp. 1–16.
24
25

26
27 Madera, J.M., Dawson, M. and Neal, J.A. (2013), “Hotel managers’ perceived diversity
28
29 climate and job satisfaction: The mediating effects of role ambiguity and conflict”,
30
31 *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Elsevier Ltd, Vol. 35, pp. 28–
32
33 34.
34
35

36
37 Mathieu, C. and Babiak, P. (2016), “Corporate psychopathy and abusive supervision:
38
39 Their influence on employees’ job satisfaction and turnover intentions”,
40
41 *Personality and Individual Differences*, Elsevier Ltd, Vol. 91, pp. 102–106.
42
43

44
45 Mathieu, C., Fabi, B., Lacoursière, R. and Raymond, L. (2015), “The role of
46
47 supervisory behavior, job satisfaction and organizational commitment on employee
48
49 turnover”, *Journal of Management and Organization*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 113–129.
50
51

52
53 Di Meglio, F. (2011), “Dream jobs: College students make their picks”, *Bloomberg
54
55 Businessweek*, available at: [https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2011-05-
56
57 12/dream-jobs-college-students-make-their-picks](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2011-05-12/dream-jobs-college-students-make-their-picks) (accessed 3 October 2019).
58
59

60
Melián-González, S. (2016), “An extended model of the interaction between work-

related attitudes and job performance”, *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol. 65 No. 1, pp. 42–57.

Misra, P., Jain, S. and Sood, A. (2013), “Compensation: impact of rewards and organisational justice on turnover intentions and the role of motivation and job satisfaction: a study of retail store operations in NCR”, *International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management*, Vol. 13 No. 2/3, p. 136.

Moro, S., Rita, P. and Coelho, J. (2017), “Stripping customers’ feedback on hotels through data mining: The case of Las Vegas Strip”, *Tourism Management Perspectives*, Vol. 23, pp. 41–52.

Moro, S., Rita, P. and Oliveira, C. (2018), “Factors Influencing Hotels’ Online Prices”, *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, Routledge, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 443–464.

Moro, S., Rita, P. and Vala, B. (2016), “Predicting social media performance metrics and evaluation of the impact on brand building: A data mining approach”, *Journal of Business Research*, Elsevier Inc., Vol. 69 No. 9, pp. 3341–3351.

Olesen, C., White, D. and Lemmer, I. (2007), “Career models and culture change at microsoft”, *Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 31–35.

Petrou, P., Demerouti, E. and Schaufeli, W.B. (2018), “Crafting the Change: The Role of Employee Job Crafting Behaviors for Successful Organizational Change”, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 44 No. 5, pp. 1766–1792.

Ramos, R.F., Rita, P. and Moro, S. (2019), “From institutional websites to social media and mobile applications: A usability perspective”, *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 138–143.

- 1
2
3 Raziq, A. and Maulabakhsh, R. (2015), "Impact of Working Environment on Job
4 Satisfaction", *Procedia Economics and Finance*, Elsevier B.V., Vol. 23 No.
5
6 October 2014, pp. 717–725.
7
8
9
10 Refaeilzadeh, P., Tang, L. and Liu, H. (2009), "Cross-validation", *Encyclopedia of*
11
12 *Database Systems*, Springer US, pp. 532–538.
13
14
15 Schmidt, E. and Rosenberg, J. (2014), *How Google Works*, Hachette UK.
16
17
18 Schmidt, S., Roesler, U., Kusserow, T. and Rau, R. (2014), "Uncertainty in the
19 workplace: Examining role ambiguity and role conflict, and their link to
20 depression-a meta-analysis", *European Journal of Work and Organizational*
21
22 *Psychology*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 91–106.
23
24
25
26
27
28 Shih, S.P., Jiang, J.J., Klein, G. and Wang, E. (2013), "Job burnout of the information
29 technology worker: Work exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal
30 accomplishment", *Information and Management*, Elsevier B.V., Vol. 50 No. 7, pp.
31
32 582–589.
33
34
35
36
37
38 Silva, A., Moro, S., Rita, P. and Cortez, P. (2018), "Unveiling the features of successful
39 eBay smartphone sellers", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 43,
40
41 pp. 311–324.
42
43
44
45
46 Skule, S. (2004), "Learning conditions at work: a framework to understand and assess
47 informal learning in the workplace", *International Journal of Training and*
48
49 *Development*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 8–20.
50
51
52
53 Slaughter, S., Ang, S. and Boh, W. (2007), "Firm-specific human capital and
54 compensation organizational tenure profiles: An archival analysis of salary data for
55
56 it", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 46 No. 3, pp. 373–394.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Statista. (2016), “Job satisfaction rate among IT professionals in the United States in
4 2016”, available at: [https://www.statista.com/statistics/730285/us-it-professionals-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/730285/us-it-professionals-job-satisfaction-rate/)
5 [job-satisfaction-rate/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/730285/us-it-professionals-job-satisfaction-rate/) (accessed 14 October 2018).
6
7
8
9

10 Statista. (2018a), “Share of IT decision-makers’ reporting an IT industry skills gap, by
11 region, in 2016 and 2017”, available at:
12 <https://www.statista.com/statistics/730617/worldwide-reporting-it-skills-gap/>
13 (accessed 14 October 2018).
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Statista. (2018b), “Reasons behind IT industry’s skills gap worldwide in 2016 and
21 2017”, available at: [https://www.statista.com/statistics/730622/worldwide-reasons-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/730622/worldwide-reasons-behind-it-skills-gap/)
22 [behind-it-skills-gap/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/730622/worldwide-reasons-behind-it-skills-gap/) (accessed 14 October 2018).
23
24
25
26
27

28 Stoller, K. (2017), “The World’s Largest Tech Companies 2017: Apple And Samsung
29 Lead, Facebook Rises”, *Forbes*, available at:
30 [https://www.forbes.com/sites/kristinstoller/2017/05/24/the-worlds-largest-tech-](https://www.forbes.com/sites/kristinstoller/2017/05/24/the-worlds-largest-tech-companies-2017-apple-and-samsung-lead-facebook-rises/)
31 [companies-2017-apple-and-samsung-lead-facebook-rises/](https://www.forbes.com/sites/kristinstoller/2017/05/24/the-worlds-largest-tech-companies-2017-apple-and-samsung-lead-facebook-rises/) (accessed 14 October
32 2018).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Sung, S.Y. and Choi, J.N. (2014), “Do organizations spend wisely on employees?
41 Effects of training and development investments on learning and innovation in
42 organizations”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 35, pp. 393–412.
43
44
45
46
47

48 Tam, M.Y.M. and Chiu, S. (2010), “Job training provision by employers - an
49 institutional analysis of employees in Hong kong”, *International Journal of Human*
50 *Resource Management*, Vol. 21 No. 12, pp. 2194–2217.
51
52
53
54

55 Taylor, J. (2014), “Public service motivation, relational job design, and job satisfaction
56 in local government”, *Public Administration*, Vol. 92 No. 4, pp. 902–918.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Thatcher, J.B., Stepina, L.P. and Boyle, R.J. (2002), “Turnover of Information
4
5 Technology Workers: Examining Empirically the Influence of Attitudes, Job
6
7 Characteristics, and External Markets”, *Journal of Management Information
8
9 Systems*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 231–261.
- 10
11
12
13 Urbach, N. and Ahlemann, F. (2019), “Demography, Digital Natives, and Individual
14
15 Entrepreneurship: Employees Become a Strategic Competitive Factor”, *IT
16
17 Management in the Digital Age: A Roadmap for the IT Department of the Future*,
18
19 Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 109–118.
- 20
21
22
23 Walsh, J.L., Persky, L.R. and Pinnock, K. (2019), “The Effect of High Performing
24
25 Bullying Behavior on Organizational Performance: A Bullying Management
26
27 Dilemma”, *Global Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 71–81.
- 28
29
30
31 Williams, M.L., Brower, H.H., Ford, L.R., Williams, L.J. and Carraher, S.M. (2008), “A
32
33 comprehensive model and measure of compensation satisfaction”, *Journal of
34
35 Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 81 No. 4, pp. 639–668.
- 36
37
38
39 Wood, S.J. and Wall, T.D. (2007), “Work enrichment and employee voice in human
40
41 resource management-performance studies”, *International Journal of Human
42
43 Resource Management*, Vol. 18 No. 7, pp. 1335–1372.
- 44
45
46
47 Zayas-ortiz, M., Rosario, E., Marquez, E. and Gruñeiro, P.C. (2015), “Relationship
48
49 between organizational commitments and organizational citizenship behaviour in
50
51 a sample of private banking employees”, *International Journal of Sociology and
52
53 Social Policy*, Vol. 35, pp. 91–106.
- 54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Zheng, C. and Lamond, D. (2009), “A critical review of human resource management
studies (1978-2007) in the People’s Republic of China”, *International Journal of
Human Resource Management*, Vol. 20 No. 11, pp. 2194–2227.

1
2
3 Zhou, J. and George, J.M. (2001), "When Job Dissatisfaction Leads to Creativity:
4 Encouraging the Expression of Voice", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 44
5
6
7
8 No. 4, pp. 682–696.
9

10
11 Zou, M. (2015), "Gender, work orientations and job satisfaction", *Work, Employment*
12
13 *and Society*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 3–22.
14

15
16 Zumrah, A.R. and Boyle, S. (2015), "The effects of perceived organizational support
17
18 and job satisfaction on transfer of training", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 44 No. 2, pp.
19
20
21 236–254.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 - Forbes 2017 ranking

| Tech | Rankings | | Company | Country |
|------|----------|-------------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| | US Tech | Global 2000 | | |
| 1 | 1 | 9 | Apple | US |
| 2 | | 15 | Samsung | South Korea |
| 3 | 2 | 19 | Microsoft | US |
| 4 | 3 | 24 | Alphabet (Google) | US |
| 5 | 4 | 43 | IBM | US |
| 6 | 5 | 54 | Intel | US |
| 7 | 6 | 58 | Cisco | US |
| 8 | 7 | 98 | Oracle | US |
| 10 | 8 | 119 | Facebook | US |
| 11 | | 127 | Taiwan Semiconductor | Taiwan, China |
| 12 | | 148 | Tencent Holdings | China |
| 13 | 9 | 170 | Qualcomm | US |
| 14 | 10 | 171 | Hewlett-Packard Enterprise (HPE) * | US |
| 15 | | 178 | SAP | Germany |
| 16 | 11 | 271 | HP ** | US |
| 17 | 12 | 272 | Accenture | US |
| 18 | | 349 | SK Hynix | South Korea |
| 19 | | 363 | SK Holdings | South Korea |
| 20 | | 377 | Tata Consultancy Services | India |
| 21 | 13 | 387 | Texas Instruments | US |
| 22 | | 392 | Baidu | China |
| 23 | 14 | 433 | Corning | US |
| 24 | | 460 | Fujitsu | Japan |
| 25 | 15 | 482 | Micron Technology | US |

* Retained the HP technology solutions segments; ** Retained the HP printing and PC business segments

Source: <https://www.forbes.com/pictures/591b9072a7ea434078d412be/2017-global-2000-tech/>

Table 1 - Features used for the analysis

| Feature | Description |
|------------------|--|
| rv.month | Month when the review was written |
| rv.weekday | Weekday when the review was written |
| rv.is.weekend | If the review was written on weekend |
| rv.user.status | Current or former employee |
| rv.user.function | Management, technical, or other |
| rv.user.division | User's US division located, or from abroad |
| rv.user.region | User's US region located, or from abroad |
| rv.user.outlook | User recommendation rate, outlook, and CEO approval, one from 3 categories: Green, Orange, Red |
| rv.CEO.approval | |
| rv.user.years | Years in the company: ≤ 3 years; > 3 years |
| rv.pros.text | Free text with positive remarks, negative remarks, and advice to management |
| rv.cons.text | |
| rv.advice.text | |
| rv.score | Review score |

Table 1 - US regions and divisions

| Region | Division | States |
|-----------|--------------------|---|
| Northeast | New England | Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont |
| | Mid-Atlantic | New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania |
| Midwest | East North Central | Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin |
| | West North Central | Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota |
| South | South Atlantic | Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, District of Columbia, West Virginia |
| | East South Central | Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee |
| | West South Central | Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas |
| West | Mountain | Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming |
| | Pacific | Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington |

Source: https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/maps-data/maps/reference/us_regdiv.pdf

Table 1 - Most frequent keywords within "pros", "cons", and "advice"

| <i>rv.pros.text</i> | | <i>rv.cons.text</i> | | <i>rv.advice.text</i> | |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|
| Word | Frequency | Word | Frequency | Word | Frequency |
| work | 1335 | work | 6523 | employee | 1784 |
| benefit | 799 | company | 2868 | management | 1591 |
| company | 710 | people | 2754 | people | 1238 |
| people | 606 | benefit | 2319 | work | 1213 |
| pay | 473 | management | 1635 | company | 1029 |
| opportunity | 331 | opportunity | 1530 | keep | 892 |
| environment | 330 | balance | 1264 | need | 676 |
| employee | 273 | culture | 1197 | team | 553 |
| learn | 249 | environment | 1149 | focus | 473 |
| job | 234 | employee | 1104 | will | 468 |




Fig. 1 - Relative importance of each feature

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Fig. 1 - Influence of mentioning word "work" in the "cons" comment

Productivity and Performance Management




Fig. 1 - Influence of mentioning word "manag" in the "advice" comment

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Fig. 1 - Influence of mentioning word "learn" in the "pros" comment




Fig. 1 - More negative terms of the three comment boxes




Fig. 1 - More positive terms of the three comment boxes

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60