What do Women Want?

Men, Women, and Job Satisfaction in the Public Service

David W. Pitts*
Georgia State University
Andrew Young School of Policy Studies
14 Marietta St. NW
Atlanta, GA 30303
(404) 651-4697
(404) 651-1378 FAX
pitts@gsu.edu

Elizabeth M. Jarry
University of Georgia

Vicky M. Wilkins
University of Georgia

Sanjay K. Pandey
University of Kansas+

* Corresponding author
+ Effective AY 2006-07

What do Women Want?

Men, Women, and Job Satisfaction in the Public Service

Abstract

Research in organizational behavior and public administration has long considered differences between men and women at work. Research indicates that men and women often communicate differently, prefer different approaches to organizational structure and design, and view rewards through different lenses. As women become better represented in public organizations, and at higher levels, it becomes even more important to explore sex-based differences. This paper seeks to uncover differences between men and women when it comes to determinants of job satisfaction. We use the existing literature to develop a series of hypotheses about the different factors that predict job satisfaction for the sexes. We test these hypotheses using data from a survey of health and human services managers, finding that there are more commonalities than differences when it comes to what satisfies men and women at work.

What do Women Want?

Men, Women, and Job Satisfaction in the Public Service

Introduction

A prolific research agenda in public management, public policy, and political science has undertaken to explore differences between men and women at work, resulting in a number of ideas about how the sexes operate differently. Some research shows that men and women have different leadership, management, and communication styles, with women preferring less hierarchy and more group-based activity (Duerst-Lahti & Johnson, 1990; Pitts, 2005; Rosener, 1990). Other research, such as the stream of work on representative bureaucracy, has shown that women working in bureaucracy often represent the policy needs and preferences of women in the target population (Dolan, 2000; Keiser et al., 2002; Selden, 1997). Understanding the role of women in public service has been highlighted as one of the key questions in public administration and policy research (Guy, 1993).

This paper will undertake to explore the differences between men and women and how they approach work. The focus of this paper will be job satisfaction – not with how men and women differ in their levels of job satisfaction, but rather how different factors tend to *predict* job satisfaction for the sexes. We will begin by examining the history of women in the public service, followed by a discussion of job satisfaction. We will then review the literature relating sex to job satisfaction and formulate hypotheses. Next, we will explain the data used, methods employed, and variables chosen for our model. We will close with a discussion of our findings.

Women in the Public Service

During the last century, women have made great strides in their position in public sector employment (Kerr, Miller & Reid, 2002). From the earliest times of the United States government, women were severely limited in their ability to gain federal employment. Until 1919, women were unable to enter approximately 60 percent of federal government positions covered by examinations (Shafritz et al., 2001). The Classification Act of 1923 was an important step forward for women. The act required equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex. President Kennedy made one of the first major efforts to protect women in federal government positions. He created the Commission on the Status of Women, and he issued a memorandum prohibiting the consideration of sex in promotions and appointments unless the Commission could justify its use (Shafritz et al., 2001). Shortly thereafter, women received statutory protection against employment discrimination under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which included sex among its protected classes. The Civil Rights Act of 1991 established the Glass Ceiling Commission, which until 1996 investigated ways to remove barriers to advancement for women and minorities. While much legal progress has been made to protect women's rights to work and to earn equal pay, it remains important to study women's progress in the workforce.

Despite the substantial gains that women have made in bureaucracies, some disturbing differences in the employment of men and women are evident. Mani (1997) found that 85 percent of the clerical positions in the federal government are occupied by women, and Naff (1994) found that women comprise nearly half of the white-collar workers in the federal government. However, by 2003 women occupied only 25 percent

of the Senior Executive Service positions (US OPM, 2003). These statistics demonstrate

that women have entered the lower and middle levels in the federal government, but they

are not well represented in top level positions. Lewis (1994) found that although the

situation is improving, many occupations in the federal government continue to be

segregated according to sex. This sex segregation creates some of the differences in pay

between men and women, and it reduces women's ability to advance in agencies where

the top level jobs consist of traditionally male occupations (Lewis, 1994). For example,

1987 statistics show that women occupied five times as many positions above the GS-12

level in the Department of Education than in NASA (Lewis, 1994). Naff (1994) found

that men are promoted at a rate 33 percent faster than women at the GS-9 level, and men

are promoted 40 percent faster at the GS-11 level. Women appear to reach a "glass

ceiling" that prevents them from advancing very far or very quickly in public agencies

(Naff, 1994). Many researchers have struggled to determine why women are not

reaching parity with men in public sector employment.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a frequent topic in public management research, with a number

of efforts aimed toward understanding the impact of different types of management and

leadership on satisfaction with work. Literally thousands of studies have focused on job

satisfaction as a key variable in organizational research (Locke, 1983; Rainey, 2003).

Much of this research has operated under the assumption that high levels of job

satisfaction would lead to high levels of performance. This viewpoint has it roots in the

human relations movement of the mid 20th-century, a school of management that placed

emphasis on the individual employee's happiness and satisfaction at work. Vroom (1964) wrote that "it was typically assumed by most people associated with the human relations movement that job satisfaction was positively associated with job performance. In fact, human relations might be described as an attempt to increase productivity by satisfying the needs of employees" (p. 181).

However, empirical findings refute the assumption that a direct correlation between job satisfaction and performance exists (Katz and Kahn, 1978; Rainey, 2003; Vroom, 1964). Rather, research has moved to a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between job satisfaction and performance, finding that an indirect relationship exists. Increased job satisfaction leads to decreased absenteeism and turnover, which saves costs associated with hiring new employees or temporary workers (Brooke and Price, 1989; Carsten and Spector, 1987; Farrell and Stamm, 1988). In an era when governments are being forced to produce more with fewer resources, it is particularly important for research to work toward an understanding of factors that lead to cost savings.

Defining job satisfaction is a difficult task, and one for which no clear answer exists. Locke (1983) argued that no real consensus had developed in the thousands of studies on job satisfaction, and Rainey (2003) notes that it can be measured in a number of unique ways. A full treatment of the measurement issues associated with the concept of job satisfaction is beyond the scope of this paper. We will define job satisfaction as an affective construct consistent with others in the field: the "pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience" (Locke, 1983, p. 1300).

Determinants of Job Satisfaction and Sex-Related Differences

The literature identifies several independent variables on which one might expect to see a difference between men and women in regard to job satisfaction. The purpose of this paper, as noted above in the introduction, is to examine the differences in the *determinants* of job satisfaction by sex. As such, this section will review the relevant literature and pose hypotheses as to the differences between what tends to predict job satisfaction for men and women. We identify a total of five hypotheses that link sex and job satisfaction. These hypotheses are clustered into three general areas of research: organizational culture and hierarchy, public service motivation, pay and reward, and convenience and ease of work.

Organizational Culture & Hierarchy

An interest in increasing subordinate participation and attention to the role of the subordinate can be traced backed to the Human Relations movement and Hawthorne studies (Herrenkohl et al., 1999). Allport (1945) provided what may be the first efforts at formulating a theory of participation, and others added to the effort in subsequent years (Emery & Trist, 1962; Trist & Bamforth, 1951). A series of studies conducted in the 1950s – the Ohio State and Michigan leadership studies – touched on empowerment by identifying two types of leader behavior: task-oriented leadership and people-oriented leadership (Fleishman, 1953; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hemphill & Coons, 1957; Katz et al. 1950, 1951; Katz & Kahn, 1952). Task-oriented leaders emphasized planning, scheduling, and coordination of tasks, while people-oriented leaders emphasized human contact, treating those lower in the official hierarchy as equals, and showing empathy.

Other research developed a similar distinction between autocratic and democratic leaders, where the latter focused more on the role of the subordinate and treating him or her as an equal (Lewin et al., 1939; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958).

Substantial research leads to the conclusion that women are more likely to empower employees than men. For example, some research has shown that women seek to be empowered, and to empower others, while men seek specifically to *have* power over others (Yoder & Kahn, 1992). Moreover, Riger (1993) argues that women are more likely to be cooperative and focus on collaborative relationships, while men are more likely to seek hierarchical working relationships, and other research has shown women to be more likely to create "webs of inclusion" than hierarchies (Hegelson, 1990). Studies also illustrate that women are more likely to share information and power than men (Rosener, 1990; Rosen & Jerdee, 1995), two key components of the empowerment construct.

Research has also shown that women are more likely to promote values of egalitarianism in work-oriented relationships, something that is strongly associated with empowerment. Female-dominated groups are less likely to socially isolate men than male-dominated groups are likely to isolate women (Schreiber, 1979; Fairhurst & Snavely, 1983). Moreover, in a study of male-female working relationships, men in groups that were predominantly comprised of women were treated more equitably than women in groups of mostly men (Konrad et al., 1992). Women have been shown more likely to take on a democratic leadership style (Eagly & Johnson, 1990), and Browne (1995) found that women preferred values of community to values of individualism.

Other studies have shown little or no difference between the behaviors of men and women managers, and some argue that changing social values could result in subordinate males being less uncomfortable with female managers (Wise & Tschirhart, 2000). Itzhaky and York (2000) found that gender did not have an impact on empowerment, and other work has shown only small differences between men and women (Daley & Naff, 1998; Guy, 1993; Bayes, 1991). Some argue that women who work in an organization with mostly male managers are socialized to the "male" model of management, such that any original differences in gender behavior are effectively erased within a matter of time (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Guy, 1993; Bayes, 1991). Nevertheless, the preponderance of research indicates sex-based differences that warrant the following hypotheses (Table 1):

- H_1: A group-oriented organizational culture will lead to higher job satisfaction among women, whereas a bureaucratic culture that focuses on rules and hierarchy will lead to higher job satisfaction among men.
- H_2: Organizations with more hierarchy will result in higher job satisfaction for men than for women.

INSERT TABLE ONE ABOUT HERE

Commitment to the Public Interest/Civic Duty

A growing literature exists on the theory of public service motivation. Perry and Wise defined public service motivation "...as an individual's predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations" (Perry and Wise 1990, 368). Perry (1996) extended the work of Perry and Wise (1990) by

utilizing their typology of motives to create a scale with which to measure the public

service motivation construct. The goal was to enable researchers to empirically test

propositions made in the literature about the behavioral implications of public service

motivation. Perry developed Likert-type scales using concepts that he found in the public

service motivation literature. The questions that Perry used to measure public service

motivation fell under four categories: attraction to policymaking, compassion, self-

sacrifice, and commitment to the public interest/civic duty. Naff and Crum (1999) tested

Perry's public service motivation construct to determine whether it has an impact on

public employees' work-related attitudes. In particular, they determined that public

service motivation has a positive impact on employees' job satisfaction. Perry (1997)

further tested his public service motivation construct and found evidence that men score

higher on the public interest/civic duty dimension. Based on this literature, we expect that

public service motivation in the form of commitment to the public interest/civic duty will

have a positive relationship to job satisfaction for both men and women but that the

relationship will be stronger for men.

- H_3: High levels of commitment to the public interest/civic duty will be more
  strongly associated with job satisfaction for men than for women.

Extrinsic Reward

The notion that increased pay will lead to increased job satisfaction is the basis for

a number of reforms in government packaged as "merit pay." Those reforms tend to tie a

public servant's pay directly to his or her performance and are justified as a means

through which to correct what is perceived as weak motivation and poor performance

(Ingraham, 1993; Kellough and Lu, 1993; Rainey, 2003). Some states, such as Georgia and Florida, have dismantled civil service systems to soften barriers to paying employees a particular salary (Gossett, 2002). Managers are being empowered more and more to reward employees with financial incentives under new plans to make government more like business.

Research has shown that women tend to rate social needs, such as working with people and being helpful to others, as more important in work than men, who tend to rate pay as the overriding criteria in determining job satisfaction (Lawler, 1971; Tang & Talpade, 1999). Men tend to favor a merit pay system of compensation, while women tend to favor a system of equal pay for perceived equal work, which is often associated with a more harmonious work environment (Heneman, 1992). Research has shown that men score higher than women in the valuation of money and in positive attitudes about money (Furnham, 1984). In a study of university faculty, Tang and Talpade (1999) found that males tend to exhibit higher job satisfaction when it is linked to pay, whereas women tend to be more satisfied with job satisfaction when it is linked to co-workers. They argue that money might satisfy esteem needs that are important to men, while personal relationships might satisfy esteem needs that are important to women. Other findings show that men value extrinsic aspects of work, such as pay and promotion, while women are more likely to value intrinsic returns to work (Moir and Jessel, 1989; Neil and Snizek, 1987). Given these links between pay and productivity, and that the literature suggests that high pay will play a larger role in predicting the job satisfaction of men than women, we hypothesize the following:

- H$_4$: High levels of extrinsic reward will be more strongly associated with job satisfaction for men than for women.

- H$_5$: High levels of intrinsic reward will be more strongly associated with job satisfaction for women than for men.

Convenience Factors

Beyond organizational factors and extrinsic rewards, job satisfaction is likely linked to the "convenience" of the work or the ease in which the work can be completed. Hakim (1991) has described the factors in the workplace that affect the ease of completing the work as "convenience" factors. These are factors that allow employees to better fit their jobs in with their other life obligations. The literature has revealed that convenience factors are an important determinant of women's job satisfaction (Ezra & Deckman, 1996; Hakim, 1991). Hakim argues that many women value "...convenience factors, such as shorter work hours and short journeys to work, that are important in accommodating paid employment with other activities and priorities" (Hakim, 1991: 108). Ezra and Deckman (1996) analyzed the impact of the federal government's family-friendly policies on employee job satisfaction. They found that work/family balance had a highly significant impact on the job satisfaction of working parents. Overall, Ezra and Deckman found that mothers were less satisfied with their work/family balances. The authors contend that this is most likely caused by women bearing the brunt of childrearing responsibilities. The literature implies that convenience factors will be more important to women than men, since women are less satisfied with their work/family balance and possibly have more family obligations.

11

- H_6: Convenience and ease of work will be more strongly associated with job satisfaction for women than with men.

Data and Methods

We will test the differences between men and women using data from Phase II of the National Administrative Studies Project (NASP-II), which focused on state level primary health and human service agencies. Primary health and human service agencies were identified according to the definition used by American Public Human Services Association (APHSA) and include agencies housing programs related to Medicaid, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), and child welfare. In addition to collecting state and agency information from secondary data sources, original data was collected from a survey of senior managerial employees in these organizations including the top program administrator as well as managers of information system applications, evaluation and research, and public information and communication. The sampling frame was developed from the most widely used and authoritative directory of human service agency managers: the APHSA directory. Application of study criteria resulted in a sampling frame made of 570 managers, representing all fifty states and Washington, D.C. Given the small size of the sampling frame, a decision was made to administer the survey to the entire sampling frame (i.e. conduct a census).

The data collection phase of the study began in fall of 2002 and followed Dillman's (2000) comprehensive tailored design method (TDM) approach to maximizing the response rate. Based on information cumulated during this period, the size of the sampling frame was reduced from 570 to 518. Although the APHSA directory is the best

available source of information on the sampling frame, the information in the directory at publication time is a year old. As a result, managers having left the organization before survey administration efforts were deleted from the sampling frame. By the time survey administration concluded in winter of 2003, a total of 274 responses were received. Thus, the response rate for the study was approximately 53%.

A number of studies on public management have used data from NASP initiatives (e.g., Bozeman and Kingsley, 1998; Bozeman and Rainey, 1998; Pandey and Kingsley, 2000; Pandey and Scott, 2002). Of the 265 managers who reported their sex on the NASP-II survey, 53.5% (N=142) identified themselves as men, and 46.6% (N=123) identified themselves as women.

The nature of our sample provides both methodological benefits and concerns. While it is helpful from a data analysis standpoint to have a large sample of women in our survey, it is also important to point out that agencies responsible for health and human service policy provision tend to be more likely to attract women in the first place (Kelly & Newman, 2001; Guy & Newman, 2004). The cultures of these organizations are more likely to be driven by the needs and attitudes of women, given that women are more represented there and tend to self-select into that line of work.

Gendered nature of the policy areas addressed by these agencies also raises some concerns. In many cases women are the "targets" of the policies handled by these agencies. This creates a situation where the policy areas are politically salient to women. Thus, gender is inevitably present in the practices, processes, and images of the institution. The presence of gender in the institution influences the context in which supervisors set priorities and allocate resources. (Newman 1995; Kelly and Newman

2001; Saidel and Loscocco 2005). As a result, the results of this study are most likely to be directly applicable to areas of the public service that are populated largely by women and deal with gendered policy areas.

In order to test the relationship between sex and job satisfaction, we created a model that we will run for both men and women, the variables of which are explained in the section below.

Measurement

Our dependent variable, job satisfaction, was measured using a series of three widely used questions from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cook, Hepworth, Wall and Warr, 1981). Managers were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements using a five-point scale: "In general, I like working here," "In general, I don't like my job," and "All in all, I am satisfied with my job." A score of "5" indicates strong agreement, and a score of "1" indicates strong disagreement. We reverse-coded the second statement and created an index that added the scores from the three statements. The result is a dependent variable with a minimum value of 3 and a maximum value of 15. Cronbach's Alpha for this scale is 0.87, indicating a high degree of reliability in the measure. In our sample, the mean score was 13.16 with a standard deviation of 2.10. The mean score for men was 13.15, while the mean score for women was 13.16, a small difference that is not statistically-significant (Table 2). The narrow difference in job satisfaction contradicts previous research indicating that women tend to rate job satisfaction higher than men (Hakim, 1991).

INSERT TABLE TWO ABOUT HERE

The group-oriented organizational culture was measured through three questions that were adapted from Zammuto and Krakower (1991). Respondents were asked to note agreement on a scale of 1 through 5, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 5 indicating strong agreement, with the following statements: (1) "My agency is a very personal place. It is like an extended family. People seem to share a lot of themselves"; (2) "The glue that holds my agency together is loyalty and tradition. Commitment to this agency runs high"; (3) "My agency emphasizes human resources. High cohesion and morale in the agency are important." Values for these three questions were added to create an indexed variable for group-based culture, with values ranging from a low of 3 to a high of 15. In our sample, the mean for this variable was 9.80, with a standard deviation of 2.55. Cronbach's Alpha was 0.69, indicating an acceptable level of reliability in the measure.

The variable for bureaucratic organizational culture is also based on Zammuto and Krakower (1991) and was captured through three questions. Respondents were asked to note agreement on a scale of 1 through 5, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 5 indicating strong agreement, with the following statements: (1) "My agency is a very formalized and structured place. Bureaucratic procedures generally govern what people do"; (2) "The glue that holds my agency together is formal rules and policies. Maintaining a smooth running agency is important here"; (3) "My agency emphasizes performance and stability. Efficient, smooth operations are important." Values for these

three questions were added to create an indexed variable for bureaucratic culture, with values ranging from a low of 5 to a high of 15. In our sample, the mean for this variable was 10.22, with a standard deviation of 2.11. Cronbach's Alpha for this measure was lower than ideal – 0.42 – but given that these variables have been tested and used in a number of management analyses before, we choose to include them together as a scale instead of eliminating one or more them.

Hierarchy is measured by responses to the survey item, "Please assess the extent of hierarchical authority in your organization." Respondents were asked to enter a number between 0 and 10, with 0 signifying few layers of authority and 10 signifying many layers of authority (Bozeman, 2000). The mean for our sample was 6.02, with a standard deviation of 2.18.

The variable for commitment to the public interest/civic duty is based on Perry (1996). We created an indexed variable by adding together the responses to four questions. Respondents were asked to indicate agreement on a scale of 1 through 5, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 5 indicating strong agreement, with the following statements: (1) "I consider public service my civic duty"; (2) "I would prefer seeing public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harmed my interests"; (3) "I unselfishly contribute to my community"; (4) "Meaningful public service is very important to me." The indexed variable had values ranging from a low of 5 to a high of 20. The mean for our sample was 15.40, with a standard deviation of 2.55. Cronbach's Alpha for this measure was 0.67, indicating acceptable reliability for the measure.

We created an index for convenience and ease of work that incorporated two questions (Sims et al., 1976). These questions followed the same Likert-type format of

those described above. While the convenience hypothesis might be most effectively answered with information on children and family, it is reasonable to conclude that those with children who feel they do not have the necessary accommodations to get their work done would answer negatively to these questions. The two questions were (1) "I can successfully perform any task assigned to me in my current job," and (2) "I can complete the work that is expected of me." The index that added these two variables resulted in a minimum value of 4 and a maximum value of 10. The mean for our sample was 8.40, with a standard deviation of 1.50. Cronbach's Alpha was 0.61.

We measured extrinsic reward by creating an index using four survey questions. Respondents were asked to rate the following aspects of their jobs with a value between 1 and 5, with 1 indicating the item is not important and 5 indicating that it is important: job security, high income, good opportunities for advancement, and opportunities to learn new skills through training. The index that added these four variables had a minimum value of 4 and a maximum value of 20. The mean for our sample was 14.80, with a standard deviation of 2.83. Cronbach's Alpha was 0.58.

Intrinsic reward is operationalized through three survey questions (Saleh & Hosek, 1976). Respondents were asked to respond to these statements with a value between 1 and 7, with 1 noting strong disagreement and 7 noting strong agreement. The questions were (1) "The most important things that I do are involved with my job," (2) "I enjoy my work more than anything else I do," and (3) "The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job." We added these three indicators to create an indexed variable for intrinsic reward, with a minimum value of 3 and a maximum value of 21. The mean for our sample was 11.85, with a standard deviation of 3.98. Cronbach's Alpha was 0.76.

We included a series of control variables in our analysis in order to ensure that potentially-relevant demographic and organizational variables did not confound our results. The literature is sufficiently scant on the relationship between gender, job satisfaction, and these variables to prevent adequate formulation of hypotheses. We included span of control – the total number of employees reporting directly to the respondent. The mean value for this variable was astonishing – 42.27, with a standard deviation of 154.87, but this because respondents are reporting number of subordinates rather than only direct reports. We also included total agency budget, and a series of individual-level variables, such as job tenure, age, race, and education. Descriptive statistics for control variables are shown in Table 2.

In order to test differences between men and women with regard to the determinants of job satisfaction, the most expedient approach would be to create a single equation. The equation would include all of the relevant explanatory variables, along with a dichotomous variable for sex and a series of interactive terms that combined sex with each of the other explanatory variables. However, a common problem with using interactive variables is that they often introduce multicollinearity. Indeed, when we attempted to structure our model in this way, diagnostics indicated severe collinearity in the interactive variables, which inflated the standard errors and suppressed statistical significance. Even after "centering" the interactive terms, multicollinearity remained in all seven of those variables and none of them reached statistical significance. Given that our dataset is not enormous – 274 cases – and these variables are Likert-scale survey items that necessarily include some amount of "noise" or error, it would be very unlikely for any variable to reach statistical significance in the face of such high collinearity.

As a result, we chose to split our sample into two subsamples – one for men, and one for women – and regress job satisfaction on our explanatory variables separately for each group. This permits us to see how the different factors determine job satisfaction for each group independently, although it remains impossible for us to test the statistical significance of differences between the sexes. As such, this research is a first attempt at discovering sex-based differences – while we cannot claim with certainty that men and women differ in the ways that we will discuss below, we can provide some first steps toward understanding differences, with the hope that these steps will be expanded upon in future research.

Findings

Using OLS regression with our job satisfaction index as the dependent variable, we tested the relationship between the independent variables described above and job satisfaction, running models separately for men and women. The models performed similarly for each of the sexes. The adjusted-R^2 for men was 0.272, while the adjusted-R^2 for women was 0.264. The F-statistic for men was 4.78, significant at the 0.001 level, and the F-statistic for women was 4.15, significant at the 0.001 level. This indicates that the model performs well, particularly given that the dependent variable is an index of only three survey items. The results are presented in Table 3.

INSERT TABLE THREE ABOUT HERE

19

The relationship between group-based organizational culture and job satisfaction is similar for both men and women. The coefficient for men is 0.234, which is statistically-significant at the 0.01 level, and the coefficient for women is 0.350, which is statistically-significant at the 0.001 level. The coefficient is higher for women than for men, meaning that job satisfaction does increase at a greater rate in the presence of a group-based organizational culture for women than for men. The significance level is also higher – 0.001 versus 0.01. These results provide some support for the hypothesis that women will be more satisfied with a group-based organizational culture than men. However, it is notable that the relationship for men is almost as strong as that for women, and it is significant at the 0.01 level. The difference between the sexes here is in degree, not in overall direction, and the salience of groups for women cannot be stated in terms much more strongly than the salience of groups for men. This suggests that increased attention in both research and practice to empowerment and participative management may have "caught men up," such that differences previously found between the sexes are beginning to disappear.

Our variable for bureaucratic culture did not contribute to job satisfaction in a meaningful way for men or women. It was not significant for either subsample, which is not surprising in light of the fact that men are more likely to be satisfied with a group-based organizational culture than was hypothesized. However, it is somewhat surprising that a statistically-significant, *negative* relationship was not found for men or women. A bureaucratic culture is antithetical to a group-based culture. As discussed in the literature review above, a culture that flattens hierarchies and empowers individuals to work together at low levels is very different from a culture that focuses on hierarchy, chain of

command, and efficiency. It would seem that satisfaction derived from one would make it likely that dissatisfaction would be derived from the other. This brings us to the third culture-based variable that we included in the model: hierarchy. Interestingly, hierarchy was not statistically-significant for men or for women. This refutes our third hypothesis linking hierarchy to job satisfaction by gender – it simply doesn't matter for men or for women. Like the results for the bureaucratic culture variable, this is somewhat surprising, since group-based culture is statistically-significant for both men and women. More research is needed into the role of hierarchy and bureaucratic culture in order to clear up the concepts.

Our hypothesis involving commitment to the public interest/civic duty is partially supported by the results. We found a positive and statistically significant relationship between commitment to the public interest/civic duty for men but unexpectedly found a statistically significant and *negative* relationship for women. The coefficient for men is 0.116, which is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The coefficient for women is -0.083, but is not statistically significant. Our hypothesis is supported to the extent that the relationship between commitment to the public interest/civic duty and job satisfaction is stronger for men than for women. However, further research is needed to explain why this dimension of public service motivation might have a negative relationship to women's job satisfaction. Public service motivation is a developing theory, and the findings of this study may indicate that it may be more nuanced than expected with respect to gender.

The third set of hypotheses related to the presence of intrinsic and extrinsic reward structures. We hypothesized that high levels of extrinsic reward will result in

higher job satisfaction with men than with women. While the coefficient for men was positive and the coefficient for women negative, the results were not statistically-significant and do not provide support for a hypothesis relating to extrinsic reward. Before interpreting this result, it is important to consider the findings associated with our intrinsic reward variable. The coefficient for women was 0.072 but statistically insignificant, while the coefficient for men was 0.117 and statistically-significant at the 0.01 level. For women, we find that there is no association between the presence of extrinsic *or* intrinsic rewards and job satisfaction, but for men, we find that there is a relationship between intrinsic reward and job satisfaction. These findings do not support our hypotheses. Perhaps, men's identity and subjective well being is more closely tied to workplace relations because work, rather than family or community, is more likely a central life interest for men (Dubin 1992; Pandey and Kingsley 2000). It could also be that the nature of public service calls to duty those with a higher level of public service motivation, a concept that is more tightly linked to intrinsic motivation than extrinsic motivation. Gender differences, then, might disappear, since both men and women who enter the public service have a higher level of intrinsic motivation than those who enter private-sector employment.

Our variable related to convenience and ease of work found statistically-significant results for both men and women. For men, the coefficient was 0.302 and statistically significant at the 0.01 level, whereas for women, the coefficient was 0.381 and statistically significant at the 0.001 level. This provides partial support in favor of our hypothesis, and partial support against our hypothesis. For women, convenience and ease of work relates more strongly to job satisfaction than for men. The coefficient is larger in

the model for women, and the result is statistically-significant at a higher level. However, the substantive difference between the sexes is not very large, and one could argue that the difference between them is in degree, not in direction or orientation. That is, women respond slightly more strongly to convenience and ease of work than do men, but for all practical purposes, this result tells us that both men and women respond to the concept about the same. The remainder of the tested variables were included strictly as controls, with no expectation as to degree or direction of influence. None of these variables was statistically-significant.

Conclusion

This paper provides some interesting insights into the differences and similarities between men and women and job satisfaction. As we stated at the outset, we are not testing the claim that men and women experience different levels of job satisfaction. Indeed, our findings show that the level of jobs satisfaction for men and women are almost identical. The basic claim we sought to evaluate was whether and how the antecedents of job satisfaction for men and women differ. Thus for our research question "What do women want?" the answer seems to be "the same as what men want." One important result is that men and women vary little on two key constructs – group-oriented culture and convenience and ease of work. This refutes existing research showing that differences exist between men and women in these areas. Another interesting result is that commitment to the public interest/civic duty had a negative relationship to job satisfaction for women. This finding could indicate that any efforts to encourage or tap into employees' public service motivation for organizational gains might need to take

into account a more nuanced understanding of public service motivation with respect to gender. As for motivation, neither men nor women seemed to be more or less satisfied in the presence of extrinsic reward, but men, not women, seemed to respond strongly to intrinsic reward. Surprisingly, bureaucratic culture and the existence of hierarchical layers did not contribute to job satisfaction for men or for women.

Future research should attempt to disentangle the relationship between key organizational variables and job satisfaction for men and women. This study shows that more commonalities than differences exist between men and women, but it could be that shared values leading these individuals to the public service have erased differences. Data from other public-sector settings might be utilized in order to build evidence for this explanation. Indeed, data limitations prevent this study from pursuing some questions as thoroughly as we might like. For example, the size of our dataset limits the statistical power of the tests. Larger datasets can help overcome this limitation. In the meantime, this study takes a first cut at some of the differences between men and women and what determines job satisfaction, and it is our hope that future research will build on what we have uncovered here.

Table 1: Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1	A group-oriented organizational culture will lead to higher job satisfaction among women, whereas a bureaucratic organizational culture will lead to higher job satisfaction among men.
Hypothesis 2	Organizations with more hierarchy will result in higher job satisfaction for men than for women.
Hypothesis 3	High levels of commitment to the public interest/civic duty will be more strongly associated with job satisfaction for men than for women.
Hypothesis 4	High levels of extrinsic reward will be more strongly associated with job satisfaction for men than for women.
Hypothesis 5	High levels of intrinsic reward will be more strongly associated with job satisfaction for women than for men.
Hypothesis 6	Convenience will be more strongly associated with job satisfaction for women than with men.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics and Variable Operationalization

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Frequency
Job satisfaction	13.16	2.10	
Group culture	9.80	2.55	
Bureaucratic culture	10.22	2.11	
Levels of Hierarchy	6.02	2.18	
Public Interest/Civic Duty	15.40	2.55	
Convenience/ease of work	8.40	1.50	
Intrinsic reward	11.85	3.98	
Extrinsic reward	14.80	2.83	
Span of control	42.27	154.87	
Total budget (in millions)	3436.88	4146.21	
Job tenure	5.23	4.52	
Age	49.89	7.62	
Education			8.8% Some college 39.8% Bachelor's 16.4% MPA 32.8% Other graduate degree
Race			4.4% Hispanic 6.0% Black 85.8% White 2.2% Asian 1.5% Other

Table 3: Regression Results for Job Satisfaction Model

	Men	*Women*
Group culture	0.234**	0.350***
	(0.075)	(0.077)
Bureaucratic culture	-0.061	-0.052
	(0.074)	(0.089)
Levels of hierarchy	-0.017	-0.030
	(0.089)	(0.086)
Commitment to the Public Interest/Civic Duty	0.116*	-0.083
	(0.051)	(0.077)
Convenience/ease of work	0.302**	0.381***
	(0.118)	(0.115)
Intrinsic reward	0.117**	0.072
	(0.040)	(0.050)
Extrinsic reward	0.081	-0.039
	(0.060)	(0.071)
Span of control	-0.001	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.006)
Total budget	0.000	0.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)
Job tenure	0.010	-0.041
	(0.031)	(0.050)
Age	0.031	0.031
	(0.025)	(0.026)
Race	-0.093	-0.234
	(0.261)	(0.387)
Education	-0.206	0.070
	(0.153)	(0.184)
Adjusted R^2	0.272	0.264
F-statistic	4.78	4.15
N	132	114

Levels of statistical significance:
+ at $p < .10$
* at $p < .05$
** at $p < .01$
*** at $p < .001$

Bibliography

Allport, G. (1945). The psychology of participation. *Psychological Review* 52(1), 117-132.

Bayes, J. (1991). Women in public administration in the United States. *Women and Politics, 11*(4), 85-109.

Bozeman, B. 2000. Bureaucracy and Red Tape. Upper Saddle Hill, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bozeman, B., & Kingsley, G. (1998). Risk culture in public and private organizations. *Public Administration Review, 58*, 109-118

Bozeman, B., & Rainey, H. G. (1998). Organizational rules and bureaucratic personality. *American Journal of Political Science, 42*, 163-189.

Brooke, P. P., & Price, J. L. (1989). The determinants of employee absenteeism: An empirical test of a causal model. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 62*(1), 1-19.

Browne, C. V. (1995). Empowerment in social work with older women. *Social Work* 40(2), 358-364.

Carsten, J. M., & Spector, P. E. (1987). Unemployment, job satisfaction, and employment turnover: A meta-analytic test of the Muchinsky model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(2), 374-381.

Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B. (1981) *The Experience of Work: A Compendium of 249 Measures and Their Use*. London: Academic Press. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Daley, D. M. & Naff, K. C. (1998). Gender differences and managerial competencies: federal supervisor perceptions of the job of management. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 18*(2), 41-56.

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *The tailored design method*. New York: J. Wiley.

Dolan, J. (2000). The senior executive service: gender, attitudes, and representative bureaucracy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 10*(3), 513-530.

Dubin, R. 1992. Central Life Interests: Creative Individualism in a Complex World. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Duerst-Lahti, G. & Johnson, C. M. (1990). Gender style in bureaucracy. *Women and Politics, 10*(4), 67-120.

Eagly, A.H. & Johnson, B.T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 108(2), 233-256.

28

Emery, F.E. & Trist, E.L. (1962). Socio-technical systems. In C.W. Churchman & M. Verhulst (Eds.), *Management sciences: Models and techniques* (pp. 83-97). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.

Ezra, M. & Deckman, M. (1996). Balancing work and family responsibilities: Flextime and childcare in the federal government. *Public Administration Review, 56*(2), 174-179.

Fairhurst, G. & Snavely, B. (1983). A test of the social isolation of male tokens. *Academy of Management Journal* 26(2), 353-361.

Farrell, D., & Stamm, C. L. (1988). Meta-analysis of the correlates of employee absence. *Human Relations, 41*(3), 211-227.

Fleishman, E.A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. *Personnel Psychology* 37(1), 1-6.

Furnham, A. (1984). Many sides of the coin: The psychology of money usage. *Personality and Individual Differences, 5*, 95-103.

Gossett, C. W. (2002). Civil service reform: The case of Georgia. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 22*(2), 94-113.

Guy, M. E. (1993). Three steps forward, two steps backward: The status of women's integration into public management. *Public Administration Review, 53*(4), 285-292.

Guy, Mary Ellen, and Meredith A. Newman. (2004). Women's Jobs, Men's Jobs: Sex Segregation and Emotional Labor. *Public Administration Review* 64 (3):289-298.

Hakim, C. (1991). Grateful slaves and self-made women: Fact and fantasy in women's work orientations. *European Sociological Review, 7*(2), 101-121.

Halpin, A.W. & Winer, B.J. (1957). A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. In R.M. Stogdill & A.E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement* (pp. 39-51). Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.

Hegelson, S. (1990). *The female advantage.* New York: Doubleday.

Hemphill, J.K. & Coons, A.E. (1957). Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire. In R.M. Stogdill & A.E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement* (pp. 6-38). Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.

Heneman, R. L. (1992). *Merit pay: Linking pay increases to performance ratings.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Herrenkohl, R.C., Judson, G.T., & Heffner, J.A. (1999). Defining and measuring employee empowerment. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 35(3), 373-389.

Ingraham, P. W. (1993). Of pigs in pokes and policy diffusion: Another look at pay-for-performance. *Public Administration Review, 53*, 348-356.

Itzhaky, H. & York, A. (2000). Empowerment and community participation: Does gender make a difference? *Social Work Research* 24(4), 225-234.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1952). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley.

Katz, D., Maccoby, N., & Morse, N. (1950). *Productivity, supervision, and morale in an office situation.* Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Kelly, Rita Mae, and Meredith A. Newman. (2001). The Gendered Bureaucracy: Agency Mission, Equality of Opportunity, and Representative Bureaucracies. *Women & Politics* 22(3): 1-33.

Keiser, L. R. & Wilkins, V. M., Meier, K. J., & Holland, C. A. (2002). Lipstick and logarithms: Gender, institutional context, and representative bureaucracy. *American Political Science Review, 96*(3), 553-564.

Kerr, B., Miller, W. and Reid, M. 2002. Sex-based occupational segregation in U.S. State Bureaucracies, 1987-97. Public Administration Review. 62(4): 412-423.

Kellough, J. E. & Lu, H. (1993). The paradox of merit pay in the public sector. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 13*, 45-64. Allport, G. (1945). The psychology of participation. *Psychological Review* 52(1), 117-132.

Konrad, A., Winter, S., & Gutek, B. (1992). Diversity in work group sex composition. In P. Tolbert & S. Bacharach (Eds.), *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* (pp. 115-140). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Lawler, E. E., III. *Pay and organizational effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology* 10(2), 271-301.

Lewis, G. B. (1994). Women, occupations, and federal agencies: Occupational mix and interagency differences in sexual inequality in federal white-collar employment. *Public Administration Review, 54*(3), 271-276.

Locke, E. A. (1983). The nature and cause of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. New York: Wiley.

Mani, B. G. (1997). Gender and the federal senior executive service: Where is the glass ceiling? *Public Personnel Management, 26*(4), 545-559.

Moir, A., & Jessel, D. (1989). *Brain sex: The real difference between men and women.* New York: Dell Publishing.

Naff, K. C. (1994). Through the glass ceiling: Prospects for the advancement of women in the federal civil service. Public *Administration Review, 54*(6), 507-514.

Naff, K. C. & Crum, J. (1999). Working for America: Does public service motivation make a difference? *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 19(5)*, 5-16.

Neil, C. C., & Snizek, W. E. (1987). Work values, job characteristics, and gender. *Sociological Perspectives*, *30*, 245-265.

Pandey, S. K. & Kingsley, G. A. (2000). Examining red tape in public and private organizations: Alternative explanations from a social psychological model. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 10*, 779-800.

Pandey, S. K. & Scott, P. G. (2002). Red tape: A review and assessment of concepts and measures. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 12*, 553-580.

Perry, J. L. & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review, 50(3),* 367-73.

Perry, J. L. (1996). Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,6(1),* 5-22.

Perry, J. L. (1997). Antecedents of public service motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 7(2),* 181-197.

Pitts, D. W. (2005). Leadership, empowerment, and public organizations. *Review of Public Personnel Administration,5,* 5-28.

Rainey, H. G. (2003). *Understanding and managing public organizations (3rd ed.).* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Riger, S. (1993). What's wrong with empowerment? *American Journal of Community Psychology* 21(3), 279-292.

Rosen, B. & Jerdee, T. H. (1995). *The persistence of age and sex stereotypes in the 1990s.* Public Policy Institute Issue Brief. Washington, DC: American Association of Retired Persons.

Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review, 68*(6), 119-126.

Saleh, S.D. and Hosek, James. 1976. Job Involvement: Concepts and Measures. *Academy of Management Journal* 19:213-224.

Saltzstein, A. L., Tang, Y., & Saltzstein, G. H. (2001). Work-family balance and job satisfaction: The impact of family-friendly policies on attitudes of federal government employees. *Public Administration Review, 61*(4), 452-468.

Schreiber, C. (1979). *Changing places: Men and women in transitional occupations.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Selden, S. C. (1997). *The promise of representative bureaucracy: Diversity and responsiveness in a government agency.* Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Shafritz, J. M., Rosenbloom, D. H., Riccucci, N. M., Naff, K. C., & Hyde, A. C. (2001). *Personnel management in government: Politics and Process.* New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.

Sims, H.P., Szilagyi, A.D. and McKemey, D.R. 1976. Antecedents of Work-related Expectancies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 19: 547-559.

Tang, T. L. & Talpade, M. (1999). Sex differences in satisfaction with pay and co-workers: Faculty and staff at a public institution of higher education. *Public Personnel Management, 28*(3), 345-349.

Tannenbaum, R. & Schmidt, W.H. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review* 36(2), 95-101.

Trist, E.L. & Bamforth, K.W. (1951). Some social and psychological consequences of the longwall method of coal-getting. *Human Relations* 4(1), 3-38.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management. (2006). http://www.opm.gov/speeches/2003/KCJ-Apr10a.asp. Webpage accessed February 2.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work Motivation*. New York: Wiley.

Wise, L.R. & Tschirhart, M. (2000). Examining empirical evidence on diversity effects: How useful is diversity research for public sector managers? *Public Administration Review* 60(5), 333-352.

Wright, B. E. & Kim, S. (2004). Participation's influence on job satisfaction. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 24*(1), 18-40.

Yoder, J.D. & Kahn, A.S. (1992). Toward a feminist understanding of women and power. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 16(2), 381-388.

Zammuto, Raymond F., and Jack Y. Krakower. 1991. Quantitative and Qualitative Studies of Organizational Culture. *Research in Organizational Change and Development* 5: 83-114.