

# Job Satisfaction Across Different Levels in Human Services Career: Staff, Supervisors, and Managers Levels

Jirayut Monjagapate<sup>1\*</sup> and Settanan Wanvoraset<sup>2</sup>

Received: August 30, 2024

Revised: September 18, 2024

Accepted: October 7, 2024

## Abstract

This study examines work satisfaction among professionals in the human services field, focusing on 8 staff members, 10 supervisors, and 4 managers (22 participants). The findings reveal significant differences in satisfaction levels across these roles. Staff members reported low satisfaction with an average score of 2.5, while supervisors were more content with a score of 3.2, especially in understanding their duties and job descriptions. Managers, despite having an overall satisfaction score of 2.86 (all levels of human service), expressed concerns about peer relationships, which received a low score of 1.0, resulting in a lower satisfaction score of 2.75. The OLS regression analysis showed that work satisfaction is strongly influenced by opportunities for both career advancement, and responsibility for performance. This research enhances understanding of work satisfaction within the human services sector by identifying varying levels of satisfaction across staff, supervisors, and managers. It also emphasizes key factors influencing satisfaction and provides practical recommendations for improving employee well-being and engagement.

**Keywords:** Job Satisfaction, Ordinary Least Square, Regression Analysis

## Introduction

### *Human Services*

The area of human services is characterized by its vast scope and multidisciplinary approach, with the primary goal of addressing and fulfilling human needs. It aims to both prevent and resolve issues while working towards improving the overall well-being of the individuals it serves. Human services professionals aim to enhance service delivery systems by improving the quality of direct services and increasing accessibility, accountability, and coordination among various professionals and agencies involved in providing these services (National Organization for Human Services, n.d.).

According to Wake Forest University (n.d.), the professional area of human services includes a diverse variety of practical disciplines. Academically, the study of human services includes acquiring the skills to effectively oversee and coordinate multidisciplinary initiatives associated with this discipline. Human services degree programs focus on teaching students how to provide exceptional care and assistance in specific fields. A Master of Arts in Human Services trains students to champion the rights of others and provides them with the necessary skills for managerial positions within human services businesses.

Human services specialists are employed in a range of contexts, including group homes, halfway houses, prisons, centers for intellectual impairments, community mental health clinics, and organizations that address problems such as alcoholism, drug addiction, family violence, and aging.

---

<sup>1</sup>Master's degree student, Business Analytics and Digital Transformation, School of Management, Asian Institute of Technology.

<sup>2</sup>Master's degree student, Asian and China Studies, National Chung Hsing University. E-mail: settanan1999@gmail.com

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: jirayut.monjagapate@gmail.com

Their primary goal is to help people and communities' function optimally across all domains of life. Their goal is to improve the quality of direct services and promote accessibility, accountability, and coordination among various professions and organizations in order to enhance service delivery. Essential characteristics in this domain include a profound inclination to assist others, endurance, comprehension, attentiveness, adeptness in communication, accountability, and proficient time management (National Organization for Human Services, n.d.).

#### *Employees' satisfaction with their work*

Job satisfaction is a complex emotional state influenced by attitudes in three primary areas: (i) specific aspects of the job; (ii) individual traits; and (iii) ties with external groups (Mishra, 2013). These aspects are interrelated and should be considered together for a comprehensive analysis. According to the prevailing perspective, job satisfaction refers to the extent to which workers evaluate their work in a positive or negative manner. When the work requirements coincide with the wants and expectations of employees, it is accomplished.

To have a comprehensive understanding of work satisfaction, it is important to take into account a wider array of criteria. Factors such as the employee's age, health, temperament, desires, and aspirations are vital. Younger workers, for example, may emphasize professional progression prospects, while senior employees may place more importance on employment security and stability. Likewise, an employee's health may have a significant impact on their ability to perform tasks and their overall level of work satisfaction. Moreover, individual characteristics such as disposition and ambitions have a substantial impact. An individual's temperament, which refers to their innate personality qualities, may impact their reactions to certain job scenarios. Aspirations, which refer to an employee's aims and desires, also impact their levels of contentment. When workers perceive that their employment contributes to achieving their long-term goals, they are more likely to experience higher levels of satisfaction. In addition, family relationships and socioeconomic status can play significant roles. The familial circumstances of an employee might have an influence on their stress levels and the equilibrium between their personal and professional lives, thereby impacting their degree of job satisfaction. An employee's social status, which encompasses the level of respect and recognition they get from their community, may also impact their work satisfaction. Engaging in leisure activities and participating in diverse outside endeavors can contribute to job satisfaction. Employees who engage in gratifying hobbies and leisure pursuits are more likely to experience reduced stress levels and increased overall enjoyment. Engaging in organizational, political, or social activities may foster a feeling of inclusion and meaning, hence boosting work contentment.

#### *The importance of job satisfaction*

The level of work happiness significantly impacts employees' job performance. Employee dissatisfaction leads to a decline in their engagement with their job. Over time, their productivity diminishes, and they may exhibit a lack of diligence in their activities. Nevertheless, when workers are content with their positions, they exert their utmost endeavor for the organization. Employees who get satisfaction from their work cultivate strong interpersonal connections, exhibit diligent effort, and are

more inclined to maintain long-term employment with the organization (Swofford, 2023). Content workers often seek opportunities to contribute to their team beyond their assigned responsibilities to do supplementary jobs, consistently arrive punctually, and are more inclined to remain with the firm, hence decreasing absenteeism and turnover. Increasing employee satisfaction leads to better professional relationships. Workplace issues are less prevalent, and employees have harmonious relationships, believe they are treated fairly, and see their colleagues as collaborators.

Assessing job satisfaction and identifying its determinants is particularly critical in businesses that rely primarily on human labor. In such industries, keeping a consistent workforce is vital, and employee satisfaction directly impacts consumer satisfaction with the services rendered (DeFrance and Schmidgall, 2001). Nevertheless, there is a dearth of research specifically addressing the expectations and work satisfaction of employees in the tourist sector. Researchers have examined the correlation between overeducation and underemployment with work happiness (Kokko & Guerrier, 1994), as well as the connection between job satisfaction and the inclination to switch occupations (Qu & Tse, 1996). The subsequent research demonstrated that workers who experience lower job satisfaction are more inclined to resign.

#### *Hierarchical organizational structures*

Job satisfaction and staff motivation are greatly influenced by hierarchical organizational systems. According to Breslin (2020), hierarchical structure has consistently been a prominent feature throughout history. In professional environments, hierarchical systems dictate the actions of subordinates via issuing authoritative instructions, which may have both favorable and unfavorable consequences. The presence of hierarchical management and social structures may have an impact on task clarity, work security, and employee evaluation. Nevertheless, substantial obligations associated with these systems might impede human potential, necessitating a lifelong commitment and exertion for mere existence instead of actualizing an individual's talents.

In places such as sub-Saharan Africa, workers have difficulties arising from hierarchical systems in which decision-making power is concentrated in the hands of a small group of individuals. The process of centralization may have a negative influence on employee motivation, which in turn affects their performance, growth, and overall effectiveness (Manzoor, 2012). The relationship between commitment and position within the hierarchy is significant since positions have a pivotal impact on self-categorization, shaping the values, expectations, and interests of workers (Horton et al., 2014).

Studies conducted by Hanafi et al. (2019) and Barzani & Sindi (2020) have shown a clear relationship between organizational structure and employee motivation. These studies indicate that a well-designed organizational structure is crucial for promoting motivation and enhancing performance. In a competitive workplace, building a strong organizational structure and successfully motivating the workforce are critical to achieving business objectives and optimizing employee performance.

#### *Research objectives*

This research investigates the level of job happiness among professionals working in the human services field. It identifies notable variations in job satisfaction depending on different job positions and

emphasizes the influence of hierarchical organizational structures on employee motivation and satisfaction.

#### *Research Contribution and Importance of Research*

The research contributes to the understanding of work satisfaction within the human services field by identifying distinct satisfaction levels across various hierarchical positions—staff members, supervisors, and managers. Importantly, it reveals that work satisfaction is significantly influenced by several conditions. This research also offers practical recommendations for improving employee satisfaction. In addition, the importance of this research lies in its detailed examination of work satisfaction across different hierarchical levels within the human services field. By revealing specific factors that influence employee satisfaction. The findings offer practical solutions that can be implemented by human services organizations to enhance employee engagement, improve work conditions, and ultimately drive organizational success.

### **Literature Reviews**

#### *Job Satisfaction*

Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988) explain that empowerment connects personal strengths and skills, support from others, and proactive actions to social policy and change. It means individuals gain control over their lives and participate in their community. Zimmerman (1990) says empowerment happens at three levels: personal (psychological and behavioral), organizational (resource use and participation), and community (social structure and change). Empowerment at one level can affect and be affected by other levels. Interestingly, ideas about organizational empowerment are mainly found in management and business literature. Researchers like Bass (1990) and Conger (1989) have shown that empowering practices in these fields lead to higher employee satisfaction, better management, increased morale and motivation, improved organizational functioning, productivity, and consumer satisfaction. However, in psychology and social work writings, empowerment is not frequently used to describe how employees and organizations operate, particularly in human service agencies (Reisch & Wenocur, 1986).

Strong (1958), and Graen (1969) noted that satisfaction strictly applies to outcomes already experienced by an individual. Graen (1969) preferred the term "attraction," defining it as the expected satisfaction from an outcome. In other words, satisfaction relates to past experiences, whereas attraction or valence relates to future expectations. Both terms refer to feelings about a job, but satisfaction concerns past experiences, and attraction concerns future ones.

Job satisfaction measures have been used to predict absenteeism and turnover. However, satisfaction hasn't always been strongly linked to these variables. The distinction between job satisfaction and job attraction is crucial for predicting absenteeism and turnover. It seems logical that job attraction would better predict these variables than job satisfaction. In short, job attraction might have a stronger negative correlation (Wanous & Lawler, 1972).

According to Mishra (2013), the level of satisfaction can vary based on several factors. Mishra's research (2013) identified three main factors: (1) personal factors consist of gender, age, education background, and time on the job, (2) job factors consist of type of occupation, worker's skills, job status, and the job's responsibility, and (3) management factors consist of salary, working condition, job security, and growth in career path.

Employees working from home reported higher satisfaction with their working conditions, flexible scheduling, and the ability to manage family and personal responsibilities. This matches the profile of many at-home workers, who often have children and need to balance work and family. However, these telecommuters were less satisfied with the amount of work available to them, likely because they were part-time contract workers wanting more hours and income (Dubrin, 1991). The differences in job satisfaction between telecommuters and office workers can be explained by the "personal welfare" view of job satisfaction, which suggests that satisfaction comes from work that meets personal welfare needs (Miner, 1988).

#### *Hierarchy of organizational structures*

Breslin (2020) has provided a definition of hierarchical organization in his work. He states that throughout history to the present day, hierarchical organization has remained a distinguishing characteristic. Social groups and professional environments use an organizational framework. In a professional setting, a hierarchical upper-levels direct subordinates in accordance with model commands. His investigation presented the instances. Hierarchical management and social structure influence both positive and negative results. The adverse impact of a hierarchical structure on task clarity and job security is significant. Universal employee assessment. Conversely, the significant responsibilities that come with being employed in the others' presence may greatly hinder human potential. It requires a lifetime of dedication and effort.

It is intended for survival rather than the realization of an individual's furthest capabilities, as referenced by Breslin (2020). For example, in the sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) region, workers of African descent also face the Individuals within their organization face challenges stemming from the hierarchical structure, since all decision-making authority rests with a select few. Those in executive positions and those in entry-level positions both possess Users use the command interface to accomplish their jobs, resulting in a reduction and limitation. Employee motivation is crucial for enhancing performance, fostering development, and increasing effectiveness. The organization has a detrimental impact (Manzoor, 2012). Additional assistance provided by There is a connection between commitment and the position in the hierarchy. The statement indicated the presence of distinct hierarchical structures. Positions have a crucial role in establishing a fundamental foundation for self-categorization, which varies across individuals. Workers' values, expectations, and interests are linked (Horton et al., 2014). Additionally, Cole and Bruch (2006) pointed out that the correlation between commitment and the 8 The presence of hierarchical levels at each step of an organizational hierarchy might result in distinct outcomes. Horton et al. (2014) highlighted the level of dedication towards the goal of leaving a job.

The relationship between organizational structure and employee motivation (Hanafi et al. (2019); Barzani & Sindi, (2020)) conducted research on this subject and established the correlation between organizational structure and its impact on employee motivation. Previous research findings revealed that the organizational structure has a vital role in fostering motivation. It is a significant determinant. To improve employee performance and lay a solid foundation for organizations to thrive, surmount intense competition. At present, corporations face numerous obstacles and challenges. There is intense pressure to excel in this highly competitive workplace. Constructing a robust to effectively perform duties and assume responsibilities, the interaction between workers is critical. The establishment of a corporation is contingent upon the organization's structures and is of utmost importance. Approaches. Companies can effectively accomplish their goals by motivating their workforce.

### Methodology

The study's participants consisted of personnel from the human services department. The survey was done and gathered by Pierce County, Washington, United States. The data was collected and is accessible in 2023, which is secondary data. In the data set, there are 15 careers in the survey which consist of Assessor-Treasurer's Office, Assigned Council, Clerk of Superior Court, Council's Office, District Court, Economic Development, Exec Office & Directors, Facilities Management, Finance and Performance Management, Human Services, Juvenile Court, Parks and Recreation. Planning and Public Works, Prosecuting Attorney's Office, and Sheriff's Department. The research emphasizes on the participants who work for human service. In each career type, it is categorized into three primary work levels: staff, supervisor, and manager. After the data investigation and cleaning, the survey data only included replies from those who successfully filled out the form. The human services sector consisted of a total of 22 individuals, including 8 staff workers, 10 supervisors, and 4 managers. Nevertheless, the survey and data analysis largely adhere to Durbin's methodology (1991).

**Table 1: Samples of Employees in Human Service**

Demographic Characteristics	Participants (n=22)	Participants (n=100%)
Staff	8	36%
Supervisor	10	45%
Manager	4	18%

The primary measure of job satisfaction used in the survey was designed by Pierce County, Washington, United States. The survey contains 10 items related to various job aspects, and respondents rate their satisfaction on a 4-point (0 to 4) the scale can be explained that 0: Not Applicable, 1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Agree, and 4: Strongly Agree.

The questionnaires are:

1. I understand what my job responsibilities are.
2. I get to use my strengths at work every day.
3. I have been acknowledged or praised for my good work in the past week.
4. My supervisor or someone at work shows that they care about me personally.
5. The mission or purpose of our organization makes me feel that my role is important.
6. I have a close friend at my workplace.
7. Over the past year, I have had chances to learn and grow in my job.
8. My supervisor ensures that employees are held accountable for their performance.
9. My department supports inclusivity and diversity.
10. I am generally satisfied with my job.

To highlight, the question 10 asks the overall satisfaction of participant’s job. Questionnaire data were analyzed to find how human service workers have perspective on their position. Also, to find which question is statistically significant to influence the satisfaction, the equation is stated below.

$$\ln(\text{Satisfaction}_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln(Q_{1,i}) + \dots + \beta_9 \ln(Q_{9,i}) + \epsilon_i \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

The model 1 shows the OLS regression as we let satisfaction score become dependent variable and all independent variables are question 1 to 9 to find which factors are influencing satisfaction score.  $\beta$  is the coefficient to be estimated.  $Q$  represents the question from 1 to 9 because the question 1 is set to be a dependent variable.  $i$  represents each participant. Last,  $\epsilon$  represents the error term.

In this study, data were collected from samples of 22 participants who responded to a set of 10 questions designed to measure satisfaction on human service career. The internal consistency of these questions was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, which yielded a coefficient of 0.8057. This value indicates robust reliability among the questionnaire items, suggesting they effectively measure the targeted construct across the sample. The high Cronbach's alpha underscores the consistency in participant responses, attributing variation more to differences in the construct being measured rather than measurement errors. According to Bobbitt (2021), as Cronbach’s Alpha is calculated to be 0.8057, it can be understood that the internal consistency of this survey is “good”.

## Results

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Mean	3.59	3.27	2.77	3.32	3.23	2.00	3.27	3.14	3.27	2.86
Standard Error	0.13	0.15	0.20	0.17	0.15	0.28	0.16	0.17	0.15	0.18
Median	4	3	3	3.5	3	2	3	3	3	3
Mode	4	3	3	4	3	2	3	3	3	3
Standard Deviation	0.59	0.70	0.92	0.78	0.69	1.31	0.77	0.77	0.70	0.83

Sample Variance	0.35	0.49	0.85	0.61	0.47	1.71	0.59	0.60	0.49	0.69
Range	2	2	3	2	2	4	3	2	2	3
Minimum	2	2	1	2	2	0	1	2	2	1
Maximum	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Count	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Confidence Level (95.0%)	0.26	0.31	0.41	0.35	0.30	0.58	0.34	0.34	0.31	0.37

All participants' responses are shown in Table 2. However, because there are differences in job positions even though the participants are in the same field of human services, Table 3 and next demonstrates the descriptive statistics for each position (staff, supervisor, and manager).

**Table 3: Staffs' perspectives**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Mean	3.63	3.25	2.38	2.75	2.75	2.50	3.25	2.63	3.25	2.50
Standard Error	0.18	0.25	0.42	0.25	0.25	0.46	0.25	0.32	0.25	0.27
Median	4	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	2
Mode	4	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	2
Standard Deviation	0.52	0.71	1.19	0.71	0.71	1.31	0.71	0.92	0.71	0.76
Sample Variance	0.27	0.50	1.41	0.50	0.50	1.71	0.50	0.84	0.50	0.57
Range	1	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2
Minimum	3	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2
Maximum	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Sum	29	26	19	22	22	20	26	21	26	20
Count	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Confidence Level(95.0%)	0.43	0.59	0.99	0.59	0.59	1.09	0.59	0.77	0.59	0.63

Table 3 Provides a comprehensive summary of the feedback received on human services employment opportunities. The mean score for items 1 to 10 is 2.8, which falls between the categories of "disagree" and "agree," indicating a typically low level of satisfaction. Specifically, item ten, which evaluates work satisfaction in relation to position, has a rating of just 2.5, indicating that staff members are dissatisfied with their responsibilities. Of particular significance is question 3, which had the lowest rating of 2.38. This, along with the discontent associated with their employment, suggests that these

individuals may still lack experience and may not yet match the acceptable degree of skill anticipated by their bosses.

**Table 4: Supervisors' perspectives**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Mean	3.70	3.40	2.80	3.60	3.50	2.00	3.30	3.40	3.20	3.20
Standard Error	0.15	0.22	0.13	0.22	0.17	0.39	0.15	0.16	0.20	0.20
Median	4	3.5	3	4	3.5	2	3	3	3	3
Mode	4	4	3	4	4	2	3	3	3	3
Standard Deviation	0.48	0.70	0.42	0.70	0.53	1.25	0.48	0.52	0.63	0.63
Sample Variance	0.23	0.49	0.18	0.49	0.28	1.56	0.23	0.27	0.40	0.40
Range	1	2	1	2	1	4	1	1	2	2
Minimum	3	2	2	2	3	0	3	3	2	2
Maximum	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Sum	37	34	28	36	35	20	33	34	32	32
Count	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Confidence Level(95.0%)	0.35	0.50	0.30	0.50	0.38	0.89	0.35	0.37	0.45	0.45

Table 4, Conversely, it provides a summary of the feedback received on employment in the field of human services. Question 10, which evaluates work satisfaction in relation to one's position, likewise received a score of 3.2, indicating that staff members are content with their responsibilities as supervisors. This score is significantly elevated in comparison to previous levels. Specifically, question one had the highest score of 3.7, indicating that supervisors have a strong understanding of their duties and job descriptions, as well as the requisite experience to fulfill work requirements. This, in turn, adds to their total job satisfaction.

**Table 5: Managers' perspectives**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Mean	3.25	3.00	3.50	3.75	3.50	1.00	3.25	3.50	3.50	2.75
Standard Error	0.48	0.41	0.50	0.25	0.29	0.58	0.75	0.29	0.50	0.63
Median	3.5	3	4	4	3.5	1	4	3.5	4	3
Mode	4	3	4	4	4	2	4	3	4	3
Standard Deviation	0.96	0.82	1.00	0.50	0.58	1.15	1.50	0.58	1.00	1.26

Sample Variance	0.92	0.67	1.00	0.25	0.33	1.33	2.25	0.33	1.00	1.58
Range	2	2	2	1	1	2	3	1	2	3
Minimum	2	2	2	3	3	0	1	3	2	1
Maximum	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4
Sum	13	12	14	15	14	4	13	14	14	11
Count	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Confidence Level(95.0%)	1.52	1.30	1.59	0.80	0.92	1.84	2.39	0.92	1.59	2.00

Table 5 The data shows that question 6 received the lowest score, possibly due to interpersonal difficulties among peers in this role. Although several questions have received high ratings, the aggregate satisfaction score for managers is 2.75, which falls between the range of "agree" and "disagree." This implies that managers possess a certain level of comprehension about their work duties and obligations, but they have lower levels of satisfaction in their positions when compared to supervisors.

Table 6: Satisfaction on human service career by Level

Human Service Career Level	Score
Staff	2.50 S.D. 0.76
Supervisor	3.20 S.D. 0.63
Manager	2.75 S.D. 1.26
Overall	2.86 S.D. 0.81

Table 7: Regression Result

Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	0.9107
R Square	0.8294
Adjusted R Square	0.7015
Standard Error	0.1850
Observations	22

	Coefficients	Standard Error	T-Stat	P-Value
C	-0.9524	0.3772	-2.5249	0.0267
<i>ln Q1</i>	0.5158	0.3710	1.3903	0.1897
<i>ln Q2</i>	0.0366	0.2533	0.1445	0.8875
<i>ln Q3</i>	0.1577	0.1913	0.8243	0.4258
<i>ln Q4</i>	-0.4957	0.3178	-1.5596	0.1448
<i>ln Q5</i>	0.5792	0.4228	1.3699	0.1958
<i>ln Q6</i>	0.0150	0.0416	0.3608	0.7245
<i>ln Q7</i>	0.6113*	0.2748	2.2248	0.0460
<i>ln Q8</i>	0.4954*	0.2428	2.0401	0.0640
<i>ln Q9</i>	-0.1981	0.2929	-0.6762	0.5118

	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	9	1.9973	0.2219	6.4831	0.0019
Residual	12	0.4108	0.0342		
Total	21	2.4080			

Notice: \* refers to  $P < 0.1$ , \*\* refers to  $P < 0.05$ , and \*\*\* refers to  $P < 0.01$

Table 6 indicates that supervisors exhibit the greatest levels of satisfaction in comparison to other occupations, while staff workers have the lowest levels of job satisfaction. Furthermore, if we conduct a study to identify the relevant elements using OLS regression, The following is the outcome.

According to the result in Table 7, the OLS regression analysis reveals that there are two specific questions that have a significant impact on overall work satisfaction across all occupations. Question 7 demonstrates that the presence of learning and growth opportunities in the workplace has a direct impact on an employee's assessment of their professional development and potential for future progress. This is consistent with the results of Mishra's (2013) study, which found that career advancement plays a crucial role in determining work happiness. When workers see opportunities for skill development and career advancement, it boosts their overall workplace satisfaction and drive. According to the literature, work satisfaction is attained when the needs of a job match the wants and expectations of employees, including the desire for professional advancement (Mishra, 2013). Furthermore, Question 8 demonstrates that holding workers accountable for their performance guarantees that they are acknowledged and incentivized according to their contributions, enhancing their motivation and happiness. When managers enforce accountability among workers, it cultivates a culture characterized by responsibility and exceptional performance. This is corroborated by the research that highlights the significance of accountability and efficient management strategies in enhancing employee satisfaction and organizational success (National Organization for Human Services, n.d.; Swofford, 2023). Furthermore, the focus on performance responsibility is in line with the empowerment strategies examined by Bass (1990) and Conger (1989), which result in enhanced management, heightened morale, and greater production.

### *Execution*

To address these results, it is recommended that human services businesses prioritize the provision of explicit career advancement possibilities and establish mechanisms for holding employees accountable for their performance, with the aim of improving work satisfaction. For staff personnel, this entails providing additional avenues for professional development and clearly defining job responsibilities. Supervisors may ensure high satisfaction levels by consistently providing clear job descriptions and acknowledging their work. Managers may boost work satisfaction by enhancing peer connections and offering extra assistance. By prioritizing these specific areas, firms may cultivate a staff that is highly motivated and content, leading to enhanced service delivery and overall organizational success.

### *Research Limitations*

The survey and the data set gathered by Pierce County, Washington, United States in 2023. The data set consists of several career fields. Authors emphasize on the human service fields, which consist of 22 samples of participants, which may be seen as a small sample size. In addition, the data set is secondary data without participants' personal points of view.

### **Conclusion**

This study examines the extent of job happiness among professionals in the human services industry, specifically focusing on variances depending on job positions and the impact of hierarchical organizational structures on employee motivation and satisfaction. The research indicates that there are varying degrees of satisfaction among staff members, supervisors, and managers. Staff members, in particular, exhibit poor satisfaction, especially in regard to their duties, with an average score of 2.5. Supervisors, however, express more satisfaction with an average score of 3.2, indicating a favorable perspective of their responsibilities. Managers have a varied amount of contentment, with an average satisfaction score of 2.75, but express discontentment primarily with peer connections of 1.0.

Regression research reveals that there are two notable elements that have a large impact on work satisfaction across all positions: chances for learning and advancement, and responsibility for performance. professional development opportunities have a substantial influence on work satisfaction, as noted by Mishra (2013) who highlighted the significance of professional progression. Moreover, the implementation of performance accountability guarantees that workers get recognition and rewards for their efforts, therefore promoting a culture of responsibility and exceptional performance, as shown by current literature (National Organization for Human Services, n.d.; Swofford, 2023).

Hierarchical organizational structures have a substantial influence on work clarity, job security, and employee motivation. Although these frameworks might enhance clarity and stability, they can also impede employee potential by consolidating decision-making power and constraining performance and motivation. To tackle these problems, it is necessary to provide explicit chances for professional

growth, establish responsibility for performance, and promote clear definitions of roles together with assistance.

In order to increase work satisfaction, it is important for human services businesses to provide priority to opportunities for professional growth, create systems for evaluating performance, and foster clear role definitions and support. Organizations may enhance employee motivation, contentment, and overall performance by concentrating on these specific areas. This, in turn, will improve service delivery and contribute to the overall success of the firm.

## References

- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(90\)90061-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-5)
- Barzani, W., & Sindi, H. (2020). *The effect of organization structure on employee motivation* (Master Thesis, University of Kurdistan-Hewler, Iraq). Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345385964\\_The\\_effect\\_of\\_organization\\_structure\\_on\\_employee\\_motivation](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345385964_The_effect_of_organization_structure_on_employee_motivation)
- Breslin, J. T. (2020). *A Workers Perspective On Hierarchical Organization Structure And The Potential For Non-Hierarchical Management Systems* (Master Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, United States). Retrieved from <https://repository.upenn.edu/handle/20.500.14332/41865>
- Bobbitt, Z. (2021). How to Calculate Cronbach's Alpha in Excel. Retrieved from <https://www.statology.org/cronbachs-alpha-excel/>
- Cole, M. S., & Bruch, H. (2006). Organizational Identity Strength, Identification, and Commitment and their Relationships to Turnover Intention: Does Organizational Hierarchy Matter? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(5), 585-605. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.378>
- Conger, J. A. (1989). Leadership: The art of empowering others. *Academy of Management Executive*, 3(1), 17-24. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4164863>
- DeFranco, A. L., & Schmidgall, R. S. (2001). Satisfaction: Is Money Everything? *Hospitality Review*, 19(2), 1-12. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1345&context=hospitalityreview>
- Dubrin, A. J. (1991). Comparison of the Job Satisfaction and Productivity of Telecommuters versus in-House Employees: A Research Note on Work in Progress. *Psychological Reports*, 68(3), 1223-1234. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1991.68.3c.1223>
- Graen, G. (1969). Instrumentality theory of work motivation: Some experimental results and suggested modifications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 53(2), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0027100>
- Horton, K. E., McClelland, C. R., & Griffin, M. A. (2014). Defined by our hierarchy? How hierarchical positions shape our identifications and well-being at work. *Human Relations*, 67(10), 1167-1188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713516374>
- Hanafi, A. (2019). Effect of Organizational Structure, Job Analysis and Leadership Style on Work Motivation and Its Impact on Performance of Employees. *Journal of Public Administration Studies*, 4(1), 39-45. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jpas.2019.004.01.8>
- Kokko, J., & Guerrier, Y. (1994). Overeducation, underemployment and job satisfaction: a study of Finnish hotel receptionists. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 13(4), 375-396. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0278-4319\(94\)90073-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0278-4319(94)90073-6)
- Miner, J. B. (1988). *Organizational behavior: Performance and productivity*. New York: Random House.

- Manzoor, Q. A. (2011). Impact of Employees Motivation on Organizational Effectiveness. *Business Management and Strategy*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.5296/bms.v3i1.904>
- Mishra, P. K. (2013). Job Satisfaction. *IOSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science*, 14(5), 45-54. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/download/32109833/F01454554.pdf>
- National Organization for Human Services. (n.d.). What is Human Services. Retrieved from <https://www.nationalhumanservices.org/what-is-human-services/>
- Qu, H., & Tse, S. C. S. (1996). An Analysis of Employees' Expectations Satisfaction Levels and Turnover In The Hong Kong Hotel Industry. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 21(2), 15-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.1996.11014771>
- Reisch, M., & Wenocur, S. (1986). The Future of Community Organization in Social Work: Social Activism and the Politics of Profession Building. *Social Service Review*, 60(1), 70-93. <https://doi.org/10.1086/644350>
- Strong, E. K. (1958). Satisfaction and interests. *American Psychologist*, 13(8), 449-456. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047824>
- Swofford, M. (2023). The importance of job satisfaction. Retrieved from <https://www.charlestonsouthern.edu/blog/the-importance-of-job-satisfaction/>
- Wake Forest University. (n.d.). Why Work in Human Services? Retrieved from <https://counseling.online.wfu.edu/blog/work-human-services/>
- Wanous, J. P., & Lawler, E. E. (1972). Measurement and meaning of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56(2), 95-105. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0032664>
- Zimmerman, M. A. (1990). Toward a theory of learned hopefulness: A structural model analysis of participation and empowerment. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 24(1), 71-86. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566\(90\)90007-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(90)90007-S)
- Zimmerman, M. A., & Rappaport, J. (1988). Citizen participation, perceived control, and psychological empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16(5), 725-750. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF00930023>