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The purpose of this paper is to recognize and improve the understanding of social workers’ job satisfaction in the geriatric area. Low job satisfaction makes social workers want to move their field and change their career. The research is the conceptual model of the moderating effect of patient engagement. The hypothesis is that the organizational factors of this model (climate, workplace, pay, supervision) lead to low job satisfaction for social workers and the generation gap between Millennials and older generations will result in different job satisfaction. The assumption was that among the factors (climate, workplace, pay, supervision), salary has the strongest effect to impact job satisfaction for social workers, and Millennials will report significantly lower job satisfaction than older generations. However, the result came as an unexpected outcome.

Data presented in this study is secondary data (University of Texas at Austin, n.d.), or Survey of Employee Engagement (SEE) collected by the Institute for Organizational Excellence (IOE), the University of Texas at Austin. The survey uses selection criteria which are selected from a working sample of geriatric practitioners: caseworkers and non-caseworkers who work for all regional offices and State office that provides adult protective services. The sample includes all employees of Adult Protective Services of all regional offices and state office in Texas ($N = 622$).

The result is that job satisfaction was not different depending on the generation type or age and that salary did not have the strongest effect of all the organizational
factors on job satisfaction; however, the order was climate, workplace, pay, and supervision. The factors influenced job satisfaction, however, generation gap is not a significant issue. In order to improve job satisfaction for social workers, organizations will need more consideration of supporting factors (climate, workplace, pay, supervision) for enhancing high job satisfaction for social workers.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction has been a concern for many companies and organizations. In geriatric care facilities, studies have shown decreasing levels of job satisfaction (Denton, Zeytinoglu, & Davies, 2003). Studies have been conducted to identify the factors causing this decrease. There were major differences found among generations namely Baby Boomers and Millennials (Leavitt, 2014). Millennials tend to have a more negative outlook on most social work positions (Dennison, Poole, & Qaqish, 2007). Students entering into the social work field tend to start out with lower pay, less benefits, and more workload. These factors lead to lower satisfaction among social workers in any position (Chou & Robert, 2008). Social workers are few in number in geriatric care facilities, facing them with a large amount of workload for less pay than other workers. This is because of the negative connotation that comes with working in social work and with older adults. Younger generations are less likely to begin careers in these positions due to the lack of job satisfaction found in these facilities (Dennison, Poole, & Qaquish, 2007).

Older generations, such as Baby Boomers, have more experience and were brought into the social work field in a time where all of these factors had more value than in current times. Older generations begin to change their values in social work, as they age, to more emotionally meaningful interactions and closeness in their workplace.
(Yeung, Fung, & Chan, 2015). Since their values change, the factors that affect their job satisfaction may also change.

There is a clear generational gap found in job satisfaction among social workers. In order to develop the professional social workers’ population and improve social work in geriatric care, social workers need to gain motivation and higher satisfaction in their work. However, the inherently stressful nature of social work often hinders highly motivated social workers from reaching their full potential. In social work positions, they begin to have high stress levels in the workplace and their jobs become highly stressful (Parry-Jones et al., 1998). Stress and job satisfaction have been found to have many links in the social work field. When a social worker reaches high stress levels they begin to lose job satisfaction, causing overall performance to decrease (Lloyd, King, & Chenoweth, 2002). These issues begin to affect clients and their families, leaving them with little help. The lack of empathy low job satisfaction causes, presented by the social worker, not only affects the clients and their loved ones, but the organization as well. The geriatric facility is represented by its workers. When their workers’ performance decreases due to low job satisfaction, the reputation and image of the organization can be greatly affected. Job satisfaction among workers, especially social workers, is an important factor in many companies and facilities for geriatric adults. Their specific, vital care needs must be met, and social workers ensure they are to be taken care of to the highest degree. These needs are of the utmost importance to the client as their life and longevity is greatly dependent on facility’s care. Job satisfaction greatly affects more than just the workers, but the whole system in geriatric care facilities.
The Survey of Employee Engagement (SEE) researched (2016) factors that affected the engagement of employees among social workers in the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS). In the areas of concern that were analyzed, job satisfaction was ranked as the second lowest factor that affected engagement among the workers. Although a plethora of research on factors of job satisfaction has been conducted in the past, the knowledge based on older societies may not be applicable to a new generation of workers who live in a new society.

The overarching research question of this study is how organizational factors affect job satisfaction of social workers in geriatrics. In order to answer this research question, a comprehensive literature review was conducted. Literature provides different reasons why this population is vulnerable to stress and what could protect them from the effects of organizational factors. Promoting job satisfaction through different programs is an emerging approach. Although ample studies have been conducted to answer how factors of the organization affect job satisfaction, little research has examined the relationship of these factors between Millennials and older generations. To inform human resources management better in the current context, an area of study includes the investigation of the difference between generations on job satisfaction. There are mixed results. Other researchers (Gladwell, Dorwart, Stone, & Andi, 2010) did not find the generational differences in terms of job satisfaction and organizational benefits. In addition, there is a lack of study on social work practitioners who work with older adults.

The results of this study will inform the organization the areas of improvements to be made for improving job satisfaction in the workforce. Through this study, the researcher will compare research factors that makes social workers have low satisfaction
in the field and the job satisfaction levels of the Baby Boomer era and Millennial’s era. Therefore, this study can contribute to agencies providing better services by promoting job satisfaction of their practitioners.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review was conducted to explore research on job satisfaction in general and that of practitioners who provide service to older adults, to identify major factors that are associated with their job satisfaction, and to understand how a certain generation type plays a role on the relationship between the organizational factors and job satisfaction.

To identify research, two databases were used in search: Google Scholar and EBSCO Information Services. The search criteria included the availability of the full text and academic articles published in peer-reviewed journals since 2000. The search terms used include “social work * job satisfaction”, “adult care * job satisfaction”, “job satisfaction * generations”, “job satisfaction * baby boomer generation”, and “job satisfaction * millennials.”

Job Satisfaction

Social workers’ satisfaction with their job is a critical factor of social workers’ performance (Parry-Jones et al., 1998). Studies reported mixed results about social workers’ job satisfaction. According to research done by Mack (2012), a large number of social workers have a high level of job satisfaction. In the mental health field in England and Wales, about 47% of social workers reported they were satisfied with their job while 19% reported dissatisfaction. About 1.6% of social workers in Crete, Greece, showed an
extremely high level of job satisfaction, and 46% showed high satisfaction levels. In the United States, job satisfaction has been a concern for many organizations. Organization in United States see it as a necessity to keep their employees. In the US, job satisfaction has been an issue among many healthcare staff members, including social workers (Parry-Jones et al., 1998). A study done by Monroe and Deloach (2004) found social workers to have a mean job satisfaction level of 12.57, on a scale with a range from 6 to 30 with a score of less than 15 indicating a high level of satisfaction. In the study, they also found that social workers were “not as satisfied as their counterparts” (Monroe & Deloach, 2004).

On the other hand, many social workers experience burnout and therefore find it difficult to be satisfied with their job (Diaconescu, 2015; Kim, Ji, & Kao, 2011). Social workers feel pressured because they must deal with societal changes and stress of everyday life while they work (Lloyd, King, & Chenoweth, 2002). Social workers often experience secondary traumatic stress (STS) when working with clients due to reduced sound of mind from fatigue (Wagaman, Geiger, Shockley, & Segal, 2015).

Social workers who work with older adults are vulnerable to a high level of stress or burnout because their work often is underappreciated by supervisors and clients (Lloyd, King, & Chenoweth, 2002). In adult care, there are many high-stress situations. Social workers tend to have a higher workload due to the fact of low employment rates among many adult care facilities (Roh, Moon, Yang, & Jung, 2015). In addition, practitioners who work in those facilities have work overload. They work long hours for little pay and face many people who look to them for guidance (Parry-Jones et al., 2005).
While some enjoy feeling needed, others can experience high levels of stress due to this (Jessen, 2015).

Past research on factors of job satisfaction among social workers has shown the variables responsible for work-related satisfaction. Mack (2012) identified organizational factors associated with job satisfaction of social workers. Those factors include poor social support, negative work environment, lack of supervision, inadequate salary, and heavy workload in the work field. Other researchers (e.g., Leavitt, 2014) individual factors such as the generation type influence job satisfaction arguing that there have been differences found among Millennials and older generations in these factors. The next part of literature discusses major factors that may affect the level of job satisfaction into two sections: organizational factors and an individual factor (i.e., generation type). However, organizational factors (lack of supervision, high stress, low salary, work climate, and workload) cause job satisfaction levels to decrease in the social work field (Mack, 2012).

Organizational Factors

Overall Work Environment

A positive work environment is important to social workers to have an organized company system and facility. The environment of social services affects social worker’s satisfaction in adult care facilities. An environment with low aid levels influences social workers to have low levels of satisfaction in their field placement. In order to be a professional social worker, the placement has to meet and set up an organized system, increasing well-being (Graham & Sheir, 2014). Although social workers are expected to provide high quality services and care to clients, these overbearing expectations add on to their workload, leaving them with more stress than they can handle (Malley & Fernandez,
2010). Social workers report factors leading to their dissatisfaction as low promotion rate, feeling undervalued as an employee, supervisory level is inadequate, and little to no say in policies of the organization (Parry-Jones et al., 1998). These conditions begin to create a negative work climate. Negativity in the work place can become a toxic environment not only for the clients, but for the workers as well.

In order to improve the work environment, the organization must create a system of better conditions and increase satisfaction rate. An organization needs a system that has higher quality training, educational programs, and support for their employees. After developing a positive work environment, employment rates in social work will increase because job environment and conditions will improve. Improvements to the systems will help social workers avoid pushing their clients into a blind spot and forgetting to help them. This will improve, not only the social worker’s job satisfaction, but the client’s satisfaction with their care.

**Supervision**

There are many aspects that social workers search for in an ideal workplace. A competent, quality supervisor shows a higher rate of social workers being satisfied with their jobs. Many studies have shown that if a supervisor is involved with the employee’s tasks and work, the percentage of social workers that want to remain at their job will increase (Tham, 2007; Weaver et al 2007). Many social workers feel undervalued by their supervisors, which has become one of the most important factors of job satisfaction (Jessen, 2015). High supervision helps social workers feel as though they are on the right track in work. It navigates social workers to have high levels of job satisfaction.
Salary

Salary is an element that makes social work appealing to prospective social work professionals and is a major factor of job satisfaction for social workers. The Profile of Social Work Workforce (Salsberg et al., 2017) presents information regarding the salary for social workers 2017. The median income for social workers with a master’s degree is $48,000. The workforces with the highest median incomes in the United States are “national security and international affairs ($69,000), elementary and secondary education ($60,000), executive offices and legislative carriers ($57,000), hospitals ($56,000), and other health care settings ($56,000), with a master’s degree or higher. The average salary for persons in family and individual services is around $45,000” (Salsberg et al., 2017, p. 6). Although the median pay for social workers is fairly high compared to some occupations, some believe it is not enough to cover costs of living. In the survey done by University of Texas at Austin (2016), they asked the participants if they believed their pay rate allows for cost of living. A mere 13% agreed to the statement, which exhibits that over 70% of the participants feel unable to live with their salary. Salary was found to be the lowest construct of the UT Austin survey. These results yield concern in many facilities and should be looked at as a major concern for future employees.

Work incentives, such as fair salary, motivate workers to perform more efficiently and have higher satisfaction. According to Zlotnik et al. (2005), salary was one of the strongest factors affecting turnover in the research they performed. In their study, social workers reported they were not satisfied with their pay and their pay was reflecting the amount of work they put in. In a survey done with the Department of Family and Protective Services (University of Texas at Austin), salary was shown as the lowest
scoring construct among the areas surveyed. In regard to fair pay, about 12% agree that they are paid fairly for the work they do in their workplace (University of Texas at Austin, 2016).

**Individual Factors**

Although many professional groups have similar issues with job satisfaction, some researchers have studied on the factors of job satisfaction among various age groups especially difference between the Millennial generation, who are those born between the years of 1981 and 2000, and older generations.

Some researchers have presented possible reasons for difference in job satisfaction between different generations. There are differences in perceptions and interpretations of the state of emotional exhaustion across generations and the difference in work centrality (Twenge, Freeman, & Campbell, 2012).

Super’s career stage theory (1980) suggests older generations who are mostly in the maintenance stage may consider maintaining their current status and holding their current job as a top priority. On the other hand, Millennials who are mostly in the earlier career stage may be willing to try other occupations as their potential ideal career.

Boomer employees tend to be more willing to endure emotional emptiness rather than blaming on their job. They have a strong emphasis on their job place (Lu & Gursoy, 2016). Emotional exhaustion can, therefore, become a much stronger facilitator of job dissatisfaction and turnover intention for Millennials because of their weaker commitment toward their job compared with Baby Boomers. Therefore, taken together, it is not surprising to find that Millennial employees are likely to exhibit higher job dissatisfaction and turnover intention than Boomer employees. Baby Boomers and
Millennials have different views and perspectives of job satisfaction, such as social lifestyle, experience, and history. The values, attitudes, and preferences of their jobs have a general gap.

There are some empirical studies for supporting these theories. Lu and Gursoy (2016) conducted a survey study of employees from 29 mid- or upscale hotels in America. Baby Boomers were found to have higher levels of job satisfaction than Millennials. This is thought to be because of older generations’ willingness to take on more at work. They are willing to work harder and put in more effort to get their work done in a timely, organized manner. Social workers who are Baby Boomers have shown results of higher job satisfaction rates. Baby Boomers seem to find more peace of mind in their positions, due to the knowledge and work ethic they have gained over the years. Millennials, on average, show a lower level of job satisfaction in the social work field. The mindset most Millennials have going into the work force is that most of the jobs will be taken or not worthwhile. This standard is created by what American society tells them.

With the variance of beliefs and values, their job satisfaction levels changes, in regards to how they were raised and what kind of lifestyle they were surrounded by. With knowledge of these generational differences, job satisfaction levels can be monitored and increased. Baby Boomers show an increase in job performance when their social work values are higher, according to a study done by Yeung et al. (2015). In the research, however, there was no correlation of social work values to age. The study does show that older generations are more likely to benefit from social work values than younger generations. The main finding of the study was “when employees’ [social work values] are met by the actual work environment, they will feel more satisfied and thus perform
better” (Yeung et al., 2015, p.242). This effect is more commonly seen in older
generations as they emphasize the values more, while younger workers focus more on
gaining knowledge in practice.

Conclusion of Literature Review

Since the aging population is expected to increase at a rapid rate in the future,
employers in nursing homes need more social workers who are motivated and satisfied to
provide quality care. The literature review has identified several organizational factors of
job satisfaction of service providers, including work environment, supervision, and
salary. Literature indicates that older generations are more adaptable to situations and act
calmly in most scenarios. Although many studies have conducted on the relationship
between organizational factors and job satisfaction, there is little study that examine how
the relationship is different across different generations among geriatric practitioners. The
purpose of this study is to examine how generation difference affects the relationship
between organizational factors and job satisfaction of service providers for older adults.
Based on the preceding literature review the following hypotheses (each of which
includes multiple hypothesis regarding organizational factors) will be examined:

- **Hypothesis I:** Gerontology practitioners who have negative experience regarding
  organizational factors will report significantly lower job satisfaction.

- **Hypothesis II:** When having negative experience regarding organizational
  factors, Millennials will report significantly lower job satisfaction than older
  generations do. In other words, there is an interaction effect of organizational
  factors and the individual factor (i.e., being millennial generation) on job
  satisfaction.
Conceptual Framework of This Study

Initial Framework

The original thoughts for my research were that the organizational factors affect job satisfaction, and are also affected by the worker’s generation. Depending on the generation the worker comes from, the effect of organizational factors on job satisfaction changes.

Revision of Initial Framework Through the research, it was concluded that there is no correlation between generational age and the effects of organizational factors. The organizational factors are the main factors for changes in job satisfaction.

Figure 1. Conceptual model of moderating effect of patient engagement.

Figure 2. Revised conceptual model of moderating effect of patient engagement.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study is to explore factors of job satisfaction and how the effect of those factors on job satisfaction depending on Millennials and older generations among geriatric practitioners. In order to test the hypotheses based on the literature review conducted in this study, the following methods will be used.

Research Design

The research design used in this study will be a cross-sectional survey study. This study will use a secondary data (University of Texas at Austin, n.d.), or Survey of Employee Engagement (SEE) collected by the Institute for Organizational Excellence (IOE), the University of Texas at Austin. The SEE was used to collect data regarding employees’ perception about workplace dimensions. This survey has been used in many organizations across states to measure organizational improvement over time (Collins-Camargo et al., 2009). The data used in this study is drawn from a survey of a public welfare agency in Texas in 2016. A survey study is a way to collect data or information from individuals. A cross-sectional study is an observational study used to analyze data collected from a specific group at one time. A limitation of a cross-sectional study is that they attempt to understand casual processes that occur over time, but their conclusions are drawn from observations made at only one time. Another limitation is that cross-sectional studies cannot determine cause and effect.
Sample

The secondary data set includes a survey of all employees employed in a Texas public agency on 2016. Using selection criteria, this study selected a working sample of geriatric practitioners: caseworkers and non-caseworkers who work for all regional offices and State office that provides adult protective services. Managers or supervisors were excluded; therefore, this working sample may include the surveys of frontline workers in Adult Protective Services (APS). Although it may not include all geriatric practitioners, a significant portion of the sample subjects may have similar experience with geriatric practitioners.

Data Collection

The SEE was completed through the collaborative efforts of a public welfare agency in Texas and the researchers of the IOE. For confidentiality of the answers, the survey began with the following statement: “Demographic items are used for research purposes. To ensure anonymity, your organization does not receive any information which could identify an individual or group containing less than 5 people.” After receiving approval from both the university and public agency institutional review boards, the survey was administered for the employees. The survey was administered both online and printed version as each employee's survey packet. Collection period was on March 25, 2016, to April, 15, 2016.

The survey has many factors that show how engaged the employees are in an organization. The first main indicator of the level of employee engagement is the response rate of the survey. The response rate for the SEE Survey was 64.9%, which proposes a soundness in the organization since it is over 50%. This turnout rate is on the
higher edge of the spectrum which suggests that employees are invested into the organization. Their investment shows that they are willing to participate in the survey to improve work conditions. This level of engagement shows that the employees expect changes to be made when brought forward.

**Instruments**

In order to measure the variable for this study, the SEE survey constructs were used. All the primary constructs were measured with five Likert-scale response options ranging from 1 “Strongly Disagree” to 5 “Strongly Agree.” Scores from each construct is calculated by following the method the IOE used: their scores are average and multiplied by 100. If the respondent selected “Don’t Know/Not Applicable,” their response is considered a valid response, but it will not be used in the calculation of the scores.

**Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction**

The SEE survey defines job satisfaction as employees’ perceptions about the overall work situation and ability to maintain work-life balance. For measuring this construct, the following four questions were asked: “My work environment supports a balance between work and personal life,” “I feel free to be myself at work,” “The amount of work I am asked to do is reasonable,” and “I am proud to tell people that I work for this organization.” Lower scores indicate that the respondents feel overworked, unable to perform at their best and unhappy with their work.

**Independent Variables**

**Organizational Factors**

Independent variables in this study were job organizational factors in the area of organizational factors. From the SEE survey, major organizational factors that are
expected to make the workers feel stressed and therefore impact job satisfaction were selected as followings.

**Climate.** An organization’s climate in which employees’ work affects the efficiency and capability of the organization. SEE did not measure this as a construct but assess the climate of work place where employees work. This survey defines the appropriate climate as a combination of a safe, non-harassing environment and proactive management. The following six questions were used to assess climate:

- Harassment is not tolerated at my workplace.
- Employees are generally ethical in my workplace.
- I believe we will use the information from this survey to improve our workplace.
- I am satisfied with the opportunities I have to give feedback on my supervisor's performance.
- Upper management (i.e. Executive and/or Senior Leadership) effectively communicates important information.
- I am treated fairly in my workplace.

**Workplace.** The workplace construct entails how the employees perceive the overall work atmosphere, safety, and overall feel. This construct shows the level that employees see the workplace as satisfactory, safe, and providing resources readily and easily available. This construct was measured by answers given to the following four statements:

- Given the type of work I do, my physical workplace meets my needs.
- My workplace is well maintained.
- There are sufficient procedures to ensure safety of employees in the workplace.
• I have adequate resources and equipment to do my job.

Supervision. The construct of supervision shows how satisfactory the employees’ relationships with their supervisor is perceived. If a higher score is found in this construct then it can mean that the supervisors are helpful, fair with all employees, and provide necessary feedback to aid the workflow. This construct was measured by the following example questions:

• My supervisor provides me with a clear understanding of my work responsibilities.

• My supervisor recognizes outstanding work.

• I am given the opportunity to do my best work.

• My supervisor is consistent when administering policies concerning employees.

• My supervisor is consistent when administering policies concerning employees.

Pay. The pay construct shows how employees perceive their pay rates and compensations from the organization. Employees compare between organizations to see how well the rate holds up. A lower score in the pay construct can suggest that employees are dissatisfied with their pay rate. This can also suggest that it is a main concern for many of the employees and brings discontent due to the lack of comparability among similar organizations. This construct was measured by the following statements:

• My pay keeps pace with the cost of living.

• Salaries are competitive with similar jobs.

• I feel I am paid fairly for the work I do.
**Moderating Variable**

In order to measure if the respondent is Millennial or not, the question regarding age will be used to create a new variable. In this survey, age is categorized as 16-29 (1), 30-39 (2), 40-49 (3), 50-59 (4), 60+ (5), and prefer not to answer (6). Because a specific age is not included in this data set, it is not possible to identify Millennials accurately. Considering the Millennial generation was 34 years or older in 2016 when the survey was conducted respondents with answers of the first and second categories will be treated as Millennial (1) and the rest as older generations (0).

**Control Variables**

Other sociodemographic factors were included as controls. Gender was classified as male (1) and female (2). Race/ethnic identification is organized as follows: African-American or Black (1), Hispanic or Latino/a (2), Anglo-American or White (3), Asian (4), American Indian or Pacific Islander (5), Multiracial or Other (6), and prefer not to answer (7). Education level was characterized as did not finish high school (1), high school diploma (or GED) (2), some college (3), associate’s degree (4), bachelor’s degree (5), master’s degree (6), doctoral degree (7), and prefer not to answer (8).

**Data Analysis Plan**

Descriptive and frequency statistics will be run to determine the characteristics of the sample. Descriptive analyses will be conducted to examine the overview of major variables. Multiple hierarchical regression analyses will be carried out to examine the moderating effect of generational differences on the relationships among job stress and job satisfaction.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Participants

The sample includes all employees of Adult Protective Services of all regional offices and state office in Texas. Table 1 shows statistics of individual characteristics of the sample. There is a total of 622 participants in the sample. The table shows a significantly larger female population of 482 (80.2%) than their male counterparts of 119 (19.8%). Anglo-American or White are the dominant race of 257, accounting for 44.2%. The sample has an age range from 16-60+, however, a majority of the respondents were aged 30-59 (79.8%), with the largest age group of 168 being those aged 30-39, which accounts for 28.3%. In the education section, the respondents with a bachelor degree were the majority of the sample (71.4%)
Table 1
Individual Characteristics of the Sample (N = 622)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>“Female”</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Male”</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>“African-American or Black”</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Hispanic or Latino”</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Anglo-American or White”</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Asian”</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“American-Indian”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Multiracial or Other”</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>“16-29”</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“30-39”</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“40-49”</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“50-59”</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“60+”</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>“High school or GED”</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Some college”</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Associate degree”</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Bachelor degree”</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Master degree”</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Doctoral degree”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of participants, 481 out of the total, worked with people in in-home care (77.1%). Out of the total, 505 respondents, accounting for 80.9%, had no direct reports with a manager or a supervisor. Caseworkers, at 406 accounting for 65.1%, made up the majority of respondents. A vast majority of the participants, 488 accounting for 80.4% of the total, were not in a supervisory role. The group for annual salary with the most respondents had 231 out of the total, accounting for 39.4%, was $35,001-$45,000. Table 1 and Tble 2 explain, in detail, the respondents’ demographic background.
Table 2
Organizational Characteristics of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cat 2</td>
<td>“APS State Office”</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“In-Home”</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Facilities”</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>org 4</td>
<td>“Manager or supervisor with Direct Reports”</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“No Direct Reports”</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseworker</td>
<td>“Caseworker”</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Non-Caseworker”</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I am currently in a supervisory role.”</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“No”</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual salary before taxes</td>
<td>“Less than $15,000”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000-$25,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“$15,001-$35,000”</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“$35,001-$45,000”</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“$45,001-$50,000”</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“$50,001-$60,000”</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“$60,001-$75,000”</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“More than $75,000”</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reliability Analysis: Internal Consistency of a Composite Variable**

A series of preliminary analyses were performed to check the internal consistency of three composite variables (perceived stress and mindfulness). Cronbach’s alpha is a widely-used tool for assessing the reliability of a scale. This value refers to “the extent that correlations among items in a domain vary, there is some error connected with the average correlation found in any particular sampling of items” (Nunnally, 1978, p. 206). Nunnally argued the alpha level of equal or higher than .60 considered to be indicative of minimally adequate internal consistency.
Job Satisfaction

As noted in Table 3, a set of answers exhibited a high internal consistency ($\alpha = .822$). Therefore, the scores on the 4 items were averaged to generate the overall score. Higher scores are indicative of higher levels of job satisfaction.

Table 3
Internal Consistency of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>$\alpha$ Without</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My work environment supports a balance between work and personal life.”</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel free to be myself at work.”</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The amount of work I am asked to do is reasonable.”</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I am proud to tell people that I work for this organization.”</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workplace

As noted in Table 2, a set of answers exhibited a high internal consistency ($\alpha = .804$). Therefore, the scores on the four items were averaged to generate the overall score. Higher scores are indicative of well-maintained workplace and overall agreement with statements.

Table 4
Internal Consistency of Workplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>$\alpha$ Without</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Given the type of work I do, my physical workplace meets my needs.”</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My workplace is well maintained.”</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There are sufficient procedures to ensure the safety of employees in the workplace.”</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I have adequate resources and equipment to do my job.”</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Climate

As noted in Table 5, a set of answers exhibited a high internal consistency ($\alpha = .806$). Therefore, the scores on the five items were averaged to generate the overall score. Higher scores are indicative of a better climate and higher levels of agreement with each statement regarding climate.

Table 5
Internal Consistency of Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>$\alpha$ Without</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Our organization is known for the quality of work we provide.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I know how my work impacts others in the organization.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My organization develops services to match the needs of our customers”</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Our organization communications e”</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I have a good understanding of our mission, vision, and strategic plan.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervision

As noted in Table 6, a set of answers exhibited a high internal consistency ($\alpha = .918$). Therefore, the scores on the five items were averaged to generate the overall score. Higher scores are indicative of stronger agreement with the statements regarding supervision and satisfactory levels of supervision.
Table 6

*Internal Consistency of Supervision*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Without</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My supervisor provides me with a clear understanding of my work responsibilities.”</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My supervisor recognizes outstanding work.”</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I am given the opportunity to do my best work.”</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My supervisor is consistent when administering policies concerning employees.”</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My supervisor evaluates my performance fairly.”</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pay**

As noted in Table 7, a set of answers exhibited a high internal consistency (α = .884). Therefore, the scores on the three items were averaged to generate the overall score. Higher scores are indicative of higher satisfaction with pay and higher levels of agreement with the statements regarding pay.

Table 7

*Internal Consistency of Pay*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Without</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My pay keeps pace with the cost of living.”</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Salaries are competitive with similar jobs in the community.”</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel I am paid fairly for the work I do.”</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Statistics of Major Variables**

Job Satisfaction was measured using five constraints form the SEE. The average of each constraint was used to measure the level of job satisfaction: extremely low (1 through 1.99), low (2.00 through 2.99), moderate (3.00 through 3.99), high (4.00
through 4.99), extremely high (5.00). Data on the sum of the constraints can be seen in Table 8. The mean of the satisfaction sum was 3.59 with a standard deviation of 0.84.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics of Major Variables (N= 622)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-.543</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-.679</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-.584</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-.958</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Testing

A multiple regression analysis was performed to test the following hypotheses included in the proposed conceptual model.

- **Hypothesis I:** Gerontology practitioners who have negative experience regarding organizational factors will report significantly lower job satisfaction.

- **Hypothesis II:** When having negative experience regarding organizational factors, Millennials will report significantly lower job satisfaction than older generations do. In other words, there is an interaction effect of organizational factors and the individual factor (i.e., being millennial generation) on job satisfaction.

An initial test of the proposed regression model showed the effect of any the organizational factors on job satisfaction was not different depending on the generation type or age, indicating Hypothesis II was not supported. Different models were tested to
see if there are some interaction effect between organizational factors and generation
type: e.g., split the data into younger and older generations, Millennials vs. Baby
Boomers, including salary in addition to the subjective perception of their pay. None of
the models indicated any interaction effect between the two types of factors. A model
revision was performed by excluding all interaction terms from the regression model.
Another multiple linear regression analysis was conducted using this revised model.

Assumptions for testing a regression model were considered using Field’s
recommendation (Field, 2013). To diagnose of multicollinearity problem, the tolerance
value for predictors was used. Low tolerance values indicated a problem with the two
predictors: Age and Millennial (i.e., Generation type). Because Millennial was calculated
using Age and it had little effect on satisfaction, Millennial is excluded from the model.
After the exclusion, the set of predictors included in the model did not have a
multicollinearity. In addition, assumptions of normality of errors and linear regression
were investigated. The examination of residual plots is considered a preferable method of
detection for the assumptions for linear regression including linearity and
homoscedasticity. The residual plot in Figure 3 indicates the assumptions were
considered met. Table 9 shows bivariate correlations among predictors included in the
revised regression model.
Figure 3. Residual plot

Table 9

Bivariate Correlations among Predictors Included in the MLR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Workplace</th>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.044**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.125*</td>
<td>-.093*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.083***</td>
<td>-.070*</td>
<td>-.107**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>.575***</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>.739***</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.161***</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.561***</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.608***</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.098**</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.485***</td>
<td>.690***</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.442***</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.368***</td>
<td>.421***</td>
<td>.291***</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Table 10 demonstrates the results of the revised model (a direct model that excludes interaction terms). In a hierarchical regression analysis, predictors of the two categories in the table was added in the presented order (Model 1 and Model 2) so that the variance of the dependent variable explained by each category can be assessed by looking at the increased R squared ($\Delta R^2$). Model 1 shows that demographic information explained 2.9% of variance. Organizational factors were added to Model 1 and explained 58.1% of variance.

Model 2 shows the results when all predictors were included. Interestingly, the significant effect of age ($t = -3.447, p = .001$) and education ($t = 2.496, p = .013$) on satisfaction has become insignificant when the effects of organizational predictors were taken into account together. The results indicate there is a possibility that demographic characteristics had an association with organizational factors that mediate the effect of demographic variables on satisfaction rather.

Model 2 identifies the significant factors of job satisfaction among geriatric caseworkers. According to the beta values in Model 2, the order of stronger significant factors is climate (beta = 0.465), workplace (beta=0.189), pay (beta=0.129), and supervision (beta=0.153). Demographic factors were not significant. These results support Hypothesis I: Gerontology practitioners who have negative experience regarding organizational factors will report significantly lower job satisfaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-1.580</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-3.447**</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-2.496**</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-1.670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-2.496**</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-1.670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>5.877***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor</td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>11.619***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>4.226***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>4.459***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² (Adj. R²)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.029 (.024)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.611 (.606)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td></td>
<td>.029</td>
<td></td>
<td>.581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.847**</td>
<td></td>
<td>130.339***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.978 through .985</td>
<td></td>
<td>.417 through .980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

With the increasing aging population growing significantly, the concern for social resources grows as well. This growth leads to a higher demand for geriatric practitioners, including social workers. Social workers are especially important in geriatric care facilities and organizations because they defend their client’s needs. Geriatric patients need someone to advocate for them and ensure they are being taken care of to the highest degree.

The purpose of the study was to research the potential effects of organizational factors on job satisfaction and their relation to generational differences. My main focus in research were those who work in geriatric care. The organizational factors covered were as follows: workplace, climate, supervision, pay. The generations used for comparison were Millennials and Baby Boomers. Through the research, it was found that there are little to no relations between generations and job satisfaction levels. However, the research was found that organizational factors impact levels of job satisfaction for geriatric practitioners.

After conducting the research, the conclusion was that there was no significant difference of job satisfaction levels between generations. Being part of a specific generation did not affect the relationship between organizational factors and job satisfaction, in that social workers have similar goals in their workplace. Each organization has different work ethics and set goals within the facility. There was no
pattern found among age groups that would cause significant concern for a specific generation.

Through the research that it shows that there are no relations between generations and job satisfaction, it looks people live in Texas are conservative. They tend to be conservative as a political tendency in the state of Texas. Traditionally, people who live in the state of Texas are disposed toward conservative. The conservative view of people has a paternalistic approach in the society and they do not want to change generation difference. In order to develop their society and community, they do not think of the generation gap but they have a strong sense of community. On the other hand, the liberal states, such as New York or California, have preference of independent style and system. They want to have individual inclination and create relationships for society and community. That is why the survey I have gotten from University of Texas at Austin shows that there is no generation gap between Millennials and Baby Boomers for the job satisfaction.

A limitation I encountered in my research was a lack of previous studies of geriatric practitioners in social work. This limitation allowed for me to provide new results for this area of research. The need for research in this area is high to ensure that improvements are made throughout this area.

A problem I faced when attempting to conduct my research was the lack of social workers as geriatric practitioners. In my area, there is a large number of geriatric facilities; however, each only has one or two social workers in the facilities. I needed to use the Survey of Employee Engagement, conducted by the School of Social Work at the University of Texas at Austin, to provide substantial research outside of my area.
I want to provide this research in order to show how important geriatric care is. The elderly population is constantly growing every year, and is going to grow significantly in the next 50 years. Understanding the areas of concern for these facilities can help improve the overall work ethic and satisfaction for social workers. With improvements being made, a growth of prospective workers could follow.

**Implications of Findings**

The initial prediction of this study was that pay would be the area for highest concern. The expectation of the research was that a worker’s salary would affect job satisfaction levels significantly more than the other organizational factors: workplace, climate, supervision. The results indicate that each organizational factor plays a key role in job satisfaction levels. In the final results, workplace and climate were shown to effect job satisfaction for social workers more than any other area. In addition, the research also concludes that level of education and age differences are not a cause for concern for facilities. The table 10, model 1, shows components of education level and age difference are very significant toward job satisfaction. Education and age can greatly affect job satisfaction. However, model 2 includes elements, organizational factors: workplace, climate, supervision, and pay that shows that education level and age difference do not bring significant affect for job satisfaction, but organizational factors (workplace, climate, supervision, and pay).

The expectation of most important organizational factors was salary. However, it was first climate, second workplace, third pay, and last supervision. The organizational factor, climate, is extremely higher number affection among fours factors (workplace, climate, supervision, and pay).

In order for geriatric facilities and organizations to improve upon their job satisfaction levels for their social workers, they will need to show concern for the
areas mentioned above. Workplace and climate are significant in the levels of job satisfaction. Making a change in these areas will yield better results of job satisfaction allowing for higher levels of service. The quality of service will improve, but also, the ability to improve will grow and leave room for greater improvements in the future.

Low job satisfaction will lead the employers to change jobs within other fields or move to the same field. The employees want to be valuable and desirable in the organization and they want to have enough salary for their needs. On the other hand, companies do not want to expand their budget because they want to increase their company size and expand larger business for other areas. However, if companies and organizations focus on expanding quantity of company size instead of increasing quality of employer’s factors (climate, workplace, pay, and supervision), they will lose out developing their core value of organization. First, they will lose their capable people who already had skill and had educated by company role, law, policy, and others that company need to educate them. Second, the budget will increase several times and spend time for hiring employers. Third, if the employers are changed over and over again, existing staff will be tired of educating and transferring one’s business to one who is new member of organization. The organization will lose professional employers who already know and have the necessary skills and techniques. Through these factors, not only the organization cannot develop their core value, but also their reputation will drop down and affect worker’s job satisfaction. The organization needs to consider and make a balance about the factors: climate, workplace, pay, and supervisor.

**Limitations of Study and Recommendation for Further Studies**

A limitation faced during research was lack of resources for social workers in geriatric care facilities. There are many articles over nurses and job satisfaction in
geriatric care, however the lack of research called for a new study to be done. The data I used was also a limitation because I had very few geriatric centers in my area with social workers as geriatric practitioners. I used data from a survey performed by the University of Texas at Austin to provide the research. However, most of their participants worked for the Department of Family and Protective Services. This caused another limitation, as only a small number of respondents worked with geriatrics.

Recently, the geriatric area issue is growing rapidly. There are numbers of research databases, resources, and information in the medical area following the job satisfaction of doctors and nurses. Collecting this data and information might be relative with the social work field. I would like to recommend anyone researching job satisfaction in the future to research job satisfaction of doctors and nurses. The results could be carried over to the social work field if they work in the same facility.

I would recommend performing research in a larger area close to the area of future researchers. This will help provide data that is clearer and more concise in results. I would also recommend using resources from different fields of study, such as job satisfaction in other facilities. Gerontology has a growing need for healthcare providers so focusing on all workers in a geriatric facility could yield sharper conclusions.

**Conclusion**

Since the aging population is set to grow in coming years, organizations need to raise social worker to be professional workers. As the study found that the factors such as workplace, climate, pay, and supervision affect workers’ job satisfaction, organizations need to improve the areas of concern. Particularly, job satisfaction is seriously affected by workplace and climate. The organization will need to focus on
these core areas to improve their workers’ job satisfaction and overall work ethic. Once these changes are made and satisfactory levels are met in all areas, organizations can thrive without needing to worry about turnover or burnout. Job satisfaction is important in all settings, but in areas where it is low, there is cause for major concern. Geriatric care facilities need to look out for lower levels in these areas and provide better resources and environment of the workplace. My research showed that pay is the area of least concern out of the four organizational factors. Organizations do not need to worry about pay unless it starts to become lower once other conditions improve. Geriatric facilities should look at these factors and see which affect their social workers most. With improvements, more social workers can be brought on to help lower the workload and create a better climate for the entire workplace.
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