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ABSTRACT

To answer the research question—“What intrinsic and extrinsic factors increase job satisfaction in private practice, online counseling, and agency practice?”—a survey was administered to assess demographic information and to rate 25 intrinsic and extrinsic components of job satisfaction. Individual components of job satisfaction with the strongest correlation to overall job satisfaction were identified for the entire study sample and within the three different work settings (i.e., agency practice, private practice, and online practice). Due to the small sample sizes of demographic and work setting groups, no correlations with individual components of job satisfaction were statistically significant (all such $p$ values were greater than 0.26). Participants in this dissertation study reported higher overall job satisfaction than participants who completed the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967), with a 95% statistical significance ($p = 0.5$). Nine individual components of job satisfaction with the strongest correlation to overall satisfaction were identified. The single most influential component, “Trust between employees and senior management,” by itself had a strong correlation ($r = 0.76$) with overall job satisfaction. Overall job satisfaction within each work setting was primarily influenced by the same nine most influential individual components. A small number of other individual components have the potential to influence job satisfaction within each work setting differently, but they are eclipsed by the influence of the nine most influential components.
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CHAPTER 1—INTRODUCTION

Overview

Job satisfaction is important for many reasons, including the impact on individuals’ physical and mental health. This study helped determine what factors influenced job satisfaction across the three settings in the year 2020/2021. With the added impact of COVID-19, this was one of the first studies to examine the influence this virus had on counselors who transitioned to an online-only work environment. It is hoped that this research will increase understanding of the factors that impact job satisfaction.

Statement of the Problem

Job scales are designed to measure job satisfaction. However, all examined job scales were woefully outdated, with the newest ones designed in 1990. For this reason, this researcher added additional survey questions to the study that focused on some of the factors found by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM; 2016) that contributed to job satisfaction but were not included in any of the job satisfaction scales. The topics added were respectful treatment of all employees at all levels, the feelings about the employee’s commute to work, the way the employee feels about their co-workers, the clientele of the employee, and trust between employees and senior management. It is important to note that the most important factor overall that impacted job satisfaction within SHRM’s study was “respectful treatment of all employees at all levels.”

This literature review found that there was little research on the broad topic of job satisfaction and just a few studies on how the job setting impacted job satisfaction. The research overwhelmingly supported the idea that those counselors working in an agency
had lower job satisfaction than those working in private practice. Another gap in the literature involved online counseling related to job satisfaction. There were no research studies found regarding this topic.

Need for the Study

This study was very important since it focused on the factors identified during the literature review to survey counselors working in different job settings (i.e., agency practice, private practice, and online practice) and what factors they felt contributed most to their job satisfaction. As stated previously, all of the job satisfaction scales are woefully out of date and may no longer represent what factors lead to increased job satisfaction in our current time. In addition, the researcher of this study was unable to find any research at all that examined counselor job satisfaction related to online practice.

Purpose of the Study

As stated previously, there has not been much written about in the literature concerning job satisfaction across different settings: online, agency practice, and private practice. Job satisfaction is important for many reasons, including the impact on individuals’ physical and mental health. Job scales are designed to measure job satisfaction. However, all of the job scales that were examined are woefully out of date, with the newest ones designed in 1990.

Because of this, this researcher added additional survey questions to the current study that focused on some of the factors found by SHRM (2016) that contribute to job satisfaction but were not included in any of the job satisfaction scales. The topics added were respectful treatment of all employees at all levels, feelings about the employee’s
commute to work, the way the employee feels about his/her co-workers, the clientele of the employee, and trust between employees and senior management.

The research overwhelmingly supported the idea that those counselors working in an agency had lower job satisfaction than those working in private practice. A gap in the literature was found that involved online counseling related to job satisfaction. There were no research studies found regarding this topic. Online counseling was a larger focus in this study.

This research helped determine what factors influence job satisfaction across the three settings in 2020/2021. With the added impact of COVID-19, this was one of the first studies to examine the influence this virus has had on counselors who had to transition to an online-only work environment. Licensed mental health counselors, (e.g., LMHC, LPC, NCC, LMFT) currently working in agency practice, private practice, or online practice were eligible to take part in a survey online through Airtable regarding job satisfaction. The results were then computed using factor analysis.

**Research Question**

The dissertation research question was: “What intrinsic and extrinsic factors increase job satisfaction in private practice, online counseling, and agency practice?”

**Definitions of Terms**

The following are terms used in this dissertation and their definitions:

- *Agender*: Agender people feel that they have no gender or that their gender is neutral (Brennan, 2021).
- *Burnout*: 
A syndrome conceptualized as resulting from chronic workplace stress that has not been successfully managed. It is characterized by three dimensions: feelings of energy depletion or exhaustion; increased mental distance from one’s job, or feelings of negativism or cynicism related to one’s job; and reduced professional efficacy. (World Health Organization, 2018, para. 4)

- **Component**: One of the 25 Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) Plus survey questions (20 were from the MSQ short form, and 5 were added by the dissertation committee).

- **Disposition**: “A habit, a preparation, a state of readiness, or a characteristic tendency to act in a specified way” (Cohrs et al., 2006, p. 346).

- **Extrinsic variable**: Includes job-specific factors and environmental conditions (e.g., the way my supervisor handles his/her workers, the competence of my supervisor in making decisions).

- **Factor**: Any demographic data (nominal or ratio) or individual component of job satisfaction (as rated on a Likert scale).

- **Genderfluid**: A person whose gender identity (the gender they identify with most) is not fixed. It can change over time or from day to day (WebMD, 2020).

- **Genderqueer**: “The term genderqueer means someone who does not follow binary gender norms. They may be non-binary, agender, pangender, genderfluid, or another gender identity” (Brennan, 2021, para. 1).
• **Intrinsic factor:** Intrinsic factors are related to the counselor directly and not to a particular job (e.g., keeping busy all the time, the chance to work alone on the job).

• **Job characteristic:** A facet of employment that produces ideal conditions for high motivation, satisfaction, and performance (Hackman & Oldham, 1974).

• **Job satisfaction:** Job satisfaction has emotional, cognitive, and behavioral components. The emotional component includes feelings about the job like boredom, happiness, or anxiety. The cognitive component refers to beliefs about one’s job, for instance, thinking that one’s job is mentally taxing and difficult. Finally, the behavioral component includes people’s actions regarding their work, such as being late getting to work, staying late at the job working, or faking illness to avoid work (Bernstein & Nash, 2008).

• **Non-binary:** Non-binary is used to describe people who believe their gender cannot be defined within the margins of the gender binary. Instead, they understand their gender in a way that goes beyond simply identifying as either a man or woman (LGBT Foundation, n.d.).

• **Overall job satisfaction:** The sum of all individual components of job satisfaction normed to 100.

• **Pangender:** Identifying as multiple genders at the same time or shifting between multiple genders (Lane, 2021)

• **Social information processing:** A job design model where significant job factors depend on interpersonal views or what others tell an employee about the job (Jex, 2002).
Summary

This dissertation covers the following chapters:

- Literature Review: This chapter discusses basic definitions of job satisfaction, the most prevalent job satisfaction scales are explored, the most up-to-date research regarding job satisfaction is then discussed. The chapter concludes with a table that lists all the job satisfaction scales and the rationale behind them.

- Methodology: This chapter discusses the statement of the problem, the research question, the participants and sample size, the instruments used, data collection procedures, statistical and data analysis, and finally, ethical considerations.

- Results of the Study: This chapter focuses on the data analysis utilizing factor analysis and percentile rank.

- Discussion of Findings: This chapter explores the findings, the implications for the profession, and suggestions for future research.
Chapter 2—LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review begins with a definition of job satisfaction, spotlighting several popular ideas about what truly is meant by the term *job satisfaction*. Next, this chapter discusses why job satisfaction is important to both employees and employers as well. Myths regarding job satisfaction are then explored focusing on what the research shows. Three common factors that contribute to job satisfaction are then explained. These include job characteristics, organizational characteristics, and worker characteristics.

Next, this researcher explores what organizations can do to improve job satisfaction for their employees (e.g., trust, respect, security). Counseling job settings are then listed along with examples, focusing on the three utilized in this study. The most prevalent job satisfaction scales are then highlighted, including their reliability and validity statistics.

Since there is little research specifically on job satisfaction studies, burnout is explored, as much research has been conducted in this area. Job satisfaction across the three settings this research will focus on is examined next. Online counseling and the various facets of this setting are then examined as this is the newest practice setting for counselors. Table 1 is then discussed, along with the rationale for the job satisfaction scale chosen for this research.

**What Exactly is Job Satisfaction?**

Hoppock was the first industrial psychologist in 1935 to discuss job satisfaction as “a combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances which cause a person to truthfully say ‘I am satisfied with my job’” (Azash & Thirupalu, 2017,
p. 114). Job satisfaction was described by Cambridge Dictionary (n.d., para. 1), as “the feeling of pleasure and achievement that you experience in your job when you know that your work is worth doing, or the degree to which your work gives you this feeling.” In 1969, Locke described job satisfaction as positive feelings about one’s job and that one’s job is tied to reaching one’s goals. There are three factors involved: “the perception about the facet of the job, a value system, and an evaluation of the relationship between the perception and the value system” (Azash & Thirupalu, 2017, p. 114). Locke (1976) later revised his definition, stating that it is “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (p. 1304). In 1992, Cranny et al. defined job satisfaction as an “employee’s emotional state surrounding their job,” particularly their expectations and the resulting reality of their job experiences (Azash & Thirupalu, 2017, p. 114).

In addition, job satisfaction has emotional, cognitive, and behavioral components. The emotional component includes feelings about the job such as boredom, happiness, or anxiety. The cognitive component refers to beliefs about one’s job, for instance, thinking that one’s job is mentally taxing and difficult. Finally, the behavioral component includes people’s actions regarding their work, such as being late getting to work, staying late at the job working, or faking illness to avoid work (Bernstein & Nash, 2008).

It is clear from these different definitions that job satisfaction is not a one-definition concept; job satisfaction means different things to different people. It is clear that as time has moved forward, the definition of job satisfaction has evolved and become less general and more specific and complete. These are just some of the definitions that
describe job satisfaction; there are many more. This researcher will use Bernstein and Nash’s (2008) definition because it is comprehensive and thorough.

**Why is Job Satisfaction Important?**

Job satisfaction is important for so many reasons. One of the primary reasons is that society spends more time working than enjoying other leisure time activities. Because we spend much more of our lives working than enjoying time with friends and families, it is important to our emotional well-being to be as satisfied as we can be (U.S. Department of Labor, 2019). Job satisfaction has been associated with mental/physical health, motivation (of employee), accidents, productivity, absenteeism/tardiness, and general life satisfaction (Landy, 1978). A popular idea within the research has been that a person’s emotional state is impacted by interactions within their work environment.

In their meta-analysis that examined the relationship between job satisfaction and health, Faragher et al. (2005) found an immensely strong correlation between job satisfaction and physical and mental health. A systematic review and meta-analysis of 485 studies with a sample size of 267,995 participants were conducted, evaluating the research that studied job satisfaction measures to physical and mental well-being. According to Faragher et al. (2005):

Job satisfaction was most strongly associated with mental/psychological problems; strongest relationships were found for burnout (corrected $r = 0.478$), self-esteem ($r = 0.429$), depression ($r = 0.428$), and anxiety ($r = 0.420$). The correlation with subjective physical illness was more modest ($r = 0.287$). (p. 107)
These correlations suggest that job satisfaction is an important factor influencing the physical and mental health of employees. Faragher et al. (2005) confirmed that dissatisfaction at work can be hazardous to an employee’s mental health and well-being.

However, in reviewing the literature, the latest information about job satisfaction is positive. According to the SHRM, the number of individuals who say they were happy with their job increased from 81% in 2013 to 88% in 2016. SHRM believed that the likely reason for this was an improvement to the economy, which led to employers increasing salaries, perks, and benefits for their employees. Furthermore, stabilization of the job market allowed more individuals to find new job opportunities that fit their knowledge, interest, and skill set (SHRM, 2016).

Job satisfaction of employees is also vital for employers. It can lead to a lower turnover rate, which also leads to savings for businesses as training new employees is a large expense for all employers. It also leads to a more positive job environment for all employees. Workers satisfied with their jobs have higher productivity rates than employees who have a lower job satisfaction rate. It can also lead to more employee loyalty. When workers feel that the company values them and their concerns, they are more likely to support their mission and objectives (SHRM, 2016).

SHRM reported that recognition programs for employees are another way to create a positive workplace environment. SHRM defined workplace recognition as “a way to reward employees and reinforce an organization’s goals. Recognition includes anything and everything an organization, manager or peer does to acknowledge, praise and appreciate the hard work, success and achievements of colleagues” (SHRM, 2018, p. 7). In the survey, 68% of employers reported that their recognition programs positively
affected the retention of employees, and 56% reported that they positively affected recruitment (SHRM, 2018). It is critical for organizations to be aware of what factors affect job satisfaction as they can certainly contribute to job retention for their employees. Swift (2007) reported that for organizations to stay competitive and have more satisfied and productive employees, they must have a good comprehension of work-life balance and speak to those issues to have a satisfied workforce. Bright (2008) agreed, stating that people who maintain a good work-life balance are happier workers and show better organizational conscientiousness, courtesy, and citizenship.

**What Can Organizations Do to Improve Job Satisfaction?**

As mentioned above, the SHRM (2016) study found several factors that were effective for organizations to improve job satisfaction for their employees. These included:

- **Respect**—Respecting all employees is actually the most crucial factor in job satisfaction for organizations.
- **Trust**—Trust between the worker and the employer (particularly senior management).
- **Security**—Employees want to feel safe and secure at their job through transparency and honest communication about the company’s future.
- **Healthy environment**—A work environment with low stress and high morale without instances of discrimination or harassment leads to a healthier and more positive workspace.
- **Career path**—Employees want to know that they can strive for upward mobility with an opportunity to earn more money and take on new, bigger responsibilities.
• Pay and benefits—Being paid well with needed benefits for their families helps make workers feel valued and lessens the chance they will leave their employer.

**Myths About Job Satisfaction: What the Research Shows**

Several myths exist about job satisfaction. One such fallacy is that a cheerful employee is productive (Syptak et al., 1999). Research has done little to support that a cheerful employee is productive. In fact, some research has suggested that causality may flow the other way, from productivity to satisfaction (Bassett, 1994).

Another myth is that pay is the most crucial factor in job satisfaction. Actually, it appears that employees are more satisfied when they are pleased with their job environment. An employee can have a job that pays very well and still not be satisfied because it is boring and lacks sufficient stimulation (Berry, 1997). In fact, a low-paying job can be seen as satisfying if it is adequately challenging or stimulating.

An additional myth is that employees leave because they do not like the company they work for when they resign. In reality, when employees resign, it is more often than not because of their direct supervisor and not the company itself. Hyacinth (2017) reported that a Gallup poll of more than one million workers found that 75% of workers stated that their primary reason for quitting their jobs was their direct supervisor and not their position or the company itself. There are likely additional myths that exist about job satisfaction as well.

**Factors That Contribute to Job Satisfaction**

Researchers have identified numerous factors that appear to contribute to either job satisfaction or organizational commitment (Glisson & Durick, 1988). To explain the development of job satisfaction, researchers have taken three common approaches: job...
characteristics, social information processing (organizational characteristics), and disposition (worker characteristics) (Glisson & Durick, 1988; Jex, 2002).

**Job Characteristics**

In referring to the job characteristics approach, studies have shown that an individual’s type of job or the organization’s characteristics that the individual works for primarily determine job satisfaction (Jex, 2002). According to Hackman and Oldham (1974), a job characteristic is a facet of employment that produces ideal conditions for high motivation, satisfaction, and performance. In addition, they proposed five core job characteristics that each job should contain:

- **Skill variety:** “The degree to which a job requires a variety of different activities in carrying out the work, which involves the use of several different skills and talents of the employee” (Hackman & Oldham, 1974, p. 5). For example, counselors may utilize cognitive-behavioral therapy with some clients and art therapy with other clients.

- **Task identity:** “The extent to which an individual can complete a whole and identifiable piece of work” (Hackman & Oldham, 1974, p. 5). For example, an employee is asked by their supervisor to write a revised training manual, but before it is complete, the supervisor suggests that a co-worker take over and write the rest of the manual. The work would likely be more meaningful if the employee could work on the project from start to finish (Renn & Vandenberg, 1995).

- **Task significance:** According to Hackman and Oldham (1974), “The degree to which the job has a substantial impact on the lives or work of other people—whether in the immediate organization or in the external environment” (p. 5). For example, a
counselor working with domestic violence survivors who feels as if their work is meaningful and helpful to that population.

- **Autonomy:** “The degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion of the employee in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out” (Hackman & Oldham, 1974, p. 5). For example, if a counselor runs their own private practice, they have a great deal more autonomy over their job than a counselor working in an agency.

- **Feedback:** “The degree to which carrying out the activities inherent in the job provides clear information to the employee about the effectiveness of their performance” (Hackman & Oldham, 1974, p. 5). For example, when a counselor is working with a client, the counselor notices whether the client is completing any homework the counselor is giving the client. If the client is not, the counselor should recognize that and ask the client where the disconnect is and try to improve it.

Hackman and Oldham (1974) also described four personal and work outcomes:

- **Internal work motivation:** “The degree to which the employee is self-motivated to perform effectively on the job (i.e., the employee experiences positive internal feelings when working effectively on the job, and negative internal feelings when doing poorly)” (Hackman & Oldham, 1974, p. 10). An example of this would be a counselor keeping a journal, not for publication. The counselor does it simply for themselves.

- **Growth satisfaction:** “Opportunities for personal growth and development that the person finds personally satisfying” (Hackman & Oldham, 1974, p. 10). For example, the counselor studies yoga and meditation to enhance their personal lives and help their clients practice calming and stress relief.
• General satisfaction: “Overall measure of the degree to which people are happy and satisfied” (Hackman & Oldham, 1974, p. 10).

• Work effectiveness: “Quality and quantity of goods and services produced” (Hackman & Oldham, 1974, p. 10). For example, how many clients does the counselor see daily, and how long is each session?

A common occurrence in research regarding the consequences of job circumstances on job satisfaction is that individuals interpret job satisfaction by comparing what they are currently receiving from their work and what they might wish to or believe they should receive. This comparison would apply to every job facet (e.g., skill level, seniority, promotional opportunities, supervision) (Jex, 2002). Locke (1976) would likely believe that this process is complex because the importance of work facets is different for every individual. An example is when one worker might believe the work environment is very important while another might think compensation is not significantly important. In explaining the consequences of these kinds of differences, he suggested the idea of the range of affect theory. The idea of this theory is that employees weigh facets differently when assessing job satisfaction.

Consequently, this results in an individual measure of satisfaction or dissatisfaction when expectations are or are not met. For example, the job satisfaction of an employee who places extreme importance on the work environment would be positively impacted if they were to be moved to an office with a window (if the window signified a positive change in the work environment). Conversely, their pay level would have little impact on the job satisfaction of an employee who places minimal importance on pay (Locke, 1976).
Social Information Processing (Organizational Characteristics)

Social information processing can be described as a job design model where significant job factors depend on interpersonal views or what others tell an employee about the job. Based largely on Festinger’s (1954) social comparison theory, Jex (2002) posited that employees focus on co-workers to make sense of and develop attitudes about their work environment during social information processing. In other words, if employees see that their co-workers are positive and satisfied, they will most likely be satisfied; however, if their co-workers are negative and dissatisfied, then the employee will most likely become dissatisfied.

Weiss and Shaw (1979) performed a research study in which the subjects watched a training video where assembly line workers either made positive or negative comments about their jobs. The subjects who watched the video were then given the opportunity to do the same job. The study determined that the subjects shown the positive video liked performing the job tasks more than the subjects who viewed the negative tape.

Mirolli et al. (1998) also conducted a similar study. In this study, the subjects performed a task with two experimenters pretending to be other subjects (the study referred to them as confederates). In the first condition, the confederates made positive comments about the job and how much they enjoyed it. In the second condition, the confederates commented negatively about the job and how much they did not like it.

Regarding the control condition, no positive or negative comments were made referring to the job. The actual research subjects who had interactions with the confederates who made positive comments ranked the job tasks as more enjoyable than the subjects exposed to the negative comments by the confederates. This study further
supports social information processing theory (Aamodt, 2009). In general, “the research on social information processing theory supports the idea that social environment does have an effect on employees’ attitudes and behaviors” (Aamodt, 2009, p. 374).

**Disposition (Worker Characteristics)**

Disposition can be defined as “a habit, a preparation, a state of readiness, or a characteristic tendency to act in a specified way” (Cohrs et al., 2006, p. 346). Internal disposition is the basis of the most recent method to explain job satisfaction and suggests that some people tend to be satisfied or dissatisfied with their work regardless of their job or job setting (Jex, 2002). Furthermore, although people inevitably change jobs and employers, individual disposition is consistent by using survey results on job satisfaction (Staw & Ross, 1985).

Dispositional affect is the predisposition to have related emotional moods over time (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2008). This theory assumes that an employee’s attitude about their job has its origins from an internal (mental) state. Additionally, there is strong evidence that supports disposition causing job satisfaction from a social cognitive aspect. Causation through disposition suggests that job satisfaction is often determined by a person’s general overall outlook.

Judge and Locke (1992) discussed that the subjective well-being that results from an affective disposition led to individuals experiencing information recall about their job. To simplify, happy individuals tend to store and evaluate job information differently than unhappy individuals do. This type of recollection suggests that job satisfaction can be influenced by subjective well-being. Multiple studies have been conducted on the dispositional source of job satisfaction and have presented strong evidence that job
satisfaction, at least to some extent, is based on disposition (Judge & Larsen, 2001). Staw & Ross (1986) found that teenagers who displayed a positive disposition were correlated with higher adult job satisfaction for as many as 40 years later.

Tait et al. (1989) completed a meta-analytic review that revealed an average correlation between job and life satisfaction of 0.44. This helps to support the theory of a dispositional effect on job satisfaction. In addition, Howard and Bray (1988) found with the study they performed with AT&T managers that motives such as ambition and desire to get ahead are some of the strongest predictors for advancement.

Bandura (1986) posited that an individual’s aspirations become their standards of self-satisfaction. This suggests that those with ambitious goals, theoretically, should be harder to satisfy than people with low goals. This would also suggest that a high level of ambition resulting from high standards can point to a lower satisfaction as a result.

It is often the case that unsatisfied workers are extremely ambitious but unhappy due to their inability to be promoted within an organization. This is the reason ambition can negatively influence job satisfaction. However, Judge and Locke (1992) cautioned that dysfunctional thinking is not the only dispositional factor affecting job satisfaction. They also pointed out that “self-esteem, locus of control, self-efficacy, intelligence, and ambition” can affect job satisfaction as well (p. 485).

These three causes have all been correlated in some significant way to job satisfaction; interestingly, however, there have been no studies conducted to this point to simultaneously compare all three of these potential causes of job satisfaction (Baker, 2004). The largest and most recent study on job satisfaction that was found was conducted by SHRM (2016), who surveyed 600 employees and found that the top
predictors of job satisfaction were (1) Respectful treatment of all employees at all levels; (2) Overall compensation/pay; (3) Overall benefits; (4) Job security; (5) Tie: Trust between employees and senior management and (5) Opportunities to use your skills/abilities in your work.

Burnout

Burnout is defined as “a syndrome conceptualized as resulting from chronic workplace stress that has not been successfully managed. It is characterized by three dimensions: feelings of energy depletion or exhaustion; increased mental distance from one’s job, or feelings of negativism or cynicism related to one’s job; and reduced professional efficacy” (World Health Organization, 2018, para. 4). Although much research is focused on burnout (Lawson, 2007), there is comparatively little research focused on job satisfaction. Therefore, this researcher broadened the scope of the literature review to include information relevant to burnout. The factors related to job satisfaction are likely the opposite factors of burnout. Therefore, some of the factors of burnout could then be hypothesized to correlate to job satisfaction. This is relevant because so many job satisfaction scales are outdated, and the job satisfaction factors may be less accurate.

One of the earliest studies that examined the influence of work setting on burnout was conducted by Vredenburgh et al. (1999). This study consisted of a sample of 521 doctoral-level psychologists from the American Psychological Association. Of that sample, 43% worked primarily in private practice, 29% were employed in a university setting, 10.9% worked in inpatient hospital settings, 7.3% worked in community mental health, and 9.8% were employed in other settings. They found that private practice
participants reported the lowest levels of burnout, and professionals in hospital settings reported the greatest levels. This could be associated with the autonomy and income associated with private practice work. There was also a positive correlation found between hours of client contact and a sense of personal accomplishment. This may be partly due to the psychologists’ thinking that the more clients they were seeing, the more they felt they were making a difference and helping many people.

Fortener (2000) and Gaal (2009) showed similar results in their prospective studies. They both indicated that mental health professionals working in private practice experienced less burnout than those working in other settings. Fortener performed a study that examined the relationship between the counselors’ work setting, client prognosis, and client suicidal ideations and burnout among counselors. A total sample of 208 licensed professional clinical counselors (LPCCs) and psychologists in Ohio was used, comprising 102 psychologists, 94 LPCCs, and 12 who were both LPCCs and psychologists.

In the research study, 13 hypotheses were developed to determine: (a) the prevalence of counselors’ burnout in the state of Ohio; (b) the relationship between work setting (self-employed versus other-employed) and level of burnout; (c) the relationship between the percentage of clients with poor prognosis and level of burnout; (d) the relationship between the percentage of clients with suicidal ideation and levels of burnout; and (e) which of the three factors (i.e., counselors’ work setting, clients’ prognosis, or clients’ suicidal ideation) is the greatest contributor to burnout. Data were analyzed using a series of multiple regressions, using the demographic factors (i.e., gender, years of experience, minority status, marital status, and years of experience) as
control variables. The three predictor variables were therapists’ work setting, client suicidal ideations, and client prognosis.

Separate regressions for each subscale (i.e., emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment) of the Maslach Burnout Inventory were performed. The study found that those working in other settings, which consisted of agencies, community programs, higher education, and institutional settings, had a higher burnout rate than those working in private practice. One of the most interesting conclusions about this study was that therapists’ work setting was the greatest contributor to therapists’ burnout.

Gaal (2009) posited that therapists working in a mental health organization experience significantly more burnout symptoms than therapists working in private practice settings. The purpose of her study was to examine specific factors that appear to lead to burnout and how the counselors’ employers can help to alleviate their employees from being impacted by burnout. She distributed 200 surveys to mental health therapists in Colorado.

Of those distributed, 96 were returned; 42 were from therapists in private practice, and 56 were from therapists in mental health organizations. Data were collected from 32 males and 66 females. The participants ranged in age from 22 years to 76 years, with a mean age of 49.4 years. Regarding ethnicity, 85 of the participants were Caucasian, 4 were African American, 3 were Hispanic/Latino, 2 were Asian American, and 4 were classified as other. Of the participants, 58 had a master’s degree or less, and 40 had doctorates or had completed post-graduate work. Regarding licensure, 69 of the participants reported being licensed, while 29 participants did not have a license.
The length of time worked in the mental health field ranged from 2 years to 40 years, with a mean of 16.6 years. The length of time worked at their current setting ranged from 2 months to 35 years, with a mean of 7.9 years. Regarding clientele, 92 participants said that most of their clients were adults, and only 6 participants said that most of their clients were children. Gaal found in her study that individuals who work in private practice experience significantly fewer burnout symptoms than individuals working in agency practice. She found that personal accomplishment, recognition, control over job responsibilities, high/low caseloads, like/dislike the job, amount of paperwork, and a sense of autonomy were all factors contributing to burnout (Gaal, 2009).

Another important study was conducted by Rupert and Morgan (2005). Their research involved 571 doctoral psychologists. They were asked about their professional activities, work environment, and burnout. They discovered that individual and group-independent practitioners reported a greater sense of personal accomplishment than agency participants did. Greater exhaustion was correlated with less control over work activities, working more hours, and other factors that decreased one’s sense of autonomy. Lent and Schwartz (2012) also found that community mental health outpatient counselors reported significantly greater burnout than either private practice or inpatient counselors. By looking at a national sample of professional counselors, the study intended to discover the impact of work setting, demographic characteristics, and personality factors on burnout.

Responses from an online survey were collected from 340 professional counselors. The sample was 75% female and 25%, male. White/Euro-Americans
comprised 85% of the sample, 11% Black/African American, 2% Native American, and 2% Hispanic/Latin American. In addition, 77% of the participants held a master’s degree, while 34% held a doctorate.

**Mental Health Counselors and Job Satisfaction**

Only two studies were found. The first was a dissertation conducted by Cunningham (2014) that pertained to mental health counselors’ job satisfaction and the different settings of private practice and agency practice. Two assessments and a survey were administered to 135 counselors, and the results showed that private practitioners reported statistically significant higher levels of job satisfaction.

The second study was also a dissertation pertaining to mental health counselors and job satisfaction, examining whether education level and education specialty impacted job satisfaction. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was the instrument of choice. The JDI was administered to 464 counselors at the master-level or higher. The results showed, “Doctorate-level were more satisfied with promotions than Master-level counselors, and counselor educators were more satisfied with promotion opportunities than mental health, school, or creative arts/other counselors” (Gambrell, 2010, p. 1).

**Counseling Job Settings**

Multiple job settings exist for mental health counselors (Careers in Psychology, n.d.). Please note, this list is not exhaustive, but instead some of the more common settings where mental health counselors work. These include the following: hospitals, inpatient/outpatient detoxification centers, religious institutions, residential care facilities, halfway houses, geriatric-related facilities, correctional facilities/prisons, educational
system, career centers at high schools/colleges/universities, mental health agencies, private practice, and online counseling.

This research study focused on three types of job settings: private practice (in-person), agency (including all settings 1-10 listed above as well as possibly others), and online counseling (e.g., telehealth, online therapy). Private practice counselors typically have their own counseling practice or are in a small group of providers with other counselors. Agency counselors typically work for large counseling agencies, non-profit organizations, and the like. Online counselors provide their counseling services to their clients through an online platform.

**Job Satisfaction Scales**

The purpose of job satisfaction scales is to measure the job satisfaction of an employee. This study examined how accurate the following job satisfaction scales are relevant to today’s society and today’s counselors overall and in a new job setting such as online counseling. The most recent job satisfaction scales available with research supporting their efficacy was published in 1990. They are usually categorized in one of three ways: (a) global measures; (b) facet measures; or (c) a combination of global and facet measures.

**Global Job Satisfaction**

These measures are just a simple measure of one’s overall job satisfaction. It seeks to answer the question, “Overall, how satisfied is one with one’s job?” Nagy (2002) claimed that one overall measure of job satisfaction is sufficient because most employees know whether their job brings them satisfaction or not and do not need to answer multitudes of questions to determine job satisfaction. However, Thierry disagreed, citing
that when employees fill out this type of global measure, they are not likely to compare all of the different facets related to the job, and if they did, they would not weigh the facets of the job equally (Azash & Thirupalu, 2017). These global measures include Hoppock’s Scale, Job Satisfaction Index, Overall Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, Job in General Scale, Job-Related Affective Well Being Scale, and the Career Satisfaction Scale.

**Hoppock’s Scale**

The very first scale was introduced by Hoppock in 1935 and consists of four items detailing general job satisfaction. Those four items (McNichols et al., 1978) are:

1. Which one of the following shows how much of the time you feel satisfied with your job?
   
   Answers: 1. Never. 2. Seldom. 3. Occasionally. 4. About half of the time. 5. A good deal of the time. 6. Most of the time 7. All the time.

2. Choose the one of the following statements which best tells how well you like your job.
   
   Answers: 1. I hate it. 2. I dislike it. 3. I don’t like it. 4. I am indifferent to it. 5. I like it. 6. I am enthusiastic about it. 7. I love it.

3. Which one of the following best tells how you feel about changing your job?
   
   Answers: 1. I would quit this job at once if I could. 2. I would take almost any other job in which I could earn as much as I am earning now. 3. I would like to change both my job and my occupation. 4. I would like to exchange my present job for another one. 5. I am not eager to change my job, but I would do so if I
could get a better job. 6. I cannot think of any jobs for which I would exchange. 7.
I would not exchange my job for any other.

4. Which one of the following shows how you think you compare with other people?
Answers: No one dislikes his job more than I dislike mine. 2. I dislike my job
much more than most people dislike theirs. 3. I dislike my job more than most
people dislike theirs. 4. I like my job about as well as most people like theirs. 5. I
like my job better than most people like theirs. 6. I like my job much better than
most people like theirs. 7. No one likes his job better than I like mine.

**Job Satisfaction Index (JSI)**

Introduced by Brayfield and Rothe in 1951, this measure has 18 items that
measure overall job satisfaction. Answers are given using a five-point Likert scale
ranging from 1 to 5 with 1 meaning “strongly disagree” to 5 meaning “strongly agree.”
This scale shows acceptable reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.87. The scale is
shown below:

0. There are some conditions concerning my job that could be improved.

1. My job is like a hobby to me.

2. My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.

3. It seems that my friends are more interested in their jobs.

4. I consider my job rather unpleasant.

5. I enjoy my work more than my leisure time.

6. I am often bored with my job.

7. I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.

8. Most of the time, I have to force myself to go to work.
9. I am satisfied with my job for the time being.
10. I feel that my job is no more interesting than others I could get.
11. I definitely dislike my work.
12. I feel that I am happier in my work than most other people.
13. Most days, I am enthusiastic about my work.
14. Each day of work seems like it will never end.
15. I like my job better than the average worker does.
16. My job is pretty uninteresting.
17. I find real enjoyment in my work.
18. I am disappointed that I ever took this job.

**Overall Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (OJSQ)**

This five-question scale was developed by Andrews and Withey in 1976. The five-item self-report measure simply examines how happy the individual is with their job. The OJSQ is measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale, with scores ranging from 1, which indicates “delighted,” to 7, which indicates “terrified.” Lower scores indicate individuals’ greater satisfaction with their work. The Cronbach’s coefficient alpha reliability is 0.81. This scale also demonstrated “a high degree of convergent validity” (Rentsch & Steel, 1992, p. 360). The scale is below:

a. How do you feel about your job?

b. How do you feel about the people you work with – your co-workers?

c. How do you feel about the work you do on your job – the work itself?

d. What is it like where you work – the physical surroundings, the hours, the amount of work you are asked to do?
e. How do you feel about what you have available for doing your job – I mean equipment, information, good supervision, and so on?

**Job in General Scale (JGS)**

This scale was introduced by Ironson et al. in 1989. Eighteen items focus on job satisfaction. Each item is a short phrase about the job as a whole. There are three response choices, similar to the JDI: yes, no, or “?”. The JGS showed good reliability and had a coefficient alpha ranging from .82 to .94. In addition, there is an abridged version of the JGS as well that only has 8 items as opposed to 18 items in the full version.

**Job-Related Affective Well Being Scale**

Warr (1990) developed a scale that attempted to examine job-related and non-job-related mental health. It consisted of the following items: job competence, job aspiration, job carry-over, non-job competence, and non-job aspiration. According to Sevastos et al. (1992), the reliabilities of the scales were similar to those reported by Warr (Warr’s numbers are in parentheses); specifically, anxiety-commitment = 0.82 (0.76) and depression-enthusiasm = 0.85 (0.80). Evidence for the construct validity of the well-being and mental health scales was based on the association with job characteristics.

**Career Satisfaction Scale**

This scale was developed by Greenhaus et al. in 1990. It is a very simple, straightforward scale that consists of five items:

1. I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career.
2. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my overall career goals.
3. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for income.
4. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for advancement.
5. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for developing new skills.

Participants indicated their agreement on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (do not agree at all) to 5 (fully agree). The scale reliabilities were found to be good at all times of measurement. In three studies, Wolff and Moser (2009) provided evidence for these scales’ validity and differential validity.

**Facet Job Satisfaction**

These measures examine the different facets frequently involved that determine how satisfied one is with one’s job (e.g., pay, time off work, workload). Porter and Steers (1973) and Howard and Frink (1996) found that because job satisfaction consists of many different elements, that is what all adds up to overall job satisfaction as a whole. These job facet scales focus on which particular aspects of the job could be improved. One of the global scale approach criticisms is that it is too extensive and therefore cannot be interpreted properly (Morrison, 1996; Rice et al., 1989).

According to Kerber and Campbell (1987), measurements of job facet satisfaction may help find out which specific aspects of a job require improvements. Those results may guide organizations in improving overall job satisfaction or explaining organizational issues such as high turnover. Arnold and Feldman found that facet measures are likely to be more accurate because they incorporate many different factors of the category being measured, and they prevent the chance that an outlier response to
one question will change the measure completely (Azash & Thirupalu, 2017). These facet measure scales include the JDI and the MSQ.

*Job Descriptive Index*

This is likely the most prevalent job satisfaction scale and was introduced by Smith et al. (1969). It is also one of the most revised and validated job satisfaction instruments (Azash & Thirupalu, 2017). It consists of 72 items consisting of 5 categories: work, supervision, pay, co-workers, and promotion opportunities. The items are short phrases that reference the job. There are three response choices: “yes,” “no,” or “?”.

“Reliability estimates on each of the 5 facets in the 1997 revision were computed using the data from approximately 1,600 participants to the JDI. Cronbach alpha coefficients ranged from .86 to .91. In general, there is strong evidence of construct validity in that the JDI has been shown to correlate with other job satisfaction scales and with various job attitudes and behaviors” (Harwell, 2009).

In addition, there is also an abridged version of the scale published in 2009 that maintains adequate reliability but reduces the administration time. It is comprised of 30 items, compared to 72 for the full version (Bowling Green State University, n.d.). However, the MSQ (Weiss et al., 1967) discussed below is more comprehensive and incorporates more potential job satisfaction factors.

*Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*

The scale was introduced by Weiss et al. in 1967 and asks 100 questions to assess 20 facets of job satisfaction (Azash & Thirupalu, 2017). One of the primary weaknesses with this scale is its length, as considerable time is required to complete it. The facets are: variety, supervision (human relations), activity, social status, independence, supervision
(technical), security, authority, company policies and practices, moral values, social
service authority, ability utilization, compensation, advancement, responsibility,
creativity, working conditions, co-workers, recognition, and achievement.

The short-form version of the MSQ (Weiss et al., 1967) was published. This
version has only 20 questions but still examines all 20 facets of job satisfaction utilizing 3
scales: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction. For the
intrinsic satisfaction scale, the reliability coefficient ranged from 0.84 to 0.91; for the
extrinsic satisfaction scale, the coefficients varied from 0.77 to 0.82; and for the general
satisfaction scale, they varied from 0.87 to 0.92. The scale also showed through the
different occupational groups, including social workers (similar to counselors) the
validity to differentiate job satisfaction at the 0.001 significance level on all scales.

**Combination Scales**

**Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS)**

Developed by Hackman and Oldham (1974), this survey begins with questions
indicating an overall job satisfaction that query for variety in the job, characteristics of
the job, the meaningfulness of the work experience, comparing attitudes to co-
workers/supervisors regarding the job, general satisfaction, and internal work motivation.
The second section then queries specific items, including job security, pay/compensation,
social, supervisors, and personal growth. The internal consistency reliabilities range from
a high of 0.88 to a low of 0.56. In general, the results suggest that both the internal
consistency reliability of the scales and the discriminant validity of the items are
satisfactory.
Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)

Introduced by Spector in 1985, this survey combines an overall job satisfaction score and nine facet-specific scores. The different categories that comprise the facet-specific scores are promotion, fringe benefits, operating conditions, nature of work, pay, supervision, contingent rewards, co-workers, and communication. It utilizes a Likert scale with six points ranging from 1 meaning “disagree very much” to 6 meaning “agree very much.” The 9 facet subscales have 4 questions, each totaling 36, representing a general job satisfaction score (Azash & Thirupalu, 2017).

According to Spector (1985):
The nine subscales related moderately to well between each other. Overall, an average of 0.70 for internal consistency was obtained out of a sample of 3,067 individuals. Studies using various scales for job satisfaction on a single employee supported validity. A correlation of 0.61 for co-workers to 0.80 for supervision was calculated between five of the Job Satisfaction subscales and some of the Job Description Index. (p. 700)

Job Satisfaction Within the Three Job Settings

Much of the published research focuses on private practice vs. agency settings and the correlation with job satisfaction. Unfortunately, this researcher could not find even one study that examined online counseling and the correlation with job satisfaction. This is likely because the field of online counseling is a fairly new one. There is definitely a gap in the research covering the area this study investigated. All of the research found that examined the type of practice related to job satisfaction showed that those counselors who worked in private practice had higher job satisfaction than
counselors working in agency settings (Cunningham, 2014; Dupree & Day, 2008; Farber, 1985; Fortener, 2000; Gaal, 2009; Lent & Schwartz, 2012; Raquepaw & Miller, 1989; Rosenberg & Pace, 2006; Rupert & Morgan, 2005; Vredenburgh et al., 1999).

**Online Counseling**

Online counseling is known by many names, such as e-therapy, e-counseling, teletherapy, telecounseling, telehealth, cyber-therapy, or cyber-counseling. It serves to provide mental health counseling and support over the internet. There are many routes for clients to access these services, such as email, text messaging, video conferencing, online chat, messaging, or internet phone. This can occur in real-time, such as in telephone conversations and text messaging, or in a time-delayed format, such as through email messages (Cherry, 2020).

One of the primary reasons this is becoming such a popular way to provide and receive counseling is because it is convenient and accessible (Cherry, 2020). In addition, during the writing of this dissertation, the entire nation and world were hit with the COVID-19 virus, which led to widespread shutdown and social distancing. Most counselors went to online counseling to continue to see their clients. It is likely that once society gets past this virus, online will continue to be a preferred way to access counseling.

**Competencies**

Therapists should obtain knowledge, training, and supervision in online therapy practices and techniques in addition to being qualified as a counselor with state certification. Additional informal training opportunities (both workshops and conferences) help counselors obtain the skills they need to be competent in providing
online counseling (Cherry, 2020). It should be noted that the following lists are not exhaustive.

**Computer Competencies**

To provide online counseling, Cherry (2020) stated that the following computer competencies and applications may be needed: email, text messaging, real-time chat, internet phone, videoconferencing, and mobile device apps.

**Credentials**

The most widely used credential for online counseling is the board certified-Telemental Health provider (BC-TMH). The National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC) stated:

The Board Certified-TeleMental Health Provider (BC-TMH) credential was designed to help mental health professionals navigate this type of service delivery. Developed by the Center for Credentialing & Education (CCE), an affiliate of the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC), in conjunction with leaders in the field, the BC-TMH provides the training, knowledge, and credibility that clients and employers demand from mental health professionals, allowing them to seek the best practices to offer safe and effective services.

Mental health professionals interested in obtaining the BC-TMH credential must either hold a current, active, qualifying license to practice in a behavioral health field in the state or country in which they live or work, or hold a current, active, qualifying credential to practice in a behavioral health field from the list of qualifying credentials and certifications found on CCE’s website.

Candidates must successfully complete the online Telemental Health Prof.
Training Series, passing each of the nine modules and the comprehensive final exam within two years of applying for the credential. The credential is valid for five years as long as the holder complies with credential standards.

The nine modules of the training series are as follows (Center for Credentialing and Education, 2020):

1. Introduction to Telemental Health.
2. Presentation Skills for Telemental Health.
7. Orienting Clients/Patients to Telemental Health.
8. Direct to Consumer Telemental Health.
9. Telemental Health Settings and Care Coordination.

In addition to these modules, an examination must be passed that consists of 50 multiple-choice questions. Examinees have 90 minutes to complete the examination, which must be completed in one sitting. Correctly answering 85% of the questions is considered a passing score. To gain the BC-TMH, there is a $150 initial fee, a $45 annual fee, and 4 CEUs to maintain the certification.
Comparison of Job Satisfaction Scales

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Hoppock’s Job in General</th>
<th>Job Description</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale</th>
<th>Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction Survey</th>
<th>Overall Job Satisfaction Questionnaire</th>
<th>Job Diagnostic Survey</th>
<th>Career Satisfaction Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude about job</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work tasks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work surroundings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job variety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude about supervisor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In discussing Table 1, it should be noted that several of the factors that were determined by SHRM (2016) to be important are missing from all of the job satisfaction scales: respectful treatment, trust between employees/senior management, and opportunities to use skills/abilities. This information is critical as the SHRM (2016) survey is the newest research on job satisfaction that this researcher found in performing this literature review. These topics could be missing from the scales because, as previously mentioned, the scales are dated and likely do not represent current attitudes about job satisfaction. The table lists some very prevalent factors such as “attitude about job,” which, not surprisingly, is represented in all of the job scales examined as well as “promotion.”

Instrument Used for This Research Study

This study utilized the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form (Weiss et al., 1967) coupled with custom questions to address job satisfaction across the
various settings. The abridged version (short form) maintains adequate reliability and validity while reducing the length of the survey. In doing so, this researcher hoped that more participants would agree to be a part of the study. The reasons for choosing the MSQ short form included (a) It is one of the most validated and popular job satisfaction scales currently available; (b) It is likely the most comprehensive job satisfaction scale; (c) It is free of charge to use and score; (d) Other custom questions were added based on more current research (e.g., SHRM, online counseling, type of clientele) Table 1 is included within that illuminates the similarities and differences between all these different job satisfaction scales.

**COVID-19 in Relation to this Research**

It should be mentioned that while working on this dissertation, the entire nation and world were impacted by COVID-19, which led to a significant surge of counseling being conducted online. It is unknown if online counseling will become the norm for an extended period, or if the crisis resolves, then traditional counseling will once again become the most common method of receiving counseling treatment. This study addressed counselors who worked in prior settings (agency practice or private practice) working in an online environment providing counseling.

For the first time ever, the Department of Health and Human Services (2020) waived the HIPAA privacy requirement for providing telehealth services (online counseling) for an extended period. This allowed multiple platforms to be used that traditionally were not allowed due to the HIPAA requirement. These included Apple FaceTime, Facebook Messenger video chat, Google Hangouts video, Zoom, and Skype.
Summary

This literature review began by narrowing the definition of job satisfaction that this researcher used in this study. This definition comes from Bernstein and Nash (2008):

**Job Satisfaction**

It consists of three components. The emotional component includes feelings about the job such as boredom, happiness, or anxiety. The cognitive component refers to beliefs about one’s job, for instance, thinking that one’s job is mentally taxing and difficult. Finally, the behavioral component includes people’s actions regarding their work, like being late getting to work, staying late at the job working, or faking illness to avoid work.

Job satisfaction is important for many reasons, including the impact on individuals’ physical and mental health. Job scales are designed to measure job satisfaction. However, all of the job scales that were examined are woefully out of date, with the newest ones designed in 1990. Because of this, this researcher added additional survey questions to the study that focused on some of the factors found by SHRM (2016) that contribute to job satisfaction but were not included in any of the job satisfaction scales. The added topics included respectful treatment of all employees at all levels, the feelings about the employee’s commute to work, the way the employee feels about their co-workers, the clientele of the employee, and trust between employees and senior management.

This literature review found that there has been very little research conducted on job satisfaction in general and just a few studies conducted on how the job setting impacts job satisfaction. The research overwhelmingly supports the idea that those counselors working in an agency had lower job satisfaction than those working in private
practice. Another gap in the literature involves online counseling related to job satisfaction. There were no research studies found regarding this topic.

This study was important and helped determine what factors influenced job satisfaction across the three settings in 2020 and 2021. With the added impact of COVID-19, this was one of the first studies to examine at this virus’s influence on counselors who had to transition to an online-only work environment. It is hoped that this research increased understanding of the factors that impact job satisfaction.
CHAPTER 3—METHODOLOGY

Introduction

There has not been much written about in the literature concerning job satisfaction across different settings: online, agency practice, and private practice. Job satisfaction is important for many reasons, including the impact on individuals’ physical and mental health. Job scales are designed to measure job satisfaction. However, all of the job scales that were examined are woefully out of date, with the newest ones designed in 1990.

The demographic form associated with the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al., 1967), a part of the customized survey for this study, was also out of date. This demographic form was updated. For instance, the form had only two options for gender: male or female. This researcher’s form listed six choices for gender. This helped to illuminate how people with different sexual identities view job satisfaction—something that was not found in any research on job satisfaction.

Because of this, this researcher added additional survey questions to the study that focused on some of the factors found by the SHRM (2016) that contribute to job satisfaction and from the dissertation committee’s suggestions but were not included in any of the job satisfaction scales. The topics added were respectful treatment of all employees at all levels, feelings about the employee’s commute to work, the way the employee feels about their co-workers, the clientele of the employee, and trust between employees and senior management. In addition, this study also addressed counselors who worked in prior settings (agency practice or private practice) that are currently working in an online environment providing counseling.
This study was important to help determine what factors influenced job satisfaction across the three settings in 2020 and 2021. With the added impact of COVID-19, it was one of the first studies to examine the influence this virus had on counselors who had to transition to an online-only work environment. This research increased understanding of the factors that impacted job satisfaction and how that could influence job retention.

This chapter discusses the statement of the problem, research question, qualified participants and sample size, instrumentation, sampling and data collection procedures, statistical and data analysis, and finally, ethical considerations.

**Statement of the Problem**

The newest job satisfaction scales that were found during the literature review were published in 1990. Additional questions were added to the original Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form (Weiss et al., 1967) that were based on some of the factors found by SHRM (2016) that contribute to job satisfaction but were not included in any of the job satisfaction scales. The topics added were respectful treatment of all employees at all levels, the feelings about the employee’s commute to work, the way the employee feels about their co-workers, the clientele of the employee, and trust between employees and senior management. It is important to note that the most important factor overall that impacted job satisfaction within SHRM’s study was “respectful treatment of all employees at all levels.”

This literature review found that there has been little research conducted on job satisfaction in general and just a few studies on how the job setting impacts job satisfaction. The research overwhelmingly supports the idea that those counselors
working in an agency have lower job satisfaction than those working in private practice. Another gap in the literature involves online counseling related to job satisfaction. There were no research studies found regarding this topic. Due to these gaps, the research question to be answered was: “What intrinsic and extrinsic factors increase job satisfaction in private practice, online counseling, and agency practice?”

**Participants and Sample Size**

The participants were garnered from many counselor groups, including the American Counseling Association’s (ACA) forum, where the survey was linked. In addition, the survey was distributed to the Florida Counseling Association’s current membership. Also, counseling Facebook groups, CES-Net, and the National Louis University Counseling Support Group were used for advertising the survey. Additionally, at the bottom of the survey, it read, “If you know of a licensed mental health counselor that may be interested in taking this survey, please forward the survey link to him/her.” This researcher tried to receive responses from as many participants as possible to support the generalizability of the findings.

**Instrumentation**

Multiple types of instruments were used in this research (see Appendices C and D):

a) Demographic form: To describe the characteristics of the sample (e.g., race, gender identity, sexual orientation, relationship status, licensed or intern, full or part-time, and work setting).

b) MSQ Plus:

a. Comprised of MSQ short form and custom survey questions (see Appendix D)
b. The custom survey questions were as follows:
   i. Respectful treatment of all employees at all levels
   ii. Trust between employees and senior management
   iii. The way I feel about my co-workers
   iv. The way I feel about my commute to work
   v. The way I feel about the clientele I work with.

The MSQ short form (Weiss et al., 1967) has only 20 questions but still examines all 20 facets of job satisfaction utilizing three scales: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction. For the intrinsic satisfaction scale, the reliability coefficient ranged from 0.84 to 0.91; for the extrinsic satisfaction scale, the coefficients varied from 0.77 to 0.82; and for the general satisfaction scale, they varied from 0.87 to 0.92. The scale also showed through the different occupational groups, including social workers (similar to counselors), regarding validity to differentiate job satisfaction at the 0.001 significance level on all scales.

This researcher had permission to use the MSQ (Weiss et al., 1967):

VPR no longer sells the MSQ questionnaires. All forms are available under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. This license allows the instrument to be used for research or clinical work free of charge and without written consent, provided that you acknowledge Vocational Psychology Research, University of Minnesota, as the source of the material in your reproduced materials (printed or electronic). (para.1)
Data Collection Procedures

After receiving National Louis University Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, invitations were posted on the various organizations’ websites, as mentioned previously. The same survey was made available to all participants.

Airtable.com, a cloud-based database, was used to administer the survey, and the raw data from there were converted into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. No names were asked for on the survey. Airtable.com was the preferred method for data collection for multiple reasons:

1. This researcher imposed data validation, which ensured that the participants were only able to choose from certain responses.
2. In turn, this minimized the manual data cleaning that needed to be performed.
3. There was an option for “track changes.” This allowed for complete transparency.
4. There was an option that the researcher used to comment the reason(s) for changes/exclusions to the raw data when using the “track changes” feature.
5. It allowed this researcher to customize both the input (survey) and the output (report options) to import data into Microsoft Excel for analysis.

Statistical/Data Analyses

All statistical analyses (i.e., factor analysis, significance, correlation) were performed using Microsoft Excel. A primary goal was to determine an optimal (small) number of factors that most accurately predicted job satisfaction in the three work settings. The following concerns were addressed.

- Internal validity:
  a. Study protocol: All participants were given the same survey.
b. Size of subject population: This researcher tried to include as many qualified participants as possible.

c. Time given for data collection: The data were collected within a time frame of three months.

- External validity: This researcher did everything possible to be able to generalize the results of this study.
- Missing factors: A fill-in-the-blank survey question was added at the end of the survey to address any specific factors not mentioned in the customized survey.

**Ethical Considerations**

The IRB approved the specifics for this research study on November 13, 2020. The IRB examines all potential research to ensure that all ethical considerations are followed. In addition, no identifying information was asked for in this survey, including names, addresses, or any other easily identifiable information. All participants were informed that the information they provided would be confidential. They were all asked to electronically sign an informed consent form.

The survey was conducted through airtable.com, which provides multiple layers of data security, including ISO/IEC 27001 certification, SOC 2 certification, and 256-bit transport layer security encryption. Additional information regarding data security can be found here: https://airtable.com/security#compliance. A clause was added to the informed consent stating that if any of the participants in the survey began to experience negative feelings that they needed assistance with, they were advised to visit psychologytoday.com or goodtherapy.org to find a qualified mental health counselor.
CHAPTER 4—RESULTS

Introduction

To answer the research question—“What intrinsic and extrinsic factors increase job satisfaction in private practice, online counseling, and agency practice?”—a survey was administered to assess and summarize demographic information and rate 25 intrinsic and extrinsic components of job satisfaction. This survey is hereafter referred to as the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) Plus. Factor analysis of the results was performed. Individual components of job satisfaction with the strongest correlation to overall job satisfaction were identified for the entire study sample and within the three different work settings (i.e., agency practice, private practice, and online practice). This chapter summarizes the study sample, demographics, overall job satisfaction, notable trends and correlations among individual factors, and results of the research question.

Descriptive Data

Participants, Missing Data, and Outliers

Over approximately 90 days, 434 respondents completed the survey. Of those records, 55 were eliminated because they were identified by the review committee as being non-licensed, being obvious duplicates, having obviously illogical responses, or were otherwise invalid. In all 55 cases, the decision to eliminate the record was unanimous. The resulting study sample size consisted of 379 eligible records. When an eligible record was missing one or more fields (response to a survey question), that record was excluded from calculations pertaining to that field, but the rest of the record was deemed eligible.
Only one outlier was identified. A newly licensed mental health counselor reported an individual salary of nearly $1,000,000 per year while reporting a much lower household income. Because a household income should not be lower than an individual income, this was deemed an error. The participant’s individual and household income were treated as missing data.

**Sample Size and Statistical Significance**

Unfortunately, the low number of participants resulted in a small sample size, resulting in a very poor significance for all calculations involving subgroups of the study’s eligible sample. For all such calculations, the $p$-value ranged from 0.26 to 0.84 (meaning that differences between the subgroups are at least 26% likely to be attributable to random chance). Only calculations involving the entire study sample size were statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. Accordingly, this study can only be considered a pilot study, providing insight into potential trends that merit further research.

**Demographic Groups and Work Settings**

Table 2 lists total counts and overall job satisfaction (raw score and percentile rank) for nominal demographic groups and work settings. Some demographic groups were combined to provide more statistically significant results. For example, within the gender ID category, the groups genderqueer, transgender female/woman, transgender male/man, and gender identity not listed were combined into the single group “genderqueer.” Within each demographic category (e.g., race, gender ID) selections are exclusive, so that the total category count is equal to the study sample size. A participant could select more than one work setting (for example, an individual could perform online
counseling for private practice) so that the total count of all three work settings exceeded the study sample size. Appendix E presents a matrix of counts for each demographic subgroup and work setting within every other demographic subgroup and work setting.

Table 2

Demographic Subgroups and Work Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Percentage of Entire Study Sample</th>
<th>Group Overall Job Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>Group Overall Job Satisfaction Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cis female</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cis male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/partnered</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Ratio Data

Table 2 displays the minimum, mean, and maximum values of scale (interval) demographic data collected by the survey. The abbreviation HH mentioned in the table indicates “household”.
Table 3

Demographic Ratio Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years licensed (or as an intern)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults in household</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors in household</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual annual income ($1000s)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household annual income ($1000s)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Job Satisfaction

MSQ (1967) vs. MSQ Plus (2021)

The MSQ Plus has 25 questions that evaluated components of job satisfaction from 1 through 5. These Likert score answers were summed to obtain a raw score resulting in an overall satisfaction score between 25 and 125. To compare results presented in the Manual for the MSQ (Weiss et al., 1967), the MSQ Plus results were normed to a score between 20 and 100. Additionally, the percentile rank was calculated by comparing the raw scores to other participants’ scores. For example, the lowest 1% of the scores make up the bottom one percentile rank, the lowest 2% make up the bottom two percentile rank, etc. Overall job satisfaction score and percentile ranks for each demographic subgroup and work setting are displayed in Table 3.

The Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967) summarized results of the long-form MSQ for social workers, which was deemed the most comparable to the MSQ Plus participant sample. Table 4 compares the overall job satisfaction of individual participants of the MSQ against the MSQ Plus.
### Table 4

**Overall Job Satisfaction: MSQ versus MSQ Plus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile Rank</th>
<th>Individual Overall Job Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Form MSQ</td>
<td>Short Form MSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.00%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows, on average, counselors reported higher job satisfaction scores on the MSQ Plus in the present day compared to social workers on the MSQ long form in 1967. As shown by the yellow-highlighted cells, 30% to 35% of MSQ Plus participants reported lower satisfaction scores than MSQ participants, while the green-highlighted cells show that 65% to 70% of MSQ Plus participants reported higher satisfaction scores than MSQ participants. The darker shaded cells show that more extreme differences in scoring tend to be at very low or very high percentile ranks. The average overall job satisfaction score for individual participants of the MSQ Plus is more than three full points higher than the average score from the MSQ, with a 95% significance level ($p < 0.05$). It is important to note that this is the only correlation that has a 95% significance throughout this research study.
Pre- Versus Post-COVID-19

Participants who indicated they transitioned (at least in part) to online counseling due to COVID-19 responded to the same 25 questions regarding components of satisfaction for their job both before and after the transition. Almost 85% of participants reported that they had transitioned to online counseling, with an average increase of slightly less than 1.5 to their overall job satisfaction score. However, this increase only has a 74% significance level ($p = 0.26$).

Notable Trends Within Demographic Groups

While there were no statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) correlations between any two demographic subgroups and/or individual factors, there were some apparent trends worth noting.

Race

Asian participants reported the lowest average overall job satisfaction. On average, this group reported the lowest score on four individual components of job satisfaction, where the group average was at least one point lower (on the Likert scale of 1 to 5) than the average for other race groups. These components are:

- The way company policies are put into practice.
- The chances for advancement on this job.
- Respectful treatment of all employees at all levels.
- Trust between employees and senior management.

Black participants reported the highest overall job satisfaction. On average, this group reported the highest score on four individual components of job satisfaction, where the group average was at least one point higher (on the Likert scale of 1 to 5) than the
average for other race groups. These are the same four components for which Asians reported the lowest score.

**Gender Identity**

Cis females reported the highest overall job satisfaction, followed by cis males, with genderqueer individuals reporting the lowest overall satisfaction. Individual salary and household income followed this trend (highest for cis females, lowest for genderqueer individuals). However, when it came to “my pay and the amount of work I do,” this trend was reversed; genderqueer individuals reported the highest satisfaction with this component, while cis females reported the lowest satisfaction. In other words, while genderqueer individuals, on average, were paid the least, they appeared to be the most satisfied with the compensation they received for their job.

**Table 5**

**Gender ID Trends**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Group Overall Job Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>Group Overall Job Satisfaction Percentile</th>
<th>Salary ($1000s)</th>
<th>HH Income ($1000s)</th>
<th>Satisfaction with “My pay and the amount of work I do”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cis female</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cis male</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, genderqueer individuals reported the lowest score on two of the individual components of job satisfaction discussed within the above paragraphs on race.

- Respectful treatment of all employees at all levels.
- Trust between employees and senior management.

Genderqueer individuals reported the highest score on the following two individual components of job satisfaction.
• The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.
• The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.

**Individual Components with the Strongest Correlations**

Nine survey questions regarding individual components of job satisfaction had a Pearson’s correlation coefficient of 0.6 or higher with at least two other individual components.

• The way my boss handles his/her workers.
• The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.
• The chance to do things for other people.
• The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.
• The way company policies are put into practice.
• The working conditions.
• The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.
• Respectful treatment of all employees at all levels.
• Trust between employees and senior management.

Across the entire study sample, calculating overall job satisfaction based on these nine individual components strongly correlated to overall job satisfaction based on all 25 individual components, with a Pearson’s correlation coefficient of 0.98. Four survey questions regarding individual components of job satisfaction had a Pearson’s correlation coefficient of 0.6 or higher with at least three other individual components.

• The way my boss handles his/her workers.
• The way company policies are put into practice.
• Respectful treatment of all employees at all levels.
• Trust between employees and senior management.

Across the entire study sample, calculating overall job satisfaction based on these four individual components strongly correlated to overall job satisfaction based on all 25 individual components, with a Pearson’s correlation coefficient of 0.91. The individual component of job satisfaction that was found to have the strongest correlation to the largest number of other components and overall job satisfaction was “trust between employees and senior management.” This component was taken from SHRM (2016). This component had a Pearson’s correlation coefficient of 0.6 or higher with five other individual components.

• The way company policies are put into practice ($r = 0.77$)
• Respectful treatment of all employees at all levels. ($r = 0.75$)
• The way my boss handles his/her workers. ($r = 0.69$)
• The working conditions. ($r = 0.62$)
• The competence of my supervisor in making decisions. ($r = 0.61$)

“Trust between employees and senior management” by itself has a strong correlation with overall job satisfaction, with a Pearson’s correlation coefficient of 0.76. It is worth noting that two of the individual components of job satisfaction discussed in this section are not from the original MSQ short form (Weiss et al., 1967). The questions were taken from SHRM (2016).

• Respectful treatment of all employees at all levels.
• Trust between employees and senior management.
Research Question

This study initially sought to answer the question, “What intrinsic and extrinsic factors increase job satisfaction in private practice, online counseling, and agency practice?” While the paragraphs below discuss correlations between individual components and overall job satisfaction within the three job settings, it is worth repeating that none of the findings are statistically significant (p ≥ 0.26 for all individual correlations) due to small sample sizes. Table 6 shows the work setting with the highest value for each individual component of job satisfaction. The section titled Individual Components with the Strongest Correlations identified nine individual components contributing to overall job satisfaction. Table 6 uses a bold, italicized font to denote those nine individual components.
Table 6

**Work Settings with the Highest Value for Each Factor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Component of Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Intrinsic or Extrinsic</th>
<th>Setting with Highest Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust between employees and senior management</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful treatment of all employees at all levels</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way company policies are put into practice</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my supervisor handles his/her workers</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The change to do things for other people</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The change to do something that makes use of my abilities</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The working conditions</td>
<td>Non-specific</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to keep busy all the time</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to work alone on the job</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The change to do different things from time to time</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to be “somebody” in the community</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my job provides for steady employment</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to tell people what to do</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay and the amount of work I do</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The change for advancement in this job</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The freedom to use my own judgment</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to try my own methods of doing the job</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my co-workers get along with each other</td>
<td>Non-specific</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The praise I get for doing a good job</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way I feel about my co-workers</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way I feel about my commute to work</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way I feel about the clientele I work with</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Setting: Private Practice**

As summarized in Table 2, mental health counselors in private practice reported the highest overall group job satisfaction score, followed by counselors who practice online, with counselors in an agency setting reporting the lowest overall satisfaction. For all nine of the most influential components identified in Table 6, private practice counselors reported higher satisfaction than counselors in the other two work settings. In
other words, these nine components are the primary factors that influence job satisfaction for all three work settings. In fact, private practice counselors reported the highest score for almost all individual components of job satisfaction.

**Work Setting: Online and Agency**

Counselors who practice online and in agency settings reported the highest satisfaction score for only four individual components. These four components and their correlation to overall job satisfaction within the corresponding work setting are shown below:

- **Work Setting: Online**
  - Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience. \( r = 0.65 \)
  - The chance to tell people what to do. \( r = 0.38 \)
  - The way I feel about my commute to work. \( r = 0.37 \)

- **Work Setting: Agency**
  - The way my job provides for steady employment. \( r = 0.48 \)

These moderately weak to moderately strong correlations show that the four components have some potential to influence job satisfaction within the respective work settings. However, even within these work settings, the four correlations listed above are lower than correlations between the nine most influential components and overall job satisfaction, indicating that work setting was not overly important to job satisfaction.

**Summary**

Due to the small sample sizes of demographic and work setting groups, no correlations with individual components of job satisfaction were statistically significant \( p \geq 0.26 \). Among the gender identification groups, there was a notable difference in how
individual components of satisfaction influenced overall job satisfaction: genderqueer individuals tended to receive the least pay, yet they expressed the most satisfaction with the pay they received.

Individual components of job satisfaction with the strongest correlation to overall satisfaction were identified:

- Based on the 9 most influential components, overall satisfaction is strongly correlated \((r = 0.98)\) with overall satisfaction based on all 25 components.
- Overall satisfaction based on the 4 most influential components is strongly correlated \((r = 0.91)\) with overall satisfaction based on all 25 components.
- The single most influential component, “Trust between employees and senior management,” by itself had a strong correlation \((r = 0.76)\) with overall job satisfaction. This component was not included in the original MSQ (Weiss et al., 1967). It was taken from SHRM (2016).

Overall job satisfaction within each work setting was primarily influenced by the same nine most influential individual components. A small number of other individual components could influence job satisfaction within each work setting differently, but they were eclipsed by the influence of the nine most influential components.
CHAPTER 5—DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

There has been little research conducted concerning the subject of job satisfaction within the mental health counseling profession. There has been even less research on job satisfaction within different mental health counseling work settings (i.e., private practice, agency, and online). No prior research was found related to job satisfaction and online mental health counseling. Job satisfaction scales that were found are not recent, with the last one created in 1990. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al., 1967) was deemed to be the most comprehensive (it incorporated the greatest number of demographics, intrinsic, and extrinsic factors) and relevant to mental health counselors (in that it presented results for social workers). Accordingly, the MSQ was used as the basis for the dissertation’s survey. There were five new custom survey questions: three were developed by the dissertation committee, and two were taken from a SHRM (2016) study.

The research question was: “What intrinsic and extrinsic factors increase job satisfaction in private practice, online counseling, and agency practice?” The intrinsic and extrinsic factors that most influenced overall job satisfaction were identified. However, due to the small sample size and lack of statistical significance, this research can only be considered a pilot study that suggests topics for further research. It was found that the same primary factors influenced overall job satisfaction with the three work settings.
Overall Job Satisfaction

MSQ (1967) vs. MSQ Plus (2021)

The average overall job satisfaction score derived from the MSQ Plus is higher than the overall satisfaction score reported by social workers who completed the MSQ’s (1967) long form. The average overall job satisfaction score of MSQ Plus participants was a full three points higher than the score reported by social workers in 1967, with a 95% significance level. It is important to note that this is the only result throughout the dissertation study with a 95% statistical significance. This indicates mental health counselors may be more satisfied today than they were in 1967. Obviously, there have been many changes—both in general and within the counseling field in particular—over that fast five+ decades: evolving values and societal norms increased diversity in the counseling field, the internet, online counseling, and more.

Furthermore, it was more common in the past for individuals to work for the same company throughout their entire career. By contrast, workers today are likely to change employers multiple times to seek more satisfying career positions. It may also be that online sessions impose less stress on mental health counselors than repeated in-person sessions (this is discussed in more detail regarding COVID-19 and online counseling).

Pre- vs. Post-COVID-19

Perhaps one of the more surprising findings was that the COVID-19 pandemic, which necessitated many counselors transitioning (at least in part) from working in an in-person setting to working in an online setting, appeared to result in a slight increase in overall job satisfaction—albeit not a statistically significant increase. Almost 85% of participants reported that they had transitioned to online counseling, with an average
increase of slightly less than 1.5 points in their overall job satisfaction score. This aligns with Békés and Aafjes-van Doorn (2020), who found that repeated in-person sessions caused counselors to feel tired, less competent and confident, less connected to the process, and less authentic. Transitioning to online counseling may have alleviated some of these feelings.

**Demographic Factors**

As previously stated, no demographic factors were found to significantly impact overall job satisfaction. This lack of significance is primarily due to the small sample size of demographic groups. However, two apparent trends are worth mentioning.

**Asian Individuals**

As a group, Asian individuals felt the least respected, reported the least trust between management and employees, and reported the lowest overall job satisfaction. It may not be coincident that during the period participants took the survey (November 2020 to February 2021), there were many incidents of verbal and physical assault against Asian individuals. It seems likely this was backlash caused (at least in part) by the false impression that Asian individuals were to blame for causing and/or transmitting the COVID-19 virus.

Research conducted by the Center for the Study of Hate and Extremism at California State University, San Bernardino (2021) compared data from the first quarter of 2021 to the same period in 2020 across 15 major cities. The research found that Asian hate crimes surged by 164%. Furthermore, Jeung et al. (2021) published a report showing 6,603 reported incidents of Asian hate crimes from March 19, 2020 to March 31, 2021. According to Jeung et al. (2021), “Chinese individuals have reported more hate incidents
(43.7%) than other racial or ethnic groups, followed by Koreans (16.6%), Filipinx (8.8%) and Vietnamese (8.3%)” (para. 3). It is reasonable to assume that the impact of these incidents extended into the workplace of Asian individuals.

**Genderqueer Individuals**

As previously mentioned, the original MSQ (Weiss et al., 1967) had only two choices for gender: male or female. The MSQ Plus allowed for a much wider selection of gender ID options. This led to the identification of an inverse correlation among gender ID groups regarding job satisfaction and pay. Among the gender ID groups, genderqueer individuals reported the lowest overall job satisfaction and the lowest salary, but the highest satisfaction with the amount of pay they received for their job. This suggests that pay is not a motivating factor for genderqueer individuals.

Perhaps being openly accepted as a genderqueer individual is more personally satisfying than achieving a high salary. This follows the research of Berry (1997), who found that a low-paying job can be seen as satisfying if it is challenging or stimulating. Furthermore, Achor et al. (2018) found that people were willing to be paid less if the work was meaningful. Their survey showed that most individuals would be willing to trade a percentage of their lifetime wages for more meaningful work.

**Most Influential Factors Contributing to Overall Job Satisfaction**

Nine individual components of job satisfaction were found to be the primary influencers of overall job satisfaction across all three work settings.

- Trust between employees and senior management
- Respectful treatment of all employees at all levels
- The way company policies are put into practice
The way my boss handles his/her workers

The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job

The chance to do things for other people

The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities

The working conditions

The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.

The average Likert score reported for these nine components has a nearly perfect ($r = 0.98$) correlation with overall job satisfaction. The average score reported for the top four components yields a very strong ($r = 0.91$) correlation with overall job satisfaction. The top factor on its own yields a strong ($r = 0.76$) correlation with overall job satisfaction.

The top factor that contributed to job satisfaction is “Trust between employees and senior management.” This factor came from SHRM (2016), and as such, is one of the five custom questions added to the MSQ. This factor had a strong ($r \geq 0.6$) correlation with five other individual components of job satisfaction, indicating that employees who have a high level of trust with their managers are likely to be more satisfied with other aspects of their job.

Previous research also shows that trust plays a crucial role in job satisfaction. Gilstrap and Collins (2012) conducted a research study with 246 participants working in a large industrial corporation. One part of their study looked at the effect trust had on job satisfaction and found, “subordinates who trust their supervisors experience higher job satisfaction” (p.159). Johannsen and Zak (2021) found similar results. They performed a study involving 1,095 individuals working in both the public (21% of the sample) and
private (79% of the sample). This study examined whether trust affected individual and company performance. The results showed that trust indeed increased job satisfaction ($r = 0.59$). A 10% increase in trust resulted in a 4.5% increase in job satisfaction.

Identifying these most influential factors is meaningful because it shows that only nine survey questions may be able to predict overall job satisfaction with nearly as much accuracy as a much longer survey. An even smaller number of factors—four, or even just one—may be able to predict overall job satisfaction with only slightly less accuracy. This also supports the notion that an updated job satisfaction scale is necessary.

**Conclusions with Suggestions for Future Research**

**Research Question**

“What intrinsic and extrinsic factors increase job satisfaction in private practice, online counseling, and agency practice?” The nine most influential components of job satisfaction listed above were found to have the strongest correlation to overall job satisfaction in all three settings. The two most influential factors, (a) trust between employees and senior management and (b) respectful treatment of all employees at all levels, are new custom questions included in the MSQ Plus. These questions were taken from SHRM (2016) and were more influential to overall job satisfaction than any of the factors included in the original MSQ (1967).

**Implications for the Profession**

Beginning with the recruitment for this study, this researcher and the committee had difficulty finding participants. The original plan was to recruit for two months, but the committee agreed to extend the recruitment period to three months to gain more participants. This researcher started out by recruiting from the ACA, Florida Counseling
Association, and personal Facebook page. These results yielded few participants. The recruitment was then extended to Facebook groups focused on mental health counseling, which yielded much more successful results.

Therefore, job satisfaction scales are out of date and may be out of touch with current mental health counselors’ feelings about job satisfaction. It appears that a new job satisfaction scale is needed. All the job satisfaction scales identified during the literature review were evaluated, and the MSQ was deemed the most comprehensive and relevant to mental health counselors.

However, two custom questions related to extrinsic factors are the most crucial to determining overall job satisfaction and they are not included in any of the prior job satisfaction scales. This knowledge can lead to increased job satisfaction and employee retention in all industries but is especially useful to mental health career counselors and helps fill the knowledge gap regarding job satisfaction of mental health counselors.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

While most of this study’s findings were not statistically significant, several apparent trends merit further investigation. Questions that would provide insight into these trends are listed below. Refining the research question to focus on one of these trends, emphasizing achieving a larger sample size, could yield more statistically significant and actionable information.

**Job Satisfaction of Asian Mental Health Counselors**

Are Asian individuals the least satisfied demographic group of mental health counselors? What individual components of job satisfaction most influence their overall
job satisfaction? Is there a relation to the recent increase in incidents against Asian individuals?

**Job Satisfaction of Genderqueer Mental Health Counselors**

How likely are genderqueer individuals to openly identify as such in the mental health counseling field? What individual components of job satisfaction most influence their overall job satisfaction? Is there a relationship between pay and job satisfaction of genderqueer individuals in other industries?

**Overall Job Satisfaction**

How can “Trust between employees and senior management” and “Respectful treatment of all employees at all levels” be better evaluated? How can these values be fostered in the workplace? How do these factors interact with other components of job satisfaction? How can this information be used to develop an updated job satisfaction scale? How can the most influential components of job satisfaction be fostered in agency and online work settings to improve the overall job satisfaction of mental health counselors in those settings?

**Summary of Findings**

This study clearly illustrates the need for more research into job satisfaction regarding mental health counseling. The primary, overarching factor that contributes most to job satisfaction across all mental health counseling job settings and demographic groups is “trust between employees and senior management.” The study’s small sample size precluded correlations with strong statistical significance among individual demographic groups and components of job satisfaction. Some trends were noted that
merit further research into how trust can be best achieved for certain race and gender identity groups.
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APPENDIX A

Informed Consent

Examining Job Satisfaction in Different Work Settings

Before proceeding, I will thoroughly review the following information and type “yes” as a signature that I understand and agree with the information contained herein.

I have been asked to participate in a research study sanctioned by National Louis University and being conducted by LeeAnne Cravey (Doctoral Candidate) and Doctoral Committee members Dr. Joffrey Suprina and Dr. Caroline Perjessy to assist with researching job satisfaction in different work settings that will be in support of a dissertation. I was asked to be a possible participant because I am a licensed mental health counselor or registered for at least a year as a mental health counselor intern either in private practice, agency practice, and/or an online counselor. The goal is for at least 500 counselors to participate in this study. The purpose of this study is to explore how satisfied I am in my job.

If I agree to be in this study, I will be asked to fill out a survey online. This study will only take 10-15 minutes on average to complete. If I transitioned to online practice due to COVID-19, another survey will pop up asking questions about my previous job setting(s). The risks associated with this study are that I may experience negative thoughts and feelings when discussing the facets of my job satisfaction. Although we expect the risks to be very minimal, if I begin experiencing any negative feelings that I need assistance with after completing this survey, I can visit Psychology Today’s approved therapists’ page: https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/therapists/ or Good Therapy’s listing of therapists: https://www.goodtherapy.org.
The benefits of participation are that I will be contributing valuable information to counseling, which has little research regarding job satisfaction and how it relates to counseling work settings. In addition, this study will be one of the first to look at the impact of COVID-19 and the impact on job satisfaction and counseling. I can request the final results of the study by contacting LeeAnne Cravey at lcravey@my.nl.edu.

This study is confidential. No identifying information will be collected. All reasonable attempts will be made to not reveal my participation. The records of this study will be kept private. No words linking me to the study will be included in any report that might be published. No individual demographic information will be reported. It will only be reported in aggregate form as needed to discuss the impacts of demographic factors on job satisfaction. Research records will be stored securely, and only three researchers: LeeAnne Cravey, Dr. Joffrey Suprina, and Dr. Caroline Perjessy, and two statistical consultants (Dr. Hanqi Zhuang and Dustin Cravey) will have access to the records. All raw data will be deleted/destroyed after five years.

I understand that my participation is strictly voluntary. If I decide to participate, I am free to refuse to answer any of the questions that may make me uncomfortable. I can withdraw at any time without any negative consequences. I can contact the principal researcher—LeeAnne Cravey, at with any questions about this study.

The survey’s data will be through AirTable.com, which provides multiple layers of data security, including ISO/IEC 27001 certification, SOC 2 certification, and 256-bit TLS encryption. Additional information regarding data security can be found here: https://airtable.com/security#compliance.
I understand that my participation is strictly voluntary. If I decide to participate, I am free to refuse to answer any of the questions that may make me uncomfortable. I can withdraw at any time without any negative consequences. I can contact the principal researcher—LeeAnne Cravey, doctoral candidate at 5110 Sunforest Dr. Suite 102, Tampa, FL 33634; lcravey@my.nl.edu, with any questions about this study. In addition, the Dissertation Chairperson for this project is Dr. Joffrey Suprina, 5110 Sunforest Dr. Suite 102, Tampa, FL 33634, jsuprina@nl.edu and the IRRB Co-chairs: Shaunti Knauth, Ph.D., shaunti.knauth@nl.edu, or Dr. Kathleen Cornett, kcornett@nl.edu. Co-chairs are located at National Louis University, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL. This survey has been adapted from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-SF (1967) with permission from Vocational Psychology Research, University of Minnesota.

I understand that this research study has been reviewed and Certified by the Institutional Review Board, National Louis University—Tampa (IRB # ER00864). For research-related problems or questions regarding participants’ rights, I can contact the Institutional Board at IRRBMailbox@nl.edu. I have read and understand the explanation provided to me. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

By typing “Yes,” you are giving your consent to continue with this survey.

Type “yes” below if you agree.
APPENDIX B

Invitation to Survey of Job Satisfaction for Counselors Working in Agency Practice, Private Practice and/or Online Practice

We invite you to participate in a survey conducted by LeeAnne Cravey, M.S., Doctoral Candidate in the National Louis University Counselor Education and Supervision program. The dissertation chair is Dr. Joffrey Suprina and the committee member is Dr. Caroline Perjessy.

The purpose of this study is to examine the job satisfaction of mental health counselors working in various job settings in support of dissertation research. You are eligible to participate in this study if you are a licensed mental health counselor currently working in either agency practice, private practice, or online practice. We will ask you to complete an online survey, which should take approximately 10-15 minutes. This survey contains questions related to your job satisfaction with your current work position.

To find out more and access the survey, click on this link to be taken to the informed consent and survey.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

LeeAnne Cravey

Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX C

Demographic Questionnaire

1. **Age:** Enter Age Here

2. **Race:** Select from:
   - Asian or Pacific Islander
   - Biracial or Multiracial
   - Black or African American
   - Caucasian or White (Non-Hispanic)
   - Hispanic or Latina(o)
   - Native American or American Indian
   - Race Not Listed Here. Please specify.

3. **Gender Identity:**
   - Woman/Cisgender Female
   - Man/Cisgender Male
   - Genderqueer, Gender Non-binary, or Gender Fluid
   - Transgender Female/Woman
   - Transgender Male/Man
   - Gender Identity Not Listed Here. Please specify.

4. **Sexual Orientation:**
   - Asexual
   - Bisexual
   - Gay/Lesbian
   - Heterosexual/Straight
   - Pansexual
   - Queer
Sexual orientation not listed here. Please specify.

5. Current Licensure:

Licensed Counselor (ex. LMHC, LPC, NCC, LMFT, etc.)

Non-Licensed in the counseling field

Registered for at least 1 year as a registered mental health counseling intern

6a. Number of years as a practicing licensed counselor: Enter number of years here

6b. Number of years as a registered mental health counseling intern: Enter number of years here

The following questions 7-10 will be used solely to determine socioeconomic status

7. Family Structure/Relationship

Single

Married

In a Domestic Partnership

Divorced

Widowed

Relationship status not listed. Please specify.

8. Children (Select all that apply)

I have minor children

I have adult children

I have no children

9. Household Size (Number of adults): Enter number here

9b. Household Size (Number of minors): Enter number here

10. What is your household income? Enter amount here:

Please answer the following questions 11 through 30 as they apply to your current job.

11. Employment Status:

Employed full-time (32+ hours per week)
Employed part-time (less than 32 hours per week)

Not employed at this time.

12. **Do your current job duties involve mental health counseling?**
   
   Yes
   
   No

13. **Current Work Setting (Select as many as applies)**
   
   Agency Practice
   
   Private Practice
   
   Online Practice

14. **Please enter your current yearly gross salary here**
APPENDIX D

Survey

Below, you will find statements about your present job. Read each statement carefully. Decide how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job described by the statement.

Keeping the statement in mind: -if you feel that your job gives you more than you expected, check the box under “Very satisfied”; -if you feel that your job gives you what you expected, check the box under “Satisfied”; -if you cannot make up your mind whether or not the job gives you what you expected, check the box under “N” (Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied); -if you feel that your job gives you less than you expected, check the box under “Dissatisfied”; -if you feel that your job gives you much less than you expected, check the box under “Very dissatisfied.”

Remember: Keep the statement in mind when deciding how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job. Do this for all statements. Please answer every item. Be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your present job.

Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job? These are all the possible responses.

Very Satisfied means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

Satisfied means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

N means I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

Dissatisfied means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

Very Dissatisfied means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.
Job setting current/previous

a. Agency Practice  
b. Private Practice  
c. Online Practice  
d. Other setting  

In my present/previous job, this is how I feel about  

1. Being able to keep busy all the time.  
2. The chance to work alone on the job.  
3. The chance to do different things from time to time.  
4. The chance to be “somebody” in the community.  
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers.  
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.  
7. Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience.  
8. The way my job provides for steady employment.  
9. The chance to do things for other people.  
10. The chance to tell people what to do.  
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.  
12. The way company policies are put into practice.  
13. My pay and the amount of work I do.  
14. The chances for advancement on this job.  
15. The freedom to use my own judgment.  
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.  
17. The working conditions.
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other.

19. The praise I get for doing a good job.

20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.

21. Respectful treatment of all employees at all levels.

22. Trust between employees and senior management.

23. The way I feel about my co-workers.

24. The way I feel about my commute to work.

25. The way I feel about the clientele I work with.

Are there any other variables that you feel contribute to/inhibit your job satisfaction that were not mentioned above? Please provide an exhaustive listing here.

_____________________________

End of Survey

Adapted from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-SF (Weiss et al., 1967) with permission from Vocational Psychology Research, University of Minnesota.
## APPENDIX E

Nominal Data (Demographics and Work Setting) Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>For Demographics: % of Category</th>
<th>For Work Setting: % of Study Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race: Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Black</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Hispanic</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Multi-Racial</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: White</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ID: Cis Female</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ID: Cis Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ID: Genderqueer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation: LGBTQ+</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status: Married or Partnership</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status: Single</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Setting: Agency</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Setting: Online</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Setting: Private</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender ID: Cis Female</td>
<td>Gender ID: Cis Male</td>
<td>Gender ID: Gender Queer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Hispanic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Multi-Racial</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: White</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ID: Cis Female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ID: Cis Male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ID: Genderqueer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation: LGBTQ+</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status: Married or Partnership</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status: Single</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Setting: Agency</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Setting: Online</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Setting: Private</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>Licensed</td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Multi-Racial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: White</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ID: Cis Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ID: Cis Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ID: Genderqueer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation: LGBTQ+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status: Married or Partnership</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status: Single</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Setting: Agency</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Setting: Online</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Setting: Private</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>