

Navigating Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction Among Working Americans*

Analysis using US General Social Survey (1989 to 2016)

Shirley Chen

Jessica Im

March 15, 2024

Table of contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Data	2
2.1	Source Data and Methodology	2
2.2	Data Cleaning	2
2.3	Data Terminology	3
2.4	Respondent Demographics	3
2.5	Graphs of Responses	4
2.5.1	Helps Others	4
2.5.2	Interesting Work	4
2.5.3	Social Usefulness	6
3	Results	6
3.1	Responses and demographics	6
3.2	Change in importance over time	9
4	Discussion	12
4.1	Economic Factors	12
4.2	Gender	12
4.3	Age	12
4.4	Culture	12
4.5	Technology	12
	References	12

*Code and data in this report are available at: https://github.com/shirleychen003/job_satisfaction.git.

1 Introduction

In progress...

2 Data

Based at the University of Chicago since 1972, the General Social Survey (GSS) is a project with the objective of monitoring and analyzing the intricacies of American society (1). The GSS Data Explorer makes it so that data retrieved from the project is a publicly available resource, accessible to various types of people, such as educators, policymakers, or researchers through the National Opinion Research Center (NORC).

The dataset used for this paper was retrieved from The General Social Survey (GSS) Data Explorer website (citation). We retrieved survey data relating to work and job in the years of 1989, 1998, 2006, and 2016.

2.1 Source Data and Methodology

Majority of the GSS data was collected through face-to-face interviews with the target population of adults (18+) residing in the United States, but starting in 2002, Computer-assisted personal interviewing methods were introduced (3).

All the survey data used was in relation to job and work in the Work Orientation Module; the specific variable names extracted from the dataset being `intjob`, `hlpoths`, and `hlp soc`.

2.2 Data Cleaning

The open source statistical programming language (R Core Team 2023) was used to clean and analyze the data, along with producing the graphs. The main packages that supported this process included (Wickham 2023), (Wickham et al. 2023), (Xie 2023), (Firke 2023), and (Spinu, Grolemond, and Wickham 2023)

The cleaning process involved filtering the specific data variables used for our analysis from the downloaded GSS dataset, and renaming any variables with meaningful names. For example, rather than “`intjob`” being the column name for “importance of interesting work in a job”, we renamed it to `interesting_work`, as shown in Table #. Further, the numerical values representing the participants’ responses (1-5) were changed to the representative words/phrases (not important, very important, etc.). Table 1 shows the old and new variable names used in cleaning, the description of variables, and sample responses.

Table 1: GSS Dataset

Variable	New.Name	Description	Example.Response
intjob	interesting_work	Importance of interesting work in a job	Very Important
hlpoths	helping_others	Importance of helping others in a job	Neither
hlp soc	social_usefulness	Importance of social usefulness in a job	Not Important

2.3 Data Terminology

The response choices for each question and their respective code in brackets are as follows: Inapplicable (-100), No Answer (-99), Do Not Know/Cannot Choose (-98), Very Important (1), Important (2), Neither (3), Not important (4), and Not Important At All (5). For our graphs, we did not include the Inapplicable, No Answer, and Do Not Know/Cannot choose responses to focus on the discernible participant responses.

2.4 Respondent Demographics

Table 2 shows the number and percentage of male and female respondents for 1989, 1998, 2006, and 2016. Table 4 shows the mean, median, mode, min, and max of respondent age for all four years of data collection.

Table 2: Respondent Gender Demographics by Year

Year	Sex	Count	Percentage
1989	female	786	56.51
1989	male	605	43.49
1998	female	678	58.80
1998	male	475	41.20
2006	female	807	53.48
2006	male	702	46.52
2016	female	766	52.22
2016	male	701	47.78

Table 3: Respondent Age Groups by Year

Year	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	N/A
1989	150	322	293	215	153	256	2
1998	108	254	298	187	125	180	1
2006	110	269	329	335	227	230	9

Year	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	N/A
2016	112	238	275	265	267	303	7

Table 4: Respondent Age Demographics by Year

Year	Mean	Median	Mode	Min	Max
1989	45	42	28	18	89
1998	45	42	33	18	89
2006	47	46	47	18	89
2016	49	49	58	18	89

2.5 Graphs of Responses

Figure 1, Figure 2, and Figure 3, shows the responses to the prompt “On the following list there are various aspects of jobs. Please circle one number to show how important you personally consider it is in a job” where each graph represents one of the aspects. Respondents answered on a 1 to 5 Likert scale where 1 represents “very important” and 5 represents “not important at all”.

2.5.1 Helps Others

In Figure 1, the proportion of respondents to the prompt “A job that allows someone to help other people?” is displayed. From the first year of data collection in 1989 to 2006, “Important” was the most selected response. In 2016, “Very Important” surpassed “Important” by 1%. In general, you can see an increase in “Very Important” respondents across the years while there is little change in the proportion of “Not Important” and “Not Important At All” responses. Further, there is a general decrease in “Neither” responses from 1989 - 2006 which is interrupted when there is a slight increase in 2016.

2.5.2 Interesting Work

Figure 2 shows the proportion of responses for the prompt “An interesting job?”. In 1989, “Important” responses was most chosen at around 50%. The following survey, in 1998, showed an increase in “Very Important” responses, where it had a similar proportion to “Important” responses 1989 and “Important” decreased to a proportion similar to “Very Important”.




Figure 1: Q1 - “A job that allows someone to help other people?”




Figure 2: Q2 - “An interesting job?”

2.5.3 Social Usefulness

Figure 3 displays the proportion of responses for the prompt “A job that is useful to society?”. There is a large increase in the proportion of “Very Important” responses from 1989 to 2016. In contrast, there is a gradual decline for both “Important” and “Neither”. There is little change in “Not Important” and “Not Important At All”. Compared to the other figures, this graph has the most varying change in the “neutral” response.




Figure 3: Q3 - “A job that is useful to society?”

3 Results

3.1 Responses and demographics

Table 5 summarizes the average responses per year for each question, where 1 represents “Very Important” and 5 represents “Not Important At All”. There is a general decrease in scores, meaning importance increased, each year. The largest change from 1989 to 2016 was “Social Usefulness”, with an average response decrease of 0.311. Overall, interesting work was consistently more important than helping others and social usefulness with an average of 0.264 points lower. As time passed, interesting work became rated more similarly with the other two factors, and in 2016 the average difference was only 0.144 points.

Table 5: Average of Responses by Year

Year	Helping Others	Interesting Work	Social Usefulness
1989	2.034	1.649	1.986
1998	1.932	1.550	1.939
2006	1.687	1.501	1.669
2016	1.767	1.577	1.675

In Table 6 and Table 7, we see the percentage distribution of responses by respondent sex for the importance of helping others. In 1989, female respondents took the more extremes, and had much higher percentages for “very important” compared to their male counterparts. In 2016, the trend continues but at a lesser scale, with the proportions evening more.

Table 6: Helping Others Response Proportions 1989

Response	Sex	Count	Percentage
very important	female	210	60.34
very important	male	138	39.66
important	female	417	58.90
important	male	291	41.10
neither	female	133	47.84
neither	male	145	52.16
not important	female	24	44.44
not important	male	30	55.56
not important at all	female	2	66.67
not important at all	male	1	33.33

Table 7: Helping Others Response Proportions 2016

Response	Sex	Count	Percentage
very important	female	350	56.73
very important	male	267	43.27
important	female	324	52.51
important	male	293	47.49
neither	female	80	41.03
neither	male	115	58.97
not important	female	11	32.35
not important	male	23	67.65
not important at all	female	1	25.00
not important at all	male	3	75.00

Table 8 and Table 9 show the proportion of responses by sex for the importance of interesting work. Women again generally favour importance more than men, and similarly to the tables for helping others, the difference in proportion decreases in 2016. Interesting work 2016 has the lowest disparity in responses compared to the other two questions.

Table 8: Interesting Work Response Proportions 1989

Response	Sex	Count	Percentage
very important	female	341	56.46
very important	male	263	43.54
important	female	401	57.37
important	male	298	42.63
neither	female	34	52.31
neither	male	31	47.69
not important	female	7	38.89
not important	male	11	61.11
not important at all	female	3	60.00
not important at all	male	2	40.00

Table 9: Interesting Work Response Proportions 2016

Response	Sex	Count	Percentage
very important	female	391	51.65
very important	male	366	48.35
important	female	319	52.99
important	male	283	47.01
neither	female	42	52.50
neither	male	38	47.50
not important	female	13	48.15
not important	male	14	51.85
not important at all	female	1	100.00

In Table 10 and Table 11, the previous trend continues, with more women favouring importance and a decrease in gender differences in 2016. Social usefulness and interesting work had similar differences in proportions, while 1989 helping others had the largest disparity.

Table 10: Social Usefulness Response Proportions 1989

Response	Sex	Count	Percentage
very important	female	223	56.03

Response	Sex	Count	Percentage
very important	male	175	43.97
important	female	399	58.33
important	male	285	41.67
neither	female	134	54.69
neither	male	111	45.31
not important	female	25	43.10
not important	male	33	56.90
not important at all	female	5	83.33
not important at all	male	1	16.67

Table 11

Table 11: Social Usefulness Response Proportions 2016

Response	Sex	Count	Percentage
very important	female	379	54.38
very important	male	318	45.62
important	female	314	52.86
important	male	280	47.14
neither	female	58	41.13
neither	male	83	58.87
not important	female	11	42.31
not important	male	15	57.69
not important at all	female	4	44.44
not important at all	male	5	55.56

3.2 Change in importance over time

Figure 4 demonstrates the changing proportion of responses to how important is it for a job to help others.

Figure 5 demonstrates the changing proportion of responses to how important is it for a job to help others.

```
<ggproto object: Class ScaleDiscrete, Scale, gg>
  aesthetics: fill
  axis_order: function
  break_info: function
  break_positions: function
```




Figure 4: Proportion of Responses to Importance of Job that Helps Other

```

breaks: waiver
call: call
clone: function
dimension: function
drop: TRUE
expand: waiver
get_breaks: function
get_breaks_minor: function
get_labels: function
get_limits: function
guide: legend
is_discrete: function
is_empty: function
labels: waiver
limits: NULL
make_sec_title: function
make_title: function
map: function
map_df: function
n.breaks.cache: NULL
na.translate: TRUE

```

```

na.value: NA
name: waiver
palette: function
palette.cache: NULL
position: left
range: environment
rescale: function
reset: function
scale_name: viridis_d
train: function
train_df: function
transform: function
transform_df: function
super: <ggproto object: Class ScaleDiscrete, Scale, gg>

```




Figure 5: Proportion of Responses to Importance of Interesting Work in Job

4 Discussion

4.1 Economic Factors

4.2 Gender

Women generally placed more importance on occupations that help others, are interesting, and are useful to society. The disparity between attitudes of women and men was largest for the importance of occupations that help others, and it is evident how this translates to women working in care work. In 2021, 77.6% of the 21.2 million U.S. care workers were women (Daily 2022). Care work includes occupations in which workers care for others like children, persons with disabilities, seniors, and include industries such as education, healthcare, personal services, and more (“Study: Women Working in Paid Care Occupations” 2022). Despite the essential work the care industry does, it has historically been underpaid work and home health care workers had an average salary of \$13.81 from 2018 to 2020 (Gould, Sawo, and Banerjee 2021). The issue worsens when intersectional impacts are considered, as care workers are disproportionately women of colour. The change in attitude disparity between 1989 and 2016 may be a sign of more supportive views for care work and lowered inequality; however, the continued low pay of care workers is evidence that changing attitudes have not largely improved the care economy.

The general trend of lower importance across all three factors for men may also be an indication of persisting stereotypes that men need to prioritize pay and supporting their own family. This may be a feedback loop, where men believe they must be making more money to support their family while women believe their value is in care work, and when men receive higher pay than their female counterparts it is confirmed that they are responsible for monetarily supporting the family.

4.3 Age

4.4 Culture

4.5 Technology

References

- Daily, The Economics. 2022. “Over 16 Million Women Worked in Health Care and Social Assistance in 2021.” 2022. <https://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2022/over-16-million-women-worked-in-health-care-and-social-assistance-in-2021.htm>.
- Firke, Sam. 2023. *Janitor: Simple Tools for Examining and Cleaning Dirty Data*. <https://github.com/sfirke/janitor>.

- Gould, Elise, Marokey Sawo, and Asha Banerjee. 2021. “Care Workers Are Deeply Undervalued and Underpaid: Estimating Fair and Equitable Wages in the Care Sectors.” Working Economics Blog. 2021. <https://www.epi.org/blog/care-workers-are-deeply-undervalued-and-underpaid-estimating-fair-and-equitable-wages-in-the-care-sectors/>.
- R Core Team. 2023. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Spinu, Vitalie, Garrett Golemud, and Hadley Wickham. 2023. *Lubridate: Make Dealing with Dates a Little Easier*. <https://lubridate.tidyverse.org>.
- “Study: Women Working in Paid Care Occupations.” 2022. Statistics Canada. 2022. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/220125/dq220125a-eng.htm>.
- Wickham, Hadley. 2023. *Tidyverse: Easily Install and Load the Tidyverse*. <https://tidyverse.tidyverse.org>.
- Wickham, Hadley, Winston Chang, Lionel Henry, Thomas Lin Pedersen, Kohske Takahashi, Claus Wilke, Kara Woo, Hiroaki Yutani, and Dewey Dunnington. 2023. *Ggplot2: Create Elegant Data Visualisations Using the Grammar of Graphics*. <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>.
- Xie, Yihui. 2023. *Knitr: A General-Purpose Package for Dynamic Report Generation in r*. <https://yihui.org/knitr/>.