ScSciencePG
Science Publishing Group

Research Article

Organizational Pride: The Key to Unlocking Job Satisfaction Among Municipal Utility Employees

Mark Ellickson[1], * iD, **Terry Stone[2]** iD, **Stephanie O'Connor[3]**

[1]Department of Political Science, Missouri State University, Springfield, USA

[2]Department of Psychology, University of Nebraska Omaha, Omaha, USA

[3]City Utilities of Springfield, Springfield, USA

Abstract

This study examines the key factors influencing job satisfaction among municipal utility employees—a rarely studied yet essential group of workers providing vital services such as electricity, gas, and water. Amid a serious workforce shortage in the public utilities sector, understanding the main drivers of employee satisfaction is crucial for improving recruitment and retention efforts, with significant implications for public health and societal stability. Drawing on survey data from nearly 400 employees at one of the largest municipally owned utility companies in the United States, the study employs the Person-Environment (P-E) Fit model as its theoretical framework. Regression analysis assessed the impact of nine variables across four dimensions of the work environment on job satisfaction. Results indicated that municipal utility workers' job satisfaction is primarily influenced by achieving a strong person-environment fit. The most significant factor is fostering a culture of organizational pride and an emotional connection to the organization. Other important factors associated with job satisfaction include ensuring equitable workloads, offering competitive pay, effectively utilizing employee skills, and providing opportunities for advancement. Contrary to expectations, the quality of coworker interactions was not a significant determinant of job satisfaction. This model explains two-thirds of the variation in job satisfaction among municipal utility employees. The study also discusses research and organizational implications.

1. Introduction

Understanding why some employees report varying levels of job satisfaction has long been a central focus of organizational scholars [31, 38] and a topic of great interest to practitioners [8, 56]. Improving job satisfaction is essential for practical reasons, such as increased productivity, reduced

absenteeism, and improved employee retention [61]. It also has humanitarian considerations as individuals spend a large portion of their lives at work. Moreover, satisfied workers are more likely to engage in altruist behaviors that exceed formal job requirements [25], whereas dissatisfied workers

are prone to counterproductive actions like sabotage, theft, and workplace aggression [59].

The concern over job satisfaction is particularly pressing in the power utilities sector. With a growing scarcity of utility workers due to baby boomer retirements, attracting and retaining high-performing employees has become a critical workforce challenge for utilities, with serious implications for public health and societal stability [13, 42]. This challenge is especially acute for publicly owned utility companies, which make up two-thirds of the nearly 3,000 utilities in the U.S. [65] and are responsible for delivering essential services such as electricity, water, and gas.

Identifying the key determinants of job satisfaction among municipal utility workers is crucial due to the unique nature of their roles compared to other employees, such as:

1) Essential Services: Municipal utility workers deliver critical services like electricity, water, and natural gas, requiring round-the-clock availability to address any problems that might arise.
2) Emergency Response: Municipal utility workers are frontline responders during emergencies such as power outages and natural disasters, frequently under hazardous conditions.
3) Technical Expertise: Many municipal utility workers require specialized technical skills and training to operate and maintain complex systems and critical infrastructure.
4) Community Impact: The performance of municipal utility workers directly impacts the health, safety, and economic well-being of all residents and businesses in the community.
5) Regulatory Environment: Municipal utility workers operate in a highly regulated environment, closely monitored by governmental agencies to ensure compliance with safety, environmental, and consumer protection standards.
6) Community Interaction: Municipal utility workers regularly have direct interactions with the public, whether responding to service calls, resolving utility-related complaints, conducting maintenance, or assisting during emergencies and natural disasters.

In sum, municipal utility workers operate in a distinct work environment shaped by a unique blend of technical expertise, critical infrastructure maintenance, regulatory oversight, hazardous conditions, and direct interaction with the community. These factors set their work experience and job satisfaction dynamics apart from those of most other employees.

This paper addresses a notable gap in the job satisfaction literature by identifying the primary drivers of job satisfaction among a distinct group of workers. The findings offer valuable insights for human resource managers aiming to attract and retain high-performing municipal utility employees. Specifically, the study develops and tests a model that evaluates nine potential determinants of job satisfaction, us-

ing survey data from nearly 400 employees at one of the largest municipally owned utility companies in the U.S. This model explains two-thirds of the variance in job satisfaction.

2. Theoretical Framework

Job satisfaction is often defined as the extent to which employees like or dislike their jobs, based on their perceptions of the work environment [60]. One commonly used model to study factors influencing job satisfaction is the Person-Environment Fit (P-E) model [16, 53]. This model suggests that job satisfaction depends on how well the job, organization, and individual align in terms of skills, values, and goals [34, 66]. P-E fit studies typically focus on four dimensions of the work environment: person-job (P-J) fit, person-organization (P-O) fit, person–supervisor (P-S) fit, and person-group (P-G) fit. Regardless of the type of fit being evaluated, the greater the perceived fit from the employee's perspective, the higher their job satisfaction [35].

1) Person-Job Fit: This refers to the alignment between an individual's skills, abilities, and needs, and the requirements, tasks, and responsibilities of the job. When there is a good fit between the person and the job, employees feel competent, challenged, and engaged [49, 60]. There are two distinct types of person-job fit: abilities-demand fit and needs-supplies fit. Abilities-demand fit refers to the match between the employee's skills and abilities and the job's requirements, while needs-supplies fit pertains to how well the job fulfills the employee's needs through the tasks and responsibilities assigned to their role [7].
2) Person-Organization Fit: This describes the degree to which an individual's values and goals align with those of the organization. When there is a strong fit, employees experience a sense of belonging, pride, and identification with the organization, all of which contribute to higher job satisfaction [9, 67].
3) Person-Supervisor Fit: This aspect of fit refers to the relationship between employees and their supervisors. When there is compatibility in communication styles, leadership approaches, and support, employees are more likely to experience job satisfaction and positive work outcomes [35, 66].
4) Person-Group Fit: This aspect of fit considers how well an individual fits within their work group. Employees who feel accepted and valued by their coworkers are more likely to experience higher levels of job satisfaction [35, 53].

In summary, the Person-Environment Fit model emphasizes the importance of aligning individuals' characteristics with their jobs and organizations to enhance job satisfaction. When there is a good fit, employees are more likely to be motivated, committed, and satisfied in their roles. This model serves as the theoretical framework guiding this study.

3. Literature Review and Research Hypotheses

Person-Job Fit: People generally seek jobs that utilize their skills, knowledge, and capabilities [29]. When organizations fail to effectively use employee abilities, it can lead to dissatisfaction due to boredom, frustration, and stress [15, 16, 41]. Viewed through the lens of the P-E fit model, specifically the abilities-demand fit component, skill underutilization is a form of P-J misfit that ultimately results in dissatisfied employees who underperform [28]. Previous research [16, 44] confirms that job satisfaction improves when employees' skills and abilities align with job demands. Considering the high-demand skill sets required in today's technologically advanced utilities industry [13, 42], the efficient utilization of skills and abilities is likely to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction among municipal utility workers.

Hypothesis 1: Overall job satisfaction is positively influenced by the effective utilization of employee skills and abilities.

Employee concerns over workload distribution are also closely tied to abilities-demand fit. Workload refers to the mental or physical demands placed on an employee within a specific time frame. While excessive workload (work overload) has been linked to higher stress levels [5] and reduced job satisfaction [27], insufficient workload (work underload) can result in boredom and dissatisfaction, particularly among achievement-oriented employees [52]. Job satisfaction is optimal when the job demands align with an employee's mental and physical capabilities.

Hypothesis 2: Satisfaction with one's workload is positively related to overall job satisfaction.

Employee need for workplace safety, on the other hand, aligns more closely with Cable and DeRue's needs-supplies fit rather than abilities-demand fit [7]. Workplace safety addresses employees' fundamental need for physical well-being. Workers who feel safe in their workplaces are generally more satisfied with their jobs than those who do not [26, 45]. Employees who hold positive perceptions of workplace safety tend to attribute this to management's concern for employee well-being, fostering higher levels of job commitment and satisfaction [43]. Given that utility workers perform some of the most dangerous jobs in America [64], a strong link between workplace safety perceptions and job satisfaction is expected.

Hypothesis 3: Overall job satisfaction is positively influenced by employee perceptions of a safe work environment.

Promotional opportunities, salary, and fringe benefits, when viewed through the needs-supplies fit perspective, play pivotal roles in influencing job satisfaction. Each of these factors addresses an individual's need for career advancement and financial security. When aligned with employees' expectations, they are likely to bolster job satisfaction. Conversely, discrepancies in any of these aspects can lead to dissatisfaction.

The relationship between promotions and job satisfaction stems from the organization's recognition of employee contributions, which creates opportunities for career advancement, increased status, financial growth, and professional mobility [12, 33].

The link between pay and job satisfaction is well-established. Pay helps employees meet lower-level needs like housing, food, and medical care, while also addressing higher-level needs such as achievement and recognition. However, this relationship is nuanced. Research shows that wages strongly influence job satisfaction at lower and mid-level pay scales, but the effect diminishes at higher income levels [48]. Additionally, perceptions of pay equity play a crucial role in shaping job satisfaction [30]. Employees are more likely to experience higher job satisfaction when they perceive their pay as fair in relation to their contributions and in comparison to others.

Less frequently examined has been the impact of fringe benefits on job satisfaction. Fringe benefits can represent a significant portion of an employee's total compensation package [64]. However, employees may undervalue their benefits package if they already receive similar benefits through a spouse or partner [3]. Nevertheless, research has shown that fringe benefits contribute to a favorable needs-supplies fit, and a positive relationship between fringe benefits and job satisfaction has been documented [3, 4, 56].

Based on the preceding discussion, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 4: Satisfaction with opportunities for promotions is positively related to overall job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5: Satisfaction with pay is positively related to overall job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6: Satisfaction with fringe benefits is positively related to overall job satisfaction.

Person-Organization Fit: Alignment between an individual's values and those of the organization can foster a sense of pride and allegiance, thereby enhancing overall job satisfaction among employees [9, 53]. While organizational pride has long been considered a vital component of organizational success [18], it is a relatively new variable in the search for key drivers of job satisfaction and has received limited attention in scientific studies [39, 47], particularly within the context of the power utility industry.

Organizational pride refers to a collective feeling of loyalty that binds employees together, fostering camaraderie, purpose, and belongingness within the organization [6]. According to social identity theory, individuals derive part of their self-identity from the groups and organizations they belong to [17]. When employees hold positive feelings toward their work organization, derived from its values, achievements, and reputation, it enhances their self-esteem and pride in being part of the organization. This, in turn, contributes to overall job satisfaction [24].

Organizational pride has been linked to higher levels of employee engagement [11] and motivation [32], as well as

improved retention rates [23]. Employees who are proud of their organization are also more likely to support its strategic objectives, speak positively about the organization, and actively contribute to its success [50]). Although limited, existing research suggests a potentially significant and positive relationship between organizational pride and job satisfaction [39].

Drawing on social identity theory and the Person-Organization Fit model, organizational pride is expected to have a significantly positive effect on job satisfaction among utility workers.

Hypothesis 7: Overall job satisfaction is positively related to employee feelings of organizational pride.

Person-Supervisor Fit: This aspect of fit suggests that the quality of the relationship with one's supervisor significantly influences job satisfaction. Numerous studies have shown that employees with supportive supervisors tend to experience higher job satisfaction [20-22, 62]. Rhodes and Eisenberger reviewed over 70 studies, concluding that that positive supervisory interactions strengthen perceptions of organizational support, which in turn boosts job satisfaction [54]. Hence, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 8: Satisfaction with one's immediate supervisor is positively related to overall job satisfaction.

Person-Group Fit: This component of fit focuses on the quality of relationships with coworkers. Positive interactions among colleagues can enhance employee job satisfaction by reducing stress, providing social support, and creating a more enjoyable work environment [14, 36, 58]. Chiaburu and Harrison's meta-analysis of 161 studies involving 78,000 employees revealed a strong link between coworker support and job satisfaction [10]. Similarly, a study of state employees in the Southeastern U.S. found that work environments promoting favorable coworker relationships led to higher job satisfaction [57]. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 9: Satisfaction with one's coworkers is positively related to overall job satisfaction.

4. Data and Measures

To evaluate the nine hypotheses, data were collected through a survey administered to 930 employees of one of the largest municipally owned utility companies in the United States, serving over 200,000 residential, commercial, and industrial customers. An independent research firm designed and conducted the utility-approved survey. Employees were assured anonymity, and utility officials were not allowed access to the questionnaires at any stage of the process. Conducted in November 2020, the survey yielded 398 completed responses, resulting in a 43% response rate. A comparison of the sample demographic profile with the utility's overall employee profile revealed close alignment, with the sole exception of job level: non-supervisory employees (70%) were somewhat underrepresented in the sample (78%).

Employees responded to survey questions using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree") or 1 ("very dissatisfied") to 5 ("very satisfied"), depending on the question. One variable in the study was derived from responses to five specific questions assessing the immediate supervisor's performance. These questions focused on whether the supervisor provided clear work expectations, listened to employee concerns, kept employees informed, offered motivation, and demonstrated competence. The internal reliability of this scale was measured using Cronbach's alpha, yielding a coefficient of.94, indicating strong reliability.

To assess overall job satisfaction, employees were asked: "Thinking about all aspects of your job, how would you rate your overall level of job satisfaction?" Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("very dissatisfied") to 5 ("very satisfied"). While some job satisfaction measures use multiple items, single-item measures have been shown to offer comparable validity and reliability [19] and achieve similar accuracy [40] with no significant loss of reliability [69]. This is especially true for single-item measures focused on overall job satisfaction [46, 68].

Table 1. Definitions of Variables Used to Measure Job Satisfaction.

Variables	Survey Question/Statement Used to Define Variable
Dependent Variable	
Job satisfaction	Thinking about all aspects of your job, how would you describe your overall level of job satisfaction?
Independent Variables	
Promotional opportunities	Overall, how satisfied are you with your promotional opportunities?
Pay	Overall, how satisfied are you with your pay?
Benefits package	Overall, how satisfied are you with your benefits package
(medical, dental, vision, vacation, sick leave, pension, etc.)?	
Skill utilization	My job-related skills and abilities are used effectively.

Variables	Survey Question/Statement Used to Define Variable
Workload distribution	Overall, how satisfied are your workload?
Safe workplace	The organization is committed to ensuring a safe workplace.
Immediate supervisor[a]	Index formed from responses to 5 Likert-scaled statements:
Keeps me informed on issues that affect me.	
Provides clear expectations regarding my job.	
Takes the time to listen to me and consider my opinions.	
Motivates me to look for better ways to perform my job.	
Is competent and effective.	
Coworkers	Overall, how satisfied are you with your co-workers?
Organizational pride	I am proud to tell people that I work for this organization.

[a]Cronbach's Alpha =.941

Note: Variables were measured using a five-point Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 ("very dissatisfied") to 5 ("very satisfied") or 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree"), depending on the question.

5. Results

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among study variables are presented in Table 2, and collinearity statistics are displayed in Table 3. Tests for multicollinearity showed that no pair of independent variables was correlated above.58, and the regression of each independent variable on all remaining independent variables revealed no coefficient of determination (R^2) above.51. Variance inflation factor (VIF) values ranged from 1.433 to 2.056, and tolerance values varied between.486 to.698. The Durbin-Watson statistic was 2.088. According to Lewis-Beck and Lewis-Beck [37], these findings suggest that multicollinearity and autocorrelation are not significant concerns in this study.

***Table 2.** Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations of Study Variables.*

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Skill utilization	4.07	.98	—									
2. Workload distribution	4.00	.97	.38	—								
3. Safe workplace	4.25	.86	.43	.34	—							
4. Promotional opportunities	3.32	1.26	.38	.32	.31	—						
5. Pay	3.95	1.02	.42	.31	.43	.45	—					
6. Benefits package	3.79	1.03	.26	.28	.46	.38	.58	—				
7. Organizational pride	4.12	.99	.49	.43	.54	.46	.49	.53	—			
8. Immediate supervisor	4.09	.94	.47	.41	.38	.37	.31	.25	.45	—		
9. Coworkers	4.31	.79	.26	.38	.26	.27	.22	.26	.35	.51	—	
10. Job satisfaction	4.26	.93	.56	.56	.53	.53	.58	.52	.68	.51	.39	—

N = 398

Note: The absolute value of correlations ≥.22 are significant at ≤.05 level (two-tailed tests).

***Table 3**. Collinearity Statistics.*

Variables	Tolerance	VIF
Skill utilization	.613	1.632
Workload distribution	.698	1.433
Safe workplace	.607	1.648
Promotional opportunities	.681	1.468
Pay	.554	1.804
Benefits package	.535	1.870
Organizational pride	.486	2.056
Immediate supervisor	.560	1.785

Variables	Tolerance	VIF
Coworkers	.683	1.465

Durbin–Watson = 2.088

Ordinary least squares regression was used to analyze the relationship between the dependent variable (overall job satisfaction) and the nine independent variables. Both standardized (B) and unstandardized (b) coefficients were reported, highlighting the relative influence and predictive power of each factor. The model explained a substantial portion of the variance in job satisfaction, with an R^2 value of .673 and an adjusted R^2 value of .665.

***Table 4**. Regression Results.*

Variables	Standardized Coefficients (B)	Unstandardized Coefficients (b)	Probability*
Skill utilization	.141	.136	.001
Workload distribution	.203	.199	.001
Safe workplace	.080	.087	.019
Promotional opportunities	.122	.092	.001
Pay	.172	.159	.001
Benefits package	.089	.081	.015
Organizational pride	.250	.236	.001
Immediate supervisor	.081	.080	.022
Coworkers	.031	.036	.199
Intercept		-.168	.395

N = 398 R^2 = .673 Adjusted R^2 = .665 F = 83.660 Probability = .001
*One-tail probability

Dependent variable: Job Satisfaction

The analysis revealed that eight of the nine independent variables tested were statistically significant factors influencing job satisfaction among municipal utility employees. Moreover, all eight variables affected the dependent variable in the hypothesized direction.

As predicted, variables examining the congruence between employees' skills, abilities, needs and the job's requirements, tasks, and responsibilities (i.e., person-job fit) were significant drivers of job satisfaction. Specifically, the effective utilization of employee skills and abilities (B =.141, p <.001), equitably distributed workloads (B =.203, p <.001), and a safe workplace (B =.080, p <.019) all had significant positive effects on job satisfaction. Additionally, as anticipated, the availability of promotional opportunities (B =.122, p <.001), satisfaction with pay (B =.172, p <.001), and satisfaction

with fringe benefits (B =.089, p <.015) were instrumental in shaping employee perceptions of job satisfaction.

The confirmation of Hypothesis 7 highlights the importance of aligning employee and organizational values (person-organization fit) in fostering organizational pride and job satisfaction. The standardized coefficient for organizational pride (B =.250, p <.001) underscores its substantial influence, making it the strongest predictor of job satisfaction among the independent variables.

The validation of Hypothesis 8 confirms the significance of employee-supervisor relations (person-supervisor fit) in influencing job satisfaction (B =.081, p <.022). Supervisors play a crucial role in shaping employee perceptions of job satisfaction through actions such as stating clear work expectations, keeping subordinates informed, listening to their input, providing motivation, and demonstrating competence.

In contrast, the expected link between coworker satisfaction and job satisfaction (Hypothesis 9), based on the person-group fit perspective, was not supported (B =.031, p <.199).

6. Discussion

This paper seeks to explain the key factors influencing job satisfaction among municipal utility employees. Despite their vital role in delivering essential services such as electricity, gas, and water, this unique group of workers has been largely overlooked in job satisfaction research. With the ongoing workforce shortage in the public utilities sector, understanding the primary drivers of employee satisfaction is critical for improving recruitment and retention efforts.

Among the nine independent variables analyzed in this model, organizational pride emerged as the most influential factor affecting job satisfaction, underscoring its critical role in fostering employees' emotional connection to the organization. Pride occurs when employees perceive their organization as meaningful, effective, and beneficial to the community [2]) and when they believe the organization's actions exceed community expectations [63]. However, negative encounters with residents, such as during power outages or bill disputes, can distort employees' perceptions of public sentiment and diminish organizational pride. To counter this, municipal utilities should consider conducting regular, probability-based customer surveys to monitor community perceptions and share the results with employees. This approach would provide a more accurate understanding of public sentiment, rather than relying solely on isolated negative encounters. Additional strategies municipal utilities can implement to increase organizational pride include:

1) Highlighting Community Contributions: Regularly communicate the impact of the utility's services on the community, helping employees understand that their work is meaningful and contributes to the greater good.
2) Employee Involvement: Involve employees in decision-making where feasible and encourage their input on organizational initiatives to instill a sense of shared purpose and pride in the utility's achievements.
3) Employee Recognition: Acknowledge individual and team achievements, tying them to the organization's overall mission. This can be done through employee-of-the-month awards, team recognition events, or company-wide announcements.
4) Community Involvement: Promote and encourage employee involvement in community service events or projects that align with the utility's mission.

The regression analysis revealed that perceptions of workload distribution and pay are the second and third most significant drivers of job satisfaction among municipal utility workers. Consistent with equity theory [1], when workloads and pay are perceived as fair, employees feel valued and motivated; however, perceived unfairness can lead to frustration, resentment, and dissatisfaction [27]. This is particularly relevant for Millennial and Generation Z workers, who tend to be more attuned to fairness, transparency, and work-life balance, making them especially sensitive to perceived inequities in the workplace [55].

While fringe benefits (such as medical, dental, vision, vacation, sick leave, and pension) were a significant predictor of job satisfaction (B =.089, p <.015), they were among the least influential of the eight variables in the final model. This finding aligns with previous research [3], that employee perceptions of benefits are influenced by their availability through other sources, such as a spouse or partner. To maximize the impact of benefits on job satisfaction, municipal utilities should offer a diverse range of benefits that cater to the varying needs and preferences of their employees. Regularly collecting employee feedback on satisfaction with current benefits, maintaining transparency about the cost and value of benefits, and periodically updating offerings to stay competitive with industry standards can enhance employees' perceptions of their value and contribute to overall job satisfaction.

The research also found that job satisfaction among utility workers is significantly influenced by the effective application of their skills. As noted earlier, municipal utility roles require technical expertise and specialized training to manage complex systems and equipment. Therefore, when workers can fully utilize their skills, they experience a stronger sense of self-worth, increased engagement, and, ultimately, higher job satisfaction.

A safe work environment was also identified as a significant contributor to employee satisfaction. Municipal utility workers often perform physically demanding tasks involving heavy equipment, hazardous materials, and potentially dangerous environments. Ensuring that safety protocols are in place minimizes the risk of accidents and injuries, reduces stress, and directly enhances workers' sense of well-being and satisfaction. Conversely, neglecting safety measures can create a perception that management is indifferent to employee welfare, leading to increased stress, anxiety, and decreased job satisfaction [51].

The finding that positive relationships with supervisors significantly impact overall job satisfaction among utility workers reinforces the importance of building trust through clear communication, empowerment, and opportunities for professional development. Interestingly, no significant link was found between favorable coworker relationships and higher job satisfaction. This may be due to the utility industry's task-oriented work environment, where technical skills are prioritized over interpersonal interactions. Moreover, utility workers often spend a considerable amount of time outdoors performing repairs and inspections, limiting opportunities for coworker interaction.

7. Conclusion

This study concludes that job satisfaction among munici-

pal utility workers largely depends on achieving a strong person-environment fit. Key factors include, first and foremost, fostering a culture of organizational pride, followed by ensuring equitable workloads, offering competitive pay, effectively utilizing employee skills, and providing opportunities for advancement. While elements such as workplace safety, positive supervisor-employee relationships, and fringe benefits contribute to overall job satisfaction, their impact is comparatively less significant. Contrary to expectations, the quality of coworker interactions did not emerge as a key determinant of job satisfaction.

Despite ongoing challenges like baby boomer retirements, a shrinking pool of skilled workers, strict environmental regulations, and public pressure to provide reliable and affordable energy, the utilities sector can benefit greatly from recognizing the critical link between organizational pride and job satisfaction. By leveraging this insight, managers will be better positioned to cultivate a more engaged, productive, loyal, and satisfied workforce.

To gain a more comprehensive understanding of job satisfaction in the utility sector, future research should include investor-owned utilities and cooperatives, as well as municipally owned utilities. Expanding the pool of explanatory variables and conducting studies across diverse regions would further enhance the external validity of the findings.

Abbreviations

P-E Fit	Person-Environment Fit
P-J Fit	Person-Job Fit
P-O Fit	Person-Organization Fit
P-S Fit	Person- Supervisor Fit
P-G Fit	Person-Group Fit

Author Contributions

Mark Ellickson: Conceptualization, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Software, Validation, Writing – original draft

Terry Stone: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Writing – review & editing

Stephanie O'Connor: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Supervision, Resources

Data Availability Statement

The data is available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

[1] Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 422–436. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040968

[2] Arnett, D. B., Laverie, D. A. & McLane, C. (2002). Using job satisfaction and pride as internal-marketing tools. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly,* 43(2), 87-96. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-8804(02)80035-0

[3] Artz B. (2010). Fringe benefits and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Manpower*, 31(6), 626–644. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437721011073346

[4] Barber A. E., Dunham R. B. & Formisano R. A. (1992). The impact of flexible benefits on employee satisfaction: A field study. *Personnel Psychology*, 45(1), 55–75. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1992.tb00844.x

[5] Bowling N., Alarcon G., Bragg C. & Hartman M. (2015). A meta-analytic examination of the potential correlates and consequences of workload. *Work & Stress*, 29(2), 95-113. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2015.1033037

[6] Boyt T., Lusch R. & Mejza M. (2005). Theoretical model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational, workgroup and professional esprit de corps. *European Management Journal*, 23(6), 682–701. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2005.10.008

[7] Cable, D. M. & Derue, D. S. (2002). The Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Subjective Fit Perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5), 875-884. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.5.875

[8] Cantarelli P., Belardinelli P. & Belle N. (2016). A meta-analysis of job satisfaction correlates in the public administration literature. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 36(2), 115–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X15578534

[9] Chen, P., Sparrow, P. & Cooper, C. (2016). The relationship between person-organization fit and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(5), 946-959. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-08-2014-0236

[10] Chiaburu D. S. & Harrison D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1082–1103. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1082

[11] Crossan, M., Byrne, A., Seijts, G., Reno, M., Monzani, L. & Gandz, J. (2017). Toward a framework of leader character in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies,* 54(7), 986-1018. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12254

[12] De Souza G. (2002). A study of the influence of promotions on promotion satisfaction and expectations of future promotions among managers. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 13(3), 325–340. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1034

[13] Dickey C. & Levine R. (2021). Prioritizing the workforce is critical to utility transformation. *Power*, 1 June 2021, pp. 22-23. https://www.powermag.com/prioritizing-the-workforce-is-critical-to-utility-transformation

[14] Ducharme L. J. & Martin J. K. (2000). Unrewarding work, coworker support, and job Satisfaction. *Work and Occupation*, 27(2), 223-243. https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888400027002005

[15] Durst, S. L. & DeSantis V. S. (1997). The Determinants of Job Satisfaction among Federal, State, and Local Government Employees. State and Local Government Review, 29(1), 7-16.

[16] Edwards, J. R. & Shipp, A. J. (2007). The relationship between person–environment fit and outcomes: An integrative theoretical framework. Ostroff and Judge (Eds.), *Perspectives on Organizational Fit,* Jossey-Bass, 209–258. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203810026

[17] Ellemers N. & Haslam S. A. (2012). Social identity theory. Van Lange P., Kruglanski A. W., and Higgins E. T. (Eds.), Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology, Sage, pp. 379-398. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249222

[18] Fayol H. (1949). *General and Industrial Management*, Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Inc.

[19] Fisher, G. G., Matthews, R. A. & Gibbons, A. M. (2016). Developing and investigating the use of single-item measures in organizational research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21(1), 3-23. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039139

[20] Frenkel S., Sanders K. & Bednall T. (2013). Employee perceptions of management relations as influences on job satisfaction and quit intentions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 30, 7–29. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-012-9290-z

[21] Golden T. D. & Veiga J. F. (2008). The impact of superior–subordinate relationships on the commitment, job satisfaction, and performance of virtual workers. The Leadership Quarterly, 19(1), 77–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.12.009

[22] Gordon V. (2011). Exploring the job satisfaction of municipal clerks. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 31(2), 190–208. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X11408570

[23] Gouthier, M. & Rhein, M. (2011). Organizational pride and its positive effects on employee behavior. *Journal of Service Management,* 22(5), 633-649. https://doi.org/10.1108/09564231111174988

[24] Helm S. (2012). A matter of reputation and pride: Associations between perceived external reputation, pride in membership, job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *British Journal of Management*, 24(4), 542–556. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2012.00827.x

[25] Hoffman B. J., Blair C. A., Maeriac J. P. & Woehr D. J. (2007). Expanding the criterion domain? A quantitative review of the OCB literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 555–566. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.555

[26] Huang Y., Lee J., McFadden A., Murphy L., Robertson M., Cheung J. & Zohar D. (2016). Beyond safety outcomes: An investigation of the impact of safety climate on job satisfaction, employee engagement and turnover using social exchange theory as the theoretical framework. *Applied Ergonomics*, 55, 248–257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2015.10.007

[27] Inegbedion H., Inegbedion E. & Peter A., Harry L. (2020). Perception of workload balance and employee job satisfaction in work organizations. *Heliyon*, 66, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e03160

[28] Jessurun, J. H., Weggeman, M. C. D. P., Anthonio, G. G. & Gelper, S. E. C. (2020). Theoretical reflections on the underutilization of employee talents in the workplace and the consequences. *SAGE Open*, 10(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020938703

[29] Judge T. A. & Klinger R. (2012). Promote job satisfaction through mental challenge. In Locke E. A. (Ed.), *Handbook of Principles of Organizational Behavior: Indispensable Knowledge for Evidence-Based Management* (2nd ed), John Wiley & Sons, 105–121. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119206422

[30] Judge T. A., Picclo R. F., Podsakoff N. P., Shaw J. C. & Rich B. L. (2010). The relationship between pay and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the literature. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 77(2), 157–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.04.002

[31] Judge T. A., Weiss H. M., Kammeyer-Mueller J. D. & Hulin C. L. (2017). Job attitudes, job satisfaction, and job affect: A century of continuity and of change. Journal of Applied Psychology, 102(3), 356–374. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000181

[32] Katzenbach, J. R. (2003). *Why Pride Matters More Than Money: The Power of the World's Greatest Motivational Force*. Crown Business.

[33] Kosteas V. D. (2011). Job satisfaction and promotions. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 50(1), 174–194. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-232X.2010.00630.x

[34] Kristof-Brown, A. & Guay, R. P. (2011). Person-environment fit. Zedeck, S. (Ed.), *American Psychological Association Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, American Psychological Association, 1-50. https://doi.org/10.1037/12171-000

[35] Kristof-Brown A. L., Zimmerman R. D. & Johnson E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281–342. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x

[36] Lambert E., Minor K. I., Wells J. B. & Hogan N. L. (2016). Social support's relationship to correctional staff job stress, job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *The Social Science Journal*, 53(1), 22–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2015.10.001

[37] Lewis-Beck C. & Lewis-Beck M. S. (2016). *Applied Regression*. 2nd ed. Sage.

[38] Locke E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. Dunette, M. D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* Rand McNally, 1297–1349.

[39] Mas-Machuca, M., Jasmina, B. M., & Ines, A. (2016). Work-life balance and its relationship with organizational pride and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(2) 586-602. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-09-2014-0272

[40] Matthews R. A., Pineault L. & Hong Y. (2022). Normalizing the use of single-item measures: Validation of the single-item compendium for organizational psychology. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 37(1), 639–673. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-022-09813-3

[41] Maynard D. C., Joseph T. A. & Maynard A. M. (2006). Underemployment, job attitudes, and turnover intentions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(4), 509–536. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.389

[42] McAuliffe G. (2022). Addressing the challenges presented by a retiring utility workforce. *Power,* 22 June 2022, https://www.powermag.com/addressing-the-challenges-presented-by-a-retiring-utility-workforce

[43] Michael J. H., Evans D., Jansen K. J. & Haight J. M. (2005). Management commitment to safety as organizational support. Journal of Safety Research, 36(2), 171–179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2005.03.002

[44] Morrison D., Cordery J., Girardi A., & Payne R. (2005). Job design, opportunities for skill utilization, and intrinsic job satisfaction. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 14(1), 59–79. https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320444000272

[45] Morrow P. C. & Crum M. R. (1998). The effects of perceived and objective safety risk on employee outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 53(2), 300–313. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1997.1621

[46] Nagy, M. S. (2002). Using a single-item approach to measure facet job satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 77–86. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317902167658

[47] Ozbezek, B. D., Paksoy, H. M., & Guultekin, V. M. (2023). The effect of organizational pride on job satisfaction: A study in the tourism sector. *Business and Economics Research Journal,* 14(2), 243-255. https://doi.org/10.20409/berj.2023.414

[48] Parker K. N. & Brummel B. J. (2016). Examining the curvilinear relationship between income and job and pay satisfaction. Journal of Personnel Psychology, 15(4), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000162

[49] Peng, Y. & Mao, C. (2015). The impact of person–job fit on job satisfaction: The mediator role of self-efficacy. *Social Indicators Research*, 121(3), 805–813. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0659-x.

[50] Pereira, L., Patrício, V., Sempiterno, M., da Costa, R. L., Dias, A., & Antonio, N. (2021). How to build pride in the workplace? *Social Sciences*, 10(3), Article 104. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci10030104.

[51] Pindek S., Howard D. J. & Krajcevska A., Spector P. E. (2019). Organizational constraints and performance: An indirect effects model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 34, 79–95. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-03-2018-0122

[52] Pindek S., Zhou Z., Kessler S., Krajcevska A. & Spector P. (2022). The lingering curvilinear effect of workload on employee rumination and negative emotions: A diary study. *Work & Stress*, 36(3), 292-311. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2021.2009055

[53] Rauvola, R. S., Rudolph, C. W., Ebbert, L. K. & Zacher, H. (2020). Person–environment fit and work satisfaction. *Work, Aging and Retirement*, 6(2), 101-117. https://doi.org/10.1093/workar/waz011

[54] Rhodes, L. & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698

[55] Sanchez-Hernandez M, Gonzalez-Lopez O, Buenadicha-Mateos M, & Tato-Jiménez J. (2019). Work-Life Balance in Great Companies and Pending Issues for Engaging New Generations at Work. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(24), 5122. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16245122

[56] SHRM (Society for Human Resource Management). (2016). Employee job satisfaction and Engagement. https://leadershipfreak.blog/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2016-employee-job-satisfaction-and-engagement-report.pdf

[57] Simon L. S., Judge T. A., & Halvorsen-Ganepola M. (2010). In good company? A multi-study, multi-level investigation of the effects of coworker relationships on employee well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76), 534–546. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.01.006

[58] Sloan M. M. (2012). Unfair treatment in the workplace and worker well-being: The role of coworker support in a service work environment. *Work and Occupations*, 39, 3–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888411406555

[59] Spector P. & Fox S. (2005). The stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behavior. Fox S. and Spector P. (Eds*.), Counterproductive Workplace Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets*, American Psychological Association, 151–174. https://doi.org/10.1037/10893-000

[60] Spector P. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences*. Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231549

[61] Spector P. (2022). *Job Satisfaction: From Assessment to Intervention*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003250616

[62] Stringer, L. (2006). The link between the quality of the supervisor–employee relationship and the level of the employee's job satisfaction. *Public Organization Review*, 6(2), 125–142. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-006-0005-0

[63] Sturm, R., Jolly, P. & Williams, S. (2022). It's a matter of organizational pride: How perceptions of organizational virtuousness and competence affect employee behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 37, 1079-1097. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-021-09766-0

[64] U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2022). Employer costs for employee compensation summary. September 20, 2022. www.bls.gov/news.release/ecec.nr0.htm

[65] U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration, Independent Statistics & Analysis. (2019), https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=40913

[66] van Vianen, Annelies E. M. (2018). Person–environment fit: A review of its basic tenets. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 75-101. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104702

[67] Verquer, M. L., Beehr, T. A. & Wagner, S. H. (2003). A meta-analysis of the relations between person-organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 473-489. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00036-2

[68] Wanous, J. P. & Hudy, M. J. (2001). Single-item reliability: A replication and extension. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(4), 361-375. https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810144003

[69] Wanous J. P., Reichers A. E. & Hudy M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 247–252. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.247