

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

THE JOB SATISFACTION: A REVIEW OF WIDELY USED MEASURES & INDEXES

*Sitora Inoyatova*¹

¹Westminster International University in Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Corresponding Author¹ s.inoyatova@gmail.com

Sitora Inoyatova. (2021). The Job Satisfaction: A Review Of Widely Used Measures and Indexes -- Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 18(2), 456-464. ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction Indexes, Job Satisfaction Instruments

ABSTRACT:

Job satisfaction has been studied over decades as a concept by various researchers worldwide. This paper provides an overview of widely used measures of job satisfaction and outlines the importance of their use in Uzbekistan and other countries, where research within job satisfaction is very limited. This paper provides a foundation and quick overview of job satisfaction measures and indexes for other researchers' convenience and use in their studies.

INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction has been studied for many years in industrial and organizational psychology (Wright, 2006), and has been one of the most widely researched topics (Spector, 1997). There are multiple publications which studied the (i) causes of job satisfaction (Fisher & Gitelson, 1983; Loher, Noe, Moeller & Fitzgerald, 1985; Jackson & Shuler, 1985; Fried & Ferris, 1987; Grunig, 1990); (ii) relationship between job satisfaction and job performance (Petty et al., 1984; Laffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Judge et al., 2001; Goslin, 2005; Davar & RanjuBala, 2012; Cullen et al., 2014; Bakotić; 2016); (iii) relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism (Farrel & Stamm 1988; Schaumberg et al., 2017); (iv) relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover (Tett & Meyer, 1993; Shepherd et al., 2020); (v) relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction (Judge & Watanabe, 1993; Unanue et al., 2017). According to Locke (1976), there were over 3,000 studies done 25 years ago pertaining the job satisfaction. According to Spector (1985), who extended Locke's (1976) study "...calculations to 1985 yields an estimate of 4,793" studies related to job satisfaction" (p. 693). In the PsycINFO database, there were about 7,856 studies on job satisfaction published since 1973, noting that even though the studies on

job satisfaction were very popular, there is an indication of a decline within this research area since 1980s (Anderso

JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Given the widely studied nature of job satisfaction there are several different measures that have been created to measure job satisfaction. (Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969; Spector, 1985; Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967).

A review of literature suggests that job satisfaction measures can be grouped into two categories, namely *facet* and *global* measures. *Facet* measures of job satisfaction focus on measuring specific areas of the job such as pay, supervision, promotion etc. (Spector, 1997). While *global* measures of job satisfaction focus on gathering information about overall or general job satisfaction in order to predict possibility of quitting the job (Ironson et al, 1989).

Job satisfaction is usually measured using self-completing survey questionnaires. Job Descriptive Index (JDI) proposed by Smith et al., (1969), Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) proposed by Weiss et al., (1967), the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) proposed by Spector (1985); the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) proposed by Hackman & Oldham (1975) are the examples of popular survey instruments that are based on facets. Noteworthy to mention, that the JDI and MSQ are the ‘two widely used, nationally recognized, reliable and valid instruments that measure facet-specific levels of job satisfaction’ (Green, 2000, p.23).

In addition to facet measures, there are measures of overall or general job satisfaction, also referred to as *global* scales which include the Overall Job Satisfaction Scale proposed by Brayfield & Rothe (1951); Faces Scale proposed by Kunin (1955); Global Job Satisfaction Questionnaire proposed by Warr et al., (1979); the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ) proposed by Cammann et al., (1979;1983); the Job in General Scale (JIG) proposed by Ironson et al., (1989) and Overall Job Satisfaction Scale proposed by Judge (1994).

Refer to Table 1 below for the widely known measures of Job Satisfaction:

S/N	Title	Abbreviation	Author Name	Year
Facet-specific Satisfaction Measure				
1	Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire	MSQ	Weiss et al.,	1967
2	Job Descriptive Index	JDI	Smith et al.,	1969
3	Job Satisfaction Survey	JSS	Spector	1985
4	Job Diagnostic Survey	JDS	Hackman & Oldham	1975
Global Job Satisfaction Measure				
1	Faces Scale	FS	Kunin	1955
2	Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire	MOAQ	Cammann et al.,	1979 & 1983
3	Job in General Scale	JIG	Ironson et al.,	1989
4	Overall job satisfaction scale	OJS	Brayfield & Rothe,	1951
5	Global job satisfaction questionnaire	GJSQ	Warr et al.,	1979
6	Overall job satisfaction scale	OJS	Judge et al, 1994	1994

Table 1: List of Widely Known Measures of Job Satisfaction

Source: Self- prepared by researcher

Hoppock's Job Satisfaction Blank

It is worthwhile to mention, that one of the first contemporary measures of job satisfaction using the survey instrument and attitude scales, also known as Job Satisfaction Blank, was published by Hoppock in 1935 (Gruneberg, 1979). Hoppock (1935) studied industrial employees to measure general job satisfaction using 4-item measure, where he claimed that job satisfaction is not only affected by the nature of job itself, but by factors such as social status, health, relationships. Hoppock's (1935) publication *Job Satisfaction* resulted in multiple additional research conducted by Maslow (1954), Herzberg et al., (1959), Adams (1963), Vroom (1964), Smith et al., (1969), Locke (1969), Lortie (1975), Hackman and Oldman (1976), Bullock (1984), and Spector (1997) – who claimed that job satisfaction depends on specific factors and individual's perception of those factors. Job Satisfaction Blank is still in use today.

Job Descriptive Index (JDI)

Job Descriptive Index (JDI) includes a 72-item survey aimed to measure the level of individual's job satisfaction based on five (5) facets which include pay, work, supervision, promotion, and co-workers (Smith et al., 1969). Each facet consists of nine to eighteen items or phrases that describe respondent's job experiences such as the work itself, pay, and remaining facets. Instrument offers a short response format ('Yes', 'No, or '?') which simplifies the task for the respondent and takes several minutes to complete the survey. JDI has been widely used instrument in measuring job satisfaction over the past fifty years. (Bowling et al., 2008; Cooper-Hakim et al., 2005; Lake et al., 2015).

The Abridged Job Descriptive Index (aJDI)

Stanton et al., (2002) developed a brief or shorter version of the JDI – the Abridged Job Descriptive Index (aJDI), which keeps the desirable characteristics of the original survey, while reducing the number of items in the subscales, administration time, and required survey space for the instrument, which is suitable for the multivariate organizational research. As such, the abridged job descriptive index maintains same level of quality as the original longer version of the survey. The abridged Job descriptive index consists of 25 items with same five facets. National sample of 1,534 respondents was used in the development of the aJDI. Nowadays, the JDI instrument is accessible and free of charge for the use of any researchers through the Bowling Green State University.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

The instrument which was created as a result of the Work Adjustment Project discussed earlier, was named as Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) which is comprised of 20 scales, namely: *ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social service, social status, supervision-human relations, supervision-technical, variety and working conditions*. There are five (5) questions for each of the twenty (20) scales totaling to 100 items in the survey instrument which normally takes a respondent about ten (10) to twenty (20) minutes to complete, also known as the "long version of the MSQ (1977)".

Five-point Likert (1932) scale is used for scoring each of the 100 items in the survey such as 'very dissatisfied', 'dissatisfied', 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied', 'satisfied' and 'very satisfied' with the 'very dissatisfied' being the first response option left to right (Weiss et al., 1967).

Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1985)

Job Satisfaction Survey developed by Spector (1985) was originally designed for the use in human service organizations; however, it is applicable to both private and public organizations (Spector, 1994). JSS consists of nine facets with total of 36 item scales aimed at measuring individual attitudes towards the job and its aspects. Nine facets include: promotion, pay, fringe benefits, supervision, contingent rewards (appreciation and recognition), co-workers, nature of work, communication and work conditions. Six-point scale response options range from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. The Job Satisfaction Survey provides a total job satisfaction score for each individual as well as provides subscales that demonstrate separate components of the job satisfaction. JSS instrument is accessible free of charge for non-commercial and educational purposes. According to Spector (1997), JSS is a very popular and modifiable instrument with well-documented reliability and validity.

Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS)

Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) have been developed by Hackman and Oldham (1975) to test the effects of job characteristics on individuals. The theory proposed that individuals can be motivated by the intrinsic satisfaction they find through performing their job activities. JDS is a measurement of overall and facet specific job satisfaction. They used five (5) job characteristics in their theory such as *skill variety*; *task identity*; *task significance*; *autonomy*; and *job feedback* to offer a work redesign approach in order to increase the motivation of employees. These five job characteristics can lead to greater job performance, job satisfaction, and motivation and attendance, according to the theory. Also, these five job characteristics of job lead to three psychological states such as meaningfulness of work; responsibility; and knowledge of (job related) results; which in turn impact job satisfaction and motivation of individuals.

JDS consists of measure of *overall* job satisfaction which is comprised of *three* dimensions such as *general* satisfaction measure, which includes five items; *internal work motivation*; and *growth satisfaction*; these three dimensions are also combined to provide a single measure of satisfaction score. Among the facet-specific measurements are pay, colleagues, supervision and security.

Seven-point measurement scale is used to measure each facet ranging from 'extremely dissatisfied' to 'extremely satisfied'. A number of studies support the task characteristics model to impact job satisfaction directly (Ting, 1996; Reiner & Zhao, 1999; Bhuian & Menguc, 2002)

Faces Scale

Faces scale proposed by Kunin (1955), is a single item measure of job satisfaction with the reliability of .66. The Faces scale is composed of drawings of several face expressions ('smileys') ranging from broad smile to a deep frown. Each responded marks the face expression best reflecting his/her overall

current feelings. Dunham & Herman (1975) developed a female version of the faces scale which can be used interchangeably as a measure of job satisfaction.

Job in General Scale (JIG)

Job in general Scale (JIG) proposed by Ironson et al., (1989) includes 18 items to measure global job satisfaction independent from satisfaction with facets, with reliability ranging from .82 to .94 (Wanberg, 1995). Respondents provides a 'yes' or 'no' answer related to his or her job in general. Items are: pleasant; bad (R); ideal; waste of time (R); good, undesirable (R); worthwhile; worse than most (R); acceptable; superior; better than most; disagreeable (R); makes me content; inadequate (R); excellent; rotten (R); enjoyable; poor (R), where 'R' indicates a reverse scoring. Global job satisfaction is positively correlated with job satisfaction and other factors) Cropanzano et al., 1993; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Major et al., 1995).

Overall Job Satisfaction Scale

Overall job satisfaction scale proposed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951), also includes 18 items to measure overall job satisfaction with reliability ranging from .88 to .91 (Pillai et al., 1999). Overall job satisfaction positively correlated with job facets, autonomy, task significance, performance, and job involvement (Aryee et al., 1999; Judge et al., 1998). Five-point Likert scale is used as a measurement of responses ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'.

Global Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

Global job satisfaction was proposed by Warr et al., (1979) with the use of 15 items to measure overall job satisfaction, with reliability ranging from .80 to .91 (Abraham & Hansson, 1996). There are two subscales measuring satisfaction with extrinsic and intrinsic factors of a job. Seven-point Likert scale is used to measure overall job satisfaction with scale ranging from 'extremely dissatisfied' to 'extremely satisfied'. Items include: physical work condition; freedom to choose own method of working; colleagues; recognition; boss; responsibility; pay; attention paid to suggestion an individual makes; opportunity to use own abilities; industrial relations between management and employees; chances for promotions; working hours; job variety; job security; and company management.

Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ)

Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire proposed by Cammann et al., (1979 & 1983) as a three-items measure of overall/global job satisfaction, with reliability ranging from .67 to .95 Sanchez & Brock, 1996; Hochwarter et al., 1999). Job satisfaction positively correlated with involvement of a leader; organizational commitment; job involvement and job focus (McLain, 1995). Seven-point Likert scale is used with responses ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. Items include: 'all in all I am satisfied with my job'; 'I'm general I don't like my job' (R); in general, 'I like working here', where (R) is reverse scored.

Overall Job Satisfaction Scale (Judge et al, 1994)

Overall job satisfaction scale proposed by Judge et al., (1994) as a measure of overall job satisfaction using three items, namely: (i) question used in the Gallup

poll ('are you satisfied with your job – 'yes/no' answer is used); (ii) Faces scale (where an individual marks one of eleven face expressions that best describe their feeling about overall job); and (iii) question about the percentage of job satisfaction of each individual. All three responses to these questions are summed up to generate an overall job satisfaction. Reliability of this measurement scale ranges from .78 to .85 (Judge et al, 1999).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper provides a review of widely used measures of job satisfaction worldwide. It should assist current researchers in countries, where number of research articles within topics of job satisfaction are limited and thus needs to be increased and emphasized, since employee job satisfaction cannot be neglected. Evidence of the literature review proves the importance of this topic and the link of job satisfaction with job performance, absenteeism, employee turnover, and overall life satisfaction. This is particularly important to Uzbekistan, the developing country located in Central Asia, where more and more investors are entering the market, where HRM systems are being built to match international best practices, where more international universities are being opened to match international quality standards of education. In other words, with the creation of more job places, organizations grow, and as organizations grow, there is a place for stronger HRM systems with the emphasis on ongoing analysis of job satisfaction and employee engagement strategies in order to gain sustained competitive advantage and as a result, contribute to the economical development of the country.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, J. D., & Hansson, R. O. (1996). Gender differences in the usefulness of goal-directed coping for middle-aged and older workers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*(8), 657–669.
- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*(5), 422-436.
- Aryee, S., Fields, D., Luk, V. (1999). A Cross-cultural test of a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Management, 25*(4), 491-511.
- Bhuiyan, S.N., and B. Menguc, (2002). "An Extension and Evaluation of Job Characteristics, Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction in an Expatriate, Guest Worker, Sales Setting," *The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, Vol. 22* (1), pp. 1-11.
- Bowling, N. A., Hendricks, E. A., & Wagner, S. H. (2008). Positive and negative affectivity and facet satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 23*, 115-125.
- Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F., (1951). "An Index of Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology, 35*, 307 – 311.
- Bullock, R. J. (1984). Improving job satisfaction. New York, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Cooper-Hakim, A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). The construct of work commitment: Testing an integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin, 131*, 241–259.
- Cropanzano, R., James, K., & Konovsky, M.A. (1993) Dispositional affectivity as a predictor of work attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*, 595-606.

- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. Seashore, E. Lawler, P. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.), *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures and practices*. New York. John Wiley.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. Seashore, E. Lawler, P. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.), *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures and practices*. New York. John Wiley.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., Klesh, J. (1979). *The Michigan organizational assessment questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., Klesh, J. (1979). *The Michigan organizational assessment questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Dunham, R.B. and Herman, J.B. (1975) 'Development of a female faces scale for measuring job satisfaction', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(5): 629–651.
- Green, J. (2000). Job satisfaction of community college chairpersons (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2000). *Electronic Theses & Dissertations Online, URN Number etd-12072000-130914*.
- Hackman J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of Job Diagnostic Survey, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 60.
- Hackman J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Hochwarter, W. A., Perrewé, P. L., Ferris, G. R., & Brymer, R. A. (1999). Job satisfaction and performance: The moderating effects of value attainment and affective disposition. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(2), 296–313. Available at: [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers.
- Ironson, G.H., Smith, P.C., Brannick, M.T., Gibson, W.M., Paul, K.B. (1989). Construction of a job in general scale: A Comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 193-200.
- Judge, T. A., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz, R. D., Jr. (1994). Job and life attitudes of male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(5), 767–782. <http://www.timothy-judge.com/JS1.htm>
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(1), 17–34.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Pucik, V., & Welbourne, T. M. (1999). Managerial coping with organizational change: A dispositional perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(1), 107–122. Available at: [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Konovsky, M.A., & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(5), 698-707.
- Kunin, T. (1955) The construction of a new type of attitude measure. *Personnel Psychology*, 8, 65-77.
- Lake, C. J., Gopalkrishnan, P., Sliter, M. T., & Withrow, S. (2015). The Job Descriptive Index: Newly Updated and Available for Download. Available at: [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology* 140, 1-55.
- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4(1), 309-336.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *School teachers: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Major, F.A., Kozlowski, S.W., Chao, G.T. & Gardner, P.D. (1995). A longitudinal investigation of newcomer expectations, early socialization outcomes, and the moderating effects of role development factors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 418-431.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- McLain, D. L. (1995). Responses to health and safety risk in the work environment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(6), 1726–1743. Available at: [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25(6), 897–933.
- Reiner, M.D., and J. Zhao, (1999). “The Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among United States Air Force Security Police,” *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, Vol. 19 (3), pp. 5-18.
- Sanchez, J. I., & Brock, P. (1996). Outcomes of perceived discrimination among Hispanic employees: Is diversity management a luxury or a necessity? *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3), 704–719. Available at: [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693- 713.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stanton, J. M., Sinar, E. F., Balzer, W. K., Julian, A. L., Thoresen, P., Aziz, S., Fisher, G. G., & Smith, P. C. (2002). Development of a compact measure of job satisfaction: The abridged Job Descriptive Index. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 62(1), 173–191. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ting, Y., (1996). “Analysis of Job Satisfaction of the Federal White-Collar Work Force: Findings from the Survey of Federal Employees,” *American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 26 (4), pp. 439-456.

- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Wanberg, C. (1995) A longitudinal study of the effects of unemployment and quality of reemployment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 46, 40-54.
- Warr, P., Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1979). Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 52, 129- 148.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation* (No. XXII), 1–119. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Sitora INOYATOVA

Sitora Inoyatova is a full-time lecturer at the Westminster International University in Tashkent. She received her BSc in Business Administration with concentration in Finance degree from Long Island University, C.W. Post, NY, USA, MA in International Business and Management degree from Westminster International University in Tashkent and currently she is a PhD candidate at the Tashkent State University of Economics, Uzbekistan. E-mail is: s.inoyatova@gmail.com; s.inoyatova@wiut.uz