

Taking the Measure of Work: A Guide to Validated Scales for Organizational Research and Diagnosis

1 Job Satisfaction

Contributors: Dail L. Fields

Book Title: Taking the Measure of Work: A Guide to Validated Scales for Organizational Research and Diagnosis

Chapter Title: "1 Job Satisfaction"

Pub. Date: 2002

Access Date: October 15, 2013

Publishing Company: SAGE Publications, Inc.

City: Thousand Oaks

Print ISBN: 9780761924258

Online ISBN: 9781452231143

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452231143.n1>

Print pages: 1-43

This PDF has been generated from SAGE Research Methods. Please note that the pagination of the online version will vary from the pagination of the print book.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452231143.n1>

[p. 1 ↓]

1 Job Satisfaction

The Construct

For decades, organizational researchers have been intrigued by employee satisfaction with work. Some studies have examined antecedents of job satisfaction, specific dimensions of job satisfaction, and the relationship between job satisfaction and outcomes such as job performance or turnover. Meta-analyses have shown that the relationship between performance and job satisfaction is positive, but small (George & Jones, 1997). However, analysis at the organizational level has shown that organizations with higher average levels of job satisfaction outperform other organizations (Ostroff, 1992). Some have suggested that we still lack a workable understanding of the way different factors such as work values, job satisfaction, and performance interact with one another (George & Jones, 1997).

Job satisfaction is generally defined as an employee's affective reactions to a job based on comparing actual outcomes with desired outcomes (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). It is generally recognized as a multifaceted construct that includes employee feelings about a variety of both intrinsic and extrinsic job elements (Howard & Frink, 1996). Porter and Steers (1973) argued that the extent of employee job satisfaction reflected the cumulative level of met worker expectations. That is, employees expect their job to provide a mix of features (e.g., pay, promotion, autonomy) for which the employee has certain preferential values. The range and importance of these preferences vary across individuals, but when the accumulation of unmet expectation becomes sufficiently large there is less job satisfaction, and greater probability of withdrawal behavior (Pearson, 1991). Indeed, some interest in job satisfaction is focused primarily on its impact on employee commitment, absenteeism, intentions to quit, and actual turnover (Agho, Mueller, & Price, 1993). However, across studies, the proportion of variance in turnover explained by levels of satisfaction may be smaller than originally thought (Horn &

Griffeth, 1991; Lee, Mitchell, Holtom, McDaniel, & Hill, 1999). On the other hand, a 2-year longitudinal study showed that employees who changed jobs and moved into a new occupation had higher levels of work satisfaction in the new job than employees who changed jobs and stayed in the same occupation and employees who did not change jobs at all (Wright & Bonett, 1992). In particular, satisfaction with the facets of meaningful work and promotion opportunities were significant [p. 2 ↓] predictors of intentions to leave an organization. Mathieu's (1991) tests of the causal ordering of job satisfaction and organizational commitment found that the effects of a variety of antecedents on organizational commitment were mediated by their impact on job satisfaction (Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992).

Aspects of the work situation have been shown to be determinants of job satisfaction (Arvey, Carter, & Buerkley, 1991). For example, a broad situational factor, job level, is positively correlated with satisfaction with all aspects of the job probably because higher-level jobs tend to have better working conditions, pay, promotion prospects, supervision, autonomy, and responsibility (Robie, Ryan, Schmieder, Parra, & Smith, 1998). Zeitz (1990) found that perceptions that employees have about numerous aspects of their work environment (management climate, job content, reward fairness, employee influence on work group, and promotion opportunities) explained job satisfaction. This study also found distinct patterns of work satisfaction at different age levels for non-college graduates (U shape), non-elite professionals (downward sloping), and elite professionals (upward sloping). Personal characteristics such as age, gender, education level, and pay grade did not contribute incrementally to explaining the variance in work satisfaction beyond that explained by variables describing the job situation. In Agho, Price, and Mueller (1992), evaluation of alternative confirmatory factor models found that job satisfaction and the personality tendencies of negative and positive affectivity were empirically distinct.

Judge and Hulin (1993) tested the differential effects of employee affective disposition on job satisfaction. The study found that affective disposition was antecedent to general well-being, and well-being was reciprocally related with job satisfaction. Judge and Watanabe (1993) found in a longitudinal study that the effects of life satisfaction on job satisfaction were considerably larger than the effects of job satisfaction on life satisfaction. It is possible that people with higher levels of satisfaction with life pay more attention to the positive aspects of jobs and less attention to the negative aspects.

However, it appears that under conditions of organizational change, job satisfaction has larger effects on life satisfaction, suggesting that job satisfaction is an essential component of an employee's life (Judge & Watanabe, 1993).

A qualitative study (Bussing, Bissels, Fuchs, & Perrar, 1999) suggested that job satisfaction is developed through assessment of the match among expectations, needs, motives, and the work situation. Based on this assessment, a person builds up satisfaction (steady feeling of relaxation as a result of met expectations and needs) or dissatisfaction (feeling of tension as a result of unsatisfied needs and expectations) with her or his work. In the case of dissatisfaction, employees may maintain or reduce their level of aspiration. Maintaining aspirations in the face of work dissatisfaction can result in pseudo work satisfaction, fixated dissatisfaction, and constructive dissatisfaction. Fixated and constructive work dissatisfaction may result in mobilization of an employee's problem-solving behavior (Bussing et al., 1999). Problem-solving behaviors seem to depend largely on variables such as control or social support at work. Alternately, a more cynical view is that decreases in aspirations may lead to "resigned" job satisfaction. That is, some proportion of satisfied workers found in attitudinal studies may be explained by some workers who have passively resigned or given up on their work situation (Bussing et al., 1999).

The Measures

Measures of job satisfaction may assess global satisfaction with a job or satisfaction with several key aspects of the job such as pay, supervision, promotion, co-worker, and [p. 3 ↓] the job itself. Sometimes facet measures are averaged together for an overall measure of satisfaction (Wright & Bonett, 1992). Some studies have used measures of both global and specific job facet satisfaction because specific facet satisfaction measures may better reflect changes in relevant situational factors, whereas a global measure may more likely reflect individual differences than responses to specific items (Witt & Nye, 1992). For example, Watson and Slack (1993) used the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) to measure satisfaction with several facets, such as the work itself, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers. This study also used the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) to measure global or overall job satisfaction. The levels of facet satisfaction had varying degrees of relationship with

global satisfaction. Satisfaction with supervision had the largest positive correlation, whereas satisfaction with pay had the lowest. In Taber and Alliger (1995), significant relationships were found between task-level experiences assessed through job analysis, facet satisfaction (the work itself), and global job satisfaction. The percentage of time an employee spends in enjoyable tasks was correlated positively with higher levels of facet and global satisfaction. It is possible that workers form a perception pattern about their jobs that is influenced by the task experiences (Taber & Alliger, 1995). Howard and Frink (1996) found that individuals in an organization undergoing change who perceived growth opportunities were more satisfied with their job overall. Although co-workers were more important than supervisors for keeping workers internally motivated, supervisors were more critical than co-workers for keeping employees satisfied with their jobs.

Rice, Gentile, and McFarlin (1991) found that facet importance moderated the relationship between facet amount and job satisfaction for each of 12 job facets: pay, hours worked, commuting time, promotion opportunity, interaction with co-workers, customer/client contact, opportunity to learn new skills, decision making, physical effort required, mental effort required, supervisor contact, and a worker's control over his or her schedule. I have included several alternative validated measures for global job satisfaction as well as several alternatives that measure satisfaction with specific job facets.

Some researchers have suggested that job satisfaction measures may differ in the extent to which they tap affective satisfaction or cognitive satisfaction (Moorman, 1993). Affective satisfaction is based on an overall positive emotional appraisal of the job and focuses on whether the job evokes a good mood and positive feelings. Cognitive satisfaction is based on logical and rational evaluation of the job, such as conditions, opportunities, or outcomes (Moorman, 1993). Organ and Near (1985) noted that most satisfaction measures asked respondents to compare facets of their job to some referent (a cognitive process) and did not really ask for judgments about feelings and emotions. Brief and Roberson (1992) tested the relative effect of cognition and affect in frequently used job satisfaction measures and found that the MSQ and JDI were predominantly cognitive, but with some affective influence present. For example, the Brayfield-Rothe measure of job satisfaction (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951) includes questions on the degree to which a respondent is bored, interested, happy, enthusiastic,

disappointed, or enjoying work. These questions center not on specific appraisals about job conditions, but on the emotional reactions to the work. Therefore, job satisfaction measures appear to differ in the degree they reflect cognition and affect with the mix depending on the nature of the items used in the measure.

A final measurement consideration is the extent to which job satisfaction measures reflect “true variance” in satisfaction as opposed to error or method variance. Buckley, Carragher, and Cote (1992) found that for the JDI composite measure of job satisfaction, trait (actual job satisfaction) variance accounted for approximately 43% of the total [p. 4 ↓] variance, with common method and random error variance comprising the balance. For the JDI measures of facet satisfaction, trait variance accounted for approximately 41% for the measure of supervision, 34% for the measure of satisfaction with work itself, 38% of the variance in satisfaction with coworkers, 56% of satisfaction with pay, and 61% of the satisfaction with promotions. The same study estimated that trait variance accounted for approximately 46% of the total variance in other measures of job satisfaction including the MSQ.

[p. 5 ↓]

Overall Job Satisfaction

Description

This measure, developed by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1983) as part of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (OAQ), uses three items to describe an employee's subjective response to working in his or her job and organization. This is a global indication of worker satisfaction with a job.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha values ranged from .67 to .95 (Hochwarter, Perrewé, Igalens, & Roussel, 1999; McFarlin & Rice, 1992; McLain, 1995; Pearson, 1991; Sanchez & Brock, 1996; Siegall & McDonald, 1995).

Validity

Job satisfaction correlated positively with leader's positive affectivity, leader's job involvement, distribution of risk exposure in the workplace, the economic value placed on health and safety, organizational commitment, job involvement, job focus, and work complexity (George, 1995; McLain, 1995; Siegall & McDonald, 1995). Job satisfaction correlated negatively with employees' off-job focus, perceived danger, perceived risk, task distractions, and intent to leave (Siegall & McDonald, 1995). In Sanchez, Kraus, White, and Williams (1999), confirmatory factor analysis showed that organizational munificence, high-involvement human resources (HR) practices, benchmarking, and job satisfaction were empirically distinct constructs.

Source

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. Items were taken from Table 4–2, p. 84. Copyright © 1983. Reprinted by permission of John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Items

Responses are obtained using a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *slightly disagree*, 4 = *neither agree nor disagree*, 5 = *slightly agree*, 6 = *agree*, and 7 = *strongly agree*.

Items:

Items denoted with (R) are reverse scored.

[p. 6 ↓]

Job Satisfaction Relative to Expectations

Description

This measure, developed by Bacharach, Bamberger, and Conley (1991), assesses the degree of agreement between the perceived quality of broad aspects of a job and employee expectations. The measure is particularly useful to assess the extent to which job stresses, role conflicts, or role ambiguities prevent job expectations from being met.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha was .88 (Bacharach et al., 1991).

Validity

Job satisfaction relative to expectations correlated negatively with role conflict, role overload, and work-home conflict (Bacharach et al., 1991).

Source

Bacharach, S., Bamberger, P., & Conley, S. (1991). Work-home conflict among nurses and engineers: Mediating the impact of role stress on burnout and satisfaction with work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12, 39–53. Items were taken from text, p. 45. Copyright © 1991. Reproduced by permission of John Wiley & Sons Limited.

Items

Responses are obtained using a 4-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *very dissatisfied* and 4 = *very satisfied*.

[p. 7 ↓]

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Description

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) “long form” consists of 100 questions that make up 20 subscales measuring satisfaction with 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 (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). Twenty of these items make up a frequently used measure of general job satisfaction. These 20 items are referred to as the short form of the MSQ. The items can be separated into a 12-item subscale for intrinsic satisfaction (such as satisfaction with the chance to use abilities and feelings of accomplishment from the job) and an 8-item subscale measuring extrinsic satisfaction (such as satisfaction with pay, chances for advancement, and supervision). The MSQ has been translated into French and Hebrew (Igalens & Roussel, 1999; Sagie, 1998).

Reliability

Coefficient alpha values for the 20-item MSQ ranged from .85 to .91 (Hart, 1999; Huber, Seybolt, & Venemon, 1992; Klenke-Hamel & Mathieu, 1990; Mathieu, 1991; Mathieu & Farr, 1991; Riggs & Knight, 1994; Roberson, 1990; Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1992; Smith & Brannick, 1990; Wong, Hui, & Law, 1998). Coefficient alpha values for the

intrinsic satisfaction subscale ranged from .82 to .86 (Breedon, 1993; Davy, Kinicki, & Scheck, 1997; Wong et al., 1998). For the extrinsic satisfaction subscale, coefficient alpha values ranged from .70 to .82 (Breedon, 1993; Davy et al., 1997; Wong et al., 1998). A Hebrew-language version of the MSQ had a coefficient alpha of .70 (Sagie, 1998). Overall job satisfaction measured with the 20-item MSQ had test-retest reliability across three time periods of $r = .58$ (Wong et al., 1998).

Validity

Overall job satisfaction was negatively correlated with role conflict and role ambiguity, and propensity to leave (Klenke-Hamel & Mathieu, 1990; Smith & Brannick, 1990). Overall job satisfaction correlated positively with life satisfaction, non-work satisfaction, job involvement, and performance expectancy (Hart, 1999; Smith & Brannick, 1990). In both cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis, job and non-work satisfaction were predictors of life satisfaction (Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1992). In Sagie (1998), the Hebrew-language version correlated positively with organizational commitment and negatively with intention to quit.

In confirmatory analysis, Mathieu and Farr (1991) found that organizational commitment, job involvement, and job satisfaction were empirically distinct. Scarpello and Vandenberg (1992) found that job satisfaction and occupational commitment were independent constructs. Moorman (1993) factor analyzed the MSQ and found two factors: one assessing satisfaction with intrinsic aspects of the job and the other assessing satisfaction with the extrinsic aspects. In Mathieu (1991), an exploratory factor analysis of the [p. 8 ↓] MSQ yielded four factors. These four subscales included satisfaction with working conditions (six items), leadership (two items), responsibility (six items), and extrinsic rewards (six items). In Igalens and Roussel (1999), confirmatory factor analysis of a French-language version of the MSQ showed that a four-factor model fit the data best. The four factors were intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, recognition, and authority/social utility.

Source

Weiss, D., Dawis, R., England, G., & Lofquist, L. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Minnesota Studies on Vocational Rehabilitation, Vol. 22)*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center. Items were taken from pp. 110–111. Copyright © 1967. Reprinted with permission.

Items

Responses are obtained on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job*, 2 = *dissatisfied with this aspect of my job*, 3 = *can't decide if I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job*, 4 = *satisfied with this aspect of my job*, and 5 = *very satisfied with this aspect of my job*.

Instructions and items:

On the following pages, you will find statements about your present job. Read each statement carefully; decide how satisfied you are about the aspect of your current job described by the statement. Then check the box that corresponds to your level of satisfaction with that aspect of your job.

[p. 9 ↓]

Job in General Scale

Description

This measure, developed by Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, and Paul (1989), uses 18 items to describe global job satisfaction. The measure can be used alone or in conjunction with the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), which assesses satisfaction with five job facets. Because individuals may use different frames of reference when responding

to questions about facet and overall job satisfaction, this measure was developed to assess global satisfaction independent from satisfaction with facets.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha values ranged from .82 to .94 (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Long, 1993; Major, Kozlowski, Chao, & Gardner, 1995; Rowley, Rosse, & Harvey, 1992; Wanberg, 1995).

Validity

Global job satisfaction correlated positively with affective organizational commitment, trust in management, satisfaction with the job itself, tenure with a supervisor, pay satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision, satisfaction with promotion prospects, and judgments about procedural and outcome fairness (Cropanzano, James, & Konovsky, 1993; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Long, 1993; Major et al., 1995; Rowley et al., 1992). Global job satisfaction correlated negatively with turnover intentions (Cropanzano et al., 1993; Major et al., 1995).

Source

Ironson, G., Smith, P., Brannick, M., Gibson, M., & Paul, K. (1989). Construction of a Job in General Scale: A comparison of global, composite and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 193–200. Items were taken from Table 1, p. 195. Copyright © 1989 by the American Psychological Association. Reprinted with permission.

Items

Responses are obtained as “yes” if the employee agrees that the item describes his or her job in general, “no” if the item does not and “?” if the employee is undecided.

Items denoted with (R) are reverse scored.

[p. 10 ↓]

Overall Job Satisfaction

Description

This measure was developed by Taylor and Bowers (1974) as part of a survey of organizations questionnaire. The measure assesses job satisfaction by combining employee responses to single items that describe the degree of employee satisfaction with the work, co-workers, supervision, promotional opportunities, pay, progress, and the organization to assess overall job satisfaction.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha values ranged from .67 to .71 (Larwood, Wright, Desrochers, & Dahir, 1998; Singh, 1994).

Validity

In Singh (1994), overall job satisfaction correlated negatively with employee equity comparisons outside the organization. Overall job satisfaction also correlated negatively with turnover intention and job market fluidity (Larwood et al., 1998).

Source

Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B. (1981). *The experience of work: A compendium of 249 measures and their use*. London: Academic Press. Items were taken from p. 26. Copyright © 1981 by Academic Press. Reproduced with permission.

Items

Responses are obtained on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *completely satisfied* and 5 = *completely unsatisfied*.

Items:

[p. 11 ↓]

Overall Job Satisfaction

Description

This measure was developed by Judge, Boudreau, and Bretz (1994). It uses three items to assess overall job satisfaction. These include the Gallop poll question about job satisfaction (respondents are asked if they are satisfied with their job with a yes/no reply option), the G. M. Faces scale (asks for employees to choose 1 of 11 faces that best described how they feel about their job overall), and a question that asks the percentage of time respondents are satisfied with their jobs on average. The responses to the three questions are standardized and then added to form the composite measure of overall job satisfaction.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha values ranged from .78 to .85 (Judge et al., 1994; Judge, Thoresen, Pucik, & Welbourne, 1999).

Validity

Judge et al. (1994) evaluated alternative measurement models and found that job satisfaction, life satisfaction, job stress, and work-family conflict were empirically distinct. In Judge et al. (1999), job satisfaction was positively correlated with perceived job performance, coping with change, and organizational commitment. Satisfaction was negatively correlated with having reached a career plateau.

Sources

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. Items were taken from text, p. 771. Copyright © 1994 by the American Psychological Association. Reprinted with permission.

Kunin, T. (1955). The construction of a new type of attitude measure. *Personnel Psychology*, 8(1), 65–77. Faces graphic taken from Figure 2, p. 68, and Figure 3, p. 69. Reproduced with permission.

Items

[p. 12 ↓]

Global Job Satisfaction

Description

This measure was originally developed by Quinn and Shepard (1974) and subsequently modified by Pond and Geyer (1991) and Rice et al. (1991). It uses six items to measure an employee's general affective reaction to his or her job without reference to any

specific facets. Other studies have used three of the items (Fields & Blum, 1997), four (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997; Taber & Alliger, 1995), and five of the items (Birnbaum & Somers, 1993; McFarlin & Rice, 1992; Mossholder, Bennett, & Martin, 1998; Williams, Gavin, & Williams, 1996). Rice et al. (1991) substituted a revised sixth item.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha for the six-item measure was .89 (Pond & Geyer, 1991). Coefficient alpha for the five-item measure ranged from .81 to .89 (Birnbaum & Somers, 1993; McFarlin & Rice, 1992; Mossholder, Bennett, & Martin, 1998; Williams et al., 1996). Coefficient alpha values for the four-item measure ranged from .75 to .85 (Eisenberger et al., 1997; Martin & Roman, 1996; Taber & Alliger, 1995). In Fields and Blum (1997), coefficient alpha for the three-item version was .78.

Validity

Global job satisfaction correlated positively with satisfaction with the facets of the job itself, supervision, promotion, pay, interactions with a boss, customer contact, job freedom, learning opportunities, amount of decision making, and satisfaction with co-workers (Fields & Blum, 1997; McFarlin & Rice, 1992; Pond & Geyer, 1991). It also correlated positively with affective commitment to an occupation and the organization, job involvement, the importance of interaction with a boss, and the importance of customer contact (Birnbaum & Somers, 1993; McFarlin & Rice, 1992; Mossholder, Bennett, & Martin, 1998; Pond & Geyer, 1991). Global job satisfaction correlated negatively with continuance commitment to an occupation and an organization, the extent of perceived job alternatives, role conflict, role ambiguity, turnover, and the importance of pay and promotion (Birnbaum & Somers, 1993; McFarlin & Rice, 1992; Mossholder, Bennett, & Martin, 1998; Pond & Geyer, 1991).

Eisenberger et al. (1997) performed a confirmatory factor analysis of the measure and found that perceived organizational support and overall job satisfaction were empirically distinct. In Rice et al. (1991), multivariate analysis indicated that overall job satisfaction

was empirically distinct from satisfaction with each of 12 job facets. In Williams et al. (1996), exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis showed the measure had one dimension and was empirically distinct from organizational commitment, role ambiguity, role overload, role conflict, job complexity, and negative affectivity.

Sources

Pond, S. B., & Geyer, P. D. (1991). Differences in the relation between job satisfaction and perceived work alternatives among older and younger blue-collar workers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39, 251–262. Items were [p. 13 ↓] taken from text, p. 254. Copyright © 1991 by Academic Press. Reprinted with permission.

Revised sixth item from Rice, R. W., Gentile, D. A., & McFarlin, D. B. (1991). Facet importance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(1), 31–39. Item was taken from text, p. 33. Copyright © 1991 by the American Psychological Association. Reprinted with permission.

Items

Items and response scales:

The original wording of the items is in parentheses.

[p. 14 ↓]

Job Satisfaction Survey

Description

This measure, developed by Spector (1985), uses 36 items to describe nine job facets (four items per facet). The job facets include pay, promotion, supervision,

benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work, and communication. It was originally developed to assess job satisfaction in human service, nonprofit, and public organizations.

Reliability

In Blau (1999), coefficient alpha was .89.

Validity

In a longitudinal study, job satisfaction correlated positively with expected job utility and professional commitment in the previous year, and the extent of downsizing, shift assignment, and professional commitment in the current year (Blau, 1999). Spector (1997) found that the nine facets were all positively intercorrelated.

Source

Spector, P. *Job Satisfaction Survey*. Copyright © 1994. Reprinted with permission by the author.

Items

Responses are obtained on a 6-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *disagree very much*, 2 = *disagree moderately*, 3 = *disagree slightly*, 4 = *agree slightly*, 5 = *agree moderately*, and 6 = *agree very much*.

Pay satisfaction items:

Promotion satisfaction items:

Supervision satisfaction items:

[p. 15 ↓]

Benefits satisfaction items:

Rewards satisfaction items:

Operating procedure satisfaction items:

Co-workers satisfaction items:

Work itself satisfaction items:

Communication satisfaction items:

Items denoted with (R) are reverse scored.

[p. 16 ↓]

Job Satisfaction Index

Description

This measure was developed by Schriesheim and Tsui (1980). It uses six items to form an index that describes overall job satisfaction. The scale includes single questions to assess the degree of satisfaction with the work itself, supervision, co-workers, pay, promotion opportunities, and the job in general.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha ranged from .73 to .78 (Cohen, 1997; Tsui et al., 1992).

Validity

Overall job satisfaction correlated positively with age, tenure, psychological commitment to the organization, personal coping ability, organizational support for non-work activities, and intention to stay. It correlated negatively with frequency of absences, job level, conflict between work and non-work roles, and years in an occupation (Cohen, 1997; Tsui et al., 1992).

Source

Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly, C. A., III. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37(4), 549–580. Items were taken from the appendix, p. 588. Copyright © 1992 by *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Reprinted with permission.

Items

Responses are obtained on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

[p. 17 ↓]

Job Perception Scale

Description

The Job Perception Scale was developed by Hatfield, Robinson, and Huseman (1985). It uses semantic differential responses to 21 items that describe aspects of a job. These include the work itself, pay, promotions, supervision, and co-workers. The Job Perception Scale was selected for use in Smith, Smits, and Hoy (1998) because it was

likely to be easily understood by workers with a wide range of educational backgrounds. The items of the Job Perception Scale can also be collapsed to form one summed measure of job satisfaction (Smith et al., 1998).

Reliability

Coefficient alpha values ranged from .87 to .93 for the 21-item composite measure (Miles, Patrick, & King, 1996; Smith et al., 1998).

Validity

Overall job satisfaction correlated positively with age, supervisory positive relationship communications, positive communications about the job, and perceptions of the quality of management. It correlated negatively with negative relationship communications (Miles et al., 1996; Smith et al., 1998).

Source

Hatfield, J., Robinson, R. B., & Huseman, R. C. (1985). An empirical evaluation of a test for assessing job satisfaction. *Psychological Reports*, 56, 39–45. Items were taken from Table 2, p. 42. © Psychological Reports, 1985. Reprinted with permission of the authors and publisher.

Items

Respondents are asked to choose a level from 1 to 5 that describes their present job using each pair of words as end-point anchors.

Work items:

Pay items:

Promotion items:

Supervisor items:

Co-workers items:

[p. 18 ↓]

Overall Job Satisfaction

Description

This measure, developed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951), uses 18 items to describe overall job satisfaction. The items form a one-dimensional measure of overall job satisfaction. A six-item version has also been used to measure overall job satisfaction (Agho et al., 1993; Aryee, Fields, & Luk, 1999).

Reliability

Coefficient alpha values for the entire measure ranged from .88 to .91 (Moorman, 1991; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; Shore, Newton & Thornton, 1990). Coefficient alpha values for the six-item version ranged from .83 to .90 (Agho et al., 1993; Agho et al., 1992; Aryee et al., 1999; Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998).

Validity

Overall job satisfaction correlated positively with a composite measure of job facets, autonomy, distributive justice, supervisory support, task significance, sensitivity to equity, employee perceptions of performance, and job involvement (Agho et al., 1993; Aryee et al., 1999; Judge et al., 1998; O'Neill & Mone, 1998). Overall job satisfaction correlated negatively with family-work conflict, work routinization, role ambiguity, and

role conflict (Agho et al., 1993; Aryee et al., 1999). Brooke, Russell, and Price (1988) examined the measure using confirmatory factor analysis and found that this measure of job satisfaction was empirically distinct from measures of organizational commitment and job involvement. In Judge et al. (1998), an employee's significant other also reported about their perceptions of the employee's job satisfaction. The correlation of self and significant other perceptions was .68.

Sources

Original items: Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B. (1981). *The experience of work: A compendium of 249 measures and their use*. London: Academic Press. Items were taken from pp. 18–19. Copyright © 1981 by Academic Press. Reproduced with permission.

Six-item version: Agho, A. O., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1992). Discriminant validity of measures of job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negative affectivity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65, 185–196. Items were taken from the appendix, p. 195. Copyright © 1992. Reproduced with permission.

Items

Original measure:

Responses are obtained using a 5-point Likert-type scale where 5 = *strongly agree*, 4 = *agree*, 3 = *undecided*, 2 = *disagree*, and 1 = *strongly disagree*.

Items denoted with (R) are reverse scored.

Six-item measure:

Responses are obtained using a 5-point Likert-type scale where 5 = *strongly agree*, 4 = *agree*, 3 = *undecided*, 2 = *disagree*, and 1 = *strongly disagree*.

Items:

Items denoted with (R) are reverse scored.

[p. 20 ↓]

Job Diagnostic Survey

Description

The Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS), developed by Hackman and Oldham (1974), measures overall and facet specific job satisfaction. Overall job satisfaction is measured in terms of three dimensions including general satisfaction (five items), internal work motivation (six items), and growth satisfaction (four items). These dimensions are often combined into a single measure of job satisfaction. The JDS also measures satisfaction with the job facets of security, compensation, co-workers, and supervision. Satisfaction with these facets and growth satisfaction have also been combined to form a composite measure (Duffy, Ganster, & Shaw, 1998).

Reliability

Coefficient alpha for the measure encompassing general satisfaction, internal work motivation, and growth satisfaction ranged from .55 to .92 (Adkins, 1995; Mannheim, Baruch, & Tal, 1997; Munz, Huelsman, Konold, & McKinney, 1996; Netemeyer, Johnston, & Burton, 1990; Pearson, 1992; Rothausen, Gonzalez, Clarke, & O'Dell, 1998). General satisfaction had a coefficient alpha of .77, internal work motivation had an alpha of .67, and growth satisfaction had an alpha of .85 (Munz et al., 1996). In Duffy et al. (1998), coefficient alpha for a composite of facet and growth satisfaction was .91. Coefficient alphas for the facet satisfaction subscales were .89 for satisfaction with supervision, .84 for satisfaction with growth, .73 for satisfaction with job security, .88 for satisfaction with pay, and .63 for satisfaction with co-workers (Mathieu, Hofmann, & Farr, 1993).

Validity

Overall job satisfaction correlated positively with organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviors, and interrole facilitation. It correlated negatively with tenure (Duffy et al., 1998; Thompson & Werner, 1997). In confirmatory factor analysis, Mathieu and Farr (1991) found that organizational commitment, job involvement, and overall job satisfaction were empirically distinct.

Source

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1974). *The Job Diagnostic Survey: An instrument for the diagnosis of jobs and the evaluation of job redesign projects* (Tech. Rep. No. 4). New Haven, CT: Yale University, Department of Administrative Sciences. Prepared in connection with research sponsored by the Office of Naval Research (Contract No. N00014-67A-0097-0026, NR170-744) and the U.S. Department of Labor (Manpower Administration, Grant No. 21-09-74-14).

Items

General satisfaction instructions and items:

Each of the statements below is something that a person might say about his or her job. You are to indicate your own personal feelings about your job by marking how much you agree with each of the statements. How much do you agree with the statement?

[p. 21 ↓]

(1 = *disagree strongly*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *disagree slightly*, 4 = *neutral*, 5 = *agree slightly*, 6 = *agree*, 7 = *agree strongly*)

Now please think of the other people in your organization who hold the same job you do. If no one has exactly the same job as you, think of the job which is most similar to

yours. Please think about how accurately each of the statements describes the feelings of those people about the job. It is quite all right if your answers here are different from when you described your own reactions to the job. Often different people feel quite differently about the same job. How much do you agree with the statement?

(1 = *disagree strongly*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *disagree slightly*, 4 = *neutral*, 5 = *agree slightly*, 6 = *agree*, 7 = *agree strongly*)

Internal work motivation items:

Now please indicate how you personally feel about your job. Each of the statements below is something that a person might say about his or her job. You are to indicate your own personal feelings about your job by marking how much you agree with each of the statements. How much do you agree with the statement?

(1 = *disagree strongly*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *disagree slightly*, 4 = *neutral*, 5 = *agree slightly*, 6 = *agree*, 7 = *agree strongly*)

Now please think of the other people in your organization who hold the same job you do. If no one has exactly the same job as you, think of the job which is most similar to yours. Please think about how accurately each of the statements describes the feelings of those people about the job. It is quite all right if your answers here are different from when you described your own reactions to the job. Often different people feel quite differently about the same job. How much do you agree with the statement?

(1 = *disagree strongly*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *disagree slightly*, 4 = *neutral*, 5 = *agree slightly*, 6 = *agree*, 7 = *agree strongly*)

[p. 22 ↓]

Growth satisfaction items:

Now please indicate how satisfied you are with each aspect of your job listed below. How satisfied are you with this aspect of your job?

(1 = *extremely dissatisfied*, 2 = *dissatisfied*, 3 = *slightly dissatisfied*, 4 = *neutral*, 5 = *slightly satisfied*, 6 = *satisfied*, 7 = *extremely satisfied*)

Facet satisfaction items:

Now please indicate how satisfied you are with each aspect of your job listed below.
How satisfied are you with this aspect of your job?

(1 = *extremely dissatisfied*, 2 = *dissatisfied*, 3 = *slightly dissatisfied*, 4 = *neutral*, 5 = *slightly satisfied*, 6 = *satisfied*, 7 = *extremely satisfied*)

Satisfaction with security:

Satisfaction with compensation (pay):

“Social” satisfaction:

“Supervisory” satisfaction:

[p. 23 ↓]

Job Descriptive Index

Description

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was originally developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). It uses 72 items to assess five facets of job satisfaction. The five facets are the work itself, pay, promotions, supervision, and coworkers. The ratings of satisfaction with the facets can be combined into a composite measure of job satisfaction. The JDI was updated by Roznowski (1989) to recognize changes in work atmospheres, job content, and work technologies. The items for the updated version of the JDI are presented below. The revised JDI showed somewhat higher alpha reliabilities than the scales composed of the original items (Roznowski, 1989). Gregson (1990) used a 30-item shortened version of the JDI based on choosing the 6 items that loaded the highest

on each dimension (work, pay, promotions, supervision, and co-workers) in a factor analysis of the job satisfaction items.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha values for satisfaction with the work itself ranged from .75 to .94; for satisfaction with pay, alpha ranged from .78 to .91; for satisfaction with supervision, alpha values ranged from .87 to .92; for satisfaction with promotions, alpha ranged from .82 to .87; for satisfaction with co-workers, alpha ranged from .87 to .92 (Buckley et al., 1992; Callen, 1993; Cropanzano et al., 1993; Gregson, 1990; Judge, 1993a; Judge & Hulin, 1993; Kushnir & Melamed, 1991; Lefkowitz, 1994; Mossholder, Bedeian, Niebuhr, & Wesolowski, 1994; Smart, 1998; Taber & Alliger, 1995; Wanberg, 1995).

Validity

Satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with supervision, satisfaction with promotion, and satisfaction with co-workers were all positively correlated (Smart, 1998). Satisfaction with the work itself correlated positively with quantity and quality of communication between supervisor and subordinate and correlated negatively with lack of perceived control over job, employee anxiety, and employee irritability (Callen, 1993; Kushnir & Melamed, 1991). In Cropanzano et al. (1993), the composite job satisfaction measure was correlated positively with affective commitment to the organization and negatively correlated with turnover intentions.

In Roznowski (1989), factor analysis showed that the JDI items loaded on five distinct factors and that the items of each subscale loaded on a single factor. Judge (1993a) found a second-order factor interpreted as overall job satisfaction. In Gregson (1990), factor analysis of a modified 30-item version of the JDI showed that communication satisfaction and job satisfaction were empirically distinct. Buckley et al. (1992) found that for the JDI composite measure of job satisfaction, trait (actual job satisfaction) variance accounted for approximately 43% of the total variance, with common method and random error variance comprising the balance. For the JDI measures of facet satisfaction, trait variance accounted for 41 % for the measure of supervision, 34% for

the measure of satisfaction with work itself, 38% of the variance in satisfaction with co-workers, 56% of satisfaction with pay, and 61% of the satisfaction with promotions. The same study estimated that trait variance [p. 24 ↓] accounted for approximately 46% of the total variance in other measures of job satisfaction such as the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. The JDI is a copyrighted measure. Users should contact Professor Patricia Smith, Department of Psychology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403.

Source

Roznowski, M. (1989). An examination of the measurement properties of the Job Descriptive Index with experimental items. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 805–814. Items were taken from Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, pp. 807–810. Copyright © 1989 by the American Psychological Association. Reprinted with permission.

Items

Updated items for the Job Descriptive Index:

Respondents are asked to put Y beside each item if it describes the feature in question, N if the item does not describe that feature, or ? if they cannot decide.

Work on present job:

Present pay:

[p. 25 ↓]

Opportunities for promotion:

Supervision on present job:

People on your present job:

[p. 26 ↓]

Satisfaction with Job Facets

Description

This measure, developed by Andrews and Withey (1976), uses five items to measure overall job satisfaction. The questions each assess satisfaction with specific job facets. The response scale is unique, obtaining responses ranging from *delighted* to *terrible*.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha values for the measure range from .79 to .81 (McFarlin & Rice, 1992; Rentsch & Steel, 1992; Steel & Rentsch, 1995, 1997).

Validity

The Andrews and Withey measure correlated positively with organizational commitment, self-rated performance, supervisory rated performance, pay level, promotion opportunities, positive conversations with boss, customer/client contact, freedom to work the employee's own way, learning opportunities, amount of decision making, and mental effort required. It correlated negatively with intention to quit (McFarlin & Rice, 1992; Steel & Rentsch, 1995, 1997). Rentsch and Steel (1992) found that the Andrews and Withey measure correlated highly with overall satisfaction scores from both the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. It also correlated positively with satisfaction with the five JDI facets of pay, supervision, promotions, co-workers, and the work itself.

Source

Rentsch, J. R., & Steel, R. P. (1992). Construct and concurrent validation of the Andrews and Withey Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52*, 357–367. Copyright © 1992 by Sage Publications, Inc. Items were taken from text, p. 359. Reprinted by permission of Sage Publications, Inc.

Items

Responses are obtained on a 7-point Likert-type scale where 7 = *delighted*, 6 = *pleased*, 5 = *mostly satisfied*, 4 = *mixed (about equally satisfied and dissatisfied)*, 3 = *mostly dissatisfied*, 2 = *unhappy*, and 1 = *terrible*.

[p. 27 ↓]

Global Job Satisfaction

Description

This measure, developed by Warr, Cook, and Wall (1979), uses 15 items to describe overall job satisfaction. The measure has two subscales assessing satisfaction with extrinsic (eight items) and intrinsic (seven items) aspects of a job.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha values for the composite measure of overall job satisfaction ranged from .80 to .91 (Abraham & Hansson, 1996; Norman, Collins, Conner, Martin, & Rance, 1995). For satisfaction with intrinsic aspects of a job, alpha ranged from .84 to .88. For satisfaction with extrinsic job aspects, alpha was .76 (Cordery, Vevastos, Mueller, & Parker, 1993; Wright & Cordery, 1999).

Validity

In Winefield, Winefield, Tiggemann, and Goldney (1991), global job satisfaction was used to separate subjects into satisfied employees and dissatisfied employees. The two groups differed significantly in a variety of variables describing psychological well-being. In Abraham and Hansson (1996), job satisfaction correlated negatively with both job-related tension and control problems. Job satisfaction correlated positively with job-related well-being, satisfaction with rate of pay, perceived job competence, and perceived job control (Norman et al., 1995; Wright & Cordery, 1999).

Source

Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B. (1981). *The experience of work: A compendium of 249 measures and their use*. London: Academic Press. Items were taken from pp. 33–34. Copyright © 1981 by Academic Press. Reproduced with permission.

Items

Responses are obtained on a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *I'm extremely dissatisfied*, 2 = *I'm very dissatisfied*, 3 = *I'm moderately dissatisfied*, 4 = *I'm not sure*, 5 = *I'm moderately satisfied*, 6 = *I'm very satisfied*, and 7 = *I'm extremely satisfied*.

Items: *(E)* denotes *extrinsic satisfaction subscale*; *(I)* denotes *intrinsic satisfaction subscale*.

[p. 29 ↓]

Career Satisfaction

Description

This measure was developed by Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley (1990). It measures satisfaction with career success, an internally generated and defined career outcome. Besides general satisfaction with career progress, the measure assesses the extent to which an employee has made satisfactory progress toward goals for income level, advancement, and development of skills.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha ranged from .83 to .89 (Aryee, Chay, & Tan, 1994; Greenhaus et al., 1990; Seibert, Crant, & Kraimer, 1999).

Validity

Career satisfaction correlated positively with having a job in general management, salary level, number of promotions received, perceptions of upward mobility, sponsorship within an organization, acceptance, job discretion, supervisory support, career strategies, perceived personal-organization value congruence, presence of an internal labor market, and job performance. It correlated negatively with having reached a career plateau (Aryee et al., 1994; Greenhaus et al., 1990; Seibert et al., 1999). Confirmatory factor analysis showed that general perceptions of career satisfaction are empirically distinct from financial success and hierarchical success in an organization (Aryee et al., 1994).

Source

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, A., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal* 33(1), 64–86. © 1990 by Academy of Management. Items were taken from the appendix, p. 66. Items are reproduced with permission of Academy of Management in the format textbook via Copyright Clearance Center.

Items

Responses are obtained on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 5 = *strongly disagree*, 4 = *disagree to some extent*, 3 = *uncertain*, 2 = *agree to some extent*, and 1 = *strongly agree*.

[p. 30 ↓]

Employee Satisfaction with Influence and Ownership

Description

This measure, developed by Rosen, Klein, and Young (1986), contains two subscales that measure influence due to ownership associated with holding stock through an employee stock ownership program (ESOP) and satisfaction with the ESOP. The influence subscale has been used to measure workers' perceived actual amount of influence and desired amount of influence by changing item wording to *should* (Buchko, 1992).

Reliability

In Buchko (1992), the ESOP satisfaction subscale had a coefficient alpha of .86 and the influence subscale had a coefficient alpha of .87.

Validity

In Buchko (1992), perceived influence and ESOP satisfaction correlated positively with organizational commitment, job involvement, and overall job satisfaction. Both measures correlated negatively with turnover intentions and unionization. ESOP satisfaction also correlated positively with ESOP participation.

Source

Rosen, C., Klein, K., & Young, K. (1986). *Employee ownership in America: The equity solution*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath. Items were taken from Appendix 6-A, pp. 139–140. Copyright © 1986 by Corey Rosen. Reproduced with permission.

Items

Influence subscale instructions and items:

How much say or influence do non-managerial workers in your company actually have over the following areas? (Possible responses are 1 = *workers have no say*, 2 = *workers receive information*, 3 = *workers are asked for their opinion*, 4 = *workers decide with management*, and 5 = *workers decide alone*.)

[p. 31 ↓]

ESOP satisfaction subscale items:

(Responses are obtained on a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *completely disagree* and 7 = *completely agree*)

Items denoted with (R) are reverse scored.

[p. 32 ↓]

Satisfaction with Work Schedule Flexibility

Description

This measure, developed by Rothausen (1994), uses a five-item scale to measure employee satisfaction with work schedule flexibility. It measures the extent to which an employee feels he or she has flexibility in scheduling work, in doing part-time or flextime work, and in balancing work and family responsibilities.

Reliability

In Aryee, Luk, and Stone (1998), coefficient alpha was .79.

Validity

Satisfaction with schedule flexibility correlated positively with organizational commitment and supervisor work-family support. Satisfaction with flexibility correlated negatively with turnover intentions (Aryee et al., 1998).

Source

Rothausen, T. J. (1994). Job satisfaction and the parent worker: The role of flexibility and rewards. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44, 317–336. Items were taken from text, p. 326. Copyright © 1994 by Academic Press. Reproduced with permission.

Items

Responses are obtained on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *very dissatisfied* and 5 = *very satisfied*.

[p. 33 ↓]

Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire

Description

The Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire (PSQ) was developed by Heneman and Schwab (1985). It uses four subscales to measure satisfaction with pay level, amount of last raise, benefits, and pay structure/administration. The subscales can also be combined into a composite measure for overall pay satisfaction. Heneman and Schwab initially hypothesized five dimensions of pay satisfaction: pay level, pay raises, benefits, structure, and administration. Based on factor analysis results, the pay level, raises, and benefits dimensions were supported, but the structure and administration dimensions were combined into a single fourth dimension (Judge, 1993b).

Reliability

Coefficient alpha for the composite measure of pay satisfaction ranged from .77 to .88. Coefficient alpha values for the four subscales ranged from .73 to .96 (Blau, 1994;

Carraher & Buckley, 1996; DeConinck, Stilwell, & Brock, 1996; Huber et al., 1992; Jones, Scarpello, & Bergmann, 1999; Judge, 1993b; Lee & Farh, 1999; Welbourne, 1998; Welbourne & Cable, 1995).

Validity

Expectations about the level of equitable pay were negatively correlated with satisfaction with pay level, pay structure/administration, and amount of last raise. The four subscales of the pay satisfaction questionnaire were also positively correlated with overall job satisfaction (Huber et al., 1992). Carraher and Buckley (1996) used confirmatory factor analysis to show the number of dimensions best used to measure pay satisfaction differed by cognitive complexity of employees. Four dimensions (pay level, benefits, raises, and pay structure-administration) fit the data better for more cognitively complex employees. In Shaw, Duffy, Jenkins, and Gupta (1999), confirmatory factor analysis showed that a four-factor model had the best fit with the data. Confirmatory factor analyses by Judge (1993b) and DeConinck et al. (1996) both found that the items from the PSQ loaded on the hypothesized dimensions, and the overall fit supported the four dimensional model. The factor loadings were similar across job classifications and the dimensions of the PSQ were empirically separable. Judge (1993b) found that the PSQ dimensions displayed differing patterns of correlations with hypothesized predictors. For example, salary level correlated positively with satisfaction with pay level; pay relative to others doing similar work in other companies correlated positively with all the PSQ dimensions; pay raise history correlated positively with satisfaction with raises; understanding of the pay system correlated positively with satisfaction with pay level, satisfaction with raises and satisfaction with pay structure and administration, but not with satisfaction with benefits. Pay satisfaction measured with the PSQ correlated positively with pay satisfaction measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and pay satisfaction measured by the Job Descriptive Index. All three measures of pay satisfaction correlated negatively with perceived inequity in pay and positively with an employee's amount of pay. Correlations among pay level, pay raises, and structure/administration [p. 34 ↓] were substantially larger than the correlations of these dimensions with satisfaction with benefits (Judge, 1993b;

Welbourne & Cable, 1995). DeConinck and colleagues (1996) found that the four PSQ dimensions were empirically distinct from distributive justice.

Source

Heneman, H. G., & Schwab, D. P. (1985). Pay satisfaction: Its multidimensional nature and measurement. *International Journal of Psychology, 20*, 129–141. © 1985, Elsevier. Reprinted with permission.

Items

Responses are obtained on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *very dissatisfied* and 5 = *very satisfied*.

[p. 35 ↓]

Index of Organizational Reactions

Description

The Index of Organizational Reactions (IOR), developed by Dunham and Smith (1979), assesses employee satisfaction with his or her job and organization. The IOR assesses satisfaction with supervision, financial rewards, kind of work, physical conditions, amount of work, company identification, co-workers, and career future.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha values ranged from .82 to .83 (Lee & Johnson, 1991; McLain, 1995; Taylor, Tracy, Renard, Harrison, & Carroll, 1995).

Validity

In Lee and Johnson (1991), workplace satisfaction measured with the IOR correlated positively with organizational commitment for both permanent and temporary employees and distribution of risk exposure in the workplace. The IOR correlated negatively with education level and pay levels for exempt staff, perceived danger, perceived risk, task distractions, and risk experience (Lee & Johnson, 1991; McLain, 1995; Taylor et al., 1995).

Source

Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B. (1981). *The experience of work: A compendium of 249 measures and their use*. London: Academic Press. Items were taken from pp. 42–45. Copyright © 1981 by Academic Press. Reproduced with permission.

Items

Items and possible responses:

Supervision items:

Company identification items:

[p. 37 ↓]

Kind of work items:

Amount of work items:

Co-workers items:

Physical work conditions items:

Financial rewards items:

Career future items:

[p. 41 ↓]

Satisfaction with My Supervisor

Description

This measure, developed by Scarpello and Vandenberg (1987), describes an employee's satisfaction with his or her immediate supervisor. The measure was developed over a 3-year period using samples of more than 2,000 employees from seven manufacturing firms and tested with more than 1,000 employees in the insurance industry.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha values ranged from .95 to .96 (Jones et al., 1999; Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1987).

Validity

Although factor analysis of the 18 items making up the scale found that the items loaded on two factors, the factors were highly correlated (mean r across eight samples = .60). The items loading on the second factor also loaded on the first factor, suggesting the existence of a single underlying construct, rather than independent dimensions (Jones et al., 1999; Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1987).

Source

Scarpello, V., & Vandenberg, R. (1987). The Satisfaction With My Supervisor scale: Its utility for research and practical application. *Journal of Management*, 3, 451–470. Items were taken from Figure 1, p. 455. Reprinted with permission.

Items

Responses are obtained using a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *very dissatisfied* and 5 = *very satisfied*.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452231143.n1>