



SCALES FOR MEASURING EMPLOYEE JOB SATISFACTION

Irina Yanchovska

iyanchovska@gmail.com

Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, 1504 Sofia
THE REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA

Key words: *job satisfaction, job satisfaction scales, job satisfaction measures*

Abstract: *Since there are numerous scales measuring employee job satisfaction, containing different behavioral, cognitive and affective elements, the purpose of the present article is to present a review of the different measurement instruments, arranging them in three main categories – global, composite and facet scales. Additionally, the study aims to identify the job satisfaction factors, which are most commonly used in the facet scales.*

The examined scales have been chosen based on a detailed literature review and analysis of numerous empirical studies, which examine employee job satisfaction in different academical, industrial and cultural contexts. The identification of the most common influence factors will be done through a comparative analysis.

As a result of the literature review, 25 global and 36 facet scales have been identified. The factors that are most frequently used in the facets scales are 1) pay, 2) relationship with the supervisor, 3) relationship with the colleagues, 4) opportunities for career advancement and 5) work nature.

Due to its popularity and significance for employee behavior and organizational welfare, job satisfaction has been in the center of many studies for almost a century. As a summary of the different measurement methods of job satisfaction, the current review can be used as a convenient practical guide by academics and HR managers to improve the understanding of job satisfaction and its complex nature.

INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction, most commonly defined as the “pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences” [1], has been in the center of many studies among researchers and industrial psychologists for almost a century, due to its significance for employee behavior and organizational welfare. Given the complex nature of this construct and its various dimensions – affective, behavioral, cognitive and situational, many researchers have developed theories that try to determine the exact factors that affect satisfaction, introducing a large number of measurement instruments.

A detailed literature review revealed that job satisfaction scales can be divided into three main categories – 1) global scales, measuring the overall level of employee satisfaction, 2) facet scales, measuring satisfaction with different factors of the work environment and 3) composite scales, which are rarely used as an assessment tool, and measure the overall level of job satisfaction as an average value of the scores, obtained when measuring the individual factors.

Global scales measure the level of affective satisfaction and use one or more questions, assessing employees' emotional attitudes toward their jobs. On the other hand, facet and composite scales mostly use cognitive and behavioral questions, which make a rational comparison of the working conditions against a desired, expected or promised standard [2] and measure different work factors that are related to job satisfaction, such as pay, work nature, social relationships, job security, etc. Generally speaking, facet scales are more appropriate to study the structure and composition of employee satisfaction, while global scales are a better indicator of its overall level.

REVIEW OF THE DIFFERENT SATISFACTION SCALES

Global Scales

There are two types of global scales – the first one measures job satisfaction with a single question, and the second one uses multiple measurement items. Some researchers believe that from a psychometric point of view, one-element scales provide the best overall assessment of employee satisfaction [3], [4], while others claim that a larger number of elements are able to present a more complete and comprehensive assessment [5], [6].

Global Scales with One Element

The questions in the different single-item scales are very similar, for example: “Considering all, rate your overall satisfaction with your current job.” [7] or “How would you define your overall satisfaction with your work in this organization?” [8], where both are assessed on a 5-point scale. Another example is: “All things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your present job overall?”, measured on a 7-point scale [9]. These instruments are very popular due to their simplicity and straightforward implementation among participants from different cultural and industrial domains. A number of global scales that use one question to measure employees’ overall job satisfaction are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

№	Year	Author(s)	№	Year	Author(s)
1	1976	Andrews and Withey [10]	9	2011	Holland et al. [16]
2	1980	Hofstede [11]	10	2015	Bednarska and Szczyt [17]
3	1997	Wanous et al. [12]	11	2016	Alegre et al. [18]
4	1999	Oshagbemi [4]	12	2019	Davidkov [8]
5	2005	Dolbier et al. [3]	13	2019	Törnroos et al. [9]
6	2008	Nielsen and Smyth [13]	14	2019	Erro-Garcés and Ferreira [19]
7	2008	Gittell et al. [14]	15	2020	Nie et al. [20]
8	2009	Lange [15]	16	2021	Yanchovska [7]

Global Scales with Multiple Elements

The second type of global scales contain a group of items, which are used to measure the overall satisfaction and affective attitude of employees toward their job. The overall job satisfaction score is measured as the average value of all questions on the scale. Among the most popular global scales for measuring satisfaction with more than one element are the Job in General scale (JIG) [5] and the Job Satisfaction Index (JSI) [21]. In their original forms, both scales contain 18 elements, but in order to facilitate their broader usage in academic and business communities, researchers have created various abbreviated versions over the years. The JSI contains 18 positive or negative work-related statements like: “I do my work with enthusiasm most days”, “I find real pleasure in my work” and “I find my work quite unpleasant”, which participants assess on a 5-point scale. On the other hand, when completing the JIG scale, respondents are asked to think about their work as a whole and to answer with “yes”, “no” or “I cannot answer” to what extent it corresponds to 18 different adjectives e.g., "excellent", "pleasant", "undesirable", etc. In addition to JIG and JSI, Table 2 presents various global scales that use multiple questions to measure employees’ overall satisfaction.

Table 2

№	Scale	Items	Year	Author(s)
1	Job Satisfaction Index	18	1951	Brayfield and Rothe [21]
2	Short Index of Job Satisfaction	5	2000	Judge et al. [22]
3	Brief Index of Affective Job Satisfaction	4+3	2012	Thompson and Phua [6]
4	Andrew and Withey Job Satisfaction Questionnaire	5	1976	Andrews and Withey [10]
5	Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Subscale	3	1983	Cammann et al. [23]
6	Job in General Scale	18	1989	Ironson et al. [5]
7	The Generic Job Satisfaction Scale	10	1997	Macdonald and MacIntyre [24]
8	Abridged Job in General Scale	8	2004	Russell et al. [25]
9	Satisfaction with Job Life Scale	5	2018	Neto and Fonseca [26]

Facet Scales

Facet scales use groups of questions, containing mainly cognitive and behavioral elements, which measure employees' satisfaction with specific aspects or factors of their work and compare working conditions with specific expected results. Despite the many proponents of the short and simple global scales, many other researchers recommend the use of facet scales and the inclusion the key work-related aspects when measuring job satisfaction in order to increase the validity and reliability of the obtained results [27], [28]. The disadvantage of the facet scales is the large number of elements used, as each of the selected factors is sometimes measured by several items and there are scales that contain more than 100 questions, which makes them very long and difficult to complete [24].

Some researchers limit their scales to a small number of factors that they consider to be key in measuring satisfaction. There are instruments that use only four facets – satisfaction with pay, management, colleagues and the work itself [29]. Other authors choose to study a comprehensive list of elements of the work environment, relationships in the workplace and the various working conditions [8], [11], [30], [31].

Among the most popular facet scales for measuring job satisfaction are the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS). Even if these three scales have been developed several decades ago, they still continue to be widely used in research due to their proven reliability, validity and stability of results over time. The MSQ was introduced in 1967 [32] and currently exists in three forms – one long and two abbreviated. The MSQ measures satisfaction with 20 factors – eight, measuring satisfaction with intrinsic work aspects and 12, assessing extrinsic work elements. Spector's JSS was developed in 1985 [33] and is currently available in two forms – JSS 1, which has 36 items and measures nine job satisfaction facets (pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work and communication), and the newer commercial version – JSS 2, which measures overall satisfaction, plus seven satisfaction facets (salary, promotion opportunities, supervision, fringe benefits, coworkers, tasks and communication) [34]. The JDI measures employees' general satisfaction and their satisfaction with five job-related factors – people on their present job, work on their present job, pay, opportunities for promotion and supervision [35]. The JDI satisfaction facets, which represent the nature of work, the financial remuneration, the advancement opportunities and the good relationships with colleagues and management are not only broadly covered in various scales, but also represent the specific set of elements in a number of other instruments for measuring job satisfaction, introduced in different countries [36], [37], [38], [39]. The popularity of these five factors was also confirmed by a detailed review of 36 different facet scales, presented in Table 3. Some of these scales are well-established in literature, others are used in single studies, but examining

them in combination contributed to the identification of 33 different factor groups. Out of these 33 factors, the most frequently used satisfaction facet is “pay”, appearing in 31 of the 36 scales, followed by factors "supervision" and "colleagues", which are present in 30 of the 36 scales, and “advancement opportunities” and “nature of work”, which appear respectively in 29 and 24 of the presented scales.

Table 3

№	Scale	Items	Year	Author(s)
1	The scale of Yuzuk	6	1961	Yuzuk [40]
2	Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire	20	1967	Weiss et al. [32]
3	Job Descriptive Index	5	1969	Smith et al. [35]
4	The scale of Cross	6	1973	Cross [41]
5	INDSALES Scale	7	1974	Churchill et al. [42]
6	Job Diagnostic Survey	5	1975	Hackman and Oldham [43]
7	Managerial Job Satisfaction Questionnaire	5	1978	Cellucci and DeVries [36]
8	The scale of Hofstede	14	1980	Hofstede [11]
9	The scale of Scarpello and Campbell	6	1983	Scarpello and Campbell [28]
10	Job Satisfaction Survey	9	1985	Spector [33]
11	The scale of Khaleque and Rahman	10	1987	Khaleque and Rahman [44]
12	International Social Survey Programme	9	1989	ISSP: Work Orientations [45]
13	The scale of Vitell and Davis	5	1990	Vitell and Davis [37]
14	British Household Panel Survey	7	1991	University of Essex [46]
15	Measure of Job Satisfaction	5	1993	Traynor and Wade [47]
16	Emergency Physician Job Satisfaction Scale	6	1994	Lloyd et al. [48]
17	The scale of Gaertner	6	1999	Gaertner [49]
18	The scale of Makin et al.	5	2000	Makin et al. [38]
19	The scale of Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza	7	2000	Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza [50]
20	Gallup Q-12 Survey	9	2002	Forbringer [51]
21	The scale of Melnik and Maurer	10	2006	Melnik and Maurer [52]
22	The scale of Warr	13	2007	Warr [30]
23	Escala de Satisfação no Trabalho	5	2008	Siqueira [39]
24	The scale of Lange	5	2009	Lange [15]
25	The scale of Riaz and Ramay	9	2010	Riaz and Ramay [53]
26	The scale of Bajcar et al.	8	2011	Bajcar et al. [54]
27	The scale of Fu et al.	4	2011	Fu et al. [29]
28	The scale of Korsakienė et al.	20	2014	Korsakienė et al. [31]
29	The scale of Bednarska and Szczyt	9	2015	Bednarska and Szczyt [17]
30	The scale of Ling and Loo	16	2015	Ling and Loo [55]
31	The scale of Alegre et al.	5	2016	Alegre et al. [18]
32	The scale of Hersch and Xiao	9	2016	Hersch and Xiao [56]
33	The scale of Crespi-Vallbona and Mascarilla-Miró	8	2018	Crespi-Vallbona and Mascarilla-Miró [57]
34	The scale of Davidkov	21	2019	Davidkov [8]
35	Job Satisfaction Survey 2	7	2020	Spector [34]
36	The scale of Al-Shammari	5	2021	Al-Shammari [58]

Composite Scales

Composite scales can be defined as a combination of global and facet scales, as they aim to measure global satisfaction by finding the average value of satisfaction with the different aspects of work or satisfaction facets. In other words, some researchers use different facet scales (such as the MSQ or the JDI) and instead of examining the values of each individual factor separately, they use the average value of all measures as an overall assessment of employee satisfaction. The composite scales are most rarely used, since they are criticized by researchers as having low reliability. For example, the authors of the JDI

scale disapprove of its use as a composite instrument because it provides information on five separate factors, which are not even strongly correlated to each other [35]. It can be summarized that composite scales are unreliable because: 1) the facet scales they use as a basis may not include all aspects that are important to the individual or may include irrelevant elements, which will lead to the inaccurate estimation of overall job satisfaction; 2) the nature of the facet scales may induce a rather short-term assessment; and 3) the linear combination of factors may not capture the individual differences between employees, when calculating the overall score [5].

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The goals of the present article were first, to review over 60 different job satisfaction scales and to present the main instrument classification, and second, to extract the satisfaction factors that are most commonly used in the facet scales. The review shows that job satisfaction assessment can be done using a variety of scales, ranging from strictly specific to more general. Nonetheless, these scales should never be considered equivalent, but applied in different situations as tools that measure diverse aspects of employee satisfaction. Some researchers believe that facet scales are more suitable for measuring high and low levels of satisfaction and for drawing attention to specific problems in the work environment, while global scales are more suitable for forecasting the general level of employee satisfaction in a particular company [5].

The review of the different scales, showed that despite some similarities, the scales are quite diverse, even when compared to other instruments in their own category. Some of the scales are widely applicable and can be utilized in different industries and among different work groups (MSQ, JDI, JSS), while others are strictly specialized. The scale of Ling and Loo is created to measure the satisfaction of project managers [55], the scales of Melnik and Maurer [52] and Crespi-Vallbona and Mascarilla-Miró [57] are specifically adapted for the IT industry, while the Emergency Physician Job Satisfaction [48] and the Measure of Job Satisfaction [47] are designed for specific groups of hospital professionals.

In relation to the second goal, the analysis shows that there are many theories and approaches, which try to identify the best combination of facets that shape employee job satisfaction. However, out of the 33 identified factor groups, the facets that appear most frequently in the examined scales are pay, relationship with the supervisor, relationship with the colleagues, opportunities for career advancement and work nature. The rest of the factors have different popularity and appear under various names in the different scales.

As a conclusion, the better comprehension of the various instruments that measure job satisfaction, their purpose and proper application, as well as the refined knowledge about the individual facets that predict employee job satisfaction, pose significant practical implications. Therefore, the current review can be used as a convenient practical guide by researchers, business owners and HR managers to improve the understanding of employee job satisfaction and its complex nature.

REFERENCES

- [1] Locke, E. A. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In: *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1976, 1300 p.
- [2] Fernández-Muñoz, J. J., Topa, G. Older workers and affective job satisfaction: Gender invariance in Spain. In: *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2018, Vol. 9.
- [3] Dolbier, C. L., et al. Reliability and validity of a single-item measure of job satisfaction. In: *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 2005, Vol. 19, N 3.
- [4] Oshagbemi, T. Overall job satisfaction: How good are single versus multiple-item measures? In: *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 1999, Vol. 14, N 5.

- [5] Ironson, G. H., et al. Construction of a Job in General scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. In: *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1989, Vol. 74, N 2.
- [6] Thompson, E. R., Phua, F. T. T. A Brief Index of Affective Job Satisfaction. In: *Group and Organization Management*, 2012, Vol. 37, N 3.
- [7] Yanchovska, I. The relationship between job satisfaction and individual performance of IT employees. In: *Proceedings of CBU in Economics and Business*, 2021, Vol. 2.
- [8] Davidkov, Ts. *Izsledvaniya vurhu kulturite: Kulturni orientiri na upravlenieto*. Sofia: Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski, 2019.
- [9] Törnroos, M., Jokela, M., Hakulinen, C. The relationship between personality and job satisfaction across occupations. In: *Personality and Individual Differences*, 2019, Vol. 145.
- [10] Andrews, F., Withey, S. *Social indicators of well-being*. Boston: Springer, 1976.
- [11] Hofstede, G. *Culture's Consequences*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980.
- [12] Wanous, J. P., Lawler E. E. Measurement and meaning of job satisfaction. In: *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1972, Vol. 56, N 2.
- [13] Nielsen, I., Smyth, R. Job satisfaction and response to incentives among China's urban workforce. In: *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 2008, Vol. 37, N 5.
- [14] Gittell, J. H., et al. Impact of relational coordination on job satisfaction and quality outcomes: A study of nursing homes. In: *Human Resource Management Journal*, 2008, Vol. 18, N 2.
- [15] Lange, T. Job satisfaction and self-employment: Autonomy or personality? In: *Small Business Economics*, 2012, Vol. 38, N 2.
- [16] Holland, P., et al. Employee voice and job satisfaction in Australia: The centrality of direct voice. In: *Human Resource Management*, 2011, Vol. 50, N 1.
- [17] Bednarska, M. A., Szczyt, M. Variations in job satisfaction in service industries: comparative international analysis. In: *Foresight*, 2015, Vol. 17, N 6.
- [18] Alegre, I., Mas-Machuca, M., Berbegal-Mirabent J. Antecedents of employee job satisfaction: Do they matter? In: *Journal of Business Research*, 2016, Vol. 69, N 4.
- [19] Erro-Garcés, A., Ferreira, S. Do better workplace environmental conditions improve job satisfaction? In: *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 2019, Vol. 219.
- [20] Nie, P., Ding, L., Sousa-Poza, A. What Chinese workers value: An analysis of job satisfaction, job expectations, and labour turnover in China. In: *Prague Economic Papers*, 2020, Vol. 29, N 1.
- [21] Brayfield, A. H., Rothe, H. F. An index of job satisfaction, In: *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1951, Vol. 35, N 5.
- [22] Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Locke, E. A. Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics. In: *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2000, Vol. 85, N 2.
- [23] Cammann, C., et al. Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire. In: *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices*. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1983.
- [24] Macdonald, S., MacIntyre, P. The generic job satisfaction scale: Scale development and its correlates. In: *Employee Assistance Quarterly*, 1997, Vol. 13, N 2.
- [25] Russell, S. S., et al. Shorter can also be better: The abridged job in general scale. In: *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 2004, Vol. 64, N 5.
- [26] Neto, F., Fonseca, A. C. M. The Satisfaction with Job Life Scale Among Immigrants. In: *Psychological Studies*, 2018, Vol. 63, N 3.
- [27] Faragher, E. B., Cass, M., Cooper, C. L. The relationship between job satisfaction and health: A meta-analysis. In: *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 2005, Vol. 62, N 2.
- [28] Scarpello, V., Campbell, J. P. Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there? In: *Personnel Psychology*, 1983, Vol. 36, N 3.

- [29] Fu, W., Deshpande, S. P., Zhao, X. The impact of ethical behavior and facets of job satisfaction on organizational commitment of Chinese employees. In: *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2011, Vol. 104, N 4.
- [30] Warr, P. Searching for happiness at work. In: *Psychologist*, 2007, Vol. 20, N 12.
- [31] Korsakienė, R., et al. Factors driving turnover and retention of information technology professionals. In: *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 2015, Vol. 16, N 1.
- [32] Weiss, D. J., et al. Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. In: *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Survey*, 1967.
- [33] Spector, P. E. Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. In: *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 1985, Vol. 13, N 6.
- [34] Spector, P. E. Job Satisfaction Survey 2. In: *Industrial and organizational psychology* [online]. PaulSpector.com. 2020. [Viewed 21.01.2022]. Available from: <https://paulspector.com/assessments/job-satisfaction-survey-2/>
- [35] Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., Hulin, C. L. *Measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Raud McNally, 1969.
- [36] Cellucci, A. J., DeVries, D. L. *Measuring managerial satisfaction: a manual for the MJSQ*. Greensboro: Center for Creative Leadership, 1978.
- [37] Vitell, S. J., Davis, D. L. The relationship between ethics and job satisfaction: An empirical investigation. In: *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1990, Vol. 9, N 6.
- [38] Makin, P., Cooper, G., Cox, C. *Organizacje a kontrakt psychologiczny. Zarządzanie ludźmi w organizacji*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2000.
- [39] Siqueira, M. M. M. *Escala de Satisfação no Trabalho – EST*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2008.
- [40] Yuzuk, R. *The assessment of employee morale: A comparison of two measures*. Ohio: Ohio State University, 1961.
- [41] Cross, D. The Worker Opinion Survey: A measure of shop-floor satisfaction. In: *Occupational Psychology*, 1973, Vol. 47, N 3–4.
- [42] Churchill, G. A., Ford, N. M., Walker, O. C. Measuring the job satisfaction of industrial salesmen. In: *Journal of Marketing Research*, 1974, Vol. 11, N 3.
- [43] Hackman, J. R., Oldham, G. R. Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. In: *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1975, Vol. 60, N 2.
- [44] Khaleque, A., Rahman, M. A. Perceived importance of job facets and overall job satisfaction of industrial workers. In: *Human Relations*, 1987, Vol. 40, N 7.
- [45] ISSP: Work Orientations. International Social Survey Programme. In: *Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences* [online]. Gesis.org. [Viewed 23.03.2022]. Available from: <https://www.gesis.org/en/issp/modules/issp-modules-by-topic/work-orientations>
- [46] University of Essex. Institute for Social and Economic Research. *British Household Panel Survey: Waves 1-18* [data collection]. 2018. <http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-5151-2>
- [47] Traynor, M., Wade, B. The development of a measure of job satisfaction for use in monitoring the morale of community nurses in four trusts. In: *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 1993, Vol. 18.
- [48] Lloyd, S., et al. Development of the emergency physician job satisfaction measurement instrument. In: *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 1994, Vol. 12, N 1.
- [49] Gaertner, S. Structural determinants of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in turnover models. In: *Human Resource Management Review*, 1999, Vol. 9, N 4.
- [50] Sousa-Poza, A., Sousa-Poza, A. A. Well-being at work: A cross-national analysis of the levels and determinants of job satisfaction. In: *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 2000, Vol. 29.
- [51] Forbringer, L. R. *Overview of the Gallup Organization's Q-12 Survey*. O.E. Solutions Inc, 2002.

- [52] Melnik, G., Maurer, F. Comparative analysis of job satisfaction in agile and non-agile software development teams. In: *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 2006, Vol. 4044.
- [53] Riaz, A., Ramay, M. Antecedents of job satisfaction: A study of telecom sector. In: *Perspectives of Innovations, Economics and Business*, 2010, Vol. 4.
- [54] Bajcar, B., et al. *Satysfakcja z pracy w zawodach z misją społeczną: psychologiczne uwarunkowania*. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, 2011.
- [55] Ling, F. Y. Y., Loo, C. M. C. Characteristics of jobs and jobholders that affect job satisfaction and work performance of project managers. In: *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 2015, Vol. 31, N 3.
- [56] Hersch, J., Xiao, J. Sex, race, and job satisfaction among highly educated workers. In: *Southern Economic Journal*, 2016, Vol. 83, N 1.
- [57] Crespi-Vallbona, M., Mascarilla-Miró, O. Job satisfaction. The case of information technology (IT) professionals in Spain. In: *UCJC Business and Society Review*, 2018, Vol. 15.
- [58] Al-Shammari, E. T. Investigation of factors affecting employee satisfaction of IT sector. In: *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 2021, Vol. 12.

СКАЛИ ЗА ИЗМЕРВАНЕ НА УДОВЛЕТВОРЕНОСТТА ОТ РАБОТАТА НА СЛУЖИТЕЛИТЕ

Ирина Янчовска

iyanchovska@gmail.com

Софийски университет „Св. Климент Охридски”, 1504 София
РЕПУБЛИКА БЪЛГАРИЯ

Ключови думи: *job satisfaction, job satisfaction scales, job satisfaction measures*

Резюме: Тъй като съществуват множество скали за измерване на удовлетвореността на служителите, съдържащи разнообразни поведенчески, когнитивни и афективни измерители, целта на настоящата статия е да представи обзор на различни инструменти, подреждайки ги в три отделни категории – глобални, композитни и фасетни скали. В допълнение, проучването има за цел да идентифицира факторите на удовлетвореност, които най-често се използват във фасетните скали.

Изборът на скали ще бъде направен посредством подробен обзор на литературата и анализ на множество емпирични проучвания, които изследват удовлетвореността на служителите в различен изследователски, индустриален и културен контекст. Идентификацията на най-често използваните фактори на влияние ще се осъществи с помощта на сравнителен анализ.

В резултат на литературния обзор са набелязани 25 глобални и 36 фасетни скали. Факторите, които най-често се използват във фасетните скали са 1) възнаграждение, 2) взаимоотношения с ръководителя, 3) взаимоотношения с колегите, 4) възможности за израстване и 5) естество на работата.

Поради своята популярност и значение за поведението на служителите и благосъстоянието на компаниите, удовлетвореността от работата е обект на изследване от почти столетие. Настоящият обзор може да послужи като полезно практическо ръководство и обобщение на начините за измерване на удовлетвореност и да подобри разбирането на съставните фактори на тази сложна величина.