

JOB SATISFACTION ARTICLES - COMPARISON UPON SELECTED CRITERIA

UDC 005.32:331.101.32

Dragana Došenović

University of Banja Luka, Faculty of Economics, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Abstract. *Although the concept of job satisfaction has been explored and analyzed in numerous studies, it can be noticed that this concept has been studied in various ways. For this reason, the subject of research in this paper is a set of different scientific articles with topic related to job satisfaction. As the basic aim of this paper is to gain insight into the concept of job satisfaction, a research was carried out on a convenience sample of scientific articles. The results show that authors use different approaches when defining, studying and evaluating job satisfaction in their research. As a result, different methodologies, job satisfaction factors and scales designed for the assessment of job satisfaction can be found in existing literature.*

Key words: *job satisfaction, job satisfaction factors, the assessment of job satisfaction, job satisfaction scales*

JEL Classification: M5, D23, J28

INTRODUCTION

When it comes to management activities, it can be said that human resource management is of great importance for organizational success. Human resources have become a significant source of competitiveness and success (Garrido et al., 2005) and human resource management has become increasingly important in modern organizations (Gustainienė & Endriulaitienė, 2009).

Human resource management is a part of the organizational science which studies all aspects of employment in organizations. It also represents an important managerial

Received July 05, 2018 / Revised October 19, 2018 / Accepted October 26, 2018

Corresponding author: Dragana Došenović

University of Banja Luka, Faculty of Economics, Majke Jugovića 4, 78000 Banja Luka, Republic of Srpska, Bosnia and Herzegovina

E-mail: dragana.dosenovic@ef.unibl.org

function that has been facing special challenges in recent years due to globalization, rapid technological change, change in demographic structure, etc. (Bogićević Milikić, 2006). Several meanings of this concept can be found in scientific and professional literature, which results in different definitions. According to one of the broadly accepted definitions, human resource management refers to policies, practices and systems that affect the behavior of employees, their attitudes and work performance (Noe et al., 2011). Therefore, employees, their knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviors and specific relationships are the subject of human resource management in organizations. Compared to the narrow economic concept of the manpower the idea that employees should be considered broader originates from the first half of the last century. The thesis that an increase in employee satisfaction increases their efficiency was developed in the 1940s. Since then, human resource management has been intensively developing and changing as a scientific discipline.

Since there is no unique attitude about activities that are part of this function, different classifications of human resource management activities can be found in existing literature. However, most of these definitions include the following activities in the domain of human resources: job analysis, human resource planning, recruitment and selection, training and development, performance evaluation and rewarding, labor relations, health and safety protection, as well as managing the process of employee turnover (Bogićević Milikić, 2006). Organizations are forced to focus on creating added value through human capital in today's business conditions. If employees are adequately managed, they can become a very important source of competitive advantage. In order to achieve organizational goals, it is necessary to create a quality work environment in which employees will be satisfied with their job.

When it comes to job satisfaction, it can be said that a single definition of this concept does not exist. In broad terms, job satisfaction refers to the degree to which people love their jobs (Spector, 1997), and includes positive or negative attitudes that individuals have toward their work (Greenberg, 2011). Job satisfaction refers to the combination of cognitive and affective responses to different perceptions of what employees want to receive compared to what they actually receive (Cranny et al., 1992). It is actually an attitude that includes certain assumptions and beliefs about job (cognitive component), feelings toward job (affective component), and job evaluation itself (evaluation component). Scientists use this concept to show a combination of employees' feelings about different aspects of job, such as: the nature of work itself, the level of salary, opportunities for promotion and satisfaction with associates (Schermerhorn et al., 2005). The importance of studying job satisfaction stems from two important reasons. First, job satisfaction is associated with increased productivity and organizational commitment, less absence and fluctuation, as well as increased organizational efficiency (Ellickson & Logsdon, 2001). Benefits that employees receive affect their effort, skills, creativity and productivity (Wright & Davis, 2003). Organizational interest in job satisfaction is also motivated by humanitarian interests or understanding that employees deserve to be treated with respect and have their mental and physical well-being at the maximum level (Spector, 1997; Ellickson & Logsdon, 2001). Another important conclusion is that low level of job satisfaction has negative consequences, such as withdrawal, cost increases, profit reduction, and, consequently, customer dissatisfaction (Zeffane et al., 2008). Dissatisfied workers can develop problematic behaviors that negatively affect their productivity and performance and affect other employees around them (Spector, 1997). Low level of job satisfaction can be an important

indicator of the counterproductive behavior and can lead to behavior such as absenteeism (Spector, 1985) and intended fluctuation (Spector, 1985; Dupre & Day, 2007).

Numerous studies over several decades have tried to determine and classify factors affecting job satisfaction. Previous research has identified a number of factors that can be grouped into two categories: (1) demographic factors and (2) environmental factors. Demographic factors include personal attributes and employee characteristics such as gender, age, education level, marital status and others, while environmental factors relate to work-related characteristics, such as salaries, promotions, controls, etc. (Zeffane, 1994; Reiner & Zhao, 1999; Ellickson & Logsdon, 2001).

It is said that job satisfaction is one of the most important attitudes that employees have in relation to their job (Schneider, 1985). A great number of theoreticians, practitioners and researchers deal with this topic all around the world. They study human resource activities and many other factors that affect job satisfaction among employees. For this reason, this paper is focused on job satisfaction articles, with special focus on comparison upon selected criteria. The subject of this paper is the analysis of scientific articles that study job satisfaction. The main objectives of this type of analysis are (1) to gain a basic insight into the research topic, (2) to discover more details about the research problem, (3) to identify the theoretical framework for the observed problem and (4) to collect information for more complex research that will be carried out in the future (Saunders et al., 2009; Neuman, 2014).

The basic scientific methods used in this paper are: sampling method, content analysis, classification method and comparative method. These methods were selected as the most appropriate methods regarding the subject of research, its theoretical character, as well as the previously stated goals and the purpose of the paper.

In addition to the introduction, conclusion and literature, this paper consists of four parts. Theoretical framework is given in the introduction of the paper where basic concepts of the research problem are summarized. The first part of the paper refers to methodological basics of conducted analysis, while the second part includes research results. Limitations of the research are listed in the third part, while recommendations for the future research are given in the fourth part. Basic conclusions are given at the end of the paper.

1. METHODOLOGY

As the purpose of this paper is to obtain a basic insight into the problem of job satisfaction, this paper will analyze several scientific articles, using a convenience sample. This sample is one of the most commonly used samples in the research. It belongs to a group of samples obtained by deliberate choice of researchers. Suitability or availability is the basic criterion for selecting units into the sample (Battaglia, 2008). A convenience sample can be very useful in surveys. Information obtained from this type of sample can be used to discover the way in which the subject of the research is observed, as the initial basis for definition of hypothesis about specific research problems or for identifying shortcomings in research instruments (Salkind, 2010). However, due to the fact that a convenience sample belongs to a group of samples that are not based on the probability

theory, one should keep in mind its basic advantages and disadvantages when using it (Daniel, 2012).

In order to improve the value of a convenience sample, researchers can pay special attention to the criteria for selecting units in the sample in accordance with the subject of their research (Wegner, 2013). For this reason, the criteria used in the selection of articles for the analysis in this paper are also defined:

- 1) among other factors, the subject of research has to include job satisfaction,
- 2) job satisfaction should be stated in the theoretical basis of the articles,
- 3) each article should focus on different research subjects from the same/different countries,
- 4) the sample should only include articles published in two journals with the Thompson-Reuters Social Science Citation Index: Human Resource Management and Human Resource Management Journal.

Determining the first criterion was motivated by the desire that reviewed articles analyze direct relationship between job satisfaction and other factors in organization, in order to explore possible ways for the study and assessment of job satisfaction. The criterion related to the theoretical basis was derived from the fact that defined research subject should relate to job satisfaction, while the third criterion is defined in order to provide diverse information from countries that have different status in the international economy, which are at different levels of economic development and belong to different cultures. Focusing attention on one group of countries cannot provide generalizations regarding given problems (Lopez-Duarte et al., 2015). The fourth criterion was designed to ensure that only high-quality articles were analyzed, given the rigorous review procedures and the selection that these journals use. Since the observed journals are intended for academic and business researchers, theoreticians, consultants and managers involved in human resource issues, they are very suitable for job satisfaction analysis. For this reason, only articles published in the above-mentioned journals will be selected in the sample.

The procedure for selecting a sample of articles was done using the Google Scholar Internet Browser and internet pages of the listed journals. Ten articles that met the four stated criteria were selected.

The list of articles selected for the analysis in this paper, as well as their basic bibliographic information is given in Table 1.

In order to ensure the comparability of the articles and set the basis for the synthesis of their results, several factors have been defined. The factors identified and compared in each article are:

- 1) methodology and techniques of data collection;
- 2) subjects of research;
- 3) response rate;
- 4) independent variables;
- 5) dependent variables;
- 6) controlling variables;
- 7) description, validity, results and the source of job satisfaction scales;
- 8) limitations and recommendations for further research.

Table 1 List of selected articles

Bibliographic data
1. Alfes, K., Shantz, A. & Van Baalen, S. (2016). Reducing perceptions of overqualification and its impact on job satisfaction: the dual roles of interpersonal relationships at work. <i>Human Resource Management Journal</i> , 26(1), 84-101.
2. Brunetto, Y., Teo, S., Shacklock, K. & Farr-Wharton, R. (2012). Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, well-being and engagement: explaining organizational commitment and turnover intentions in policing. <i>Human Resource Management Journal</i> , 22(4), 428-441.
3. Buonocore, F. & Russo, M. (2013). Reducing the effects of work-family conflict on job satisfaction: the kind of commitment matters. <i>Human Resource Management Journal</i> , 23(1), 91-108.
4. Flickinger, M., Allscher, M. & Fiedler, M. (2016). The mediating role of leader-member exchange: a study of job satisfaction and turnover intentions in temporary work. <i>Human Resource Management Journal</i> , 26(1), 46-62.
5. Gittel, J.H., Weinberg, D.B., Pfefferle, S. & Bishop, C. (2008). Impact of relational coordination on job satisfaction and quality outcomes: a study of nursing homes. <i>Human Resource Management Journal</i> , 18(2), 154-170.
6. Holman, D. (2002). Employee wellbeing in call centres. <i>Human Resource Management Journal</i> , 12(4), 35-50.
7. Huang, Q. & Gamble, J. (2015). Social expectations, gender and job satisfaction: Front line employees in China's retail sector. <i>Human Resource Management Journal</i> , 25(3), 331-347.
8. Holland, P., Pyman, A., Cooper, B. & Teicher, J. (2011). Employee voice and job satisfaction in Australia: the centrality of direct voice. <i>Human Resource Management</i> , 50(1), 95-111.
9. Mayfield, J., Mayfield, M. & Kopf, J. (1998). The effects of leader motivating language on subordinate performance and satisfaction. <i>Human Resource Management</i> , 37(3), 235-248.
10. Baumgartner, M., Dwertmann, D., Boehm, S. & Bruch, H. (2015). Job satisfaction of employees with disabilities: the role of perceived structural flexibility. <i>Human Resource Management</i> , 54(2), 323-343.

Source: author

These factors were selected on recommendations about elements that every detailed literature review based on the analysis of previous empirical studies should contain (Saunders et al., 2009; Bryman, 2012; Creswell, 2013).

2. RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS

Results are presented in three separate sections. The first part deals with the methodological aspects of analyzed articles and includes methodology and techniques of data collection, research subjects and response rates. The second part consists of conceptual aspects of analyzed articles and within it independent, dependent and control variables are identified, while scales for the assessment of job satisfaction are identified and described within the third part.

2.1. Methodological aspects of analyzed articles

A comparative overview of methodological aspects is presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Comparative overview of methodological aspects

Author(s) and year	Methodology and techniques	Research subjects	Response rate
Alfes, Shantz & Van Baalen, 2016	Quantitative, email survey	Planned sample: 472 workers Surveyed: 183 workers employed in 2 organizations in the Netherlands	38,77%
Brunetto, Teo, Shacklock & Farr-Wharton, 2012	Quantitative, survey distributed directly to respondents	Planned sample: 750 workers Surveyed: 193 police officers of the state police departments, Australia	26%
Buonocore & Russo, 2013	Quantitative, survey distributed directly to respondents	Planned sample: 197 workers Surveyed: 171 nurses working in state hospitals and private clinics located in the Campania region, Italy	86,8%
Flickinger, Allscher & Fiedler, 2016	Quantitative, email survey	Surveyed: 593 workers employed by the Employment Agency, Germany	-
Gittell, Weinberg, Pfefferle & Bishop, 2008	Quantitative, email survey	Planned sample: 255 workers Surveyed: 252 nursing assistants in 15 nursing homes	99%
Holman, 2002	Qualitative-quantitative, email survey, interview	Planned sample: 705 workers Surveyed: 557 customer service representatives employed in 3 different call centers in banks, Great Britain	79%
Huang & Gamble, 2015	Quantitative, email survey	Planned sample: 2200 workers Surveyed: 1838 workers from 22 stores owned by multinational retailers from Great Britain and Japan and local stores in 8 Chinese cities	84%
Holland, Pyman, Cooper & Teicher, 2011	Quantitative, telephone and email survey	Surveyed: 1022 workers who work more than 10 hours a week, Australia,	-
Mayfield, Mayfield & Kopf, 1998	Quantitative, email survey	Planned sample: 450 workers Surveyed: 164 medical workers (151 nurses and 13 supervisors) employed by a large state-owned health care company located in the southeastern part of the United States	44%
Baumgartner, Dwertmann, Boehm & Bruch, 2015	Quantitative, email survey	Planned sample: 7530 workers Surveyed: 4141 workers employed in 110 companies from different industrial sectors, Germany	55%

Source: author

Regarding the methodological approach, most studies have a quantitative character while qualitative and mixed qualitative-quantitative studies are rare (Holman, 2002). In accordance with the nature of the research, authors use different methodological techniques and

instruments, most often using an email survey (Alfes et al., 2016; Gittell et al., 2008; Holman, 2002; Huang & Gamble, 2015; Holland et al., 2011; Mayfield et al., 1998; Baumgartner et al., 2015; Flickinger et al., 2016). In two studies, the survey was distributed directly to respondents (Brunetto et al., 2012; Buonocore & Russo, 2013), while the survey by phone was used once (Holland et al., 2011). In addition to the survey, an in-depth interview was used in one study (Holman, 2002).

Research subjects had a different character. Job satisfaction was studied in various industrial sectors and countries (Flickinger et al., 2016; Holland et al., 2011; Baumgartner et al., 2015). A number of studies are focused on particular groups of workers such as police (Brunetto et al., 2012), medical staff (Buonocore & Russo, 2013; Gittell et al., 2008; Mayfield et al., 1998), traders (Huang & Gamble, 2015) and call center workers (Holman, 2002), while on the other hand, some studies are focused exclusively on workers from a particular organization (Alfes et al., 2016; Mayfield et al., 1998) or workers employed by a particular employment agency (Flickinger et al., 2016).

The response rate was set as an indicator of the quality of analyzed articles and their research instruments. The response rate ranged from 26% to 99%, depending on the country where the empirical research was conducted. In two studies, the response rate was not indicated (Flickinger et al., 2016; Holland et al., 2011).

When it comes to observed methodological aspects, it can be noticed that the most frequent mentioned research limitations are related to the sample and subjects of the research. Thus, the most common limitation is the fact that generalizations are not possible and that further research is required, preferably of longitudinal nature, on larger samples or samples that will emerge from different countries.

2.2. Conceptual aspects of analyzed articles

A comparative overview of conceptual aspects related to independent, dependent and controlling variables is given in Table 3.

The first thing that can be noticed from the given table is that different authors use different operationalizations of dependent, independent and controllable variables.

The choice of independent variables depends primarily on research objectives, so different authors choose different independent variables in their research. The number of independent variables listed in the previous table illustrates the complexity of the job satisfaction concept. Although most authors agree that a number of independent variables (different internal and external factors) must be taken into account when researching job satisfaction, there is a disagreement about the most important factors that should be examined and about the best way for their operationalization. While it is quite justified for different authors to have different approach regarding the way they want to express job satisfaction (through some subjective categories or through some objective categories), in order to obtain a complete picture, the major problem for anyone who analyzes these studies is the absence of standardization in the determinants of job satisfaction. Thus, different independent variables were identified and different classifications of factors influencing job satisfaction were found in each of the studies. Also, it can be noticed that most authors mainly analyze the influence of various factors on job satisfaction, while a certain number of authors analyze the impact of job satisfaction on certain categories and observes job satisfaction as an independent variable (Brunetto et al., 2012; Flickinger et al., 2016).

Table 3 A comparative overview of conceptual aspects

Author(s) and year	Independent variables	Dependent variables	Control variables
Alfes, Shantz & Van Baalen, 2016	Leader – member exchange, Team cohesiveness, Perceptions of overqualification.	<i>Job satisfaction.</i>	Age, Working time, Contract type, Organisation.
Brunetto, Teo, Shacklock & Farr-Wharton, 2012	Emotional intelligence, Well-being, Employee engagement, Affective commitment, <i>Job satisfaction.</i>	Turnover intentions.	Age, Gender,
Buonocore & Russo, 2013	Time-based conflict, Strain-based conflict, Behavior-based conflict, Affective commitment, Normative commitment, Continuance commitment.	<i>Job satisfaction.</i>	Gender, Tenure, Presence of dual-earner couples, Number of children, Family responsibilities, Work schedule, Position with high level of responsibility, Number of working hours per week.
Flickinger, Allscher & Fiedler, 2016	Type of contract, Quality of leader – member exchange, <i>Job satisfaction.</i>	Turnover intentions.	Volition, Age, Tenure, Decision making, Hierarchical level, Firm size, Industry.
Gittell, Weinberg, Pfefferle & Bishop, 2008	Relational coordination between employees.	Resident quality of life, <i>Job satisfaction.</i>	Age, Work experience, Gender.
Holman, 2002	Job design, Monitoring, Human Resource Practices, Team leader support.	Anxiety, Depression, <i>Intrinsic job satisfaction,</i> <i>Extrinsic job satisfaction.</i>	Age, Tenure, Working time, Gender.
Huang & Gamble, 2015	Gender, Pay, Training, Working time, Workload, Interaction with customers.	<i>Job satisfaction.</i>	Age, Marital status, Education, Children, Ownership, Hierarchical level.
Holland, Pyman, Cooper & Teicher, 2011	Employee voice arrangements, Direct voice, United Voice.	<i>Job satisfaction.</i>	Age, Gender, Organizational size, Industry, Working time, Occupation, Gross weekly wage, Tenure, Union membership.
Mayfield, Mayfield & Kopf, 1998	Superiors' use of motivating language, Perlocutionary language, Illocutionary language, Locutionary language.	Performance, <i>Job satisfaction.</i>	-
Baumgartner, Dwertmann, Boehm & Bruch, 2015	Disability, Formalization, Centralization.	<i>Job satisfaction.</i>	Organization, Organizational size, Industry, Organizational unit, Hierarchical level, Tenure, Education, Gender, Age.

Source: author

The second observation concerns the dependent variable. In most analyzed articles, job satisfaction is the only one dependent variable, while in some studies authors observe the influence of various factors on job satisfaction and other variables, such as: quality of life (Gittell et al., 2008), anxiety and depression (Holman, 2002) and performance (Mayfield et al., 1998). Job satisfaction can sometimes be viewed both as intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction (Holman, 2002). In cases where job satisfaction appears as an independent variable, the authors observed its impact on turnover intentions (Brunetto et al., 2012; Flickinger et al., 2016).

Regarding control variables used in the analyzed articles, it can be seen that the influence of age (8 articles), gender (6), type of contract (6), hierarchical level (5), tenure (5), working time (4) and company size (3) is observed in most studies. In a smaller number of studies, the influence of control variables such as: number of children (2), education (2), industry (2), union (2), salary (1), ownership (1), occupation (1), marital status (1), schedule at work (1) and family responsibility (1) is observed. In one study, authors did not use control variables (Mayfield et al., 1998).

If conceptual aspects are observed, it can be noted that the most frequently mentioned limitation refers to a number of variables, with the recommendation that a greater number of variables should be included in future research, with different authors referring to different types of variables. Some of them think that it is necessary to include a larger number of independent variables, others consider necessary to include more dependent variables, while the third advocates for more independent and dependent variables. However, insisting on the inclusion of new variables will not be productive if different measurement instruments continue to be used.

2.3. A comparative overview of the scales used for the assessment of job satisfaction

The third part of the analysis refers to a comparative overview of scales used for the assessment of job satisfaction. A comparison of the basic characteristics of used scales was made on the basis of the criteria proposed in literature, which include: a description of the scales, validity, results and source (Bearden et al., 2011). The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4.

When looking at the scales used in analyzed articles, it can be noticed that different authors identify different aspects, factors or determinants of job satisfaction. For this reason, job satisfaction scales are created as scales with one item or as multiple item scales. Thus, authors used scales that consist of 36 items related to different job factors (Buonocore & Russo, 2013), scales with eight or seven items (Holman, 2002), six items (Huang & Gamble, 2015), five items (Flickinger et al., 2016, Baumgartner et al., 2015), four items (Brunetto et al., 2012; Mayfield et al., 1998), three items (Alfes et al., 2016), as well as single-item scales (Gittell et al., 2008; Holland et al., 2011).

Table 4 A comparative overview of scales used for the assessment of job satisfaction

Author(s) and year	Description of the scale	Validity	Result	Source
Alfes, Shantz & Van Baalen, 2016	3 items: - All in all, I am satisfied with my job. - Generally, I like working here. - When everything is taken into account, I am satisfied with my current job.	Cronbach's alpha 0.91	Mean: 6.07 Standard deviation: 0.98	Takeuchi, R., Chen, G. & Lepak, D.P. (2009). Through the looking glass of a social system. Cross-level effects of high-performance work systems on employees' attitudes. <i>Personnel Psychology</i> , 62(1), 1–29.
	7-point Likert-type scale: 1 - strongly disagree; 7 - strongly agree			
Brunetto, Teo, Shacklock & Farr-Wharton, 2012	4 items: - I feel that my job is valuable, - I think that I do something worthwhile at my job, - I think my job is interesting, - I think that my job is fulfilling.	Cronbach's alpha 0.89	Mean: 4.40 Standard deviation: 0.87	Johlke, M.C. & Duhan, D.F. (2000). Supervisor communication practices and service employee job outcomes. <i>Journal of Service Research</i> , 3(2), 154–165.
	6-point Likert-type scale: 1 – strongly disagree; 6 – strongly agree.			
Buonocore & Russo, 2013	36 items: how satisfied or dissatisfied employees are with a number of work factors, including: salaries, promotions, relationships with colleagues and supervisors, the nature of the work, etc.	Cronbach's alpha 0.84	Mean: 2.61 Standard deviation: 0.45	Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: development of the job satisfaction survey. <i>American Journal of Community Psychology</i> , 13(6), 693–713.
	6-point Likert-type scale: 1 – strongly disagree; 6 – strongly agree.			
Flickinger, Allscher & Fiedler, 2016	5 items: - work, - supervision, - pay, - promotion, - co-workers.	Cronbach's alpha 0.90	Mean: 4.62 Standard deviation: 1.27	Smith, P., Kendall, L. & Hulin, C. (1969). <i>The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement</i> . Chicago: Rand-McNally.
	7-point Likert-type scale: 1 – disagree strongly; 7 – agree strongly.			
Gittel, Weinberg, Pfefferle & Bishop, 2008	1 item: - Overall, how satisfied are you with your job? 5-point Likert-type scale: 1 – very satisfied; 5 – very dissatisfied.	Authors believe that scales with one item can provide the best global assessment of job satisfaction	Mean and standard deviation are not mentioned.	Scarpello, V. & Campbell, J.P. (1983). Job satisfaction: are the parts all there? <i>Personnel Psychology</i> , 36(3), 577–600.

Holman, 2002	<p><i>Intrinsic job satisfaction</i> 7 items: the extent to which individuals were satisfied with features integral to the work itself.</p>	Intrinsic job satisfaction - Cronbach's alpha 0.88	Intrinsic job satisfaction: Mean: 3.98 Standard deviation: 1.13	Warr, P.B., Cook, J.D. & Wall, T.D. (1979). Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being. <i>Journal of Occupational Psychology</i> , 52(2), 285-294.
	<p><i>Extrinsic job satisfaction</i> 8 items: the extent to which individuals were satisfied with features external to the work itself.</p>	Extrinsic job satisfaction - Cronbach's alpha 0.80	Extrinsic job satisfaction: Mean: 4.76 Standard deviation: 0.79	
Huang & Gamble, 2015	<p>5-point Likert-type scale: 1 – not at all; 5 – a great deal.</p>			
	<p>6 items: - achievement, - initiative, - influence, - training, - salary, - job itself.</p>	Cronbach's alpha 0.72	Mean: 3.16 Standard deviation: 0.487	Jones, M., Jones, J., Latreille, P. & Sloane, P. (2009). Training, job satisfaction and workplace performance in Britain: evidence from WERS 2004. <i>Labour (Committee on Canadian Labour History)</i> , 23(1), 139–175.
Holland, Pyman, Cooper & Teicher, 2011	<p>5-point Likert-type scale: 1 – strongly disagree; 5 – strongly agree.</p>			
	<p>1 item: - Overall, I am satisfied with my job.</p>	Authors believe that scales with one item can provide the best global assessment of job satisfaction	Mean and standard deviation are not mentioned.	Saari, L.M. & Judge, T.A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. <i>Human Resource Management</i> , 43(4), 395–407.
Mayfield, Mayfield & Kopf, 1998	<p>7-point Likert-type scale: 1 – strongly disagree; 7 – strongly agree.</p>			
	<p>4 items: - how much of the time they feel satisfied with their job, - how well they like their job, - how they feel about changing their job, - how they think they compare with other people.</p>	Cronbach's alpha 0.71	Mean: 4.19 Standard deviation: 0.84	Spector, P.E. (1997). <i>Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences</i> . Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
Baumgartner, Dwertmann, Boehm & Bruch, 2015	<p>7-point Likert-type scale: 1 – very dissatisfied; 7 – very satisfied.</p>			
	<p>5 items: - work, - coworkers, - supervision, - promotion, - pay.</p>	Cronbach's alpha 0.82	Mean: 5.09 Standard deviation: 1.18	Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M. & Hulin, C.L. (1969). <i>The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement</i> . Chicago: Rand McNally.

Source: author

From the previous table, it can be seen that all authors of the analyzed articles consider that Likert-type scale should be used for evaluation of defined items. The aim of this type of scale is to examine the attitude of respondents towards the subject of research, which can be ranged from an absolutely positive to an absolutely negative attitude. Likert-type scales with seven points are considered as the most suitable for the assessment of job satisfaction (Alfes et al., 2016; Flickinger et al., 2016; Mayfield et al., 1998; Baumgartner et al., 2015), as well as five-point scales (Gittell et al., 2008; Holman, 2002; Huang & Gamble, 2015; Holland et al., 2011), while six-point scales are less represented (Brunetto et al., 2012; Buonocore & Russo, 2013).

Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the internal conformity and reliability of the data collected in most of the analyzed studies. Cronbach's alpha was used as a measure for assessing the degree of non-contradiction between the variables in multiple measurements (Carmines & Zeller, 1979; Devellis, 2003). The calculated reference value of Cronbach's alpha in two conducted studies was ≥ 0.90 (Alfes et al., 2016; Flickinger et al., 2016), and in accordance with defined criteria, job satisfaction scales used in these studies can be assessed as wholes that possess excellent internal consent and reliability. The Cronbach's alpha had a value of $0.9 > \alpha \geq 0.8$ in four studies (Buonocore & Russo, 2013; Holman, 2002; Baumgartner et al., 2015; Brunetto et al., 2012) and the data collected in these studies can be evaluated as good, while the values of the Cronbach's alpha in the remaining two studies were $0.8 > \alpha \geq 0.7$ (Huang & Gamble, 2015; Mayfield et al., 1998), where the collected data were evaluated as acceptable and reliable.

In contrast to the above-mentioned studies with multi-dimensional scales, authors who use scales with one item believe that the direct question can best measure job satisfaction and provide the best global assessment of job satisfaction (Gittell et al., 2008; Holland et al., 2011).

The descriptive statistics from Table 4 refer to the mean and the standard deviation. Based on the analysis of these results, it can be concluded that the arithmetic mean has a value above the neutral medium in most studies, which means that respondents had a positive attitude towards job satisfaction. A more detailed insight into the respondents' responses could be obtained if the answers of respondents were sorted according to individual attitudes, which is not shown in analyzed articles.

The characteristic of all analyzed articles is the replication of scales from other articles and from previous studies. This can be justified by the fact that the scales used in previous research have already been proven as reliable and valid instruments for the assessment of job satisfaction.

Based on the analysis of the scales used by the authors of the analyzed articles, it can be concluded that the three-item scale (Alfes et al., 2016), whose reference value for the Cronbach's alpha was 0.91, was the best instrument for the assessment of job satisfaction. Also, five-item scales (Flickinger et al., 2016; Baumgartner et al., 2015) had high reference values for Cronbach's alpha. In the first study Cronbach's alpha was 0.90, and in the second study it was 0.82. These are seven-point Likert-type scales, which can be taken as a recommendation for future research dealing with this subject. However, since other scales used in the analyzed articles had an acceptable or good level of reliability, they can be also used in future research. This conclusion is not surprising, since it was created as a result of the analysis carried out on units selected from quality journals that apply rigorous procedures for selection and reviews of scientific articles.

In general, from the basic findings of analyzed articles, it is not possible to derive universally applicable premises that must be followed when modeling job satisfaction. In accordance with different research objectives, research designs, conceptualizations, research subjects and applied measurement instruments, various authors come up with different results, which also leads to differences in their conclusions. However, this conclusion is not limited to the articles analyzed in this paper, and according to the findings of more extensive and more complex literature analyzes, this is characteristic of job satisfaction studies in general. In this sense, there are three basic criticisms directed to the authors dealing with this issue. The first two concern the choice of variables that are studied and the definition of their relationships that have no basis in some previous research, and therefore do not represent replications of previous studies that would lead to generalizations. The third criticism concerns measuring instruments. When using similar variables different authors measure them differently, which makes it more difficult to improve the existing level of knowledge in this field.

3. LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

Although several conclusions can be drawn from the results of the conducted research, it is necessary to consider some basic limitations in their interpretation.

The first limitation is related to the sample size. This research was conducted on a small sample which includes ten scientific articles. Due to the number of previous studies on the job satisfaction concept, it would be useful to include more articles in further research.

Another limitation is related to the journals from which analyzed articles were selected. Although selected journals use rigorous review procedures and selection criteria and publish only high-quality articles, research results and conclusions can be enriched by including articles from various journals.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE RESEARCH

Based on the results of the analysis, a number of recommendations can be defined. Recommendations that should be followed if someone wants to achieve valuable results for theory and practice are:

- 1) despite a growing number of studies that examine job satisfaction from different aspects, particular attention can be paid to satisfaction factors that would be defined and classified on the basis of unique criteria and individual countries in order to obtain comparative data on job satisfaction;
- 2) in order to avoid partiality in research, it would be desirable to conduct unified studies of most factors and their influence on job satisfaction, as well as to study the impact of job satisfaction on other factors, which would provide a comprehensive picture of the observed causation;
- 3) a careful measurement of the investigated phenomenon, replication and aggregation of some of the existing standardized measurement scales, whose reliability and validity has already been examined, could significantly enhance the entire research design of the job satisfaction problem;

- 4) in addition to independent and dependent variables, a greater number of control variables could be included in research due to the complexity of job satisfaction concept and specific role that such variables have in quantitative research design, which would further clarify the investigated relationships.

CONCLUSION

The subject of this paper was the analysis of scientific articles related to the concept of job satisfaction in order to obtain a basic insight into the given topic, to discover more detailed information about the subject of research and to gather necessary information for the future more complex research of the descriptive-causal character. The articles included in the analysis were selected by a convenience sample and special attention was paid to their methodological and conceptual aspects, as well as to the analysis of scales used to evaluate job satisfaction.

Based on the results, several basic conclusions can be made. First, regarding the methodological aspects of analyzed articles, it can be noticed that most studies about job satisfaction use a quantitative methodology while qualitative and mixed qualitative-quantitative studies are rare. In accordance with the nature of the research, authors use different methodological techniques and instruments, most often using an email survey. When it comes to research subjects, it can be concluded that job satisfaction is being studied in various industrial sectors and countries where most studies are focused on specific groups of workers, workers from a particular organization or workers employed by a particular employment agency. The response rate is quite high in the observed type of research and depends on the country where the empirical research is conducted.

Second, regarding the conceptual aspects job satisfaction articles, it can be noticed that authors observe job satisfaction in two ways, as an independent or as a dependent variable, where different authors use different operationalizations of dependent, independent and controllable variables in their studies. As a result, numerous causes and consequences of job satisfaction can be found in the existing literature. Also, authors usually use a large number of different control variables in their research.

Finally, when it comes to job satisfaction scales, it can be noticed that different authors identify different aspects, factors or determinants of job satisfaction. For this reason, job satisfaction scales are created as scales with one item or as multiple item scales where most authors consider that Likert-type scale should be used for evaluation of defined items. Also, characteristic of job satisfaction articles is the replication of scales from previous studies which is justified by the fact that the scales used in previous research have already been proven as reliable and valid instruments for the assessment of job satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Alfes, K., Shantz, A. & Van Baalen, S. (2016). Reducing perceptions of overqualification and its impact on job satisfaction: the dual roles of interpersonal relationships at work. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 26 (1), 84-101.
- Battaglia, M. (2008). Nonprobability Sampling - Convenience Sampling. In: Lavrakas, P.J. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Baumgartner, M., Dwertmann, D., Boehm, S. & Bruch, H. (2015). Job satisfaction of employees with disabilities: the role of perceived structural flexibility. *Human Resource Management*, 54 (2), 323-343.
- Bearden, W., Netemeyer, R. & Haws, K. (2011). *Handbook of Marketing Scales*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publication.
- Bogičević Milikić, B. (2006). *Menadžment ljudskih resursa [Human Resource Management]*. Beograd: Centar za izdavačku delatnost Ekonomskog fakulteta u Beogradu.
- Brunetto, Y., Teo, S., Shacklock, K. & Farr-Wharton, R. (2012). Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, well-being and engagement: explaining organizational commitment and turnover intentions in policing. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 22(4), 428-441.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Buonocore, F. & Russo, M. (2013). Reducing the effects of work-family conflict on job satisfaction: the kind of commitment matters. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 23 (1), 91-108.
- Carmines, E.G. & Zeller, R.A. (1979). *Reliability and Validity Assessment*, Beverly Hills: Sage Publication.
- Cranny, C.J., Smith, P.C. & Stone, E.F. (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approach*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Daniel, J. (2012). *Sampling Essential - Practical Guidelines for Making Sampling Choices*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.
- Devellis, R.F. (2003). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Dupre, K. & Day, A. (2007). The effects of supportive management and job quality on the turnover intentions and health of military personnel. *Human Resources Management*, 46 (2), 185-201.
- Ellickson, M. & Logsdon, K. (2001). Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees. *State and Local Government Review*, 33 (3), 173-184.
- Flickinger, M., Allscher, M. & Fiedler, M. (2016). The mediating role of leader-member exchange: a study of job satisfaction and turnover intentions in temporary work. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 26 (1), 46-62.
- Garrido, M.J., Pérez, P. & Antón, C. (2005). Determinants of sales manager job satisfaction. An analysis of Spanish industrial firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16 (10), 1934-1954.
- Greenberg, J. (2011). *Behavior in organizations*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Gustainienė, L. & Endriulaitienė, A. (2009). Job satisfaction and subjective health among sales managers. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 4 (1), 51-65.
- Gittel, J., Weinberg, D., Pfefferle, S. & Bishop, C. (2008). Impact of relational coordination on job satisfaction and quality outcomes: a study of nursing homes. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 18 (2), 154-170.
- Holland, P., Pyman, A., Cooper, B. & Teicher, J. (2011). Employee voice and job satisfaction in Australia: the centrality of direct voice. *Human Resource Management*, 50 (1), 95-111.
- Holman, D. (2002). Employee wellbeing in call centres. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 12 (4), 35-50.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*. New York: Harper Row.
- Huang, Q. & Gamble, J. (2015). Social expectations, gender and job satisfaction: Front line employees in China's retail sector. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25 (3), 331-347.
- Johlke, M.C. & Duhan, D.F. (2000). Supervisor communication practices and service employee job outcomes. *Journal of Service Research*, 3 (2), 154-165.
- Jones, M., Jones, J., Latreille, P. & Sloane, P. (2009). Training, job satisfaction and workplace performance in Britain: evidence from WERS 2004. *Labour (Committee on Canadian Labour History)*, 23 (1), 139-175.
- Lopez-Duarte, C., Vidal-Suárez, M.M. & Gonzalez-Díaz, B. (2016). International Business and National Culture: A Literature Review and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 18 (4), 397-416.
- Mayfield, J., Mayfield, M. & Kopf, J. (1998). The effects of leader motivating language on subordinate performance and satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 37 (3), 235-248.
- Neuman, W.L. (2014). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Noe, R., Hollenbeck, J., Gerhart, B. & Wright, P. (2011). *Fundamentals of Human Resource Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Reiner, M.D. & Zhao, J. (1999). The Determinants of job satisfaction among United States Airforce Security Police. *Review of Public Personal Administration*, 19 (3), 5-8.
- Saari, L.M. & Judge, T.A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 43 (4), 395-407.

- Salkind, N.J. (2010). Convenience Sampling. In: Encyclopedia of Research Design, Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publication.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research Methods for Business Students*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Scarpello, V. & Campbell, J.P. (1983). Job satisfaction: are the parts all there? *Personnel Psychology*, 36 (3), 577–600.
- Schermerhorn, J.R., Hunt, J.R. & Osborn, N.R. (2005). *Organizational Behaviour*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schneider, B. (1985). Organizational behavior, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 36, 573–611.
- Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M. & Hulin, C.L. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Spector, P. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13 (6), 693-713.
- Takeuchi, R., Chen, G. & Lepak, D.P. (2009). Through the looking glass of a social system. Cross-level effects of high-performance work systems on employees' attitudes. *Personnel Psychology*, 62 (1), 1–29.
- Warr, P.B., Cook, J.D. & Wall, T.D. (1979). Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 52 (2), 285-294.
- Wegner, T. (2013). *Applied Business Statistics: Methods and Excel-Based Applications*. Claremont, South Africa: Juta Academic.
- Wright, B.E. & Davis, B.S. (2003). Job satisfaction in the public sector: The role of the work environment. *American Review of Public Administration*, 33 (1), 70-90.
- Zeffane, R., Ibrahim, M.E. & Al Mehairi, R. (2008). Exploring the differential impact of job satisfaction on employee attendance and conduct: the case of a utility company in the United Arab Emirates. *Employee Relations*, 30 (3), 237-250.

SKALE ZA OCJENJIVANJE ZADOVOLJSTVA POSLOM – ANALIZA ODABRANIH NAUČNIH ČLANAKA

Iako je koncept zadovoljstva poslom istražen i analiziran u brojnim studijama, može se uočiti da je ovaj koncept proučavan na različite načine. Upravo iz ovog razloga, predmet istraživanja u ovom radu predstavlja skup različitih naučnih članaka u kojima se analizira zadovoljstvo poslom. Kako je osnovni cilj ovog rada sticanje uvida u koncept zadovoljstva poslom, istraživanje je sprovedeno na prigodnom uzorku naučnih članaka. Rezultati istraživanja pokazuju da autori u svojim istraživanjima koriste različite pristupe za definisanje, proučavanje i ocenjivanje zadovoljstva poslom. Kao rezultat, u postojećoj literaturi mogu se pronaći različite metodologije, faktori zadovoljstva poslom i skale koje su dizajnirane za ocenjivanje nivoa zadovoljstva poslom.

Ključne reči: *zadovoljstvo poslom, faktori zadovoljstva poslom, ocenjivanje zadovoljstva poslom, skale zadovoljstva poslom*