

EVALUATING JOB SATISFACTION IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR. EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM THE GREEK LABOUR MARKET

Eirini TRIARCHI

*Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Ioannina, Greece
etriarhi@uoi.gr*

Vanessa ZARRA

*Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Ioannina, Greece
vanessazarra@yahoo.gr*

Kostas KARAMANIS

*Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Ioannina, Greece
kkaraman@uoi.gr*

Abstract

The evaluation of job satisfaction is significant due to its effect on workers' physical and mental health and job-related behaviours like productivity, absenteeism, and turnover. This study aims to determine the level and critical factors of job satisfaction among Greek private-sector employees. In this regard, the examination of the literature's critical instruments for assessing job satisfaction is presented. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used to conduct a quantitative survey, with findings analysed using descriptive statistics. Convenient sampling was used for data collection. The empirical results indicate that employees in the Greek private sector are marginally satisfied with their jobs. Factor analysis distinguishes the intrinsic job facets of ability utilisation, independence, and social status, along with the extrinsic facets of working conditions and co-workers as the main drivers of job satisfaction. Further, the intrinsic factors influence more overall job satisfaction than the extrinsic ones. Finally, among the socio-demographic factors, employees' education attainment determines job satisfaction in the private businesses of the Greek labour market.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), private sector, Greece, employees

1. INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is a multidimensional concept correlating with organisational commitment, job performance, high turnover, health and well-being, and life satisfaction (Adamopoulos and Syrou, 2022, p. 2). Job satisfaction has gained the attention of researchers and managers for decades, particularly in light of the contemporary proliferation of recognising people's significance in achieving competitive advantage and sustainability in organisations (Karamanis et al., 2019). Knowing how satisfied employees are with their jobs enables the diagnosis of organisational problems and assesses the effectiveness of organisational policies and practices (Bowling and Zelazny, 2022; Spector, 1997). The institutional leadership should provide employees with growth opportunities to increase job satisfaction, performance and commitment (Ahmad et al., 2021; Hashim, 2022).

Numerous studies have been conducted in various work environments and different cultural backgrounds. The vast job satisfaction literature focuses on comparing satisfaction levels between different countries and others between employees of private and public sectors. Studies, having Greece as the target country, examined most job satisfaction in the public sector, and many compared the satisfaction levels between the private and public sectors in education and health industries. This paper aims to identify the main drivers and the level of job satisfaction among employees in private enterprises in Greece. In this context, a quantitative survey was conducted using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) to measure the job-related satisfaction items. Convenient sampling was used, and 148 questionnaires were filled from private sector employees. Besides the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales that the MSQ includes, socio-demographic factors are also examined to the extent that they determine employees' job satisfaction. This paper contributes to the field's literature since it identifies the determinants of job satisfaction of employees in the private sector in Greece, matched explicitly with empirical results to derive conclusive answers.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 sets the theoretical background of job satisfaction by presenting theories distinguishing instruments for measuring job satisfaction, along with the literature review of section 3. Section 4 presents the methodology and the survey questionnaire results, while the last section concludes.

2. MAIN THEORIES, MEASURES AND INSTRUMENTS

A conceptual analysis must be preceded to understand a phenomenon (Locke, 1969, p. 334). To this extent, before the empirical analysis, this section comprises the most acknowledged theories associated with job satisfaction and the analysis of its measuring presenting the most frequently used instruments across the empirical research.

2.1. Main Theories

The degree to which individuals enjoy their work is called job satisfaction. Hoppock (1935) first used the concept of job satisfaction to explain employees' physical and individual reactions or satisfaction regarding their work environment. Job satisfaction is an attitude that reflects people's evaluations of the job from favourable to unfavourable (Spector, 1997, 2022). It consists of affective and cognitive components. The first expresses the positive and negative feelings of the employee towards the job, while the second comprises the thoughts and beliefs of the employee about his job (Garg et al., 2018, p. 62). Hulin and Judge (2003) note a tripartite conceptualisation of job satisfaction referring to the psychological responses to a person's job, with cognitive (evaluative), affective (or emotional), and behavioural components.

Job satisfaction reflects the inner accomplishment and pride attained while performing a specific task. Employees who are satisfied with their jobs are more productive, dedicated and relaxed (Hashim, 2022; Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction is a primary organisational factor in motivating and encouraging employees to perform better. It is nearly impossible to consider job satisfaction without referring to what motivates workers, what they feel and how they think (Thiagaraj and Thangaswamy, 2017, p. 465). Most motivation theories have used job satisfaction as a foundation of theory development, sharing similar dependent variables (Kian et al., 2014). Cognitive theories were developed to explain the nature of motivation and people's behaviour under specific conditions. There are two main categories: the content theories and the process theories. Content theories emphasise identifying individual needs that influence behaviour in the workplace, while process theories focus on the relationships between the dynamic variables that comprise motivation and the actions required to influence behaviour and actions.

The theories of Maslow, Alderfer, McClelland and Herzberg are found in the first group. Content theories are based on factors influencing job satisfaction (Kian et al., 2014, p. 96). Humans act for various reasons, some of which Maslow (1943) identifies in a hierarchical order; most are intertwined to maximise satisfaction. Maslow's five-step hierarchy of needs ranges from physiological to safety, social, esteem and self-actualisation. Once one level of needs in the hierarchy is satisfied, a person's motivation shifts to the next level. One is satisfied when he receives what he needs, desires, wants, deserves, or believes in his due. The highest tier in Maslow's theory, self-actualisation, is the motivation toward self-fulfilment (Navy, 2021, p. 27).

Criticism of Maslow's theory is on the lack of recent data to support it and that the focus should be more on autonomy, relatedness and competence and less on a pyramid of needs (Osemeke and Adegboyega, 2017, p. 165). C. Alderfer in 1969, based on Maslow's theory, built the Theory of ERG (existence needs, relatedness needs and growth needs) to explain workplace issues, co-worker relationship paradigms and personal development choices (Caulton, 2012). Alderfer does not adopt Maslow's hierarchy, suggesting that lower-level needs do not have to be satisfied to proceed to higher-level needs as a motivating influence.

Frederick Herzberg introduced the motivation-hygiene theory in 1959, known as the two-factor theory, which distinguishes two sets of work conditions: the motivators, meaning factors that contribute to psychological development and are referred to as job-content factors and the hygiene factors (Thiagaraj and Thangaswamy, 2017). Typical hygiene factors are salary, employment status, company policies, and company management, the absence of which is regarded as a source of employees' dissatisfaction in the workplace (Hong and Waheed, 2011). The dichotomisation of aspects of the workplace into motivators and hygiene factors aroused criticism from scholars who considered these factors mostly a methodological artefact and questioned the theory's validity (Hackman and Oldham, 1976, pp. 251–252).

Maslow believed only in his hierarchy of needs and Herzberg in his two groups of factors, ignoring extra-organisational factors like the cultural one that also accounts for individual behaviour. McClelland's theory fills

this gap by analysing how human needs are influenced by life experiences and the opinions of their culture and vary over time (Osemeke and Adegboyega, 2017). McClelland's theory's main motives, achievement, power, and affiliative, correspond to Maslow's self-actualisation, esteem, and social needs.

The second group of theories consists of the equity theory, Vroom's expectancy model, the goal theory and the attribution theory. The behavioural psychologist John Stacey Adams (1963) established the equity theory based on people's perceptions of how fairly they have been treated compared to how others have been treated. Employees' inputs in the workplace are time, effort, experience, education, skills and knowledge, while outputs are job security, salary, promotion and recognition (Adams, 1965). Employees comparing their inputs-outputs to the ratio of referent other's input-output and finding out they are in an inequitable situation will be motivated to reduce inequity to increase their satisfaction.

Vroom (1964) applies the expectancy theory to work motivation to explain occupational preference and job satisfaction. Expectancy expresses the notion that motivation is a function of the desirability of the outcome and the likelihood of achieving it (Kay, 2003, p. 607). There are different expectancy theory versions and models, though Vroom's theoretical framework is the most popular. Vroom's expectancy model is built around three concepts that evaluate the motivating downward force of traits and behaviour: valence, instrumentality, and expectations (Ahmad et al., 2021, p. 8). To define job satisfaction, Vroom focuses on the employee's role in the workplace following their emotional state towards their job roles. A person will do what he can when he wants to; hence, if an employee seeks to be promoted and believes that working harder will lead to promotion, this individual will be motivated to increase work performance (Dinibutun, 2012). Promotion's accomplishment will increase employee's job satisfaction.

In generic terms, job satisfaction can be seen through the goal-driven behavioural perspective. Locke (1969) based his goal theory on the implications of analysing the nature of emotions and defined the concepts of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Both concepts are determined by the perceived relationship between what one wants from the job and what one perceives it to offer or imply. Notably, Locke (1969, p. 316) defined job satisfaction as "the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values", whereas job dissatisfaction is "the unpleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as frustrating or blocking the attainment of one's job values or as entailing disvalues". Locke (1976) established the Value-Percept model by arguing that individuals' values determine job satisfaction. The model expresses job satisfaction in terms of employees' values and job outcomes and is one of the most often used in job satisfaction analysis (Hashim, 2022; Judge and Klinger, 2008). The greater the achievement of one's values and the greater the similarity between expected and actual outcomes, the greater the satisfaction yield (Locke, 1976).

Attribution theory, developed by Heider (1958), suggests that persons are rational and motivated to discover the causal structure of their environment. Internal forces (personal attributes) and external forces (environmental attributes) determine human behaviour. Kelley (1973) elaborated this theory by adding three criteria: distinctiveness, consensus, and consistency. Notably, Kelley argues that employees attribute behaviour to internal forces when they perceive a low level of distinctiveness and consensus and a high level of consistency. Ability is a stable factor of internal attributions, while effort is unstable. Correspondingly, task difficulty is a stable factor of external attributions, while luck is unstable. Those employees who adopt the approach of internal attributions believe in achieving high performance on their abilities, skills and efforts. Employees believe in the external attributions they relate their performance with factors they can not control (Dinibutun, 2012).

Furthermore, Kalleberg (1977), in his theory on job satisfaction, incorporates differences in work values and perceived job characteristics as key explanatory variables. Kalleberg examines the relationship between people and their jobs since he underlines the importance of including the conceptual tools provided not only by sociology but also by psychology and economics (Kalleberg, 1977, p. 142). The situational (structural) argument on the job satisfaction concept identifies the work setting as the critical factor (Kalleberg, 1977; Spector, 1997). The most influential theory based on this argument is the job characteristics theory (Hackman and Oldham, 1976). This theory indicates five key job characteristics: task identity, task significance, skill variety, autonomy and feedback to promote three psychological states: experienced meaningfulness of the work, responsibility for the work's outcomes and knowledge of the work activities. When these three are

endorsed, work motivation and job satisfaction register high (Hackman and Oldham, 1976; Mueller and Kim, 2008). Individuals' experiences with organisational factors may motivate them to exert additional effort while simultaneously satisfying their emotional needs, resulting in job satisfaction (Kian et al., 2014).

2.2. Measures

The implication of job satisfaction on employees' physical and mental well-being and job-related behaviours like productivity, absenteeism and turnover makes measuring job satisfaction an essential task for a researcher. The two basic approaches to the measurement of job satisfaction that are used to get a complete picture of employees' job satisfaction are the global approach relating to the overall job satisfaction measurement and the facet approach providing a more comprehensive overview of the aspects of the work environment (Bello et al., 2020; Inoyatova, 2021; Spector, 2022). Notably, the global approach is used to determine the overall or bottom-line attitude of whether people like or dislike their jobs, while the facet approach determines how satisfied people are with different aspects of the job (Spector, 2022). Typical facets of job satisfaction are pay, promotions, co-workers, supervision, the work itself (Smith et al., 1969), recognitions, working conditions, and company and management (Locke, 1976). Researchers also distinguish intrinsic and extrinsic factors in job satisfaction. For example, co-workers, supervision, and work are intrinsic, while pay and promotions are extrinsic (Judge and Klinger, 2008, p. 395).

An issue Scarpello and Cambell (1983) highlight in measuring job satisfaction is that the global measure of job satisfaction and the sum of the facet measures are not equivalent measures. They provide evidence that the global overall satisfaction rating is the most inclusive and reliable measure of overall satisfaction (Scarpello and Cambell, 1983, p. 598). Hence, a single satisfaction question is an acceptable measure of overall satisfaction. Examples of a single-question global measure are "Overall, how satisfied are you with your job?" or a variant, "On the whole, would you say are satisfied or dissatisfied with the work you do?" (Oshagbemi, 1999; Saari and Judge, 2004; Wanous and Reichers, 1996). Respondents will answer from a 5-range scale from satisfaction to dissatisfaction and vice versa (Oshagbemi, 1999). Studies use overall job satisfaction as a global measure, even reduced to a single item, while other incorporates facet measures to deepen the understanding of job satisfaction (Giel and Breuer, 2023).

A decision to be made in assessing job satisfaction is whether to use only facets measures, global satisfaction measures or both (Spector, 2022). Wanous and Reichers (1996) and Saari and Judge's (2004) studies acknowledge that a global satisfaction question or summing scores on various aspects of the job can be used in measuring job satisfaction, and respectable levels of reliability can be obtained. This study adopts both the global and the facet satisfaction measures in the empirical analysis (see section 3).

Many satisfaction instruments have been developed by academics and consulting firms hired to conduct surveys over time. The following section presents some of the most known job satisfaction instruments in field literature that assess facets and global satisfaction.

2.3. Instruments of measuring job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is ordinarily measured by self-reports in questionnaires (Mueller and Kim, 2008; Spector, 2022). Following the above section's analysis, the scales to measure general job satisfaction fall into the global and composite scales constructed by summing individual satisfaction facets. Both types are equally effective in measuring general job satisfaction (Bowling and Zelazny, 2022).

Composite Satisfaction Scales ask workers to report their level of satisfaction with specific aspects of their jobs (Bowling and Zelazny, 2022, p. 92). Two often used and validated employee attitude surveys are the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith et al., 1969) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al., 1967, 1977).

The JDI contains some scales that only measure job satisfaction as the Job in General Scale (JIG) but also incorporate the five facets that Smith et al. (1969) indicated. These distinct facets are pay, promotion opportunities, co-workers, supervision and work itself, the most frequently considered factors in job satisfaction (Giel and Breuer, 2023). The JDI is acknowledged for its reliability and validity (Saari and Judge, 2004, p. 400).

The MSQ considers job satisfaction as an attitude with positive and negative effects aligned with Locke's (1976) theory. The scale consists of 100 items in long form and 20 in short form, all related to job satisfaction. The later form evaluates the following facets of satisfaction (1) activity, (2) independence, (3) variety, (4) social status, (5) supervision (human relations), (6) supervision (technical), (7) moral values, (8) security, (9) authority, (10) use of skills, (11) corporate policies and practices, (12) remuneration, (13) advancement, (14) responsibility, (15) creativity, (16) working conditions, (17) work colleagues, (18) social service, (19) recognition and (20) achievement (Weiss et al., 1967, 1977). The respondent answers to a Likert-type scale of 5 categories according to the level of satisfaction with each facet of the work from 1 very dissatisfied to 5 very satisfied. The MSQ, regarding its availability in long and short forms and its faced and overall measures, is considered highly versatile (Saari and Judge, 2004, p. 400).

Recently, Hora et al. (2018), reviewing the literature about the state-of-the-art measuring instruments in job satisfaction in the second decade of the 21st century, found that the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and the MSQ are the most comprehensive and most answered measures. The JSS was first developed for social services by Spector (1985) but is now used for other sectors. The JSS is a 36-item scale that uses as a response format a six-point Likert scale, ranging from 'disagree very much' (1) to 'agree very much' (6). The JSS includes nine dimensions of job satisfaction: (1) nature of the work, (2) remuneration, (3) promotion, (4) supervisors, (5) co-workers, (6) benefits, (7) contingency rewards, (8) operational procedures and (9) quality of the communication (Hora et al., 2018).

Global satisfaction scales to measure general job satisfaction ask employees directly to report their general level of job satisfaction. Global job satisfaction measures most frequently used in empirical studies are the JIG (Ironson et al., 1989) developed to accompany the JDI (Smith et al., 1969) on the basis that composite scales may not efficiently estimate the general satisfaction; the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ) (Cammann et al., 1979, 1983; Lawler et al., 1975) most used the version of the three-item MOAQ-JSS (Cammann et al., 1979) in assessing a worker's overall attitude toward his or her job. A sample item is "All in all, I am satisfied with my job". Other scales in this group are the overall job satisfaction scale (OJS) (Brayfield and Rothe, 1951) and the Faces Scale (FS) (Kunin, 1955), one of the first widely used scales. The FS has participants respond by choosing one of the seven faces that best express their satisfaction with their job overall. A frowning face reflects their lowest level of satisfaction and a smiling face their highest level.

Regarding all the instruments mentioned above that have been tested for their reliability and validity, this study's empirical analysis uses the MSQ short form, considering its ease of completion and versatility (see section 3).

3. MAIN THEORIES, MEASURES AND INSTRUMENTS

Through the voluminous amount of literature on job satisfaction, this paper reviews studies that employ, as a survey instrument, the MSQ or, irrespective of the measurement tool, those that set Greece as a survey location.

Most job satisfaction empirical studies are based on factor analysis with the two-dimensional model of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction to gain the researcher's support. Existing research provides evidence that intrinsic factors contribute more to employees' job satisfaction than extrinsic ones (Anastasiou and Papakonstantinou, 2014; Bello et al., 2020; Feleki et al., 2021; Garg et al., 2018; Gunlu et al., 2010; Karamanis et al., 2019; Martins and Proença, 2014). Bello et al. (2020) evaluated the overall job satisfaction among doctors in Nigeria by using the MSQ and distinguished intrinsic factors as the most influential. Hence, ability utilisation, advancement, supervision-human relations, variety, and working conditions positively related to the single-item measure of overall job satisfaction. Garg et al. (2018) examined the intrinsic and extrinsic factors of job satisfaction regarding the MSQ scales among managers of private banks in India. They concluded the prevalence of the first group of factors in bank managers' satisfaction. Anastasiou and Papakonstantinou's (2014) research on job satisfaction in the Greek educational sector concluded the higher importance of the intrinsic job facets (the nature of the work, the ability to work with and help their students) in comparison to extrinsic (work conditions). Karamanis et al. (2019), measuring job satisfaction among employees in the Greek public sector by the use of the MSQ short form, resulted in the higher importance of intrinsic facets (activity, independence, creativity, security and social status) compared to the extrinsic (human relations, remuneration, colleagues and working conditions) and ranked general job satisfaction as medium to high. In more recent research on the same setting

of the Greek public sector, Feleki et al. (2021) produced similar results concerning the general satisfaction rank and the importance of intrinsic factors. The highest job satisfaction the employees receive is from intrinsic facets of security and social responsibility and the extrinsic of co-workers. The findings of Gunly et al. (2010) on job satisfaction among managers in large-scale hotels in Turkey also suggested that intrinsic job satisfaction level is greater than extrinsic. Further, demographic factors such as the managers' educational level, age and income level mainly affect extrinsic job satisfaction. Martins and Proença (2014) developed an exploratory factor analysis to assess the factor structure of the MSQ scale in Hospital workers in Portugal. They used the enrichment and supervisor empowerment factors incorporating the intrinsic and extrinsic job-related items of MSQ satisfaction, respectively and supported that intrinsic satisfaction items drive workers' satisfaction.

A medium level of general job satisfaction is found in the studies of Karanikola et al. (2021), Panagiotopoulos et al. (2018), Saner and Eyupoglu (2015), and Batiou and Valkanos (2013) and Toker (2011). Saner and Eyupoglu (2015) provide empirical evidence for the moderate level of job satisfaction among bank employees in North Cyprus by using the MSQ short form. Toker's (2011) study on job satisfaction among academicians in the universities of Turkey showed a moderately high overall job satisfaction level, driven by the intrinsic factor of job satisfaction. Panagiotopoulos et al. (2018), employing the JSS questionnaire, investigated the job satisfaction of the administrative staff of the Technological Educational Institute of Western Greece and showed that the general satisfaction of the administrative staff is moderate. Respondents appeared primarily satisfied with the facets of supervisors -human relations and co-workers while dissatisfied with the compensation and advancement. Karanikola et al. (2021), in a more recent similar to Panagiotopoulos et al. (2018) study regarding the type of employees and the organisation, also extracted a moderate level of general job satisfaction. However, the factor that scores high for extrinsic job satisfaction is security, while intrinsic satisfaction is ability utilisation. The demographic factors of age, gender, educational level, and job position are irrelevant to intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. Batiou and Valkanos (2013) produced similar results for the level of general job satisfaction using the JSS questionnaire in their administrative officials' job satisfaction study in the Greek Ministry of Employment and Social Affairs. Regarding the factors contributing most to extrinsic satisfaction these are supervision and co-workers, whereas to intrinsic satisfaction the nature of the work. Chatzopoulou et al. (2015) set their research in the same as Batiou and Valkanos study's Greek region and sector but in a different industry. They used data from the local authority of the Region of North Western Greece to identify the most critical job satisfaction factors that motivate employees to be more productive: the nature of the job and work conditions.

Some studies indicated different factor structures of the original MSQ (Glaveli et al., 2019; Hancer and George, 2003; Kara et al., 2012). Hancer and George (2003) differentiated the factor structure of the MSQ short form and introduced a four-factor structure to examine the job satisfaction of nonsupervisory employees working in restaurants. They named the first-factor extrinsic job satisfaction since it included the extrinsic facets of supervision-technical, supervision-human relations, company policies and practices, recognition, compensation, working conditions and coworkers. Factor two, extrinsic job satisfaction, comprises the intrinsic facets of social status, ability utilization, authority, achievement, social service, and variety. They introduced a third factor named satisfaction from the nature of the job consisting of security, activity, moral values, and independence. They called factor four perceived autonomy and incorporated the facets of creativity, responsibility, and advancement. The study resulted in a moderately high level of overall job satisfaction. The facets that received the highest satisfaction levels were the intrinsic of security, social service, moral values, activity, and responsibility and the extrinsic of working conditions and coworkers. Kara et al. (2012), examining gender differences in job satisfaction of five-star hotel employees in Turkey, introduced four factors under which the 20 related items of MSQ fall. Hence, the first factor is management conditions (supervisor-human relations, supervisor technical, working conditions, co-workers, recognition), the second is personal fulfilment (achievement, moral values, responsibility, security, activity), and the third the using ability in the job (ability utilization, independence, social service, creativity, authority) and the fourth job conditions (variety, social status, advancement, company policies and practices). They found differences between male and female employees. Male employees reported higher satisfaction scores with the first and third factors, while female employees reported higher satisfaction scores with the fourth. Glaveli et al. (2019), employing MSQ short-version combined with MULTicriteria Satisfaction Analysis (MUSA) methodology, conducted a factor analysis to define what drives the overall job satisfaction of seasonal employees in summer luxury resorts in Greece. Their data analysis supported the following four-factor structure: empowerment (ability utilisation, independence,

responsibility, creativity, achievement and co-workers), task enrichment (social status, social service, authority and variety), human resource management (company policies, advancement, recognition and compensation) and leadership qualities (supervisor-human relation) to represent the job satisfaction factors of a summer luxury resort. Empowerment and task enrichment incorporate intrinsic job-related items, whereas the remainder are extrinsic ones. Considering that empowerment proved to be the most influential factor, intrinsic satisfaction is higher than the extrinsic.

The following empirical analysis (see Section 4) employs the broadly accepted dichotomy of satisfaction constructs, thus the factor analysis of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The focal point of this study is to measure job satisfaction among employees of the Greek private sector. To this extent, this research uses one of the existing survey instruments that provides good evidence for construct validity, the MSQ short form (see Section 2). Further, it adopts the global and facet approach and the two-dimensional factor analysis of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction (see Section 3) to extract distinct results.

TABLE 1 - RESEARCH ANALYSIS' CONCEPTUAL MODEL UNDER THE MSQ SHORT-FORM ITEMS FRAMEWORK

MSQ Short-Form Item			
Job-Related Items		Description	Type
1	Activity	Being able to keep busy all the time	Intrinsic
2	Independence	The chance to work alone on the job	Intrinsic
3	Variety	The chance to do different things from time to time	Intrinsic
4	Social Status	The chance to be somebody in the community	Intrinsic
5	Moral Values	Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience	Intrinsic
6	Security	The way my job provides for steady employment.	Extrinsic ^a
7	Responsibility	The freedom to use my own judgement	Intrinsic
8	Authority	The chance to tell other people what to do	Intrinsic
9	Ability utilisation	The chance to do something that make use of my abilities	Intrinsic
10	Social Service	The chance to do things for other people	Intrinsic
11	Creativity	The chance to try my own methods of doing the job	Intrinsic
12	Achievement	The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	Intrinsic
13	Supervision-Human Relations	The way my boss handles his employees	Extrinsic
14	Supervision-Technical	The competence of my supervisor in making decisions	Extrinsic
15	Company Policies and Practices	The way company policies are put into practice	Extrinsic
16	Compensation (Remuneration)	My pay and the amount of work I do	Extrinsic
17	Advancement (Growth)	The chances for advancement in this job	Extrinsic
18	Recognition	The praise I get for doing a good job	Extrinsic
19	Co-workers	The way my co-workers get along with each other	Extrinsic
20	Working Conditions	The working conditions	Extrinsic

Source: Adapted from Weiss (1967, 1977) and Hirschfeld (2000)

Note: The 20 items are presented in the order used in this research anonymous questionnaire and not by alphabetical order of the Manual Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short-form (Weiss et al., 1967, 1977)

a. This item was first classified as an intrinsic factor in the original intrinsic subscale (Weiss et al., 1967, 1977), though Hirschfeld (2000), revising the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales of the MSQ, classified this item as extrinsic.

Participants

Research's population refers to employees of private organisations located in the capital of the Region of Epirus, Ioannina. The one-location population sample may prevent the generalisation of findings, though significant evidence is presented for the reader who aspires to examine further job satisfaction in the private sector. The sample includes 148 employees from all administrative levels in private organisations registered in different sectors of the economy to reduce the possibility of a one-sided response. Responses remain confidential and are used for research purposes only.

The sample's gender distribution was 58.1% female and 41.9% male, with the sample's age distribution predominantly the 26-35 age group (53.4%). Concerning education level, more than 54% of the respondents were University graduates, meaning that employees value their personal and professional growth in the highly competitive labour market of the Greek private sector. Nearly 78.4% of the respondents were at entry-level and mid-level job positions in the administrative hierarchy, with the remainder having high-level administrative positions.

Collection and processing of data

This research is survey research by taking samples from a population and using the anonymous questionnaire as the primary data collection tool. The collection of data took place between February and March 2022. In total, 170 questionnaires were distributed, and 148 responses were collected, recording a high 87% response rate.

The questionnaire was developed based on the MSQ short form by adding a single-item question for overall job satisfaction and four demographic questions (gender, age, education and job position). A 5-point Likert-type response scale from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied) accompanied the job-involved items. Thus, higher scores express greater satisfaction. Factor analysis of the MSQ-20 items (1 item per facet) measures intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. Intrinsic satisfaction refers to occupational conditions, that is, how people feel about the nature of the job's tasks, and extrinsic satisfaction reflects the environmental conditions, meaning how people feel about aspects of the job that are external to the work environment (Spector, 1997; Weiss et al., 1967, 1977), (see table 3.1). Scores for each respondent are calculated by adding the scores for the associated questions. The first 20 questions of this research's questionnaire follow the order of the items in Table 1.

Intrinsic satisfaction is assessed by items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and extrinsic satisfaction by items 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. Hence, 11 of the 20 questions are used for measuring intrinsic satisfaction, and nine are used for measuring extrinsic satisfaction. General satisfaction is found by measuring all the 20 related questionnaire items.

Statistical accuracy of indicators

Cronbach's alpha for the current study is .94, indicating high-scale reliability (min .70-max 1).

Results

The mean score and standard deviation of the single item overall job satisfaction (see Table 2) reveal that employees' level of satisfaction is ranked as marginally satisfied (77% responses of scale 3 and 4).

TABLE 2 - OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION SCORES

Overall job satisfaction	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
	3.55	0.95
Scales	n	%
1. Very Dissatisfied (VD)	7	4.7%
2. Dissatisfied (D)	6	4.1%
3. Neither dissatisfied/nor satisfied (N)	54	36.5%
4. Satisfied (S)	60	40.5%
5. Very Satisfied (VS)	21	14.2%

The empirical analysis examines whether socio-demographic factors like gender, age, educational level and job position are responsible for overall job satisfaction variations. The chi-square test of independence (X^2) on the null (H_0) and alternative (H_1) hypotheses provides the results presented in Table 3.

H_0 : There is no significant relationship between *socio-demographic and overall job satisfaction*

H_1 : There is a significant relationship between *socio-demographic and overall job satisfaction*

TABLE 3 - RESULTS OF CHI-SQUARE TEST OF INDEPENDENCE

Gender	M	Results
Male	3.5	$X^2=7.99$ $p_value=0.09>\alpha$ $CV=9.49> X^2$ No rejected- H_0 ,/independent variables
Female	3.59	
Age group	M	Results
<=25	3.6	$X^2=13,12$ $p_value=0.5>\alpha$ $CV=21.03> X^2$ No rejected- H_0 ,/independent variables
26-35	3.61	
36-45	3.63	
46-55	2.83	
Educational Level	M	Results
Bachelor's or equivalent level	3.7	$X^2=20,83$ $p_value=0,007<\alpha$ $CV=15.5< X^2$ Rejected H_0 ,/ Educational level has significant effect on job satisfaction
Post Graduates (Master's or equivalent level/Doctoral or equivalent level)	3.56	
Intermediate (Upper Secondary education/Post-Secondary non-tertiary education)	2.89	
Job Position	M	Results
Entry-level, Intermediate – level employee	3.5	$X^2=1,01$ $p_value=0,9>\alpha$ $CV=9,49> X^2$ No rejected H_0 ,/independent variables
First-level manager, Middle and Executive or senior manager	3.66	

The X^2 test results at the 5% significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) show no correlation between gender, age, job position and employee satisfaction, while at a level of education, there is. Concerning the demographic variable of gender, the study's findings are consistent with the empirical results of Panagiotopoulos et al. (2018), Batiou and Balkanos (2013), and Toker (2011). Karanikola et al. (2021) also agree on the independence between age and job satisfaction, while Gunlu (2010) agrees on the significance of the educational level in job satisfaction. The highly educated employee is more likely to be satisfied with his job.

4.1. Facet approach

The survey results show that the general job satisfaction received by the employees of our sample comes mainly from the extrinsic factor of co-workers and the intrinsic factors of ability utilisation, social status and independence. Mean responses for these facets are between three and four, indicating the respondents are between neutral and satisfied with these items. Notably, the quality of relationships with colleagues is the first ranked source of satisfaction, with $M=3.99$, $SD=0.95$, and 73.7% of the respondents declaring satisfied or very satisfied. The opportunity given to private sector employees to utilise their skills and abilities effectively while performing their jobs is one of the critical satisfaction factors that emerged from our survey ($M=3.82$, $SD=1.08$), with 70.3% of the respondents being satisfied or very satisfied. The job-related item social status is recording moderate to borderline satisfaction ($M=3.78$, $SD=0.98$), with 66.8% of respondents stating satisfied or very satisfied. The independence factor, reflecting how autonomous an individual is in performing his job, is also rated at moderate to marginal satisfaction ($M=3.78$), receiving 64.2% responses on the satisfied and very satisfied scales (see Table 4).

TABLE 4- RESPONDENT JOB SATISFACTION RESULTS FOR MSQ SHORT FORM (N=148)

Job-related Items	Satisfaction Scales n (%)					Mean
	VD	D	N	S	VS	± SD
1.Activity	1(0.68)	12(8.11)	38(25.68)	68(45.95)	29(19.59)	3.76 ± 0.88
2.Independence	3(2.03)	11(7.43)	39(26.35)	58(39.19)	37(25.00)	3.78 ± 0.97
3.Variety	5(3.38)	21(14.19)	47(31.76)	41(27.70)	34(22.97)	3.53 ± 1.09
4.Social Status	5(3.38)	8(5.41)	36(24.32)	64(43.24)	35(23.65)	3.78 ± 0.98
5.Moral Values	3(2.03)	15(10.14)	34(22.97)	58(39.19)	38(25.68)	3.76 ±1.01
6.Security	14(9.46)	21(14.19)	40(27.03)	45(30.410)	28(18.92)	3.35 ±1.21
7.Responsibility	6(4.05)	12(8.11)	38(25.68)	52(35.14)	40(27.03)	3.73 ±1.07
8.Authority	4(2.70)	18(12.16)	41(27.70)	53(35.81)	32(21.62)	3.61 ±1.04
9.Ability Utilisation	3(2.03)	11(7.43)	26(17.57)	61(41.22)	43(29.05)	3.82 ±1.08
10.Social service	7(4.73)	18(12.16)	35(23.65)	42(28.38)	45(31.08)	3.69 ±1.17
11.Creativity	10(6.76)	16(10.81)	39(26.35)	50(33.78)	33(23.30)	3.54 ±1.15
12.Achievement	8(5.41)	13(8.78)	37(25)	52(35.14)	38(25.68)	3.67 ±1.11
13.Supervision-Human Relations	9(6.08)	19(12.84)	36(24.32)	47(31.76)	37(25)	3.57 ±1.17
14.Supervision-Technical	9(6.08)	26(17.57)	40(27.03)	44(29.73)	29(19.59)	3.39 ±1.16
15.Company Policies-Practices	10(6.76)	25(16.99)	42(28.38)	48(32.43)	23(15.54)	3.33 ±1.13
16.Compensation	18(12.16)	21(14.19)	39(26.35)	48(32.43)	22(14.86)	3.24 ±1.22
17.Advancement	18(12.16)	25(16.89)	46(31.08)	38(25.68)	21(14.19)	3.13 ±1.21
18.Recognition	11(7.43)	17(11.49)	36(24.32)	54(36.49)	30(20.27)	3.51 ±1.15
19.Co-workers	3 (2.03)	7 (4.73)	29 (19.59)	59 (39.86)	50 (33.78)	3.99 ±0,95
20.Working Conditions	14(9.46)	21(14.19)	40(27.03)	45(30.41)	28(18.92)	3.63 ±1,12

In contrast, the employees appear dissatisfied with the extrinsic factors of the promotion system expressed by company policies and practices, the compensation and the advancement. Respondents derive moderate satisfaction from the company policies and practices ($M=3.33$, $SD=1.13$), with 28.38 % of them showing neutral satisfaction and 23.8% dissatisfaction or extreme dissatisfaction. Compensation ($M=3.24$, $SD=1.22$) and advancement ($M=3.13$, $SD=1.21$), are ranked last in all 20 facets of job satisfaction. Regarding compensation, 26.4% of the responses fall in the two first scales, while precisely the same percentage of responses to the third scale. Similarly, in the advancement facet, 31% of the respondents showed neutral satisfaction with their promotion opportunity, and 29.1% were dissatisfied and very dissatisfied (see Table 4).

Table iv presents the satisfaction scales (n,%), the mean scores and the standard deviation for each work facet of MSQ short form as adjusted to this study's research.

General satisfaction, measured by all 20 items on the MSQ, mean score and standard deviation are 3.58 and 1.12, respectively. Hence, employees' level of general satisfaction is ranked as marginally satisfied, a result similar to the empirical findings of Karanikola et al. (2021), Panagiotopoulos et al. (2018), Saner and Eyupoglu (2015), and Batiou and Valkanos (2013) and Toker (2011).

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors

The summary descriptive statistics for the intrinsic factors of job satisfaction are presented in Table 5. Notably, the average rate of intrinsic satisfaction is satisfactory ($M = 3.70$), reflecting the high contribution of the 11 facets in employee job satisfaction in private businesses in Greece. Among them, those that rank highest are the ability utilisation ($M=3.82$) followed by social status ($M=3,78$) and independence ($M=3,78$). The first two facets as most influential in job satisfaction are also highlighted by Toker (2011), whereas Glaveli et al.(2019) and Bello et al. (2020), in relevant research, agree on independence and ability utilisation highest ranking.

TABLE 5 - INTRINSIC FACTORS OF JOB SATISFACTION (MIN/MAX EVALUATION SCORES AND AVERAGE RATE OF RESPONSES)

Intrinsic Subscales	Min	%	Max	%	Mean	S.D.
Activity	1	0,70%	5	19,60%	3,76	0,88
Independence	1	2%	5	25%	3,78	0,97
Variety	1	3,40%	5	23%	3,53	1,09
Social status	1	3,40%	5	23,60%	3,78	0,98
Moral values	1	2%	5	25,70%	3,76	1,01
Social service	1	4,70%	5	31,10%	3,69	1,17
Authority	1	2,70%	5	21,60%	3,61	1,04
Ability utilisation	1	4,70%	5	29,10%	3,82	1,08
Responsibility	1	4,10%	5	27%	3,73	1,07
Creativity	1	6,80%	5	22,30%	3,54	1,15
Achievement	1	5,40%	5	25,70%	3,67	1,11
Average rate of Intrinsic Satisfaction					3,70	1,05

Referring to extrinsic satisfaction (see Table 6i), the average rate of extrinsic satisfaction is moderately satisfied ($M = 3.46$), thus lower than intrinsic satisfaction. The majority of employees show satisfaction with their co-workers' relationships ($M=3.99$), aligned with Karanikola et al. (2021), Feleki et al. (2021), Glaveli et al.(2019), Batiou and Valkanos (2013) and Hancer and George (2003) empirical results. This facet ranked first among the twenty. The second in rank is the working conditions ($M=3.63$), also highlighted in Chatzopoulou *et al.* (2015) and Hancer and George (2003).

Results concerning the facets of advancement and compensation ranking at the low level of satisfaction are in accordance with Feleki et al., Panagiotopoulos et al. (2018), Karamanis et al. (2019), Toker (2011), Hancer and George (2003) empirical results. The last study distinguishes compensation as the primary source of employees' dissatisfaction. Company policies and practices are not gaining the satisfaction of employees ($M=3.33$), a result that also emerged from the studies of Karanikola et al. (2021), Karamanis et al. (2019) and Glaveli et al.(2019). Table 7 summarises and compares the results presented in Tables 5 and 6.

TABLE 6 - EXTRINSIC FACTORS OF JOB SATISFACTION (MIN/MAX EVALUATION SCORES AND AVERAGE RATE OF RESPONSES)

Extrinsic Subscales	Min	%	Max	%	Mean	S.D.
Security	1	9.50%	5	18.90%	3.35	1.21
Supervision-Human Relation	1	6.10%	5	25%	3.57	1.17
Supervision-Technical	1	6.10%	5	19.60%	3.39	1.16
Company Policies and Practices	1	6.80%	5	15.50%	3.33	1.13
Compensation	1	12.,20%	5	14.90%	3.24	1.22
Advancement	1	12.20%	5	14.20%	3.13	1.21
Recognition	1	7.40%	5	20.30%	3.51	1.15
Co-workers	1	2%	5	33.80%	3.99	0.95
Working conditions	1	6.10%	5	23.60%	3.63	1.12
Average rate of Extrinsic Satisfaction					3.46	1.15

TABLE 7- INTRINSIC AND EXTRINSIC JOB SATISFACTION

Satisfaction Factors	M	SD
Intrinsic	3,70	1,05
Extrinsic	3,46	1,15

The score of intrinsic satisfaction is higher than extrinsic satisfaction, a result consistent with the empirical analysis of Feleki et al. (2021), Bello et al. (2020), Karamanis et al. (2019), Garg et al. (2018) and Toker (2011).

5. CONCLUSIONS

The present study extends previous research on the determinants of job satisfaction by measuring employees' job satisfaction in the private sector in Greece. The study's empirical analysis is consisted with the conceptual analysis regarding the theories and the instruments of measuring job satisfaction.

The empirical analysis applied the global and facet approach concept to the original two-factor structure of the MSQ short form, thus to the intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. The results reveal that employees of the Greek private sector are generally marginally satisfied and that job satisfaction attributed to intrinsic factors is higher than that of extrinsic ones. From the mean scores, under the intrinsic job satisfaction factor, ability utilisation, independence and social status are the items with the highest satisfaction mean scores. Employees are satisfied when they are empowered to use their skills and to work alone, and their perceptions about the importance of their jobs are met. Co-worker relationships and working conditions within the extrinsic factor had the highest satisfaction mean scores. While advancement, compensation, company policies and practices and security are rated low. Hence, private sector managers should focus on these weak points to improve staff satisfaction, as this could affect the organisation's overall performance. Concerning socio-demographic factors, only education has a direct relationship with job satisfaction.

The findings of this study will help human resource professionals and policymakers to focus on real drivers of job satisfaction and to design efficient policies for increasing employee engagement and productivity.

REFERENCES

- Abraham H. Maslow. (1943), "A Theory of Human Motivation", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 50, pp. 370–396.
- Adamopoulos, I.P. and Syrou, N.F. (2022), "Associations and Correlations of Job Stress, Job Satisfaction and Burn out in Public Health Sector", *European Journal of Environment and Public Health*, Vol. 6 No. 2, p. em0113.
- Adams, J.S. (1965), "Inequity In Social Exchange", *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 2 No. C, pp. 267–299.
- Ahmad, M., Khan, A. and Arshad, M. (2021), "Major theories of Job Satisfaction and their use in the field of Librarianship", *Library Philosophy and Practice*, pp. 1–17.
- Anastasiou, S. and Papakonstantinou, G. (2014), "Factors affecting job satisfaction , stress and work performance of secondary education teachers in Giorgos Papakonstantinou", *Int. J. Management in Education*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 37–53.
- Batiou, V. and Valkanos, E. (2013), "Job Satisfaction of Public Administrative Personnel in Greece", *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 3 No. 11, pp. 239–252.
- Bello, S., Adewole, D.A. and Afolabi, R.F. (2020), "Work Facets Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction among Resident Doctors in Selected Teaching Hospitals in Southern Nigeria: A Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Survey", *Journal of Occupational Health and Epidemiology*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 52–60.
- Bowling, N. and Zelazny, L. (2022), "Measuring General Job Satisfaction: Which Is More Construct Valid—Global Scales or Facet-Composite Scales?", *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Journal of Business and Psychology, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 91–105.

- Brayfield, A.H. and Rothe, H.F. (1951), "An index of job satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 35, pp. 305–311.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D. and Klesh, J. (1979), "The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire", University of Michigan, MI.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, G.D. and Klesh, J.R. (1983), "Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members.", in Seashore, S.E., Lawler, E.E., Mirvis, P.H. and Cammann, C. (Eds.), *Assessing Organizational Change*, Wiley, New York, pp. 71–138.
- Caulton, J.R. (2012), "The Development and Use of the Theory of ERG: A Literature Review", *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 2–8.
- Chatzopoulou, M., Vlachvei, A. and Monovasilis, T. (2015), "Employee's Motivation and Satisfaction in Light of Economic Recession: Evidence of Grevena Prefecture-Greece", *Procedia Economics and Finance*, Elsevier B.V., Vol. 24 No. July, pp. 136–145.
- Dinibutun, S.R. (2012), "Work_Motivation_Theoretical_Framework GSTF Business Review (GBR), 1(4), 133", *GSTF Business Review (GBR)*, Vol. 1 No. 4, pp. 133–140.
- Feleki, E., Karamanis, K. and Arnis, N. (2021), "Employee'S Job Satisfaction in Economic Recession: a Descriptive Empirical Analysis in the Greek Public Sector", *Management Research and Practice*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 15–25.
- Garg, K., Dar, I.A. and Mishra, M. (2018), "Job Satisfaction and Work Engagement: A Study Using Private Sector Bank Managers", *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 58–71.
- Giel, T. and Breuer, C. (2023), "The general and facet-specific job satisfaction of voluntary referees based on the model of effort-reward imbalance", *European Sport Management Quarterly*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 1136–1158.
- Glaveli, N., Grigoroudis, E. and Manolitzas, P. (2019), "Practical application of MSQ and MUSA methodology in determining critical job satisfaction factors of seasonal employees in summer destination luxury resorts", *Tourism Management*, Elsevier, Vol. 74 No. April, pp. 426–437.
- Gunlu, E., Aksarayli, M. and Perçin, N.Ş. (2010), "Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of hotel managers in Turkey", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 693–717.
- Hackman, J.R. and Oldham, G.R. (1976), "Motivation through the design of work: test of a theory", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 250–279.
- Hancer, M. and George, R.T. (2003), "Job Satisfaction Of Restaurant Employees: An Empirical Investigation Using The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire", *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 85–100.
- Hashim, A. (2022), "An Intense Bibliographical Study of Job Satisfaction Theories in The Private vis-a-vis Public Sector of Banks An Intense Bibliographical Study of Job Satisfaction Theories in The Private vis-a-vis Public Sector of Banks", *World Wide Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 125–128.
- Hirschfeld, R.R. (2000), "Does revising the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire short form make a difference?", *Validity Studies*, Vol. 60 No. 2, pp. 255–270.
- Hong, T.T. and Waheed, A. (2011), "Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene and Job Satisfaction in the Malaysian Retail Sector: Mediating effect of love of money", *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 73–94.
- Hoppock, R. (1935), *Job Satisfaction*, Harper.

- Hora, G.P.R., Júnior, R.R. and Souza, M.A. De. (2018), "State of the art of job satisfaction measures: A systematic review", *Trends in Psychology*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 987–1002.
- Hulin, C.L. and Judge, T.A. (2003), "Job attitudes", *Handbook of Psychology: Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 12, pp. 255–276.
- Inoyatova, S. (2021), "The Job Satisfaction: A Review Of Widely Used Measures and Indexes-Palarch's", *Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 456–464.
- Ironson, G.H., Smith, P.C., Branick, M.T., Gibson, W.M. and Paul, K.B. (1989), "Construction of a job in general scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 74, pp. 193–200.
- Judge, T.A. and Klinger, R. (2008), "Job Satisfaction: Subjective Well-Being at Work", in Eid, M. and Larsen, R.J. (Eds.), *The Science of Subjective Well-Being*, The Guilford Press, New York, pp. 393–413.
- Kalleberg, A.L. (1977), "Work Values and Job Rewards : A Theory of Job Satisfaction", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 124–143.
- Kara, D., Uysal, M. and Magnini, V.P. (2012), "Gender differences on job satisfaction of the five-star hotel employees: The case of the Turkish hotel industry", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 24 No. 7, pp. 1047–1065.
- Karamanis, K., Arnis, N. and Pappa, P. (2019), "Impact of working environment on job satisfaction: Evidence from Greek Public Sector", *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 5–21.
- Karanikola, Z., Koutsopoulou, X. and Panagiotopoulos, G. (2021), "Factors of Job Satisfaction: The case of Former Technological Educational Institute (TEI) of Western Greece", *International Journal of Educational Innovation*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 63–72.
- Kay, P. (2003), "Consumer motivation in a tourism context: Continuing the work of Maslow, Rokeach, Vroom, Deci, Haley and others", in Low Chapman, Ross L. and Sloan, Terry R., D.R. (Ed.), *Marketing Discoveries, Knowledge and Contribution : Proceedings of the 2003 Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference*, Vol. 30, ANZMAC, Deakin University, pp. 600–614.
- Kelley, H.H. (1973), "The Process of Causal Attribution", *American Psychologist*, No. February, pp. 107–128.
- Kian, T.S., Fauziah, W., Yusoff, W., Rajah, S. and Education, V. (2014), "Of Satisfaction and Motivation", *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 94–102.
- Kunin, T. (1955), "The creation of a new type of attitude measure", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 65–77.
- Lawler, E., Cammann, C., Nadler, D. and Jenkins, D. (1975), "Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ)", US.
- Locke, E.A. (1969), "What is job satisfaction?", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 309–336.
- Locke, E.A. (1976), "The nature and causes of job satisfaction", in Dunette, M.D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Rand McNally, Chicago, pp. 1297–1343.
- Martins, H. and Proença, M.T. (2014), *Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire: Psychometric Properties and Validation in a Population of Portuguese Hospital Workers*, No. 471, *Investigação e Intervenção Em Recursos Humanos*, available at: <https://doi.org/10.26537/iirh.v0i3.1825>.
- Mueller, C.W. and Kim, S.W. (2008), "The contented female worker: Still a paradox?", *Advances in Group Processes*, Vol. 25 No. 08, pp. 117–149.
- Navy, S.L. (2021), "Theory of Human Motivation-Abraham Maslow", in Akpan, B. and Kennedy, T.J. (Eds.), *Science Education in Theory and Practice An Introductory Guide to Learning Theory*, Springer, pp. 17–28.

- Osemeke, M. and Adegboyega, S. (2017), "Critical Review and Comparism between Maslow, Herzberg and McClelland's Theory of Needs", *Funai Journal of Accounting*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 161–173.
- Oshagbemi, T. (1999), "Overall job satisfaction: How good are single versus multiple-item measures?", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 14 No. 5, pp. 388–403.
- Panagiotopoulos, G., Petta, E. and Karanikola, Z. (2018), "The contribution of motivation to job satisfaction: A Survey of Technological Educational Institute Employees of Western Greece", *European Journal of Training and Development Studies*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 18–26.
- Saari, L.M. and Judge, T.A. (2004), "Employee attitudes and job satisfaction", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 395–407.
- Saner, T. and Eyupoglu, S.Z. (2015), "The Job Satisfaction of Bank Employees in North Cyprus", *Procedia Economics and Finance*, Elsevier B.V., Vol. 23 No. October 2014, pp. 1457–1460.
- Scarpello, V. and Cambell, J.P. (1983), "Job Satisfaction: Are All the Parts There?", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 577–600.
- Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M. and Hulin, C.L. (1969), *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*, Rand McNally, Chicago.
- Spector, P.E. (1985), "Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey", *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 13 No. 6, pp. 693–713.
- Spector, P.E. (1997), *Job Satisfaction. Thousands Oaks.*, Sage, GA.
- Spector, P.E. (2022), *Job Satisfaction: From Assessment to Intervention*, Routledge.
- Thiagaraj, D. and Thangaswamy, A. (2017), "Theoretical Concept of Job Satisfaction - a Study", *International Journal of Research -GRANTHAALAYAH*, Vol. 5 No. 6, pp. 464–470.
- Toker, B. (2011), "Job satisfaction of academic staff: An empirical study on Turkey", *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 156–169.
- Vroom, V.H. (1964), *Work and Motivation*, Wiley, New York.
- Wanous, J.P. and Reichers, A.E. (1996), "Estimating the reliability of a single-item measure", *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 78 No. 2, pp. 631–634.
- Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R. V. and England, G.W. (1967), *Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire--Long Form*, *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, Vol. 22, Washington, D.C.
- Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R. V., England, G.W. and Lofquist, L. (1977), *Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire--Short Form*, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*.