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Abstract

Despite a large volume of research regarding job satisfaction, there appears to be inconsistencies between theory and measurement. Locke’s (1976) Range-of-Affect theory in particular has generated considerable support, particularly for the notion that separately assessing facet importance is redundant since it can supposedly be inferred from satisfaction magnitude. This study first sought to test that inference. Additionally, it is argued that satisfaction measures consisting of prescribed facets (e.g., the Job Descriptive Index; JDI) are incomplete in that respondents may value facets they do not include, or value facets to different degrees, making it difficult to determine which facets should receive priority in an organizational intervention.

Accordingly, a sample of 153 employees at a large Midwestern company were presented with a survey allowing them to choose important facets for which to indicate their satisfaction and importance levels (the Job Satisfaction Assessment; JSA), measures of organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviors, absenteeism, and intentions to turnover, as well as the JDI, to determine if the JDI or JSA better predicted the outcome variables. After response analysis, it appeared that although facet importance and satisfaction were correlated, many respondents indicated they were moderately satisfied with an important facet, casting doubt on Locke’s (1976) proposal that importance could be inferred from satisfaction. Additionally, the JDI accounted for incremental variance in organizational commitment and citizenship behaviors, and both the JDI and JSA accounted for incremental variance in intentions to turnover. Neither survey was predictive of absenteeism. Implications and future research needs are discussed.
Chapter I

Review of Literature

Job satisfaction is among the oldest and most researched variables in Industrial-Organizational Psychology. Although various definitions have been proposed, job satisfaction can be generally conceptualized as the degree to which an individual is content with his or her job. This contentment likely results from a job fulfilling an employee’s needs and values. Although some may state that increasing employee job satisfaction is simply the “right thing to do”, research suggests that satisfying employees is more than merely a benevolent organizational gesture, and that satisfied employees should be viewed as an investment that will yield financial and behavioral returns in excess of their dissatisfied counterparts (Saari & Judge, 2004).

Researchers have identified multiple correlates of job satisfaction that should be of interest to organizations. Judge et al. (2001) reviewed 301 studies, and found that the corrected correlation between job satisfaction and job performance was .30. This correlation is higher than previously thought (correlation of .17 reported by Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985), and indicates that job satisfaction has a meaningful effect on job performance. Satisfied employees are also less likely to be excessively absent from work or quit their job entirely (Hackett & Guion, 1985; Kohler & Mathieu, 1993), and Saari and Judge (2004) reported that the approximate correlation between job satisfaction and absenteeism and turnover collectively was -.25.

Furthermore, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) have demonstrated a relationship with job satisfaction. OCBs refer to voluntary, altruistic behaviors such as helping a coworker with a heavy workload, or refilling a copier with paper rather than leaving it for
someone else. A meta-analysis conducted by Organ and Ryan (1995) reported that OCBs were robust predictors of job satisfaction, and in fact were more strongly related to satisfaction than was job performance. Organizational commitment (OC) is another desirable employee quality, and refers to an employee’s sense of attachment to their organization. Bateman and Strasser (1984) reported that organizational commitment was significantly correlated to job satisfaction.

Because of the potential benefits of a satisfied workforce, accurately assessing and efficiently increasing job satisfaction should be an organizational priority. Organizations commonly assess facet satisfaction (satisfaction with a particular aspect of a job) because such an assessment can reveal specific areas of employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Prominent facet measures such as the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), and Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) assess satisfaction with standardized and prescribed facets. Although the JDI, MSQ, JSS, and similar measures have demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties, there seems to be a discrepancy between these measures and the literary understanding of job satisfaction.

The JDI, MSQ, and similar measures only assess facet satisfaction, and do not assess facet importance. Such measures would be appropriate if it could be guaranteed that respondents equally and exclusively valued the prescribed facets included in these measures, but individuals are likely to value a wide variety of facets. Hence, assessing satisfaction with only a portion of valued facets may give an incomplete picture of satisfaction. This proposition was supported by Scarpello and Campbell (1983), who found that the summation of satisfaction scores with prescribed facets did not equate to overall satisfaction. Consequently, since prescribed facet measures are likely to give an incomplete picture of satisfaction, the degree of this incompleteness is difficult to determine if facet importance is not assessed.
A model of job satisfaction incorporating facet importance was proposed by Locke (1976), which presented satisfaction as the interaction of facet importance and the discrepancy between facet amount desired and facet amount received. Accordingly, the current study proposes that to be of maximum utility, satisfaction measures should assess the value employees place on a job facet as well as satisfaction with that facet.

Proposed Satisfaction Models

In order for satisfaction to be of maximum utility, organizations must be able to influence employee satisfaction. This necessitates knowledge of both the specific determinants of satisfaction as well as the manner in which these determinants interact to satisfy employees. This has given rise to content theories, which attempt to identify specific work facets that influence satisfaction, and to process theories that offer models or processes by which individual satisfaction is determined independently of specific work facets. A selection of prominent and thoroughly researched satisfaction theories will now be discussed.

Content Theories

Motivator-Hygiene Theory (M-HT). Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) proposed job satisfaction was derived from the presence of desirable intrinsic job aspects (Motivators) and the absence of undesirable extrinsic aspects (Hygienes). Motivators, according to Herzberg et al., act only to satisfy and their absence causes no dissatisfaction, whereas Hygienes can only dissatisfy, but their fulfillment causes no satisfaction. Thus, highest overall satisfaction arises from the fulfillment of Motivators and lack of unfulfilled Hygienes. Herzberg et al. based this theory on the responses of 200 professionals who were asked to describe instances when they were satisfied and dissatisfied with their jobs. These responses were factor-analyzed to distill general groups of Motivators such as the work itself, achievement, and
promotion and Hygenes such as salary, coworker relations, and working conditions. It should be noted that Motivators and Hygenes were classified according to the general sample response trends, and a particular facet should not be considered universally dichotomous.

Herzberg's original M-HT and its extension to psychological and physiological needs has been criticized on several counts, specifically that a fundamental attribution error may lead individuals to take undue credit for satisfying events while unduly blaming others for dissatisfaction (Vroom, 1964). Such biases may have caused the incorrect assignment of a particular facet as a Motivator or Hygiene. Research also suggests dispositional factors may influence the value placed on Motivators and Hygenes in that some people may strive for satisfaction whereas others may focus their energies on the avoidance of dissatisfaction (Gray, 1975; Gupta, 1976; Furnham, 1999). Additionally, subsequent research failed to replicate Herzberg's findings using alternate methodology (House & Wigdor, 1967).

Despite this criticism, a valuable contribution of M-HT is the implicit inclusion of importance in the M-HT model. Rather than ask respondents to report their satisfaction with a number of prescribed job facets, Herzberg et al. incorporated an open-ended, free-response based questionnaire. Using this methodology, individuals likely reported satisfaction levels of the job aspects to which they ascribed the highest importance because satisfaction or dissatisfaction with an important facet was more salient than with irrelevant facets. This methodology also assumed that the individual, rather than the researcher, could more competently and completely assess the state of his or her satisfaction if given a minimally-constrained opportunity to do so.

Additional Discussion of Importance. In an attempt to identify specific facets of job satisfaction, Maslow (1954; revised, 1970) proposed a need-hierarchy composed of five need classes, and that satisfaction with more basic needs must reach a threshold before an individual
will be concerned with needs at the next hierarchical order. This model has been criticized on multiple counts (Locke, 1976), and subsequent research has found little support for Maslow’s hierarchy (Blackler & Williams, 1971; Lawler & Suttle, 1972; Hackman & Oldham, 1976). However, Maslow’s model merits mention despite these criticisms because it passively included importance, in that more dominant needs (and values) could be conceptualized as more important because their fulfillment is necessary for higher order value attainment.

Alderfer (1969) proposed an alternative to Maslow’s hierarchy which conceptualized existence (E), relatedness (R), and growth (G) as stages of satisfaction similar to Maslow’s hierarchy. In this model, existence referred to physiological and safety needs, relatedness referred to social and external esteem, and growth referred to internal esteem and self-actualization. Unlike Maslow’s hierarchy, however, the ERG model did not require lower level stages to be partially or completely fulfilled before an individual could be concerned with higher stages. Thus, although the ERG model differentiated between needs and values, it did not incorporate importance to the same degree as Maslow’s hierarchy because progression from existence to growth did not necessitate lower stage fulfillment.

**Process Theories**

**Value Theory.** Locke (1976) defined “value” as something a person desires or seeks to attain that is not necessary for survival, and proceeded to differentiate needs from values in that needs are necessary for survival and their necessity persists independently of an individual’s cognition. Whereas all individuals have similar need requirements, values are acquired and modified throughout a lifetime (Locke, 1976), implying different people value different things.

Rand (1966) theorized that a value was composed of the value’s target, that which is actually being valued, and the intensity with which it is desired. Locke (1969; 1976) extended
this conceptualization of values to satisfaction and proposed that satisfaction was the end result of both the importance placed on a facet and the comparison of the desired amount of the facet to the amount actually being received. According to this model, highest satisfaction results from receiving the desired amount of an important facet whereas greatest dissatisfaction results from receiving too much or too little of an important facet. Locke (1976) observed that the function derived from the interaction of desired amount and importance was facet-specific, in that facet amount desired may display a linear relationship or a bell-shaped relationship with satisfaction. For example, satisfaction with facets normally desirable in greater quantities, such as pay, are linearly correlated to the amount received whereas other facets of which a moderate amount is most desirable, such as environment temperature, display a bell-shaped relationship with satisfaction because extreme values often dissatisfy employees (such as a workplace that is very hot or cold). In both cases, however, the slope of the function depends on the importance placed on the facet such that higher importance yields higher levels of satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Locke then concluded that when measuring satisfaction, it would be redundant to separately and explicitly assess facet importance because the magnitude of satisfaction reported implicitly includes facet importance. Simply put, Locke proposed that the importance placed on a facet limits the possible magnitude of facet satisfaction such that for facets of no importance, satisfaction would be only moderate at most. However, for facets that are important, the entire range of satisfaction levels (ranging from extremely satisfied to extremely dissatisfied) may be experienced. Thus, Locke proposed that facet importance may be inferred from the magnitude of facet satisfaction.

**Range of Affect Theory.** The Range of Affect (RoA) Theory represents a combination of two previous theories of satisfaction presented by Vroom (1964). The Subtractive Model
presented satisfaction as a derivation of the discrepancy between the desired and received
amount of a facet, whereas the Multiplicative Model presented satisfaction as the product of the
facet amount received and the facet’s importance. According to Locke (1976), the Subtractive
Model, which excluded importance, was insufficient because a discrepancy between the desired
and received amounts of a facet is meaningless for a facet on which zero importance is placed.
Similarly, according to Locke, the Multiplicative Model was inadequate as well because it did
not assess desired-received discrepancy making it impossible to know whether an individual is
receiving an insufficient, adequate, or excess amount of a facet. In order to accurately determine
satisfaction, Locke proposed that both the desired-received discrepancy and facet importance
must be assessed. A mathematical representation of RoA Theory follows (Equation 1), with $S$
representing satisfaction, $Vc$ representing the facet content including the amount desired, $P$
representing the facet amount received, and $Vi$ representing the facet’s importance:

$$S = (Vc - P) \times (Vi)$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

Subsequent research has supported the postulates of RoA Theory. Rice, Markus, Moyer,
and McFarlin (1991) found that, consistent with RoA hypotheses, want-have discrepancy had a
stronger relationship with satisfaction when the facet was highly important and a weaker
relationship when the facet was minimally important. Rice et al. (1991) concurred with Locke
(1976) that importance is implicitly included in an evaluation of satisfaction by serving as a
moderator between discrepancy and satisfaction, and that separately assessing facet importance
was statistically redundant and did not increase the capability to predict overall job satisfaction.

McFarlin and Rice (1992) tested RoA Theory with both student and employee samples
and found support for RoA Theory in three separate areas. The authors found that perceived
have-want discrepancy significantly increased accountable variance for job satisfaction in all
eight job facets, and that when workers placed high importance on a facet they were more satisfied with a small have-want discrepancy and more dissatisfied with a large have-want discrepancy than when the facet was minimally important. Finally, McFarlin and Rice found no evidence for the effect of importance on overall satisfaction, indicating that the strength of the relationship between facet satisfaction and overall satisfaction did not vary based on facet importance. McFarlin and Rice stressed, however, that the lack of influence of importance on overall job satisfaction did not indicate importance is unimportant but rather that importance moderates the relationship between satisfaction and the evaluation of have-want discrepancy.

McFarlin, Coster, Rice, and Cooper (1995) examined RoA theory in a sample of South African employees to test its generalizability to a non-American population. These authors found that 11 of 12 perceived discrepancy by facet importance interactions were significant, and that these significant interactions demonstrated the basic pattern of regression slopes predicted by RoA Theory. For instance, respondents placing high importance on a facet were more satisfied with when a high level of the facet was received and more dissatisfied when a small amount of the facet was received. These results support the proposed interaction between facet importance and discrepancy, per RoA Theory, in a non-American sample.

From Locke’s (1976) proposal and subsequent confirmatory studies, three general rules of RoA Theory can be identified. First, perceived have-want discrepancy is significantly related to facet satisfaction (Rice, McFarlin, & Bennett, 1989; McFarlin & Rice, 1992). Second, facet importance serves to moderate the relationship between have-want discrepancy and facet satisfaction such that a greater range of satisfaction magnitudes may be experienced for a facet of high personal importance (McFarlin & Rice, 1992). Third, separately assessing facet importance is statistically redundant because importance is already “counted” in the moderating relationship
between discrepancy and satisfaction as previously discussed (McFarlin & Rice, 1992; McFarlin et al. 1995; Rice et al., 1991) (Wu & Yao, 2006).

**Criticism of Range-of-Affect Theory**

Although research suggests that explicitly measuring facet importance is statistically redundant due to the implicit inclusion of importance via satisfaction magnitude (i.e., *very dissatisfied* or *very satisfied* representing extreme satisfaction magnitudes), this view may be contested. Although it may be true that importance *places limits* on the magnitude of satisfaction experienced, by attempting to infer facet importance from satisfaction magnitude, one assumes that important facets *always* induce extreme satisfaction levels. This view does not consider the possibility that an individual may, in fact, only be moderately satisfied with an important facet. Simply put, the possibility of experiencing more extreme satisfaction levels does not guarantee that important facets will always be extremely satisfying or dissatisfying. This could be problematic because there is no way to distinguish, in terms of importance, between moderate satisfaction with an unimportant facet (because satisfaction can be nothing else, since the facet is unimportant) and moderate satisfaction with a very important facet (because the individual is in fact only moderately satisfied). This creates difficulty for organizations attempting to increase satisfaction because intervening on a facet of little importance will likely have only a minimal impact on satisfaction.

Even if, for the sake of argument, it is accepted that separately assessing facet importance is *statistically* redundant, this alone is not a compelling reason to not assess importance because, from an organizational perspective, assessing importance is not *practically* redundant. In situations in which facet satisfaction magnitude is not extreme, the only way to determine which
facet is more important (and should therefore receive interventional priority) is to separately assess facet importance.

Interestingly, RoA Theory's mathematical representation, as presented by Locke (1976), is also inconsistent with RoA Theory. Recall again that Locke's mathematical representation of facet satisfaction was $S = (Vc - P) \times (Vi)$, where $S$ represents satisfaction, $Vc$ represents the facet content including the amount desired, $P$ represents the facet amount received, and $Vi$ represents facet importance. As an example, if an individual desires 10 units of a particular job facet and receives 8, and this individual places an importance of 10 (on a 1-10 scale) on this facet, the RoA satisfaction equation will yield a satisfaction value of 20 for this facet. Now, consider that this person again desires 10 units of the facet yet this time only receives 6, and places an importance of 5 on the facet. In this situation, the calculated satisfaction level is again 20. However, according to RoA theory, the first situation (small want-have discrepancy and high importance) should be much more satisfying than the second situation (larger want-have discrepancy and lower importance). Yet with the presented equation, these opposite scenarios yield the same calculated satisfaction level. Using this formula, it would be difficult to accurately target satisfaction interventions because it is likely a calculated facet satisfaction level may not be reflective of true satisfaction relative to other facets. It would also be difficult to compare satisfaction levels across facets to determine the facets with which employees are most and least satisfied since the same satisfaction level may be calculated in two nonequivalent scenarios.

Although both Equation 2 and the RoA equation are limited due to the capability to derive a result ($y$) an infinite number of ways using an equation of the form $y = a \times b$, it may be argued that one should not compare the absolute satisfaction levels of two unique situations, and that instead, each situation should be considered independently. If this requirement is satisfied,
the appropriateness of the satisfaction formula may be evaluated by observing the pattern of results obtained when either discrepancy or importance is varied while the other is held constant. When discrepancy is held constant and importance is varied, the RoA equation yields satisfaction results with a magnitude proportional to the level of importance placed on the facet, in that higher importance levels tend to increase the magnitude of satisfaction. This pattern of results is consistent with RoA theory. However, when discrepancy is varied and importance is controlled, the directionality of the satisfaction levels obtained from the RoA equation contradicts RoA theory. For example, if an individual desires 10 units of a facet and receives 8, and this individual places an importance of 10 on this facet, the RoA equation yields a satisfaction value of 20. Now, consider that this person again desires 10 units of the facet and this time only receives 6, yet continues to place an importance of 10 on the facet. In this situation, when the want-have discrepancy is doubled, the calculated satisfaction level also doubles to 40. This makes a facet satisfaction score calculated by this method inconsistent with RoA Theory, which proposes that high satisfaction should result from a low want-have discrepancy and high importance. In this situation, however, high discrepancy (while holding importance constant) serves to increase, rather than decrease, the calculated satisfaction.

This mathematical criticism is not an indictment of RoA Theory per se, merely the corresponding facet satisfaction equation as presented in Locke (1976). The relationship between importance and satisfaction, per RoA theory, may be more accurately represented through the division of 1 by the have-want discrepancy. This amended formula (Equation 2),

$$ S = \frac{1}{(Vc-P)} \times (Vi) \quad (2) $$

more appropriately represents the interaction of discrepancy and importance because dividing 1 by the discrepancy value yields a lower calculated satisfaction level for a given facet importance.
when the have-want discrepancy is large. For instance, using the same values as in the first example with Equation 2, a desired amount of 10, received amount of 8 and importance of 10 yields a satisfaction of 5, whereas a desired amount of 10, received amount of 6, and importance of 5 yields a theoretically-appropriate lower satisfaction score of 1.25. If importance is controlled while want-have discrepancy is varied, Equation 2 still conforms to the postulates of RoA Theory. For example, if 10 units are desired and 8 are received, and an importance of 10 is placed on the facet, Equation 2 yields a satisfaction of 5. Yet, if the discrepancy amount is doubled (desired amount of 10, received amount of 6), and importance remains 10, Equation 2 yields an appropriately lower satisfaction level of 2.5. These results contrast to the original RoA equation in which a small discrepancy decreases calculated satisfaction. Table 1 illustrates the results obtained from Equation 1 and Equation 2 when discrepancy and importance are varied.

However, it is usually only appropriate to control discrepancy or importance when testing a facet satisfaction equation to determine if it produces satisfaction levels consistent with RoA Theory in both directionality and magnitude. In reality, both discrepancy and importance are able to vary simultaneously. Much of the value in assessing facet satisfaction lies in the ability of organizations to then intervene to raise the satisfaction level of important facets with which employees are least satisfied. This necessitates comparisons of absolute facet satisfaction levels. It would be perfectly appropriate to conclude that, for example, employees were twice as dissatisfied with pay as with supervision levels. Such a result would compel a stronger intervention on pay than on altering supervisory practices.

Finally, although Equation 2 may still allow the same satisfaction level to be calculated from different discrepancy and importance values, the directionality of the results is consistent with RoA Theory. For example, if a person desires 10 units of a facet and receives 9.9, and
Table 1

*Example Satisfaction Outcomes from Equation 1 (RoA) and Equation 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equation 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equation 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
places an importance of 1 on the facet, Equation 2 yields a satisfaction of 10 for this facet. Likewise, if 10 units are desired and 9 are received, and an importance of 10 is ascribed, the satisfaction level is again 10. These results are appropriate, however, and demonstrate that Equation 2 continues to balance discrepancy and importance, in that an extremely small discrepancy may "compensate" for a lower ascribed importance, and that high importance may also "compensate" for a proportionally larger discrepancy. This is congruent with RoA Theory in that, all things being equal, low discrepancy and high importance should each be related to higher satisfaction levels.

A potential miscalculation of satisfaction may have costly implications for organizations because if an individual has a high facet discrepancy and considers the facet relatively unimportant then an organizational intervention on that particular facet is likely not required. However, a situation of moderate discrepancy but high importance may require an intervention. Accurately calculating satisfaction is, therefore, advantageous to both theory and practice.

**Job Satisfaction as a Trait**

The degree to which organizations can effectively leverage employee job satisfaction is also partially dependent on the composition of satisfaction. Components of satisfaction may be grouped into those attributable to individual differences and those attributable to environment. Environmental factors such as pay and working conditions have received much more research attention than have individual differences, and environmental variables often compose a large portion of facet satisfaction assessments (Bowling, Hendricks, & Wagner, 2008). Although it is likely that environmental influences account for a large proportion of satisfaction variance (Gerhart, 1987), research suggests dispositional influences may account for significant job satisfaction variance as well (Staw & Ross, 1985).
Indeed, if there were no dispositional components of job satisfaction then employees’ satisfaction levels would be exclusively subject to post-hire actions and all employees would respond similarly to a given situation or intervention. The fact that individuals’ responses are often dissimilar suggests disposition may have a powerful influence on satisfaction. Furthermore, these dispositional influences likely result from different preferences, or perceived importance, of different job facets. As Locke (1976) proposed, assessing discrepancy but not importance is meaningless because a facet of zero importance will have, at most, a minimal effect on overall job satisfaction. Thus, because individuals are unique and likely value different job facets to varying degrees, facet importance must be assessed in order to account for the influence of disposition on job satisfaction.

Moreover, research has identified a degree of temporal job satisfaction stability, which supports the proposition that disposition influences satisfaction across different work environments. Staw and Ross (1985) conducted a longitudinal study utilizing occupational data gathered annually from 5,000 middle-aged men. Staw and Ross coded the degree of job change experienced by each man and compared the amount of change to job satisfaction. Results indicated a significant relationship in job satisfaction levels over three and five years with correlations to the baseline year of .32 and .29 respectively. The authors also reported that satisfaction levels remained correlated in the presence of environmental changes of varying magnitudes, although greater levels of change did reduce job satisfaction consistency. Finally, Staw and Ross found that satisfaction level prior to environmental change was a stronger predictor of future satisfaction than either changes in pay or changes in job status. Despite the specific nature of the sample allowing only limited generalizability as well as the use of an admittedly unsophisticated measure of job satisfaction, results suggested that, depending on the
time span and degree of job change, up to 25% of satisfaction variance was attributable to disposition.

Yet, the assertion that dispositional components of job satisfaction comprise a meaningful portion of the construct is not made without contention. Gerhart (1987) conducted a longitudinal study similar to Staw and Ross (1985), and analyzed satisfaction levels of over 12,000 male and female respondents between the ages of 17 and 24 over a three year span. Given that this sample was more likely to undergo drastic job changes than a sample of middle aged men, Gerhart asserted this would more clearly reveal any dispositional influence on satisfaction. Contrary to Staw and Ross (1985), Gerhart reported a stronger correlation between satisfaction and pay, as well as a significant correlation between job satisfaction and job complexity. Additionally, Gerhart found that when both job and employer changed, prior satisfaction levels accounted for only about 4% of job satisfaction variance rather than the up to 25% reported by Staw and Ross. Although Gerhart stopped short of proposing that disposition had no influence on job satisfaction, he was clear in his belief that disposition had much less of an influence on job satisfaction than did environmental factors.

When taken together, it appears that disposition does have some influence on job satisfaction, although the magnitude of that influence is debatable. Accepting this dispositional component, the next task was then to identify specific dispositional traits that may be related to satisfaction rather than treating disposition as an ambiguous elemental variable. One such trait that has been extensively studied is negative affectivity (NA). Individuals high in NA tend to experience frequent or intense feelings of distress, anxiety, and low self-concept, whereas individuals low on NA tend to be more secure and content (Watson & Clark, 1984). NA has been shown to be a significant predictor of both overall and facet satisfaction. A meta-analysis by
Connolly and Viswesvaran (2000) found a corrected correlation of -.33 between NA and overall satisfaction, and a more recent meta-analysis conducted by Thoresen et al. (2003) reported a mean corrected correlation of -.34 between NA and overall satisfaction. A third meta-analysis by Bowling et al. (2008) found that NA displayed corrected correlations of -.28 for satisfaction with the work itself, -.19 for satisfaction with supervision, -.22 for satisfaction with co-workers, -.12 for satisfaction with pay, and -.13 for satisfaction with promotional opportunities. The results of these meta-analyses support a view in which a portion of variance in job satisfaction can be attributed to individuals’ unique dispositional preferences.

In addition to the previously discussed studies, other research also suggests job satisfaction is, to an extent, dispositionally dependent. Staw, Bell, and Clausen (1986) identified a link between childhood temperament and job satisfaction in adult life, and Judge, Bono, and Locke (2000) reported that core self-evaluations measured in childhood and early adulthood were predictive of adult job satisfaction. Finally, a meta-analysis conducted by Judge et al. (2002) of over 100 samples reported a multiple correlation of .41 between the Big Five personality traits and job satisfaction, and Furnham et al.’s (2008) findings suggested work reorganization without consideration of individual differences would likely be unsuccessful.

The key point to be taken from the dispositional-environmental debate is the volume of support for the notion that job satisfaction is at least partially dispositionally dependent. If job satisfaction were free of dispositional influence, individuals could be expected to identically react to environmental stimuli, but this is certainly not reflective of reality because people vary in their interpretation and acceptance of the same job aspects, job changes, and satisfaction interventions. Thus, it seems unwise to ignore these dispositional differences in an attempt to force standardization on the satisfaction construct. Rather, the influence of disposition on job
satisfaction suggests that job satisfaction measures should explicitly assess facet importance. This would account for individuals' uniquely-composed satisfaction constructs, rather than ignoring individual differences by requiring strict conformity to prescribed facets of measurement that may not be salient to all respondents. Furthermore, by identifying facets that are important, organizations may be able to design and better target interventions that will more profoundly affect satisfaction.

**Satisfaction Measurement**

Despite the aforementioned research supporting the relevance of importance to job satisfaction, many prominent facet satisfaction measures do not assess facet importance. For example, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) assesses satisfaction with five job-relevant facets: pay; coworker relations; supervision; promotional opportunities; and the work itself. The 72 items on the JDI are either single words or short phrases and respondents indicate if the item accurately describes their job by answering *yes*, *no*, or *?*. However, the JDI neither assesses facet importance nor allows respondents to explicitly report satisfaction. These omissions make it difficult to determine if the facets being measured are meaningful to the individual since importance is not explicitly assessed.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is another prominent facet satisfaction measure and is conceptually similar to the JDI. The MSQ assesses satisfaction with 20 facets via a long form containing 100 questions or a short form measuring the 20 facets with 20 questions. Respondents indicate their satisfaction with each facet on a five-point scale ranging from *very satisfied* to *very dissatisfied*, and the scale offers a neutral response as well. However, the MSQ does not assess facet importance. Since satisfaction is explicitly assessed, importance may be inferred in cases of extreme satisfaction magnitude (i.e., responses of *very satisfied* or *very*
dissatisfied) per RoA theory. Yet, if satisfaction is moderate, relative and absolute facet importance cannot be determined since facet importance is not explicitly assessed.

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) is a third prominent facet satisfaction measure. Similarly to the JDI and MSQ, the JSS assesses satisfaction with 9 prescribed facets via 36 questions. Respondents indicate satisfaction on a Likert-type scale with no neutral point. The lack of a neutral point is generally favored by organizations because it forces respondents to “choose a side” (i.e., satisfied or dissatisfied) but is generally less favored by respondents for the same reason. As with both the JDI and MSQ, the JSS does not separately assess facet importance, and for this the JSS is subject to the same shortcomings as the JDI and MSQ.

Although there are additional measures of facet satisfaction (e.g., the Index of Organizational Reactions), most follow the general methodology of those discussed here by assessing satisfaction with prescribed facets but not assessing facet importance. It could be argued that these measures are not, in fact, contrary to the theoretical understanding of job satisfaction per RoA theory, since RoA theory advocates not separately assessing facet importance apart from facet satisfaction. This argument would be more convincing if these measures assessed each individual variable of the RoA equation, such as facet amount desired, amount received, and importance. This methodology would guarantee importance is at least considered once, and that it is also considered separately from the facet amounts desired and received. However, it is less clear if merely asking about facet satisfaction induces consideration of importance, or only consideration of the want-have discrepancy. Regardless, separately assessing facet importance seems to remove a great deal of ambiguity from this issue.

A meta-analysis of research on the JDI by Kinicki et al. (2002) reported acceptable reliability and validity values, the MSQ was largely psychometrically equivalent to the JDI, and
that both measures were found to account for significant portions of job satisfaction variance. Additionally, the prescribed facets included in these measures have broad applicability, and it is likely that most respondents ascribe them some degree of importance. However, as has been previously argued, it is highly unlikely all respondents ascribe the same level of importance to all of the facets comprising job satisfaction.

As an illustration of the appropriateness of considering facet importance, Highhouse and Becker (1993) compared the responses on a single item overall satisfaction measure, a prescribed facet measure generated in-house, and employee-submitted items not covered by the prescribed facet measure. The authors reported that the employee-submitted items accounted for up to 6% additional variance in overall job satisfaction above and beyond the prescribed facet measure. A key point of Highhouse and Becker’s research is that even a prescribed facet measure generated in-house is not likely to be inclusive of all facets that contribute to employees’ overall satisfaction, and that it may be beneficial to allow employees a degree of facet choice. Although Highhouse and Becker did not separately assess facet importance, their methodology represents a step in the right direction, since the employee-chosen facets were likely ones the employees considered important.

Highhouse and Becker (1993) also compared overall satisfaction with a benefits package to satisfaction with each specific benefit (facet) of the package. If satisfaction with all facets of the package correlated highly to overall package satisfaction, it would suggest that an all-encompassing facet job satisfaction measure would, when summed, correlate highly with overall job satisfaction. The authors instead found that the summation of facet benefit satisfaction accounted for less than 25% of variance in the overall measure. Although this may at first seem to suggest that overall satisfaction is more than the sum of its parts (and by extension, an all-
encompassing facet measure may not be a vast improvement over prescribed facet measures), it should be noted that each benefit was not weighted by importance. This may have artifically reduced the correlation between facet and overall measures if a particular benefit was not important to an individual yet was equally weighted with those that were important. For example, an individual may place little value on the vision portion of their healthcare package if they are covered under a better vision package held by their spouse, yet in Highhouse and Becker’s study, vision would be equally weighted with other benefits which the individual did consider important.

There also seems to be discrepancy between the survey format adopted by most satisfaction measures such as the JDI, MSQ, IOR, JSS and similar measures, and alternative formats appearing in published research. The aforementioned measures employ a multiple-item format, with several items intended to measure satisfaction with the same facet. However, Wanous et al. (1997) found that single-item measures of overall satisfaction were highly correlated (uncorrected \( r = .63 \)) with multiple-item measures. Wanous et al. also identified practical advantages of single-item measures, such as: single-item measures require less space and time to complete; single-item measures may be more cost-effective; and single-item measures may be more face valid. Nagy (2002) compared multiple-item and single-item measures of facet satisfaction, and found that the single-item measure was significantly correlated to the facets of the multiple-item measure (in this study the JDI represented the multiple-item measure, and correlations ranged from .60 to .72). Nagy also reported that in some cases, the single-item measure accounted for incremental variance in employees’ intentions to turnover, and self-reported job performance. Additionally, Nagy suggested that single-item measures are more easily tailored to specific organizational needs because they do not require a
factor analysis of potential items or validation studies. Given these advantages, and the
psychometric similarity of single and multiple-item measures, it is somewhat surprising that the
most popular facet satisfaction measures exclusively employ a multiple-item format.

Consequently, the purpose of this study was to construct and evaluate a facet satisfaction
measure in which facet importance was explicitly assessed, and respondents were allowed to
choose the facets for which they will rank satisfaction and importance. Participants completed
the new measure (hereafter referenced as the Job Satisfaction Assessment; JSA), the JDI, a
single-item measure of overall job satisfaction, the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire
(OCQ), and self-report measures absenteeism and intentions to leave the organization.
Additionally, participants completed the 19-item organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)
measure developed by Konovsky and Organ (1996), which measures five sub-dimensions of
OCBs: altruism; generalized compliance; sportsmanship; courtesy; and civic virtue. The results
from the JSA were compared to those from the JDI to determine if the new measure better
predicted organizational commitment (OC), OCBs, absenteeism, and intentions to turnover.
Chapter II

Rationale and Hypotheses

Past research has supported the notion that separately assessing facet importance is statistically redundant when measuring facet satisfaction (Rice et al., 1991; McFarlin & Rice, 1992; McFarlin et al. 1995; Wu & Yao, 2006). However, this conclusion has been reached using Locke’s (1976) reasoning that facet importance can be derived from the level of reported facet satisfaction. As previously argued, this view does not consider situations in which an individual may be only moderately satisfied with a facet to which he or she ascribes high importance.

Figure 1 depicts the relationship between facet importance and satisfaction purported by RoA theory, in that under RoA theory, highly important facets should be extremely (dis)satisfying, whereas minimally important facets should be moderately (dis)satisfying. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

_Hypothesis 1:_ The relationship between facet importance and facet satisfaction will not conform to that predicted by RoA theory, in that respondents may indicate very important facets are moderately (dis)satisfying.

It has also been argued that the satisfaction equation as presented in Locke (1976) is inconsistent with Range-of-Affect Theory, and that Equation 2 may better represent the interaction of discrepancy and importance. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

_Hypothesis 2:_ Facet satisfaction as calculated by Equation 2 will be more highly correlated with the explicit satisfaction question than will facet satisfaction calculated via the RoA Theory equation.
Figure 1

RoA Predicted Relationship between Facet Importance and Satisfaction

Proportion of satisfaction responses of slightly dissatisfied, neutral or slightly satisfied

Facet Importance from 1 (most important) to 7 (less important)

Relationship predicted per RoA theory
Again, Equation 2 is as follows: $S = \frac{1}{(Vc-P)} \times (Vi)$ where $S =$ satisfaction, $(Vc-P) =$ have-want discrepancy, and $Vi =$ facet importance. $(Vc - P)$ is defined as the response to the question regarding the amount of a facet the job provides versus the amount that is desired. This question is measured on a five-point scale ranging from far too little to far too much, and responses will be recoded such that they reflect only discrepancy magnitude rather than directionality (responses of far too little and far too much) will be recoded to 3, slightly too little and slightly too much will be recoded to 2, and the right amount will be recoded to 1. $Vi$ is defined as the response to the question regarding the importance level ascribed to the particular facet. Ratings of satisfaction will also be recoded to reflect only satisfaction magnitude; for example, responses of very satisfied and very dissatisfied will be coded as 4, whereas a response of neutral will be recoded as 1.

Furthermore, job satisfaction has demonstrated correlations with organizationally desirable outcomes. Satisfied employees are less likely to be excessively absent from work or quit their job entirely (Hackett & Guion, 1985; Kohler & Mathieu, 1993) and more likely to engage in OCBs (Bateman & Organ 1983). Additionally, Bateman and Strasser (1984) found organizational commitment to be a correlate of job satisfaction. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are proposed:  

**Hypothesis 3:** When considering facet importance, JSA facet satisfaction will account for significant incremental variance in organizational commitment above and beyond the variance accounted for by the corresponding JDI facet satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 4:** When considering facet importance, JSA facet satisfaction will account for
significant incremental variance in organizational citizenship behaviors above and beyond the variance accounted for by the corresponding JDI facet satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5: When considering facet importance, JSA facet satisfaction will account for significant incremental variance in employee absenteeism above and beyond the variance accounted for by the corresponding JDI facet satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6: When considering facet importance, JSA facet satisfaction will account for significant incremental variance in intentions to turnover above and beyond the variance accounted for by the corresponding JDI facet satisfaction.

Although the JDI, MSQ, JSS and similar measures are psychometrically acceptable, they only allow respondents to rate satisfaction with prescribed facets. Highhouse and Becker (1993) found that allowing employees to choose some of the facets for which to rank satisfaction and importance was preferable to a measure exclusively comprised of prescribed facets. Additionally, Scarpello and Campbell (1983) reported that the summation of JDI facet satisfactions did not equate to overall satisfaction, which suggests that the JDI does not sample all facets that are often valued. Allowing employees to choose all the facets for which they will rank satisfaction and importance maximizes the likelihood that each included facet will be a meaningful component of that individual’s overall job satisfaction. Thus, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 7: When considering facet importance, facet satisfaction as measured by all chosen JSA facets will account for significant incremental variance in organizational commitment above and beyond the variance accounted for by the JDI.

Hypothesis 8: When considering facet importance, facet satisfaction as measured by all chosen JSA facets will account for significant incremental variance in organizational
citizenship behaviors above and beyond the variance accounted for by the JDI.

Hypothesis 9: When considering facet importance, facet satisfaction as measured by all chosen JSA facets will account for significant incremental variance in employee absenteeism above and beyond the variance accounted for by the JDI.

Hypothesis 10: When considering facet importance, facet satisfaction as measured by all chosen JSA facets will account for significant incremental variance in intentions to turnover above and beyond the variance accounted for by the JDI.
Chapter III

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from a large Midwestern company, and were informed of the benefits of having their satisfaction assessed and available to management but were not offered incentives for participation, and participation was voluntary. All participants completed the entire survey battery online and while at work. Because previous research produced medium effect sizes with the predictions used in this study (Highhouse & Becker, 1993; McFarlin et al., 2002), a minimum of 85 participants were needed to obtain a power of .80 (Cohen, 1992), and 153 participants completed all surveys, yielding a response rate of approximately 20%.

Demographically, 97 participants self-identified as hourly employees; 10% reported their tenure as 0-5 years, 45% reported tenure of 6-15 years, and 45% reported tenure of more than 16 years. Fifty-six participants self-identified as management; 19% reported tenure of 11-15 years, 33% reported tenure of 16-20 years, and 48% reported tenure of greater than 20 years.

There was no deception and participants had full knowledge of the study’s intent. Measures did not include participant names, and participants were informed the researcher would retain the completed measures for at least five years upon study termination. After analyses, the organization was provided with the following data in aggregate ($n > 10$) form: the satisfaction, discrepancy, and importance ratings for the JSA facets most frequently selected by respondents; the results from the scored JDI surveys; and the average overall satisfaction, average frequency of absenteeism, and average intention to leave the organization. Participants’ anonymity was maintained by virtue of not collecting participant names, and demographic information collected
was limited to job classification (hourly vs. management) and organizational tenure. Under no circumstances were data averaged from less than 10 respondents made available to the organization.

**Measures**

**Facet importance and satisfaction.** A facet job satisfaction measure that included facet importance was designed for this study. This measure, the Job Satisfaction Assessment (JSA), gave participants a list of 32 facets and asked them to choose the seven facets to which they ascribed the highest importance. Participants were then asked to identify the amount of the facet they desired relative to the amount their job provided, on a 1-5 scale ranging from *far too little* to *far too much*, which identified each individual’s facet discrepancy. Respondents were then asked to identify the importance they ascribed to a chosen facet (on a 1-5 scale with 1 being *barely important* and 5 representing *extremely important*), and their satisfaction with the facet on a 7 point scale ranging from *very dissatisfied* to *very satisfied*. The facet list consisted of facets chosen from current measures such as the JDI, MSQ, and JSS, as well as facets that were frequently identified as important by Nagy (1995), and facets appearing in Henne and Locke (1985). The goal of the facet list was to give participants a wide and non-redundant range of job facets from which to choose. See Appendix A for contact information regarding the JSA.

Facet satisfaction was also be assessed using the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; see Appendix A). The JDI’s psychometric properties have been well documented (e.g., Kinicki et al. 2002), and it is a widely accepted measure of facet satisfaction. The JDI assesses satisfaction with five facets: pay; promotional opportunities; coworker relations; supervisory practices; and the work itself. Respondents indicate if a short phrase or word describes their job with *yes, no,* or ?. Johnson et al. (1982) reported test-retest reliability coefficients ranging from .68 to .88, and coefficient
alphas ranged from .75 to .91. In this study, coefficient alphas for the JDI facets were found to be: .67 for the work itself; .84 for pay; .92 for promotional opportunities; .50 for supervision; and .85 for coworkers. Furthermore, a meta-analysis by Kinicki et al. found that the JDI trait variance averaged 43%, method variance averaged 15%, and error variance averaged 42%. These studies suggest the JDI displays acceptable reliability and validity, and that the JDI facet intercorrelations do not indicate a need to eliminate or combine facets (Kinicki et al., 2002). To derive an overall JDI satisfaction score, the mean of each of the five JDI facets was calculated, then the facet means were averaged. This was necessary because the five JDI facets contained between nine and 18 items, and computing an average across the entire 72–item JDI would bias the mean towards the facets with more questions.

Overall satisfaction was assessed with a single-item measure (see Appendix A) consistent with the propositions of Wanous et al. (1997) and Nagy (2002). Participants rated their overall job satisfaction on a seven-point scale ranging from very dissatisfied to very satisfied.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs). Organizational citizenship behavior was assessed using a survey developed by Konovsky and Organ (1996). The survey measures five aspects of OCB: generalized compliance; altruism; sportsmanship; courtesy; and civic virtue (see Appendix A). Coefficient alpha for the five aspects ranged from .80 to .90 (Konovsky & Organ, 1996), and was found to be .80 in the current study. The measure as presented by Konovsky and Organ was intended to be completed by the employee’s supervisor, but for the purposes of this study, minor grammatical changes were made to the measure that allowed it to be completed by the participants themselves rather than their supervisors, such as changing This employee to You.
Organizational Commitment (OC). Organizational commitment was assessed via the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). The OCQ was developed by Porter and Smith (1970), and assesses OC via 9 positively-worded items and 6 negatively-worded items which are reverse scored. Coefficient alpha for the OCQ was reported to be .87 by Cullen, Johnson, and Sakano (1995), at .91 by Shappe (1998; see Appendix A), and found to be .90 in the current study.

Absenteeism. Absenteeism over the previous 6 months (not including scheduled time off) was assessed with a single-item, self-report measure. Each day of a period of consecutive absences constituted one absence (e.g., 3 consecutive days of absence were scored as 3 instances of absenteeism). The absenteeism measure was scored on a five point scale ranging from zero absences to seven or more absences (see Appendix A).

Turnover. Intentions to leave the organization within a year were assessed with a single-item, self-report measure. This item focused on the intentions of the employee, rather than the employee’s expectations. Focusing on expectations to leave the company may have induced consideration of factors outside the employee’s control; for example, rumors of impending layoffs may convince employees their jobs will be eliminated. In this situation, employees may report an expectation of leaving the organization due to factors beyond their control, even if they have no desire to leave. In order to capture employee-driven turnover intentions rather than organizationally-driven turnover, the turnover item was phrased so as to assess employee likelihood of choosing to remain with the organization, and was rated on a five point scale ranging from Not at all likely to Extremely likely (see Appendix A).
Procedure

IRB approval was obtained from the Xavier University IRB prior to data collection. Because all of the participants had full-time jobs within the organization, the survey was made available for seven workdays to accommodate as many participants’ schedules as possible. After agreeing to the terms specified in the Informed Consent document (Appendix B), participants were asked to complete the JSA first, then the JDI. This ordering was intended to avoid priming effects that could result from seeing the JDI facets before the participants were asked to choose their most important facets from the JSA list. Upon completion of the JDI, participants then completed the measure of overall satisfaction, the OC measure, then the OCB measure, and finally the absenteeism and the intentions to turnover items.

Interestingly, the host organization felt that six items from the JDI were potentially offensive, and insisted upon their removal from the survey. Because of the benefits of a workforce sample versus a student sample, their requirement was met. From the co-workers facet, the prompts of “stupid”, “lazy”, and “stubborn” were omitted (leaving 15 items), and from the supervision facet, the prompts of “annoying”, “stubborn”, and “lazy” were omitted as well (again, leaving 15 items). However, there is no evidence to suggest that these omissions significantly affected the results of the study, although the item removal may be partially responsible for the relatively lower alpha of the supervision facet.

Also, at the request of the host organization, the JSA facet explicitly corresponding to the JDI coworkers facet was dropped from the survey. As a result, hypotheses three through six were tested with only the mean score of the four JDI facets for which there was a corresponding JSA facet (pay, promotional opportunities, supervision, and the work itself). Hypotheses seven through ten were unaffected as they dealt with all chosen JSA facets regardless of whether there
was a corresponding JDI facet. In a meta-analysis of job satisfaction facets, Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) found that out of seven facets, the coworkers facet displayed the third lowest correlation to performance, suggesting multiple other facets more highly impact satisfaction. Therefore, it is unlikely that results would be drastically different had the coworkers facet been included in both the JDI and JSA.
Chapter IV

Results

Hypothesis 1, which stated that facet satisfaction magnitude would not be dependent on the importance ascribed to the facet, was supported. Facet satisfaction was measured on a seven point scale, and to test hypothesis one, the responses were recoded to a 1-4 scale where 1 corresponded to the original score of 4 (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied), 2 corresponded to the original scores of 3 and 5 (slightly dissatisfied and slightly satisfied), 3 corresponded to the original scores of 2 and 6 (dissatisfied and satisfied) and 4 corresponded to the original scores of 1 and 7 (very dissatisfied and very satisfied). This new scale was a linear measure of satisfaction or dissatisfaction magnitude, which was then correlated to the importance ascribed to each of the seven chosen JSA facets. Correlations ranged from .22 to .47, and all seven correlations were significant. Results from these correlations are presented in Table 2.

These significant correlations corroborate previous proposals stating that satisfaction magnitude is limited by facet importance, and that highly important facets are more likely to be extremely satisfying or dissatisfying than less important facets. However, the question was never whether high satisfaction magnitude necessitated high importance, but rather whether moderate satisfaction precluded minimal importance; the focus of hypothesis 1 was whether highly important facets always induced extreme feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. To this point, the obtained correlations presented in Table 2 are moderate; all are well below Nunnally’s (1978) recommended value of .70 representing redundant constructs. Also, when plotting facet satisfaction and facet importance, Figure 1 reveals that even for important facets, between 24 and
Table 2

*Correlations of Satisfaction Magnitude and Facet Importance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JSA</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most important facet</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most important facet</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most important facet</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth most important facet</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth most important facet</td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth most important facet</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh most important facet</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *$p < .01$, **$p < .001$*
Figure 2

*Relationship between Facet Importance and Facet Satisfaction*

Proportion of satisfaction responses of slightly dissatisfied, neutral or slightly satisfied

Facet Importance from 1 (most important) to 7 (less important)

* This figure is a plot of the percentages of respondents that identified a given facet as moderately (dis)satisfying; that is, responses between slightly satisfied and slightly satisfied. For example, 24% of respondents indicated they were either slightly dissatisfied, neutral, or slightly satisfied with the facet they identified as most important. This contrasts to RoA Theory, which predicts highly important facets will always be extremely (dis)satisfying.
36 percent of satisfaction ratings were moderate in magnitude (between \textit{slightly dissatisfied} and \textit{slightly satisfied}), as represented by the solid line. However, RoA Theory predicts that important facets will always induce extreme satisfaction levels, as represented by the dashed line. This finding contradicts both RoA Theory and Value Theory by providing evidence that facet importance is neither redundant nor can be consistently inferred from satisfaction magnitude.

Hypothesis 2, which stated that satisfaction calculated through Equation 2 would be more highly correlated to satisfaction with that facet than satisfaction calculated through the RoA Theory equation, was generally supported for all chosen JSA facets. The amount of a facet employees’ jobs provide relative to the amount they desire was measured on a 1 (\textit{far too little}) to 5 (\textit{far too much}) scale. In order to capture the magnitude of this discrepancy, responses were recoded on a 1-3 scale, in which 1 corresponded to the original response of the \textit{right amount}, 2 corresponded to the original responses of \textit{too little} and \textit{too much}, and 3 corresponded to the original responses of \textit{far too little} and \textit{far too much}. This was appropriate, since there was no standard unit of facet amount that would be applicable to all facets (i.e., comparing desired and received amount of pay is straightforward, whereas desired and received amount of supervision is not). Correlations to satisfaction, using the recoded discrepancy values in both equations, were calculated for the RoA equation, and Equation 2. All correlations are presented in Table 3 along with the Fisher’s $r$ to $z$ test values indicating significantly different correlations. For six of the seven correlations, the correlation obtained using Equation 2 (in which satisfaction equals the facet discrepancy divided by importance) was at least 2.5 times higher than the correlation obtained using the RoA equation (in which satisfaction equals the product of the difference between have and want values and importance). Also, all the obtained correlations to satisfaction
Table 3

*Satisfaction Correlations Calculated through RoA Theory and Equation 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet</th>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Correlation to Satisfaction</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RoA</td>
<td>-.76**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equation 2</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RoA</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>6.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equation 2</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RoA</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>8.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equation 2</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RoA</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>5.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equation 2</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RoA</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>5.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equation 2</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RoA</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>5.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equation 2</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RoA</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>7.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equation 2</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01
using the RoA equation were negative, while all those obtained using Equation 2 were positive. This strongly supports the proposition that Equation 2 is a much more accurate calculation of satisfaction than Locke’s (1976) RoA equation, and that, since much previous satisfaction research has used the RoA equation to calculate satisfaction, it is premature to conclude it is statistically redundant to separately assess facet importance.

Since the host organization requested the JSA coworkers facet be excluded from the survey, only the four facets shared by both the JSA and JDI were included in the tests of hypotheses 3-6 (i.e., pay, promotional opportunities, the work itself, and supervision). The mean of the four JDI facets was entered at step one of the hierarchical regressions and the mean of the four corresponding JSA facets was entered at step two to determine if the JSA provided incremental prediction of the four organizational outcomes beyond the JDI. Then, the regressions were reversed (entering the JSA at step one and the JDI at step two) to determine if the JDI provided incremental prediction of the four outcomes beyond the JSA.

To aid in the interpretation of the subsequent regressions, a matrix displaying the correlations between the outcome variables is presented in Table 4. Hypothesis 3, which stated that satisfaction with corresponding JSA facets would account for incremental variance in organizational commitment above and beyond the JDI, was not supported $\Delta R^2 = .001$, $F(1, 140) = .039$, $p = .84$.

Hypothesis 4, which stated that satisfaction with corresponding JSA facets would account for incremental variance in OCBs above and beyond the JDI, was not supported $\Delta R^2 = .001$, $F(1, 142) = .085$, $p = .77$. 
Table 4

*Correlation Matrix of Outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>OCBs</th>
<th>Absenteeism</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCBs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>&gt; .01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absenteeism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>&gt; .01</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* OC = Organizational commitment; OCB = Organizational citizenship behavior  
* N for each correlation was between 142 and 145
Hypothesis 5, which stated that satisfaction with corresponding JSA facets would account for incremental variance in absenteeism above and beyond the JDI, was not supported. $\Delta R^2 = .016$, $F(1, 138) = 2.22$, $p = .14$. However, neither survey was a significant predictor of absenteeism. This may be partially due to very little variability in the absenteeism question ($M = 1.48$, $SD = 0.78$ on a 1 low to 5 high scale), since the host organization apparently had very low rates of absenteeism.

Hypothesis 6, which stated that satisfaction with corresponding JSA facets would account for incremental variance in turnover above and beyond the JDI, was supported $\Delta R^2 = .032$, $F(1, 139) = 5.36$, $p = .02$. See Table 5 for complete results of the tests of hypotheses 3 through 6.

To further substantiate findings from the tests of hypotheses 3-6, the hierarchical regressions were reversed (i.e., the JSA was entered in step one and the JDI in step two) to determine if the JDI accounted for incremental variance in the specified outcomes above and beyond the JSA. From the results in Table 6, it is evident that the JDI accounted for incremental variance above and beyond the JSA for all outcomes except absenteeism. Collectively, the results of testing hypotheses 3-6 reveal that when only considering facets shared by both surveys, the JDI was a stronger predictor of OC and OCBs, neither survey was a significant predictor of absenteeism, and both surveys accounted for incremental variance in turnover intentions.

For the tests of hypotheses 7-10, the JDI in its entirety (all five facets included) was entered in the regression at step one, and the JSA (consisting of all seven facets chosen by respondents regardless of whether there was a corresponding facet included in the JDI) was entered at step two, to determine if all chosen JSA facets provided incremental prediction of the four outcomes beyond the JDI. Then, the regressions were reversed (entering the JSA at step one
Table 5

*Results of Hierarchical Regression: JDI Entered at Step 1, Corresponding Facets Only*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Absenteeism</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: OC = organizational commitment; OCB = organizational citizenship behaviors*
Table 6

Results of Hierarchical Regression: JSA Entered at Step 1, Corresponding Facets Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th></th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th></th>
<th>Absenteeism</th>
<th></th>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: OC = organizational commitment; OCB = organizational citizenship behaviors
and the JDI at step two, again using only the four facets shared by both surveys) to determine if
the JDI provided incremental prediction of the four outcomes beyond the JSA.

Hypothesis 7, which stated that facet satisfaction with all chosen JSA facets would
account for incremental variance in organizational commitment above and beyond the JDI, was
not supported, $\Delta R^2 = .007, F(1, 142) = 1.42, p = .24$.

Hypothesis 8, which stated that facet satisfaction with all chosen JSA facets would
account for incremental variance in organizational citizenship behavior above and beyond the
JDI, was not supported, $\Delta R^2 = .007, F(1, 144) = 1.12, p = .29$.

Hypothesis 9, which stated that facet satisfaction with all chosen JSA facets would
account for incremental variance in absenteeism above and beyond the JDI, was not supported,
$\Delta R^2 = .006, F(1, 140) = 0.92, p = .34$. However, the JDI was not significantly predictive of
absenteeism either, $F(1, 141) = .265, p = .61$, likely due to the low rate of absenteeism.

Hypothesis 10, which stated that satisfaction with all chosen JSA facets would account
for incremental variance in turnover above and beyond the JDI, was supported $\Delta R^2 = .036, F(1,
141) = 6.04, p = .02$. Results for the tests of hypotheses 7-10 are presented in Table 7.

To further substantiate findings from the tests of hypotheses 7-10, the hierarchical
regressions were reversed (i.e., the JSA was entered in step one and JDI in step two) to determine
if the JDI accounted for incremental variance in the specified outcomes above and beyond the
JSA. From the results in Table 8, it is evident that the JDI provided incremental prediction for
organizational commitment, OCBs, and turnover intentions.

The summarized results for the tests of hypotheses 3-10 are presented in Table 9. It
appears that the JDI was a stronger predictor of both OC and OCBs than the JSA, for both the
condition consisting of only corresponding facets and the condition where all survey facets were
included. Neither survey was a significant predictor of absenteeism, likely due to the low rates of absenteeism in the host organization. Both the JDI and JSA accounted for incremental variance in turnover intentions (each survey alone accounted for approximately 12% of variance).

Additionally, the regressions were recalculated using each of the four corresponding facets as separate predictors (rather than the survey mean). Again, both the JDI and JSA facets were entered in step one of separate regressions to determine if either the JSA or JDI facet accounted for incremental variance above the other regarding the four criteria (OC, OCBs, absenteeism, and turnover intentions).

When considering OC, both the JDI work and JDI promotion facets accounted for incremental variance relative to the JSA work and JSA promotion facets. When considering OCBs, the JDI work facet accounted for incremental variance relative to the JSA work facet, and the JSA supervision facet accounted for incremental variance relative to the JDI supervision facet. When considering absenteeism, the JSA pay facet provided incremental prediction relative to the JDI pay facet (although again, neither survey as a whole was predictive of absenteeism). Finally, when considering turnover intentions, no facet from either survey accounted for incremental variance. These results are generally consistent with those from the tests involving the complete surveys, in that the JDI as a whole was more predictive of OC than the JSA, and the JDI promotion and work facets provided incremental prediction of OC relative to the corresponding JSA facets. Also, each survey as a whole provided incremental prediction of turnover intentions, and no predictive differences were observed at the facet level for either survey regarding turnover intentions.
Table 7

Results of Hierarchical Regression: JDI Entered at Step 1, All Chosen Facets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th></th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th></th>
<th>Absenteeism</th>
<th></th>
<th>Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: OC = organizational commitment; OCB = organizational citizenship behaviors
Table 8

Results of Hierarchical Regression: JSA Entered at Step 1, All Chosen Facets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Absenteeism</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: OC = organizational commitment; OCB = organizational citizenship behaviors*
Table 9

Summary of Hierarchical Regressions Comparing the JSA and JDI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Facets</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four shared</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JDI</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>JDI</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JDI</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>JDI</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Pay, promotional opportunity, supervision, and work

\(b\) All five JDI facets and all seven chosen JSA facets
Chapter V
Discussion

There are three themes which emerged from this study. First, the results of hypothesis one reveal that whereas highly important facets are more likely to be extremely satisfying or dissatisfying, it is inappropriate to attempt to infer importance from satisfaction magnitude because a large percentage of respondents reported moderate satisfaction with a highly important facet. If the results were interpreted through the RoA lens, important facets would have been deemed as unimportant for 24% to 36% of the participants due to the moderate level of satisfaction associated with those facets (despite participants explicitly rating these facets as important). This finding contradicts RoA Theory’s implicit assumption that importance can be derived from satisfaction magnitude or, put another way, that important facets are always extremely satisfying or dissatisfying. Based on the results of this study, however, it appears completely possible and plausible that an employee to whom pay is very important may be only moderately satisfied with the pay he or she actually receives.

These findings should not be interpreted as a complete disconfirmation of RoA Theory, because importance and satisfaction magnitude were correlated, in that more important facets were more likely to be extremely satisfying or dissatisfying. This is consistent with RoA Theory. However, Locke (1976) proposed that it would be redundant to separately assess facet importance, since presumably facet importance could always be inferred from satisfaction magnitude. This proposition was clearly disconfirmed in the current study, since many respondents were moderately satisfied with a highly important facet. Thus, it can be concluded
that high importance can safely be attributed to facets that induce extreme levels of satisfaction, but the reverse (that moderate satisfaction must mean minimal importance) cannot and should not be assumed.

Accordingly, if facet importance is not separately and explicitly assessed, both satisfaction theory and the application of it may suffer. Researchers may draw misleading conclusions from results based on data gathered from (unknowingly) unimportant facets, and organizations may waste resources intervening on unimportant facets in an attempt to increase employees’ job satisfaction. These outcomes are certainly possible, and perhaps even likely, if researchers and practitioners adhere to current models of job satisfaction which do not advocate the separate assessment of facet importance. If an organization were to administer the JDI and intended to act on the results to create a more satisfying workplace for their employees, management would have little direction regarding which of the five JDI facets should receive priority (i.e., which is most important to their employees) because importance is excluded from the JDI. As such, management would either have to conduct costly follow-up surveys to gauge facet importance, or take a “shot in the dark”. Hence, assessing importance along with satisfaction completely avoids this problem.

Fortunately, the facet-choice methodology of the JSA provides a relatively efficient way to include facet importance in a satisfaction assessment. Although importance could be assessed at the facet level on the JDI with the addition of only five importance questions, and would be relatively informative, this is less than ideal because participants may not consider one or more JDI facets to be important. If this is the case, the researcher or organization would be left to wonder which facets employees do consider important. The benefit of the JSA approach,
however, is that employees choose the facets to which they will respond, based on importance, guaranteeing that results will only include facets important to employees.

Second, the results of hypothesis two confirm that satisfaction calculated through Equation 2, which divides facet importance by have-want discrepancy, is much more highly correlated to actual satisfaction (as measured by the question of "how satisfied are you with this facet?") than satisfaction calculated through the RoA equation, which multiplies importance and have-want discrepancy. In fact, all but one of the satisfaction correlations calculated through the RoA equation were relatively low and negative, whereas those calculated through Equation 2 were high, positive, and of similar magnitude. It is difficult to imagine a scenario in which, when attempting to calculate facet satisfaction from discrepancy and importance, it would be undesirable for this calculation to yield values correlated to respondents' explicit reports of their satisfaction. The fact that six of the seven correlations to actual satisfaction calculated through the RoA equation were relatively small, and that all significant correlations were negative, strongly suggests that the RoA equation does not calculate satisfaction. This finding contrasts with Locke's (1976) presentation of the RoA equation; and Locke was very explicit in both his definition of the RoA equation, and in his proposal that the RoA equation calculated satisfaction. The negative correlations obtained in this study may imply that the RoA equation calculates dissatisfaction, although this presumption has yet to be tested. However, if the RoA equation calculates dissatisfaction, calculated correlations to satisfaction should be negative, but also of equivalent magnitude to the correlations to satisfaction calculated through Equation 2. The finding that six of the seven correlations to satisfaction calculated through the RoA equation were approximately one-third of the magnitude of those calculated through Equation 2 casts doubt on the presumption that the RoA equation and Equation 2 calculate opposite ends of the
same construct. Due to the markedly different correlation magnitudes, it is premature to speculate as to what the RoA equation does calculate, but it certainly does not appear to calculate satisfaction. Regardless, the current study provides strong support for the conclusion that dividing facet importance by the facet discrepancy (Equation 2) yields a much more accurate calculation of satisfaction than multiplying facet discrepancy and importance.

Third, the results of hypotheses 3 through 10 indicate that the JSA predicts intentions to turnover at a level comparable to the JDI, although the JDI was the stronger predictor of organizational commitment and OCBs. The incremental prediction attained by the JDI may be partially due to the much larger number of items in the JDI relative to the JSA. It could also be argued that the JSA’s incremental prediction of turnover was partially due to the fact it measured seven facets versus the five facets of the JDI. However, the JSA still displayed incremental prediction of turnover intentions in the test of hypotheses 3-6, which only included the four facets shared by both the JSA and JDI. This suggests the JSA’s incremental prediction of turnover intentions was not due to sampling more facets, but rather due to considering facet choice and importance.

Furthermore, the regression model comprising all seven JSA facets accounted for more variance in organizational commitment and turnover than the model including only the facets shared by the JSA and the JDI. This supports the previous contention that people likely value facets other than the five included in the JDI. To this point, on the JSA, job security was collectively rated as the most important facet, yet the JDI fails to measure satisfaction with job security. If the host organization were to attempt to create a more satisfying environment based only on the results of the JDI, they would have no reason to suspect that job security was a concern for employees, when in fact it appeared to be the dominant concern. In fact, of the top
five most important facets on the JSA (job security, healthcare, safety, pay, and customer interaction), only the pay facet is included in the JDI (See Table 10 for a complete list of the importance ratings for chosen JSA facets).

Thus, although the JDI was a stronger predictor of OC and OCBs than the JSA, it seems that the JSA provided the host organization with much more actionable information. These results strongly suggest that organizations attempting to increase satisfaction would benefit from employing a choice-based survey in order to obtain the most accurate information of what employees value.

Although the JDI was found to be the stronger predictor of OC and OCBs, this alone is an insufficient reason to universally favor the JDI over the JSA. One disadvantage of the JDI, from an organizational perspective, is its length. In fact, if an organization wished to assess satisfaction as well as OC and OCBs, they could administer the JSA, the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, and the Konovosky and Organ (1996) measure of OCBs, and still have a total item count (55) that is well below that of the JDI (72). In addition to the JDI, Bowling Green State University also developed the Abridged JDI (AJDI), which measures the same five facets, but with a subset of six JDI items per facet. To determine if the AJDI was comparable to the JDI, the regressions testing hypotheses three through ten were analyzed with the AJDI items only and compared to the JSA. The results of the tests of the AJDI were consistent with those of the JDI, in that the AJDI accounted for incremental variance in OC and OCBs, and was not predictive of absenteeism. Again, both the AJDI and JSA accounted for incremental variance in intentions to turnover. Since the AJDI appears to offer similar predictive capability (of the four criterion tested in this study) as the JDI, it suggests organizations insistent upon not assessing facet importance could use the AJDI (30 items) rather than the JDI (72 items).
Table 10

Importance Ratings of Chosen JSA Facets*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet</th>
<th>Importance (out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer interaction</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation time</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay equity</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible schedule</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional opportunity</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting work</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership opportunity</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper management</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging work</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative opportunity</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important work</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of work</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: All facets had at least 10 endorsements

*a* = JSA facet corresponding to JDI pay

*b* = JSA facet corresponding to JDI supervision

*c* = JSA facet corresponding to JDI promotional opportunity

*d* = JSA facets averaged to derive a facet corresponding to the JDI work itself facet
without any meaningful loss of predictive ability. It is also interesting that multiple individuals at
the Vice-President level within the host organization felt uncomfortable with several items on the
JDI, even after a thorough explanation of the reasoning for their inclusion. Although the
inclusion of these items would have been ideal, the benefits of an organizational sample versus a
student sample outweighed the limitations imposed by the deletion of the six items. Future
research should examine these relationships in other organizational settings which would allow
for a complete inclusion of all JDI items.

Also, the JSA appears to offer practical, non-psychometric advantages relative to the JDI.
It can be argued the JSA yields more information per question than the JDI. Because respondents
are presented with a list of 32 facets and choose the seven that are most important to them, it can
safely be inferred that unchosen facets are less important than the least important facet that is
chosen. By allowing respondents to select important facets, information about the importance of
the entire list of 32 facets can be inferred without requiring participants to answer questions
about every single facet. Although it is possible participants may value facets not included in the
JSA facet list, the JSA includes over six times the number of facets included in the JDI.

Additionally, the JSA and JDI may induce different reactions from participants. Although
reactions to each survey were not assessed in this study, it is reasonable to assume that an open-
ended survey allowing a greater degree of personal choice may be better received by employees
than a rigid survey only assessing prescribed facets, because employees may become frustrated if
a satisfaction survey does not provide them with an opportunity to convey dissatisfaction with an
important facet, such as job security.
Limitations and Future Research

Limitations in the current study include the reliance on self-report data, the unique nature of each individual’s job satisfaction, and undesirable JDI items, and small sample sizes when considering JSA facet intercorrelations. Self-report data may be subject to method variance, which refers to artificially inflated correlations between constructs measured with the same instrument or the same method. In fact, method variance has long been a criticism of studies based solely on self-report data. However, Spector (2006) argued that method variance was much less widespread and problematic than previously thought, and the effects of method variance were largely confined to the study of a few constructs such as social desirability. An alternative to self-report data would have been for supervisors or other third parties to rate job satisfaction, but besides the confound of supervisors rating their subordinates’ satisfaction with their supervision, there is little precedent for this type of assessment.

Also, despite the large number and variety of facets included in the JSA list, it is possible that participants may have highly valued facets not included in the list. Alternatively, participants may have valued more or less than seven facets, yet were asked to choose and rate seven in the JSA. It was decided to assess seven facets in an attempt to remain somewhat consistent with other current measures such as the JDI (five facets), the MSQ (20 facets) the JSS (nine facets), and the IOR (eight facets).

Another limitation in the current study was the omission of six total items from the JDI, at the requirement of the host organization, due to their potentially offensive nature. Although there is no apparent reason to suspect that any result would be dramatically different had these items been included, the JDI is intended to be completed in its entirety, but this was not possible
in the current study. As was previously mentioned, it is interesting that a large and diverse organization felt very uncomfortable distributing the JDI without removing the items in question.

Also, JSA facet intercorrelations should be examined cautiously, because the number of respondents that chose facet A and facet B is often substantially less than the number of respondents that chose facet A or facet B as part of their seven most important facets. Further research with larger sample sizes could mitigate this concern and allow facet intercorrelations to be more thoroughly explored.

Further research is needed to fully explore the benefits and potential limitations of choice-based satisfaction surveys. Although the current study asked participants to choose seven facets from a list, it would be interesting to see results from a similar study in which participants were given freedom to pick as many facets as they wish. Also, larger sample sizes would be beneficial, to increase the sample size associated with the JSA facet intercorrelations (e.g., few people may choose both supervision and respect from the facet bank).

Additionally, the JSA appears to offer promising potential, given it predicted intentions to turnover at a rate commensurate with the JDI. However, additional research is needed to determine why similar results were not obtained for the constructs of OC and OCBs. The JDI’s incremental prediction of these constructs may be partially due to the much larger number of items it contains, so further research could study a survey similar to the JSA but which contains more detailed or descriptive facets for employees to choose.

In summary, it appears that despite the volume of job satisfaction research, it is premature to label it as a closed construct. The results of this study offer promising support for the facet-choice methodology of satisfaction assessment, and provide evidence for the value in separately assessing facet importance. Additionally, this study demonstrates a need for a reconsideration of
both the assumptions imbedded in established satisfaction theories, as well as the manner in which these theories propose satisfaction is influenced and calculated.
Chapter VI

Summary

The Value of Importance When Assessing Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is among the oldest and most researched variables in Industrial-Organizational Psychology. Although various definitions have been proposed, job satisfaction can be generally conceptualized as the degree to which an individual is content with his or her job. This contentment likely results from a job fulfilling an employee’s needs and values. Although some may state that increasing employee job satisfaction is simply the “right thing to do”, research suggests that satisfying employees is more than merely a benevolent organizational gesture, and that satisfied employees should be viewed as an investment that will yield financial and behavioral returns in excess of their dissatisfied counterparts (Saari & Judge, 2004).

Researchers have identified multiple correlates of job satisfaction that should be of interest to organizations. Judge et al. (2001) reviewed 301 studies, and found that the corrected correlation between job satisfaction and job performance was .30. This correlation is higher than previously thought (correlation of .17 reported by Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985), and indicates that job satisfaction has a meaningful effect on job performance. Satisfied employees are also less likely to be excessively absent from work or quit their job entirely (Hackett & Guion, 1985; Kohler & Mathieu, 1993), and Saari and Judge (2004) reported that the approximate correlation between job satisfaction and absenteeism and turnover collectively was -.25. Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) have demonstrated a relationship with job satisfaction (Organ and Ryan, 1995), and Bateman and Strasser (1984) reported that organizational commitment was significantly correlated to job satisfaction.
Because of the potential benefits of a satisfied workforce, accurately assessing and efficiently increasing job satisfaction should be an organizational priority. Prominent facet satisfaction measures such as the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), and Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) assess satisfaction with standardized and prescribed facets. However, there seems to be a discrepancy between these measures and the literary understanding of job satisfaction, because these measures only assess facet satisfaction, and do not assess facet importance. This would be appropriate if it could be guaranteed that respondents equally and exclusively valued the prescribed facets included in these measures, but individuals are likely to value a wide variety of facets (Scarpello and Campbell, 1983).

A model of job satisfaction incorporating facet importance was proposed by Locke (1976), which presented satisfaction as the interaction of facet importance and the discrepancy between facet amount desired and facet amount received. Accordingly, the current study proposes that to be of maximum utility, satisfaction measures should assess the value employees place on a job facet as well as satisfaction with that facet.

Locke (1969; 1976) proposed that satisfaction was the end result of both the importance placed on a facet and the comparison of the desired amount of the facet to the amount actually being received. According to this model, highest satisfaction results from receiving the desired amount of an important facet whereas greatest dissatisfaction results from receiving too much or too little of an important facet. Locke (1976) observed that the function derived from the interaction of desired amount and importance was facet-specific, in that facet amount desired may display a linear relationship or a bell-shaped relationship with satisfaction. For example, satisfaction with facets normally desirable in greater quantities, such as pay, are linearly correlated to the amount received, and the slope of the function depends on the importance
placed on the facet such that higher importance yields higher levels of satisfaction or
dissatisfaction. Locke then concluded that when measuring satisfaction, it would be redundant to
separately and explicitly assess facet importance because the magnitude of satisfaction reported
implicitly includes facet importance, because the importance placed on a facet limits the possible
magnitude of facet satisfaction such that for facets of no importance, satisfaction would be only
moderate at most. However, for facets that are important, the entire range of satisfaction levels
(ranging from extremely satisfied to extremely dissatisfied) may be experienced. Thus, Locke
proposed that facet importance may be inferred from the magnitude of facet satisfaction.

A mathematical representation of RoA Theory follows (Equation 1), with \( S \) representing
satisfaction, \( V_c \) representing the facet content including the amount desired, \( P \) representing the
facet amount received, and \( V_i \) representing the facet’s importance:

\[
S = (V_c - P) \times (V_i)
\]  

(1)

Subsequent research has supported the postulates of RoA Theory. Rice, Markus, Moyer,
and McFarlin (1991) found that, consistent with RoA hypotheses, want-have discrepancy had a
stronger relationship with satisfaction when the facet was highly important and a weaker
relationship when the facet was minimally important. Rice et al. (1991) concurred with Locke
(1976) that importance is implicitly included in an evaluation of satisfaction by serving as a
moderator between discrepancy and satisfaction, and that separately assessing facet importance
was statistically redundant and did not increase the capability to predict overall job satisfaction.

Although research suggests that explicitly measuring facet importance is statistically
redundant due to the implicit inclusion of importance via satisfaction magnitude (i.e., very
dissatisfied or very satisfied representing extreme satisfaction magnitudes), this view may be
contested. Although it may be true that importance places limits on the magnitude of satisfaction
experienced, by attempting to infer facet importance from satisfaction magnitude, one assumes that important facets *always* induce extreme satisfaction levels. This view does not consider the possibility that an individual may, in fact, only be moderately satisfied with an important facet. Simply put, the possibility of experiencing more extreme satisfaction levels does not guarantee that important facets will always be extremely satisfying or dissatisfying. This could be problematic because there is no way to distinguish, in terms of importance, between moderate satisfaction with an unimportant facet (because satisfaction can be nothing else, since the facet is unimportant) and moderate satisfaction with a very important facet (because the individual is in fact only moderately satisfied). This creates difficulty for organizations attempting to increase satisfaction because intervening on a facet of little importance will likely have only a minimal impact on satisfaction.

Interestingly, RoA Theory’s mathematical representation, as presented by Locke (1976), is also inconsistent with RoA Theory. Recall again that Locke’s mathematical representation of facet satisfaction was $S = (V_c - P) \times (V_i)$, where $S$ represents satisfaction, $V_c$ represents the facet content including the amount desired, $P$ represents the facet amount received, and $V_i$ represents facet importance. Using this formula, a large discrepancy (i.e., not getting what is desired) serves to increase satisfaction (as $(V_c - P)$ increases, satisfaction increases).

The relationship between importance and satisfaction, per RoA theory, may be more accurately represented through the division of 1 by the have-want discrepancy. This amended formula (Equation 2),

$$S = \frac{1}{(V_c - P)} \times (V_i)$$

(2)

more appropriately represents the interaction of discrepancy and importance because dividing 1 by the discrepancy value yields a lower calculated satisfaction level for a given facet importance.
when the have-want discrepancy is large. See Table 1 for examples of satisfaction values calculated through each formula.

A potential miscalculation of satisfaction may have costly implications for organizations because if an individual has a high facet discrepancy and considers the facet relatively unimportant then an organizational intervention on that particular facet is likely not required. However, a situation of moderate discrepancy but high importance may require an intervention. Accurately calculating satisfaction is, therefore, advantageous to both theory and practice.

Despite the aforementioned research supporting the relevance of importance to job satisfaction, many prominent facet satisfaction measures do not assess facet importance. For example, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) assesses satisfaction with five job-relevant facets: pay; coworker relations; supervision; promotional opportunities; and the work itself. However, the JDI neither assesses facet importance nor allows respondents to explicitly report satisfaction. These omissions make it difficult to determine if the facets being measured are meaningful to the individual since importance is not explicitly assessed.

Consequently, the purpose of this study was to construct and evaluate a facet satisfaction measure in which facet importance was explicitly assessed, and respondents were allowed to choose the facets for which they will rank satisfaction and importance. Participants completed the new measure (the Job Satisfaction Assessment; JSA), the JDI, a single-item measure of overall job satisfaction, the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), and self-report measures absenteeism and intentions to leave the organization. Additionally, participants completed the 19-item organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) measure developed by Konovsky and Organ (1996). The results from the JSA were compared to those from the JDI to
determine if the new measure better predicted OC, OCBs, absenteeism, and intentions to turnover.

Past research has supported the notion that separately assessing facet importance is statistically redundant when measuring facet satisfaction (Rice et al., 1991; McFarlin & Rice, 1992; McFarlin et al. 1995; Wu & Yao, 2006). However, this conclusion has been reached using Locke’s (1976) reasoning that facet importance can be derived from the level of reported facet satisfaction. As previously argued, this view does not consider situations in which an individual may be only moderately satisfied with a facet to which he or she ascribes high importance. It has also been argued that the satisfaction equation as presented in Locke (1976) is inconsistent with Range-of-Affect Theory, and that Equation 2 may better represent the interaction of discrepancy and importance. Thus, the following hypotheses are proposed:

**Hypothesis 1:** Moderate satisfaction magnitude and high facet importance are not mutually exclusive (i.e., high facet importance does not always induce extreme feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction).

**Hypothesis 2:** Facet satisfaction as calculated by Equation 2 will be more highly correlated with the explicit satisfaction question than will facet satisfaction calculated via the RoA Theory equation.

**Hypothesis 3:** When considering facet importance, JSA facet satisfaction will account for significant incremental variance in organizational commitment above and beyond the variance accounted for by the corresponding JDI facet satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 4:** When considering facet importance, JSA facet satisfaction will account for significant incremental variance in organizational citizenship behaviors above and beyond the variance accounted for by the corresponding JDI facet satisfaction.
Hypothesis 5: When considering facet importance, JSA facet satisfaction will account for significant incremental variance in employee absenteeism above and beyond the variance accounted for by the corresponding JDI facet satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6: When considering facet importance, JSA facet satisfaction will account for significant incremental variance in intentions to turnover above and beyond the variance accounted for by the corresponding JDI facet satisfaction.

Scarpello and Campbell (1983) reported that the summation of JDI facet satisfactions did not equate to overall satisfaction, which suggests that the JDI does not sample all facets that are often valued. Allowing employees to choose all the facets for which they will rank satisfaction and importance maximizes the likelihood that each included facet will be a meaningful component of that individual’s overall job satisfaction. Thus, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 7: When considering facet importance, facet satisfaction as measured by all chosen JSA facets will account for significant incremental variance in organizational commitment above and beyond the variance accounted for by the JDI.

Hypothesis 8: When considering facet importance, facet satisfaction as measured by all chosen JSA facets will account for significant incremental variance in organizational citizenship behaviors above and beyond the variance accounted for by the JDI.

Hypothesis 9: When considering facet importance, facet satisfaction as measured by all chosen JSA facets will account for significant incremental variance in employee absenteeism above and beyond the variance accounted for by the JDI.

Hypothesis 10: When considering facet importance, facet satisfaction as measured by all chosen
JSA facets will account for significant incremental variance in intentions to turnover above and beyond the variance accounted for by the JDI.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from a large Midwestern company, and were informed of the benefits of having their satisfaction assessed and available to management but were not offered incentives for participation, and participation was voluntary. Because previous research produced medium effect sizes with the predictions used in this study (Highhouse & Becker, 1993; McFarlin et al., 2002), a minimum of 85 participants were needed to obtain a power of .80 (Cohen, 1992).

Measures

Facet importance and satisfaction. A facet job satisfaction measure that included facet importance was designed for this study. This measure, the Job Satisfaction Assessment (JSA), gave participants a list of 32 facets and asked them to choose the seven facets to which they ascribed the highest importance. Participants were then asked to identify the amount of the facet they desired relative to the amount their job provided, the importance they ascribed to a chosen facet, and their satisfaction with the facet. The facet list consisted of facets chosen from current measures such as the JDI, MSQ, and JSS, as well as facets that were frequently identified as important by Nagy (1995), and facets appearing in Henne and Locke (1985). The instructions and sample JSA item are presented in Appendix A.

Facet satisfaction was also assessed using the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; see Appendix A). The JDI's psychometric properties have been well documented (e.g., Kinicki et al. 2002), and it is a widely accepted measure of facet satisfaction. The JDI assesses satisfaction with five
facets: pay; promotional opportunities; coworker relations; supervisory practices; and the work itself.

Overall satisfaction was assessed with a single-item measure (see Appendix A) consistent with the propositions of Wanous et al. (1997) and Nagy (2002).

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs).** Organizational citizenship behavior was assessed using a survey developed by Konovsky and Organ (1996). The survey measures five aspects of OCB: generalized compliance; altruism; sportsmanship; courtesy; and civic virtue (see Appendix A). Coefficient alpha for the five aspects ranged from .80 to .90 (Konovsky & Organ, 1996), and was found to be .80 in the current study.

**Organizational Commitment (OC).** Organizational commitment was assessed via the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). The OCQ was developed by Porter and Smith (1970), coefficient alpha for the OCQ was reported to be .87 by Cullen, Johnson, and Sakano (1995), at .91 by Shappe (1998; see Appendix A), and found to be .90 in the current study.

**Absenteeism.** Absenteeism over the previous 6 months (not including scheduled time off) was assessed with a single-item, self-report measure (see Appendix A).

**Turnover.** Intentions to leave the organization within a year were assessed with a single-item, self-report measure (see Appendix A).

Interestingly, the host organization felt that six items from the JDI were potentially offensive, and insisted upon their removal from the survey. From the co-workers facet, the prompts of “stupid”, “lazy”, and “stubborn” were omitted, and from the supervision facet, the prompts of “annoying”, “stubborn”, and “lazy” were omitted as well. Also, the JSA facet explicitly corresponding to the JDI coworkers facet was dropped from the survey.
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Results

Hypothesis 1 was supported. Correlations between importance and satisfaction magnitude ranged from .216 to .472, and all seven correlations were significant (Table 1). However, Figure 1 reveals that even for important facets, between 24 and 36 percent of satisfaction ratings were moderate in magnitude.

Hypothesis 2 was supported for all chosen JSA facets (Table 2). For six of the seven correlations, the correlation obtained using Equation 2 was at least 2.5 times higher than the correlations obtained using the RoA equation, and were positive rather than negative.

Hypothesis 3 was not supported, $\Delta R^2 = .001$, $F(1, 140) = .039$, $p = .844$.

Hypothesis 4 was not supported, $\Delta R^2 = .001$, $F(1, 142) = .085$, $p = .772$.

Hypothesis 5 was not supported, $\Delta R^2 = .016$, $F(1, 138) = 2.22$, $p = .139$.

Hypothesis 6 was supported, $\Delta R^2 = .032$, $F(1, 139) = 5.36$, $p = .022$.

See Table 3 for complete results of the tests of hypotheses 3 through 6.

Hypothesis 7 was not supported, $\Delta R^2 = .007$, $F(1, 142) = 1.42$, $p = .236$.

Hypothesis 8 was not supported, $\Delta R^2 = .007$, $F(1, 144) = 1.12$, $p = .292$.

Hypothesis 9 was not supported, $\Delta R^2 = .006$, $F(1, 140) = 0.92$, $p = .340$.

Hypothesis 10 was supported, $\Delta R^2 = .036$, $F(1, 141) = 6.04$, $p = .015$.

Results for the tests of hypotheses 7-10 are presented in Table 5.

The summarized results for the tests of hypotheses 3-10 are presented in Table 7. It appears that the JDI was a much stronger predictor of both OC and OCBs than the JSA, for both the condition consisting of only corresponding facets and when all survey facets were included. Neither survey was a significant predictor of absenteeism, and both the JDI and JSA accounted for incremental variance in turnover intentions.
Discussion

There are three themes which emerged from this study. First, the results of hypothesis one reveal that while highly important facets are more likely to be extremely satisfying or dissatisfying, it is inappropriate to attempt to infer importance from satisfaction magnitude because a large percentage of respondents reported moderate satisfaction with a highly important facet. If the results were interpreted through the RoA lens, for between 24% and 36% of participants, important facets would have been deemed as unimportant due to the moderate level of satisfaction associated with those facets (despite participants explicitly rating these facets as important). This finding contradicts RoA Theory’s implicit assumption that importance can be derived from satisfaction magnitude or, put another way, that important facets are always extremely satisfying or dissatisfying. Based on the results of this study, however, it appears completely plausible that an employee to whom pay is very important may be only moderately satisfied with the pay he or she actually receives.

Second, the results of hypothesis two confirm that satisfaction calculated through Equation 2 is much more highly correlated to actual satisfaction than satisfaction calculated through the RoA equation. In fact, all the satisfaction correlations calculated through the RoA equation were dispersed and negative, while those calculated through Equation 2 were high, clustered, and positive. The fact that six of the seven correlations to actual satisfaction calculated through the RoA equation were relatively small, and that all significant correlations were negative, strongly suggests that the RoA equation does not calculate satisfaction. Regardless, the current study provides strong support for the conclusion that dividing facet importance by the have-want discrepancy yields a much more accurate calculation of satisfaction than multiplying discrepancy and importance.
Third, the results of hypotheses 3 through 10 indicate that the JSA predicts intentions to turnover at a level comparable to the JDI, although the JDI was the stronger predictor of organizational commitment and OCBs. The incremental prediction attained by the JDI may be partially due to the much larger number of items in the JDI relative to the JSA. It could also be argued that the JSA’s incremental prediction of turnover was partially due to the fact it measured seven facets versus the five facets of the JDI. However, the JSA still displayed incremental prediction of turnover intentions in the test of hypotheses 3-6, which only included the four facets shared by both the JSA and JDI. This suggests the JSA’s incremental prediction of turnover intentions was not due to sampling more facets, but rather to allowing facet choice and including importance.

Furthermore, the regression model comprising all seven JSA facets accounted for more variance in organizational commitment and turnover than the model including only the facets shared by the JSA and the JDI. This supports the previous contention that people likely value facets other than the five included in the JDI. To this point, on the JSA, job security was collectively rated as the most important facet, yet the JDI fails to measure satisfaction with job security. In fact, of the top five most important facets on the JSA (job security, healthcare, safety, pay, and customer interaction), only the pay facet is included in the JDI. Thus, although the JDI was a stronger predictor of OC and OCBs than the JSA, it seems that the JSA provided the host organization with much more actionable information. See Table 8 for a complete list of the importance ratings for chosen JSA facets.

Although the JDI was found to be the stronger predictor of OC and OCBs, this alone is an insufficient reason to universally favor the JDI over the JSA. One disadvantage of the JDI, from
an organizational perspective, is its length. In fact, if an organization wished to assess
satisfaction as well as OC and OCBs, they could administer the JSA, the Organizational
Commitment Questionnaire, and the measure of OCBs, and the total item count for these three
measures (55) is still well below that of the JDI (72).

Also, the JSA appears to offer practical, non-psychometric advantages relative to the JDI.
It can be argued the JSA yields more information per question than the JDI. Because
respondents see a list of 32 facets and choose the seven that are most important to them, it can
safely be inferred that unchosen facets are less important than the least important facet that is
chosen. By allowing respondents to select important facets, information about the importance of
the entire list of 32 facets can be inferred without requiring participants to answer questions
about every single facet. Although it is possible participants may value facets not included in the
JSA facet list, the JSA includes over six times the number of facets included in the JDI.

Additionally, the JSA and JDI may induce different reactions from participants. Although
reactions to each survey were not assessed in this study, it is reasonable to assume that an open-
ended survey allowing a great degree of personal choice may be better received by employees
than a rigid survey only assessing prescribed facets, because employees may become frustrated if
a satisfaction survey does not provide them with an opportunity to convey dissatisfaction with an
important facet, such as job security.

Limitations

Limitations in the current study include the reliance on self-report data, the unique nature
of each individual's job satisfaction, and undesirable JDI items. Self-report data may be subject
to method variance. However, Spector (2006) argued that method variance was much less
widespread and problematic than previously thought, and the effects of method variance were largely confined to the study of a few constructs such as social desirability.

Also, despite the large number and variety of facets included in the JSA list, it is possible that participants may have highly valued facets not included in the list. Alternatively, participants may have valued more or less than seven facets, yet were asked to choose and rate seven in the JSA.

A final limitation in the current study was the omission of six total items from the JDI, at the requirement of the host organization, due to their potentially offensive nature. Although there is no apparent reason to suspect that any result would be dramatically different had these items been included, the JDI is intended to be completed in its entirety, but this was not possible in the current study.

**Future Research**

Further research is needed to fully explore the benefits and potential limitations of choice-based satisfaction surveys, potentially by varying the number and descriptive level of facets included in the options from which to choose.

In summary, it appears that despite the volume of job satisfaction research, it is premature to label it as a closed construct. The results of this study offer promising support for the facet-choice methodology of satisfaction assessment, and provide evidence for the value in separately assessing facet importance. Additionally, this study demonstrates a need for a reconsideration of both the assumptions imbedded in established satisfaction theories, as well as the manner in which these theories propose satisfaction is influenced and calculated.
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Appendix A

Predictor and Criterion Measures
Job Satisfaction Facets:

Job Satisfaction Assessment:
The Job Satisfaction Assessment (JSA), and single-item measures of absenteeism, overall satisfaction, and intentions to turnover used in this study are the intellectual property of Ryan Derickson and may be obtained free of charge for research purposes by contacting Ryan Derickson at ryan.derickson@va.gov

Job Descriptive Index and Abridged Job Descriptive Index:
The JDI and AJDI were developed and copyrighted by Bowling Green State University, and may be obtained upon request from www.bgsu.edu.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior:
The measure of OCBs was published in:

DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199605)17:3<253::AID-JOB747>3.0.CO;2-Q

Organizational Commitment:
The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was published in:

Appendix B

Informed Consent Form
INFORMED CONSENT INFORMATION

WHO: You are being given the opportunity to participate in a research project conducted by Ryan Derickson (Principal Researcher) with the counsel of Mark Nagy (Thesis Chair), and with the support of <Organization>. It is important that you are aware of the details of the study, should you choose to participate.

INTENT: This study is intended to measure job satisfaction with specific aspects of work. The purpose of this study is to develop a more effective means of measuring job satisfaction, which can help employers create more satisfying workplaces for their employees. You will be asked to complete 2 surveys pertaining to your job satisfaction, 2 surveys pertaining to behavior at work, and answer a question about your absences from work, your overall satisfaction with your job, and your likelihood of choosing to remain with <Organization>.

TIME: The study should require approximately 15-20 minutes to complete, and there are no known risks of participation.

Anonymity: It is important you understand that your responses will be completely anonymous. Your name will not be recorded, and only aggregate data (such as averages and response frequencies) will be reported to the management of your organization. Furthermore, management will only have access to responses averaged from 10 or more individuals, and the researcher will maintain physical possession of the surveys for at least 5 years upon the completion of the study. In no way will your answers be traceable to you, by anyone. These measures have been implemented to ensure that you can freely respond to all questions without worrying that your privacy will be compromised. Although you are encouraged to complete all the questions, you are free to skip any that make you uncomfortable.

Declining to participate will not have any effect on your relationship with <Organization>, and if you agree to participate you are free to withdraw without penalty. By completing the attached surveys, you indicate your informed consent with the terms specified above.

If you have any questions, you may contact Ryan Derickson (Principle Researcher) at 606-344-2556, or Mark Nagy (Thesis Chair) at 513-745-1958. Questions about your rights as a research participant should be directed to Xavier University’s Institutional Review Board at 513-745-2870.
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IRB Letter of Approval
March 3, 2011

Ryan Derickson  
230 Little Round Toe Apt. 296  
Ft. Thomas, KY 41025  

Re: Protocol #1056, *The Value of Importance when Assessing Job Satisfaction.*

Dear Mr. Derickson:

The IRB has reviewed the materials regarding your study, referenced above, and has determined that it meets the criteria for the Exempt from Review category under Federal Regulation 45CFR46. Therefore your protocol is conditionally approved as exempt research pending receipt of a letter of support from Cincinnati Bell, and therefore requires no further oversight by the IRB. We appreciate your thorough treatment of the issues raised and your timely response.

If you wish to modify your study, including the addition of data collection sites, it will be necessary to obtain IRB approval prior to implementing the modification. If any adverse events occur, please notify the IRB immediately.

Please contact our office if you have any questions. We wish you success with your project!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Morell E. Mullins, Jr., Ph.D.  
Chair, Institutional Review Board  
Xavier University  

MEM: sb  

C: Mark Nagy, advisor