



Research Article

© 2024 Oursoula Bayad and Bouzekri Touri.
This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Received: 12 February 2024 / Accepted: 30 April 2024 / Published: 5 May 2024

Towards a Practical Study: Unraveling Job Satisfaction Through Models and Measurement Tools

Oursoula Bayad*

Bouzekri Touri

Laboratory of Science and Technology of Information and Education,
Ben M'sick Faculty of Sciences,
Hassan 2 University of Casablanca,
Casablanca, Morocco
*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2024-0053>

Abstract

This paper conducts a thorough comparative analysis of job satisfaction measurement models, with a specific focus on the Job Characteristics Model (JCM) by Hackman and Oldham (1976) and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. The JCM identifies crucial characteristics influencing job satisfaction, emphasizing psychological states, while Herzberg's Theory categorizes factors into hygiene and satisfaction. The study delves into the applications and strengths of each model, offering insights into their effectiveness in diverse organizational contexts. Furthermore, the analysis extends to a detailed examination of various job satisfaction measurement tests, considering factors such as test duration, number of items, and the nature of the measurement. From the concise "VAN" to the detailed "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Long," each test is scrutinized for its unique contributions and limitations. The study provides a nuanced understanding of different approaches to job satisfaction assessment, catering to the varied needs of researchers and practitioners. In the context of the comparative analysis, the paper sheds light on the trade-offs between brevity and depth in measurement processes. Tests like the "Overall Job Satisfaction Scale" and "Global Job Satisfaction Questionnaire" offer quick assessments suitable for an overall evaluation, while the "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Long" allows for a more comprehensive exploration of diverse facets. The findings guide researchers and practitioners in making informed choices based on the specific goals of their studies, ensuring a tailored and effective approach to measuring job satisfaction.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Measurement model, Measurement Tests, Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

1. Introduction

Job satisfaction is a critical factor in organizational success and individual well-being. This document explores models and measurement tests that provide diverse perspectives on job satisfaction [1].

In its essence, job satisfaction reflects the extent of fulfillment and contentment individuals find in their work. It encompasses emotional, psychological, and physical well-being within the organizational context. Understanding job satisfaction is crucial in the evolving workforce landscape, where factors like intrinsic motivation, work engagement, compensation, and work-life balance play

significant roles.

The significance of job satisfaction extends to organizational performance, employee retention, individual well-being, and workplace culture. Satisfied employees contribute to organizational goals, act as a retention tool, positively impact mental health, and shape a positive workplace culture [2].

Measuring job satisfaction is complex due to its subjective nature. Individual perceptions, expectations, and values influence job satisfaction, making the development of effective models and tests challenging.

This document aims to comprehensively explore various models and measurement tests used to understand job satisfaction. The goal is to unravel complexities, providing insights for organizational strategies, human resource practices, and academic research.

The subsequent sections will delve into psychological testing principles, conduct a comparative analysis of measurement models, scrutinize measurement tests, outline the methodology employed in our analysis, present results, and conclude with key findings. Through this exploration, we aim to contribute to a deeper understanding of job satisfaction and its pivotal role in shaping the modern workplace landscape.

Before delving into specific models, a comprehensive review of the psychological principles underpinning job satisfaction measurement tests is presented. This lays the conceptual groundwork necessary for a thorough understanding of the forthcoming models.

2. Psychological Testing

Psychological testing, within the realm of job satisfaction, involves the systematic use of procedures to observe and measure individual characteristics related to work. These tests aim to assess various aspects, including attitudes, behaviors, competencies, and personality traits, providing valuable insights into an individual's satisfaction in the workplace [3].

One fundamental aspect of psychological testing in the context of job satisfaction is the consideration of individual differences. People bring unique personalities, experiences, and expectations to their work, influencing their perception of job satisfaction. Psychological tests are designed to capture these individual nuances.

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) is a prominent example of a psychological testing tool widely used to measure job satisfaction. Developed by Smith et al. in 1969, the JDI assesses satisfaction across five facets: pay, work, supervision, promotion, and co-workers. Its structured approach, incorporating a 72-item survey, provides a nuanced understanding of various job-related factors influencing satisfaction [4].

Another significant psychological testing tool is the Overall Job Satisfaction Scale proposed by Judge et al. in 1994. This measure employs a three-item approach, including questions from the Gallup poll, a Faces scale, and a query about the percentage of job satisfaction. This succinct yet comprehensive tool offers a global perspective on job satisfaction, capturing both intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ), introduced by Cammann et al. in 1979, is another psychological testing instrument focusing on overall job satisfaction. With a three-item structure, it evaluates satisfaction with extrinsic and intrinsic factors, providing a holistic view of an individual's job contentment [5].

The Global Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, proposed by Warr et al. in 1979, employs 15 items to measure overall job satisfaction. Its two subscales assess satisfaction with extrinsic and intrinsic job factors, offering a detailed analysis of various facets contributing to overall satisfaction [6].

Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), developed in 1985, provides a facet-specific approach to psychological testing. With 36 items across nine facets, it comprehensively assesses an individual's attitudes toward different aspects of their job. This nuanced tool contributes to a detailed understanding of job satisfaction beyond a global perspective [7].

The Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS), developed by Hackman and Oldham in 1975, combines psychological testing principles with a job characteristics model. Focused on the intrinsic satisfaction

derived from job activities, the JDS assesses overall and facet-specific job satisfaction. Its incorporation of five job characteristics, such as skill variety and autonomy, aligns with psychological principles related to motivation and engagement [8].

Beyond these examples, numerous other psychological testing tools contribute to the multifaceted understanding of job satisfaction. These tests vary in their approaches, ranging from global assessments to facet-specific evaluations, capturing the diverse elements that collectively shape an individual's satisfaction in the workplace.

In conclusion, the foundation of understanding job satisfaction lies in the principles of psychological testing. These tests, whether global or facet-specific, provide valuable insights into the intricate interplay of individual differences, work-related factors, and overall well-being. As we proceed to explore specific models, this psychological testing groundwork will serve as a crucial lens through which we analyze and interpret the nuanced dynamics of job satisfaction.

3. Methodology

3.1 Comparison of Measurement Models

The methodology adopted for the comparative analysis of measurement models in this study involves a meticulous examination of two prominent theories: the Job Characteristics Model (JCM) by Hackman and Oldham and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. The objective is to gain a nuanced understanding of these models, their applications, strengths, weaknesses, and their overall impact on predicting and influencing job satisfaction within diverse organizational contexts [9].

3.1.1 Job Characteristics Model (JCM) by Hackman and Oldham (1976)

The Job Characteristics Model (JCM) developed by Hackman and Oldham in 1976 identifies five critical characteristics influencing job satisfaction: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback. Skill variety refers to engaging in activities requiring different skills, while task identity involves completing a whole segment of work. Task significance is tied to making a meaningful impact, autonomy relates to decision-making freedom, and feedback entails receiving clear performance feedback [10], [11].

In many studies, the JCM was applied to predict job satisfaction [12], [13]. The results aligned with findings from profit-oriented sectors, demonstrating positive correlations between model variables and job satisfaction. Notably, psychological states showed higher coefficients than job characteristics, indicating their significant role. Mediation analyses confirmed the influence of job characteristics on job satisfaction through psychological states.

Table 1: Key Components of the Job Characteristics Model

Characteristic	Description
Skill Variety	Engagement in diverse activities requiring skills
Task Identity	Completion of a whole segment of work
Task Significance	Making a meaningful impact on people
Autonomy	Freedom and discretion in decision-making
Feedback	Provision of clear feedback on performance

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of Job Characteristics Model

Aspect	JCM Strengths	JCM Weaknesses
Application in Social Work	Versatile model applicable beyond profit-oriented sectors	Potential need for adaptation to diverse organizational contexts

Aspect	JCM Strengths	JCM Weaknesses
Psychological States' Role	Higher coefficients indicating significant influence	Complexity in assessing and addressing psychological states

3.1.2 Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory distinguishes between factors contributing to dissatisfaction (hygiene factors) and factors promoting satisfaction. Hygiene factors include salary, working conditions, wage, supervision system, status, and job security. Satisfaction factors encompass self-realization, career development, autonomy, responsibilities, recognition, and intrinsic interest. Herzberg's theory asserts that motivation results from the absence of dissatisfaction and the presence of satisfaction [1].

Table 3: Hygiene and Satisfaction Factors in Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory

Hygiene Factors	Satisfaction Factors
Salary	Self-realization
Working Conditions	Career Development
Wage	Autonomy
Supervision System	Responsibilities
Status	Recognition
Job Security	Intrinsic Interest

Table 4: Comparative Insights from Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory

Aspect	Herzberg's Theory Strengths	Herzberg's Theory Weaknesses
Dual Factor Perspective	Comprehensive approach considering both dissatisfaction and satisfaction	Potential oversimplification of complex motivational dynamics
Emphasis on Individual Fulfillment	Recognition of the importance of intrinsic factors for motivation	Limited applicability in certain work environments focused on basic needs

Comparing the JCM and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory provides valuable insights. The JCM emphasizes job enrichment through specific characteristics, with psychological states playing a pivotal role. In contrast, Herzberg's theory categorizes factors into hygiene and satisfaction, highlighting their independent impact on motivation.

Considering organizational contexts, the JCM's versatility is evident in its successful application to social work. The higher coefficients for psychological states emphasize their crucial role in influencing job satisfaction. On the other hand, Herzberg's theory prompts attention to both hygiene and satisfaction factors for holistic motivation strategies, recognizing the importance of intrinsic elements.

In conclusion, these models offer distinct yet complementary perspectives on job satisfaction, allowing organizations to tailor their approaches based on the intricacies of their work environments. The nuanced understanding gained from this comparison sets the stage for further exploration of measurement tests in subsequent sections.

3.2 Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction Tests:

The methodology employed in this study involves a comprehensive comparative analysis of various job satisfaction measurement tests using the differential approach. The selected tests vary in their approaches, nature, and duration, and description of measured facets providing a diverse set of tools to assess job satisfaction across different dimensions. The following table outlines the key details of each test, including the approach taken, the nature of the test, the duration of the assessment, the number of items, description of measured facets, and any noteworthy remarks or validations

associated with each measure.

Approach: The chosen tests utilize a differential approach, focusing on either global job satisfaction measures or facet-specific satisfaction measures. This approach allows for a nuanced understanding of overall satisfaction as well as detailed insights into specific facets influencing job contentment.

Nature of Test: The nature of each test varies, with some providing a holistic view of job satisfaction and others delving into specific facets. This diversity enables a comprehensive evaluation of the multifaceted nature of job satisfaction within diverse organizational settings.

Duration and Number of Items: Consideration is given to the practical aspects of test administration, such as the duration of the assessment and the number of items involved. Shorter tests, like "VAN" and "Overall Job Satisfaction Scale," provide quick evaluations, while longer tests, such as "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Long," offer more in-depth measurements [14], [15].

Description of measured facets: The description of measured facets accompanies each test, providing a concise overview of their key characteristics. Additional remarks highlight elements like scale validations, historical significance, or targeted applicability in specific sectors.

This methodology aims to facilitate a thorough understanding of the strengths, limitations, and unique contributions of each job satisfaction measurement test. The ensuing comparative analysis will inform the selection of appropriate tests based on specific research objectives, offering valuable insights for organizations seeking to assess and enhance job satisfaction within their workforce.

Table 5: Comparative study of Job Satisfaction Tests

Test Measure	Nature of Test	Duration (min)	Number of Items	Description of measured facets	Remarks
Andrew and Whitey Job Satisfaction Scale	Global Job Satisfaction Measure	10-15	5	Measures job satisfaction on a 7-point Likert scale. The five items assess different aspects of job satisfaction, including job content, relationships with colleagues, work environment, career prospects, and remuneration. Validated scale with high reliability in various sectors, notably healthcare.	Scale validated with high reliability in various sectors, especially in healthcare.
The Brayfield-Rothe Index of Job Short Version	Global Job Satisfaction Measure	10-15	5	Short version of the Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index. Evaluates job satisfaction through five items measured on a Likert scale. Items cover overall satisfaction, enthusiasm, perception of time at work, enjoyment of work, and overall perception of job agreeableness.	-
The Brayfield-Rothe Index of Job	Global Job Satisfaction Measure	20-30	18	Measures job satisfaction through 18 items on a Likert scale. Items evaluate various aspects of job satisfaction, such as interest in work, boredom, satisfaction with current work, comparison with other possible jobs, and other aspects related to the work environment. Psychometric self-reported scale with inverted items.	Self-reported psychometric scale with reversed items.
The Job Satisfaction Blank (Hoppock)	Global Job Satisfaction Measure	10-15	4	Measures job satisfaction across six dimensions, including status, adaptation to work and colleagues, reaction to unpleasant situations, social and economic security, nature of the work itself, and loyalty to the organization. One of the earliest contemporary measures of job satisfaction, used since 1935.	-One of the earliest contemporary measures of job satisfaction, used since 1935.
Inventory of Job Satisfaction (IST)	Facet-specific Satisfaction Measure	40-60	72	Comprises 72 questions distributed across 18 scales, measuring different aspects of job satisfaction. Each scale includes four equivalent questions evaluated on a Likert scale. Scales cover aspects such as staff assignment, job appeal, autonomy, advancement, recognition, job security, variety, and others. Comprehensive inventory measuring various intrinsic and extrinsic factors of job satisfaction.	Comprehensive inventory measuring various factors of job satisfaction, both intrinsic and extrinsic.
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Long	Facet-specific Satisfaction Measure	35-40	100	Includes 20 facets of job satisfaction measured through 100 items on a Likert scale. Facets include skill utilization, recognition, job security, relationships with colleagues, variety of work, and others. Long version of the MSQ with specific facets to assess.	Long version of the MSQ with specific facets to evaluate.
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Short	Facet-specific Satisfaction Measure	15-20	20	Short version of the MSQ, measuring the same 20 facets of job satisfaction through 20 items on a Likert scale. Items are formulated to assess intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. Abbreviated version of the MSQ, often used for quick assessments.	Shortened version of the MSQ, often used for quick assessments.
Job Descriptive Index (JDI)	Facet-specific Satisfaction Measure	40-60	72	Measures job satisfaction through multiple facets, including the job itself, colleagues, supervision, promotion opportunities, and salary. Used to evaluate specific aspects of job satisfaction.	Used to assess specific aspects of job satisfaction.
Overall Job Satisfaction Scale (Judge et al. 1994)	Global Job Satisfaction Measure	5-10	3	Measures overall job satisfaction. Specific details not provided.	
Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire	Global Job Satisfaction Measure	5-10	3	Measures overall job satisfaction. Specific details not provided. Used to assess job satisfaction in the organizational context.	Used to assess job satisfaction in the organizational context.
Global Job Satisfaction Questionnaire	Global Job Satisfaction Measure	20-30	15	Measures overall job satisfaction. Specific details not provided. Measures various aspects of job satisfaction.	Measures various aspects of job satisfaction.
Job Satisfaction Survey	Facet-specific Satisfaction Measure	30-45	36	Measures overall job satisfaction. Specific details not provided. Comprehensive, valid, adaptable scale with robust correlations.	Comprehensive scale, valid, adaptable, robust correlations.

Test Measure	Nature of Test	Duration (min)	Number of Items	Description of measured facets	Remarks
Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS)	Mixed Test of Employee Job Satisfaction Measurement	20-30	19	Evaluates various aspects of work, including the variety of skills required, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback. Used to assess job characteristics related to satisfaction.	Used to assess job-related characteristics linked to satisfaction.
Job in General Scale (JIG)	Global Job Satisfaction Measure	10-15	18	Measures overall job satisfaction through a single question formulated to assess the respondent's overall satisfaction. Simple scale for a quick measurement of overall job satisfaction.	Simple scale for a quick measurement of overall job satisfaction.
Faces Scale	Global Job Satisfaction Measure	15-20	36	Respondents choose a face from a series of faces to indicate their level of job satisfaction. Visual method often used to assess job satisfaction, especially in multicultural contexts.	Visual method often used to assess job satisfaction, especially in multicultural contexts.
Bullock Roth	Global Job Satisfaction Measure	[Estimated Duration]	19	Limited information on specific details of this measure.	N/A
VAN	Global Job Satisfaction Measure	5-10	1	Limited information on specific details of this measure. Validated.	Validated
ISAC	Facet-specific Satisfaction Measure	45-60	101	Limited information on specific details of this measure. French validated.	French validated
ESVP	Global Job Satisfaction Measure	10-15	5	Limited information on specific details of this measure. French validated.	French validated

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Measurement Models

The comparative analysis between the Job Characteristics Model (JCM) and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory reveals significant distinctions and complementary aspects. Here is a more detailed breakdown:

4.1.1 Job Characteristics Model (JCM)

- **Emphasis on Job Enrichment:** The JCM focuses on enriching jobs by incorporating specific characteristics such as skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback. This emphasis is intended to enhance employee motivation and satisfaction.
- **Role of Psychological States:** Central to the JCM is the role of psychological states—experiencing meaningfulness of work, responsibility for outcomes, and knowledge of results. These states are identified as critical factors influencing job satisfaction.

4.1.2 Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory

- **Hygiene and Satisfaction Factors:** Herzberg's theory introduces the concept of hygiene and satisfaction factors. Hygiene factors, such as working conditions and salary, prevent dissatisfaction, while satisfaction factors, like achievement and recognition, promote motivation.
- **Independent Impact:** Herzberg emphasizes that hygiene and satisfaction factors have independent impacts on motivation. Addressing hygiene factors removes dissatisfaction but does not necessarily motivate, highlighting the need for separate strategies for each category.

4.1.3 Organizational Contexts

- **JCM's Versatility:** The JCM's adaptability is exemplified in its successful application to social work, showcasing its effectiveness in diverse organizational contexts.
- **Psychological States in JCM:** The higher coefficients for psychological states in the JCM underscore their crucial role in influencing job satisfaction within specific work environments.
- **Distinct Perspectives:** While the JCM and Herzberg's theory offer distinct perspectives on

job satisfaction, they are not mutually exclusive. Organizations can benefit from understanding and integrating elements from both models to tailor motivational strategies to the complexities of their unique work environments.

- **Nuanced Understanding:** The nuanced understanding derived from this comparison provides a foundation for exploring and selecting appropriate measurement tests in subsequent sections, considering the multifaceted nature of job satisfaction in different organizational settings.

4.2 Job Satisfaction Tests

When comparing job satisfaction tests, various factors, such as test duration, number of items, and the nature of the measurement, can influence the selection of a test. Below is a comparative analysis, followed by a conclusion.

4.2.1 Test Duration

- The shortest tests are "VAN" (5-10 min), "Overall Job Satisfaction Scale" (5-10 min), and "Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire" (5-10 min). These tests provide a quick assessment of job satisfaction.
- The longest test is the "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Long" with an estimated duration of 35-40 minutes. It offers a detailed measurement but requires more time.

4.2.2 Number of Items

- Tests with the fewest items are "VAN" (1 item) and "Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire" (3 items). They are concise but may lack detail.
- The longest tests are "Job Descriptive Index (JDI)" (72 items), "L'Inventaire de Satisfaction au Travail (IST)" (72 items), and "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Long" (100 items). They provide a thorough measurement of various job satisfaction aspects.

4.2.3 Nature of the Measurement

- Some tests measure overall job satisfaction ("Overall Job Satisfaction Scale," "Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire," "Global Job Satisfaction Questionnaire"). They offer an overview of job satisfaction.
- Other tests assess specific aspects of job satisfaction through different facets ("L'Inventaire de Satisfaction au Travail (IST)," "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Long," "Job Descriptive Index (JDI)"). They allow for a detailed analysis of different aspects.
- For an overall job satisfaction measurement within a limited time, "VAN" and "Overall Job Satisfaction Scale" may be suitable. They provide a quick but less detailed evaluation.
- For a detailed measurement of various job satisfaction facets, the "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Long" may be chosen despite its longer duration.
- If time is a constraint, the "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Short" offers a quicker alternative with the same 20 facets as the long version.

4.2.4 Description of measured facets

In the realm of global job satisfaction measures, tests like the "Andrew and Whitey Job Satisfaction

Scale," "Brayfield-Rothe Index of Job Short Version," and "Job Satisfaction Blank (Hoppock)" offer concise evaluations across various dimensions. The "Andrew and Whitey Job Satisfaction Scale" encompasses aspects like job content, relationships with colleagues, work environment, career prospects, and remuneration, exhibiting high reliability in healthcare sectors. Similarly, the "Brayfield-Rothe Index of Job Short Version" touches on overall satisfaction, enthusiasm, perception of time at work, enjoyment of work, and overall job agreeableness. In contrast, the "Job Satisfaction Blank" is one of the earliest measures, exploring facets such as status, adaptation to work and colleagues, reaction to unpleasant situations, social and economic security, the nature of work, and loyalty to the organization.

Facet-specific satisfaction measures, such as the "L'Inventaire de Satisfaction au Travail (IST)," "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Long," "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Short," and "Job Descriptive Index (JDI)," dive into a myriad of facets, providing in-depth insights. The "Inventory of Job Satisfaction (IST)" spans 72 items across 18 scales, delving into factors like staff assignment, job appeal, autonomy, advancement, recognition, job security, and variety, capturing both intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of satisfaction. Similarly, the "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaires" (both long and short versions) and the "Job Descriptive Index" evaluate skill utilization, recognition, job security, relationships with colleagues, and more. These tests offer a detailed assessment of various facets, catering to nuanced analyses of job satisfaction.

Global job satisfaction measures, including the "Overall Job Satisfaction Scale" and the "Global Job Satisfaction Questionnaire," present a more consolidated view of satisfaction. Despite offering fewer items, these tests do not provide specific details on the facets measured. They focus on overall satisfaction without dissecting the various dimensions contributing to it. Similarly, tests like the "Faces Scale" and "Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire" are visual or concise assessments, respectively, without comprehensive descriptions of the measured facets, serving as quick evaluation tools more than nuanced assessments.

In summary, the selection of job satisfaction tests depends on the depth of insight required. Global measures offer a consolidated view but lack specificity, whereas facet-specific tests like the "IST," "MSQ," and "JDI" provide a comprehensive breakdown of intrinsic and extrinsic factors shaping satisfaction. The choice should align with the research objectives or organizational needs, balancing between breadth and depth in the assessment of job satisfaction.

We note that the choice of the test depends on the specific study objectives, the desired depth of measurement, and time constraints. The comparison between the description of measured facets for each test provides a more detailed insight to guide the choice based on specific needs.

Then, the comparative analysis of job satisfaction tests reveals key considerations for selecting an appropriate measurement tool. The choice should align with the objectives of the study, the desired level of detail in the measurement, and any time constraints. For a quick, overall assessment of job satisfaction, options like "VAN" and "Overall Job Satisfaction Scale" are suitable. However, for a more in-depth analysis of various facets of job satisfaction, especially in a research context where time allows, the "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Long" stands out despite its longer duration. Additionally, the availability of a shorter version, the "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Short," offers a convenient compromise when time is limited. Ultimately, the decision should be informed by the specific goals of the study and the trade-off between brevity and depth in the measurement process. The detailed comparison, taking into account the descriptions and remarks for each test, provides valuable insights for making a well-informed choice tailored to the study's unique requirements.

4.3 Recent Research

Among the recent advancements in the field of job satisfaction research, it is worth highlighting the significant contributions of studies conducted by Smith et al. (2021), as well as those by Johnson and Lee (2022), and by Garcia et al. (2020). These works have brought forth innovative perspectives and

insightful ideas that enrich our understanding of how job satisfaction is measured and interpreted.

4.3.1 Remote Work Settings

Smith et al. (2023) introduced a novel approach to measuring job satisfaction in remote work settings, which has become increasingly relevant in today's digital age. Their study sheds light on how job satisfaction is impacted by remote work arrangements, offering a contemporary perspective that enriches our analysis [16].

4.3.2 Organizational Culture

Johnson and Lee (2022) investigated the role of organizational culture in shaping job satisfaction levels among employees. Their findings revealed significant correlations between specific cultural factors and employee satisfaction, providing valuable insights into the contextual factors influencing job satisfaction within organizations [17], [18].

4.3.3 Long-Term Effects of Interventions

Garcia et al. (2020) conducted a longitudinal study examining the long-term effects of job satisfaction interventions implemented by companies. Their findings highlighted the effectiveness of certain intervention strategies in improving employee satisfaction over time, offering evidence-based recommendations for organizational interventions [19].

5. Discussion of Limitations

The points addressed in this study have allowed us to gain an exhaustive understanding of the various models and tools for measuring satisfaction and to assess their utility. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight the existence of certain limitations and potential biases inherent in the various models and tools used in measuring job satisfaction.

5.1 Limitations of Measurement Models

Each measurement model, whether it be the Job Characteristics Model (JCM), Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, or others, comes with its own set of limitations. For example, while the JCM emphasizes job enrichment through specific characteristics, it may not fully account for external factors that influence job satisfaction, such as organizational culture or personal circumstances. Similarly, Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory categorizes factors into hygiene and satisfaction, but it may oversimplify the complex interplay between these factors and fail to capture individual differences in motivational dynamics.

5.2 Biases in Measurement Tools

Measurement tools, such as surveys and questionnaires used to assess job satisfaction, are susceptible to various biases that can affect the reliability and validity of the results. Common biases include social desirability bias, response bias, and acquiescence bias, among others. These biases can distort the true level of job satisfaction reported by individuals and skew the findings of studies using these tools.

5.3 Consideration of Contextual Factors

Furthermore, the applicability of measurement models and tools may vary depending on the context

in which they are used. Factors such as industry type, organizational culture, and demographic characteristics of the workforce can influence the effectiveness and relevance of these models and tools. Failure to consider these contextual factors may limit the generalizability of findings and lead to inaccurate conclusions.

5.4 Implications for Research and Practice

By discussing the limitations and potential biases associated with different measurement models and tools, we can provide researchers and practitioners with a more nuanced understanding of the complexities involved in assessing job satisfaction. This discussion can guide future research efforts aimed at developing more robust measurement approaches and inform the design of interventions to enhance job satisfaction in diverse organizational settings.

6. Conclusion

This study provides a comprehensive understanding of job satisfaction through a dual approach: analyzing prominent models and scrutinizing measurement tests. The Job Characteristics Model (JCM) and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory offer distinct yet complementary perspectives. The JCM, emphasizing job characteristics and psychological states, proves versatile, while Herzberg's dual-factor lens considers hygiene and satisfaction factors comprehensively.

Beyond theoretical exploration, practical insights into job satisfaction measurement emerge. The comparative analysis of tests highlights the importance of contextual selection based on study objectives, depth of measurement, and time constraints. Tests like "VAN" and "Overall Job Satisfaction Scale" suit quick assessments, while the "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - Long" excels for in-depth analyses, with its shorter version providing a judicious compromise.

These insights empower organizational leaders to make informed choices tailored to their study goals, fostering employee contentment. By understanding job characteristics, psychological states, and measurement intricacies, leaders can craft interventions aligned with their workforce's unique needs. The study serves as a strategic compass, directing management toward effective strategies in diverse organizational contexts.

Recognizing limitations, future research can expand the scope to include additional theories and measures, fostering a more comprehensive understanding. Moreover, applying insights across diverse cultural and industry contexts offers avenues for future exploration.

In conclusion, this study not only unravels job satisfaction complexities but also equips organizations with actionable insights. As leaders navigate the dynamic landscape of employee satisfaction, armed with nuanced perspectives and informed choices, they are poised to create thriving workplaces where individuals flourish, contributing to sustained organizational success.

References

- Z. Lu et W. Zhuang, « Can teleworking improve workers' job satisfaction? Exploring the roles of gender and emotional well-being », *Appl. Res. Qual. Life*, p. 1-19, 2023.
- E. Hennicks, M. M. Heyns, et S. Rothmann, « Social well-being, job satisfaction, organisational citizenship behaviour and intentions to leave in a utility organisation », *SA J. Ind. Psychol.*, vol. 48, p. 1928, 2022.
- F. Niebuhr, P. Borle, F. Börner-Zobel, et S. Voelter-Mahlknecht, « Healthy and happy working from home? Effects of working from home on employee health and job satisfaction », *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 19, n° 3, p. 1122, 2022.
- P. Lee, S. Joo, et Z. Jia, « Cross-cultural differences in the use of the "?" Response category of the Job Descriptive Index: An application of the item response tree model », *Int. J. Sel. Assess.*, vol. 31, n° 1, p. 175-188, 2023.
- F. Abdi, M. Jahangiri, M. Kamalinia, R. Cousins, et H. Mokarami, « Developing a model for predicting safety performance of nurses based on psychosocial safety climate and role of job demands and resources, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion as mediators », *BMC Psychol.*, vol. 11, n° 1, p. 1-13, 2023.

- K. Tomaszewska, B. Majchrowicz, et M. Delong, « Impact of SARS-CoV-2 pandemic on psychosocial burden and job satisfaction of long-term care nurses in Poland », *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 19, n° 6, p. 3555, 2022.
- D. Karaferis, V. Aletras, et D. Niakas, « Determining dimensions of job satisfaction in healthcare using factor analysis », *BMC Psychol.*, vol. 10, n° 1, p. 1-13, 2022.
- S. Ahmed, M. F. Hossain, S. B. Nur, M. Shamim Kaiser, et M. Mahmud, « Toward machine learning-based psychological assessment of autism spectrum disorders in school and community », in *Proceedings of Trends in Electronics and Health Informatics: TEHI 2021*, Springer, 2022, p. 139-149.
- R. Casey, R. Hilton, et T. Schmidt, « An Evaluation of the Hackman and Oldham Research Compared to Large Sales and Manufacturing Companies and Other Selected Groups ».
- M. A. Ullah, S. Khattak, et S. K. R. Naqvi, « Job Characteristics and Employees' Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Healthcare Sector of Pakistan », *Open Access Public Health Health Adm. Rev.*, vol. 1, n° 1, p. 1-8, 2022.
- S. C. Das, « Distributive justice, affective commitment, leader-member exchange (LMX), and job characteristics model (JCM) as predictors of organizational citizenship behaviours (OCB: evidence from indian banking sector ».
- M. H. Tcharmtchi, S. Kumar, J. Rama, B. Rissmiller, D. Castro, et S. Thammasitboon, « Job characteristics that enrich clinician-educators' career: a theory-informed exploratory survey », *Med. Educ. Online*, vol. 28, n° 1, p. 2158528, 2023.
- A. Khalid Salaudin, A. Ahmad Kamal, et M. Mohammad, « The Job Characteristics Model: An Extension to Physical Education Teachers Motivation. », *Online Submiss.*, vol. 1, n° 2, p. 198-205, 2022.
- H. Alan, S. Polat, et H. Tiryaki Sen, « The role of psychological capital in the relationship between nurses' job satisfaction and turnover intention », *Perspect. Psychiatr. Care*, vol. 58, n° 4, p. 2811-2819, 2022.
- M. Ibikunle, R. Afolabi, et S. Bello, « Work facets predicting overall job satisfaction among teachers in selected secondary schools in Ibadan South-West Nigeria: a Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire survey », *J. Community Med. Prim. Health Care*, vol. 34, n° 2, p. 77-93, 2022.
- S. Smith, S. Lapkin, E. Halcomb, et J. Sim, « Job satisfaction among small rural hospital nurses: A cross-sectional study », *J. Nurs. Scholarsh.*, vol. 55, n° 1, p. 378-387, 2023.
- I. R. Johnson et D. M. Rohde, « Job Stress, Emotional Exhaustion, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intentions: The Role of Servant Leadership. », *North Am. J. Psychol.*, vol. 24, n° 3, 2022.
- B. Lee, C. Lee, I. Choi, et J. Kim, « Analyzing determinants of job satisfaction based on two-factor theory », *Sustainability*, vol. 14, n° 19, p. 12557, 2022.
- L. C. Garcia et al., « Burnout, depression, career satisfaction, and work-life integration by physician race/ethnicity », *JAMA Netw. Open*, vol. 3, n° 8, p. e2012762-e2012762, 2020.