

MEASURING JOB SATISFACTION AS AN ATTITUDE

¹P. Vaijyanthi, ²R.L. Vinodhini, ³Srividya

¹Professor, Management Studies, School of Law, SASTRA Deemed to be University, Tamilnadu, India.

²Research Scholar, School of Management, SASTRA Deemed to be University, Tamilnadu, India.

³Student, School of Law, SASTRA Deemed to be University, Tamilnadu, India.

Abstract

Research in the past has intermittently established that JS was not correlated with many of the workplace behaviors which were conventionally held to be significantly interrelated. Besides, while there are abundant publications on job satisfaction there is relatively little on the job satisfaction of academicians in general and very little still on the job satisfaction among school teachers in India. This study is an attempt to find clarification in the interrelationship by measuring JS as a three dimensional attitude. Though the primary objective is to examine the effects of job satisfaction on identified workplace behavior among the academics (school teachers) in Tamilnadu, India, the secondary and tertiary goals of this paper were to validate the reconstructed tripartite JS construct in the education sector, and to look into the inner dimensions of JS attitude for gaining a better understanding of the JS-outcome relationships. Findings of the study affirm that the JS attitude was exceedingly built on Cognition and Evaluation, with low participation of the Affect in the education sector. Performance of employees were Cognition driven, while Organization commitment, Turnover Intention and Intention to stay were Affect driven. This study has made vital contribution to the understanding of JS-outcome relationships by affirming that JS is a comprehensive attitude, and its constituent components have discrete independent influences on the diverse employee behaviors in the workplace. Implications for further research and practice have also been presented.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, attitude, JS outcomes, teachers, Affect, Cognition, Evaluation.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational environments that make employees be inclined to commit and contribute industriously for the organization and themselves are inevitably important and need to be developed strategically. How employees feel about their jobs and job-related contexts is hence a big concern for many organizations. A huge number of studies conducted in the domains of organizational behavior and human resource management identified multiple antecedents of turnover (example, Griffeth, Hom & Gaertner, 2000). Research studies affirm that work satisfaction is directly linked with employee's intention to stay (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Megliano, 1979, Larrabee et al., 2003). Job

Satisfaction accordingly, has been recognized as a key contributor to employee behaviors that lead organizations to success or failure.

Job satisfaction is concomitant with employee's performance (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Judge, Thorenson, Bono, & Patton, 2001), loyalty towards organization ((Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993), turnover (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand & Megliano, 1979; Ohlin and West, 1993), and absenteeism (Tharenou, 1993). Job satisfaction is the driving force behind employee retention (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Megliano, 1979; Larrabee et al., 2003). Dissatisfied employee might not hang on to his job or might not produce satisfactory output. Job

satisfaction plays a pivotal role in the success of the organization.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Research in the past has recurrently established that JS was not correlated with many of the workplace behaviors which were conventionally held logical. While there are abundant publications on job satisfaction there is relatively little on the job satisfaction of school teachers in general and very little still on the job satisfaction among school teachers in India. Furthermore, research that trace the causality or the 'why' than 'how much' of the job satisfaction-outcomes interrelations are almost nil. This study is an attempt to clarify the interrelationship by using a reconstructed JS measure that assesses it as a three dimensional attitude.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Job Satisfaction defined as a positive inclination of an individual towards his or her work and role (Vroom, 1964), has been described as a pleasurable positive state experienced from one's job (Locke, 1976). It is a package that has and includes pay, perquisites, incentives, bonus, ex gratia, HRA, CCA and non pecuniary benefits like club membership, cultural programs, education for children, health care, congenial work environment, peer association and above all humane approach by the management. The employee's expectation and the employer's offer should sync with each other failing which would lead to job dissatisfaction. Hackman and Oldham (1980) reported that for a blue collar employee job security and the pay packet takes upper hand over finishing challenging tasks. Job satisfaction has three imperative components as laid out by Locke (1969): assessing the nature of the job, ascertaining a value standard for evaluation and establishing the level of correlation between the employee's outlook and the standard frame of reference.

Thus research has shown job satisfaction to be composite and multidimensional, with constituent parts that are relatively homogeneous and different from one another (Spector 1985; Ironson et al. 1989; Snipes et al. 2005). Besides, employees tend to differ in the

levels of satisfaction between the various facets of work, and each of the facets might have independent effects on overall satisfaction of an individual (Spector 1997).

Locke (1976) perceived Job satisfaction as an attitude. Saari & Judge (2004) also underline this nature of Job satisfaction among others (Lofquist and Dawis, 1969; Porter et al., 1975; Aziri, 2008; Mullins, 2005). According to some researchers attitude encompasses two elements: An emotional faculty and a cognitive faculty (Brief et al., 1988; Eagly and Chaiken, 1993; Crites, Fabrigar & Petty, 1994). Both these elements contribute differently in the overall attitude. These are distinctly caused and differently linked to behavior (Millar and Tesser 1986; Breckler and Wiggins, 1989; Weiss, 2000).

The affective component of attitudes corresponds to the feelings or emotions individuals associate with their jobs, and the valence of those feelings (Bagozzi, 1978). Cognition controls both meaning and importance of values, facets and outcomes (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978; Hulin, & Judge, 2003; Organ & Near, 1985). Cognitions are often characterized as the content of thoughts or beliefs about an attitude object or statement of fact in question, usually in comparison to a standard or expectation (Bagozzi, 1978; Campbell, 1976; Crites et al., 1994; Organ & Near, 1985; Weiss, 2002b; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Affect and cognition influence one another (Forgas, 1995; Jundt, & Hinz, 2002; Millar & Tesser, 1986; Weiss, 2002a) and the affective processes and cognitive processes are neither separable nor sequential (Edwards, 1990). In the meantime job satisfaction researchers have agreed that affect and cognition constitute the primary parts of attitudes, and the conventional third component - behavior, to be an outcome (Brief, 1998a; Brief 1998b; Fisher, 2000; Weiss 2002a). Previous research has also exhibited evaluation as a viable component of job satisfaction (Crites et al., 1994; Hulin & Judge, 2003; Tekell, Yeoh, & Huff, 2006).

Thus it is fitting to look at JS as a comprehensive attitude.

Among the vital behavioral outcomes of Job satisfaction, performance though increasingly crucial, is nevertheless surrounded by mystic paradoxes. Analysis of satisfaction-

performance relationship in the middle of 20th Century (Herzberg et al., 1957; Brayfield and Crockett, 1955; Vroom, 1964; Schwab & Cummings, 1970; Locke, 1970) had pitched for a theory driven examination on moderating or mediating interposes. However (Cropanzano, James, & Konovsky, 1993; George & Bettenhausen, 1990) have build the implementation of the theory based on positive emotions, which has a direct bearing on performance. Deducing job satisfaction performance has a two component approach- cognition and positive evaluation.

Several antecedents to turnover have been reported by diverse investigations on organizational behavior (for example, Loveday, 1996; Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Martin, 2007; Khadija Al Arkoubi, et al., 2011; Ahmad, Bashir et al., 2012). Turnover Intention represents a robust antecedent of turnover behavior (Shore & Martin, 1989; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Kuean, Kaur, & Wong, 2010). Attitudinal and behavioral precursors of the turnover intention should be looked into to effectively manage human resource on ground. Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction are two paramount antecedents, which are key predictors of Turnover Intention (Newton, & Thornton III., 1990; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Blau, 1993; Shields & Ward, 2001; A. Scott et al., 2006). Studies carried out in the past have not laid out concretely as to how job satisfaction and organizational commitment affect the turnover process. Employees who perform well in their job can be implied to hold on to their current jobs (Eberhardt et al., 1995). We envisage from here, to examine the association between constituent dimensions of Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention.

Organizational Commitment is the magnitude to which an employee associates himself with the organization's vision and mission and strives towards contributing his best for the organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). The popularly accepted three – dimensional construct of Organizational Commitment was presented by Allen and Meyer (1990). Employee's attachment with the organization is determined by the affect component (Mowday et al., 1979, 1982). The commitment of employees who have put in long years of service would be dependent on the organization's direct or indirect support for the employee and the extent

to which employee revels on being commensurately rewarded (Becker, 1960). A sense of deception and insecure perception engulfs the employee to take a call when there is a wide gap despite demand being made (Becker, 1960). The third commitment described as normative commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990), stands on the premises of normative pressure as analyzed by Wiener (1982). In this study we envisage to shed light on the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment.

Manpower retention is one of the challenges in the current day work environment. Employee's Intent to Stay refers to the extent of likelihood that an employee intends to stay with the organization (Al-Omari, Qablan, & Khasawneh, 2008; Lyons, 1971; Kim, Price, Mueller, & Watson, 1996). Conventional research confirm the association of Job Satisfaction with employees' Intent to Stay (Rosser and Tabata, 2010; Al-Hamdan, Manojlovich & Tanima, 2017). Labor turnover is determined by job satisfaction (Chan and Morrison (2000); Cavanaugh & Coffin, 1992; Larrabee et al., 2003). Intent to stay is determined by factors such as organizational commitment, work load satisfaction, rewards & incentives, and managerial attitude (Lynn and Redman, 2005). Clayton and Hutchinson (2002) posit that an individual's attitude towards the organization is demonstrated by their loyalty to the organization, identification with its values, readiness to make efforts in order to contribute to the organization, as well as their intention to stay in the organization. This empirical study throws light on the relationship between job satisfaction and Intent to Stay in the educational sector.

As described above, this study was carried out to identify the influence of Job satisfaction on Organizational Commitment, Performance, Turnover Intention and Intent to Stay among secondary school teachers (Neumann, 1978) in Tamilnadu, India.

METHODOLOGY

Data

The data was collected from the academicians who were working in the schools of Velammal Group educational institution, Tamilnadu. The

researchers have collected the data from a random sample of 193 sample respondents (Academicians).

Measures

The data for the current study were obtained through self-report measures. This study uses a comprehensive Job satisfaction instrument developed based on psychometric research, which perceives JS as an attitude comprising three components namely, Affect, Cognition and Behavior (Vaijayanthi & Vinodhini, 2021a). This job satisfaction instrument was developed, which could be used in a wide range of occupational groups. The initial pool of 40 items were completed by a sample of 461 workers from the cement, automobile, oil & gas, fabrication and sugar units of the manufacturing sector in India. Based on extensive literature study that confirmed the content validity, the affect items were extracted and adapted from Brayfield & Rothe, 1951. The cognitive items were extracted and adapted from Weiss et. al., 1967 and Hackman & Oldham, 1975. The behavioral component has been conceptualized as evaluative judgments and extracted and adapted from Porter & Lawler, 1961; Weiss et. al., 1967; Hackman & Oldham, 1975. Reliability estimates for this instrument have been shown to be good with coefficient alpha values ranging from 0.913 to 0.917 (Vaijayanthi & Vinodhini, 2021a). The

convergent validity of the reconstructed instrument was confirmed by strong correlations with existing cardinal JS scales including Job Satisfaction Scale (Spector, 1985), Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969), Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et. al., 1967), Overall Job Satisfaction (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951) and Job Characteristic Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) (Vaijayanthi & Vinodhini, 2021a). The measures used in this investigation were adopted from their original source and adapted for the Indian work setting. The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) by Allen & Meyer (1990) was employed in the study for measuring Organizational Commitment, constituting 3 subscales namely Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment Scales. Performance was measured using the (Griffin et. al., 2007) scale after reducing the factors. Turnover Intention was based on the scale developed by (Wayne et. al., 1997 and Metcalf et. al., 2015b). Intent to Stay was measured using the scale developed by (Gary A. Markowitz, 2012). The survey instrument consisted of 59 items in total (including JS and its outcomes). The constructs were operationalized using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

RESULTS

Table 1: *Descriptive Statistics, Scale reliabilities and Inter-correlations – JS and its outcomes*

Factors	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
Job Satisfaction	3.33	.398	(.852)				
Organizational Commitment	3.91	.598	.506	(.730)			
Performance	4.05	.661	.579	.503	(.844)		
Turnover Intention	2.94	.909	-.327	-.706	-.364	(.687)	
Intent to Stay	4.08	.948	.222	.644	.368	-.457	(.664)

Source: Primary data

Descriptive statistics, correlations and internal consistency reliabilities, of the study variables are displayed in Table 1. The alpha coefficients ranged from 0.664 to 0.852. The mean score of all the variables are above the scale mid-point 2.5, indicating a positive status of the variables in the study units. There is a significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and its

important outcome variables, namely Organizational Commitment and Performance (correlation coefficients 0.506 and 0.579) and moderate correlations with turnover intentions and Intent to stay. This also establishes the convergent validity of the reconstructed JS attitude scale in the education sector.

Table 2: Regression Analysis – Dimensions of JS attitude

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Statistical Inference	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			F value	
(Constant)	1.004	.001		2.768	.003	R = 0.881 R ² = 0.777 Adjusted R ² = 0.769	107.812
Affect	.100	.000	.177	438.368	.000		
Cognition	.459	.000	.604	1528.538	.000		
Evaluation	.450	.000	.560	1357.355	.000		

Source: Primary data

According to the regression analysis results in table 2, all the three dimensions together have contributed to Job Satisfaction to the extent of 77.7%. The R² value for the three dimensions indicates that these dimensions have a moderate variance on Job Satisfaction. The dimensions contribute 76.9% to Job Satisfaction, with the adjusted R² value of 0.769. At the 1% level of significance, the F value (107.812) is significant, indicating the model fit. The coefficients of Job Satisfaction in the regression equation given by the unstandardized coefficients,

$$\text{Job Satisfaction} = 0.100 * \text{affect} + 0.459 * \text{cognition} + 0.450 * \text{evaluation} + 1.004$$

As a result, Job Satisfaction will rise by 0.100, 0.459, and 0.450 units for each unit of affect, cognition, and evaluation, respectively. In other words, the Job Satisfaction components of cognition and evaluation have a greater impact on Job Satisfaction.

Table 3: Correlation – Dimensions of JS attitude and its outcomes

Dimensions/Constructs	Organizational Commitment	Performance	Turnover Intention	Intent to Stay
Affect	.488**	.312**	-.567**	.493**
Cognition	.348**	.519**	-.107**	.146**
Evaluation	.373**	.373**	-.288**	.346**
Overall Job Satisfaction	.495**	.483**	-.190**	.266**

Source: Primary data **p<0.05

Among the outcome variables, Job Satisfaction-Organizational Commitment relationship is found to be very strong followed by Job Satisfaction-Performance relationship. Affect component of Job Satisfaction is found to be most influential dimension in job satisfaction-organizational commitment relationship and cognition component in job satisfaction-performance relationship (r = .488 & .519 respectively). Similarly, cognition seems to be

the most influential sub-component that impacts Job Satisfaction-Intent to Stay relationship (r = .493). Cognition component of Job Satisfaction dimension has an inversely moderate relationship with Turnover Intention.

The relationship between the explanatory and response variables was estimated by a regression analysis (table 4 – table 7)

Table 4: *Regression Analysis – Dimensions of JS attitude and Organizational Commitment*

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Statistical Inference	
	B	Std. Error				Beta	F value
(Constant)	1.078	.207		5.216	.000	R = 0.579 R ² = 0.335 Adjusted R ² = 0.330	69.174
Affect	.326	.036	.386	8.983	.000		
Cognition	.255	.047	.228	5.436	.000		
Evaluation	.217	.053	.180	4.110	.000		

Source: Primary data

According to the regression analysis results in table 4, all the three dimensions of Job Satisfaction together have contributed to Organizational Commitment to the extent of 57.9%.The R2 value for the three dimensions indicates that these dimensions have a moderate variance on Organizational Commitment. The dimensions contribute 33.5% to Organizational Commitment, with the adjusted R2 value of 0.335. At the 1% level of significance, the F value (69.174)is significant, indicating the model fit. The coefficients of Organizational

Commitment in the regression equation given by the unstandardized coefficients,

$$\text{Organizational Commitment} = 0.326*\text{affect} + 0.255*\text{cognition} + 0.217*\text{evaluation} + 1.078$$

As a result, Organizational Commitmentwill rise by 0.326, 0.255, and 0.217 units for each unit of affect, cognition, and evaluation, respectively. In other words, the Job Satisfaction components of affect and cognition have a greater impact on Organizational Commitment.

Table 5: *Regression Analysis – Dimensions of JS attitude and Performance*

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Statistical Inference	
	B	Std. Error				Beta	F value
(Constant)	.779	.226		3.453	.001	R = 0.593 R ² = 0.352 Adjusted R ² = 0.347	74.524
Affect	.154	.040	.165	3.890	.000		
Cognition	.539	.051	.435	10.503	.000		
Evaluation	.265	.058	.199	4.593	.000		

Source: Primary data

According to the regression analysis results in table 4, all the three dimensions of job Satisfaction together have contributed to Performance to the extent of 59.3%.The R2 value for the three dimensions indicates that these dimensions have a moderate variance on Performance. The dimensions contribute 35.2% to Performance, with the adjusted R2 value of 0.352. At the 1% level of significance, the F

value (74.524)is significant, indicating the model fit. The coefficients of Performance in the regression equation given by the unstandardized coefficients,

$$\text{Performance} = 0.154*\text{affect} + 0.539*\text{cognition} + 0.265*\text{evaluation} + 0.779$$

As a result, Performance will rise by 0.154, 0.539, and 0.265 units for each unit of affect,

cognition, and evaluation, respectively. In other words, the Job Satisfaction components of

cognition and evaluation have a greater impact on Performance.

Table 6: *Regression Analysis – Dimensions of JS attitude and Turnover Intention*

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Statistical Inference	
	B	Std. Error				Beta	F value
(Constant)	5.151	.315		16.362	.000	R = 0.576 R ² = 0.332 Adjusted R ² = 0.327	68.317
Affect	-.684	.055	-.532	-12.375	.000		
Cognition	-.037	.072	.022	.513	.004		
Evaluation	-.208	.081	-.113	-2.582	.004		

Source: Primary data

According to the regression analysis results in table 6, all the three dimensions of Job Satisfaction together have contributed to Turnover Intention to the extent of 57.6%. The R² value for the three dimensions indicates that these dimensions have a moderate variance on Turnover Intention. The dimensions contribute 33.2% to Turnover Intention, with the adjusted R² value of 0.332. At the 1% level of significance, the F value (68.317) is significant, indicating the model fit. The coefficients of

Turnover Intention in the regression equation given by the unstandardized coefficients,

$$\text{Turnover Intention} = (-0.684 \cdot \text{affect}) + (-0.037 \cdot \text{cognition}) + (-0.208 \cdot \text{evaluation}) + 5.151$$

As a result, Turnover Intention will decrease by 0.684, 0.037 and 0.208 units for each unit of affect, cognition, and evaluation, respectively. In other words, the Job Satisfaction components of cognition and evaluation have a greater impact on Turnover Intention.

Table 7: *Regression Analysis – Dimensions of JS attitude and Intent to Stay*

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Statistical Inference	
	B	Std. Error				Beta	F value
(Constant)	1.950	.382		5.103	.000	R = 0.309 R ² = 0.096 Adjusted R ² = 0.089	14.541
Affect	.357	.067	.267	5.327	.000		
Cognition	.158	.087	.089	1.822	.000		
Evaluation	.059	.098	.031	.602	.004		

Source: Primary data

According to the regression analysis results in table 6, all the three dimensions of Job Satisfaction together have contributed to Intent to Stay to the extent of 30.9%. The R² value for the three dimensions indicates that these dimensions have a moderate variance on Turnover Intention. The dimensions contribute 9.6% to Intent to Stay, with the adjusted R² value of 0.096. At the 1% level of significance, the F value (14.541) is significant, indicating the model fit. The coefficients of Intent to Stay in the

regression equation given by the unstandardized coefficients,

$$\text{Intent to Stay} = 0.357 \cdot \text{affect} + 0.158 \cdot \text{cognition} + 0.059 \cdot \text{evaluation} + 1.950$$

As a result, Intent to Stay will rise by 0.357, 0.158 and 0.059 units for each unit of affect, cognition, and evaluation, respectively. In other words, the Job Satisfaction components of affect and cognition have a greater impact on Intent to Stay.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The current study seeks to enrich our understanding of the workplace behaviors by filling the JS literature gaps in the field of educational management, especially in the school organization setting. Though the primary focus of this study was to investigate the influence of job satisfaction on organization commitment, Performance, Turnover Intention and Intent to stay, the study also concomitantly aimed to validate and verify the acceptability of the JS attitude model (Vaijayanthi & Vinodhini, 2021a) in the education sector. This research was built on the key supposition that the reconstructed JS measure would help understand and clarify the unanswered mystery-riddled JS-outcome conundrum. The findings of the study confirm appropriate strong correlations between JS and its behavioral outcomes, establishing the primary supposition of the study that reconceptualisation of the JS construct would clarify the unanswered mysteries of the JS-outcome relationship, as was proposed by Schleicher, Watt & Gregarus (2004) and Tekell (2008). The strong positive correlations of JS with Performance and Organizational Commitment corroborates with the findings of Judge et al. (2001), and Netemeyer & Maxham (2010). Performance of employees were cognition driven, while Organization commitment, Turnover Intention and Intent to stay were Affect driven.

Since, affect influences the cognitive processes in an individual, resulting in behaviors which may either be affectively or cognitively driven (Millar & Tesser, 1986), focused learning of the antecedents to the affect component needs to be deliberated to render the JS attitude and its behavioral outcomes more amenable and predictable. Furthermore, since Negative Affect, which is a predominant antecedent of affect, appears to be more predictive of negative outcomes (Thorenson et al., 2003) the understanding of this antecedent of the affect component should be the locus of Organizational Behavior research that aims to lay control on the much eluded turnover intention in organizations.

We believe that practicing managers would now acknowledge and recognize that Job satisfaction is not all about 'needs fulfillment'. Creating a job-satisfied workforce entails 'expectation satisfaction', which implicates assessing the

work environment factors 'valued' by the employees. The principal learning for the Management boards of educational institutions is that the academics conscientiously 'evaluate' their job-related factors than assimilate their jobs overall.

This study has made vital contribution to the understanding of JS-outcome relationships by affirming that JS is a comprehensive attitude, and its constituent components have discrete independent influences on the diverse employee behaviors in the workplace. The supplementary take-home for the researchers would be the validation of the reconstructed comprehensive psychometrically researched JS attitude instrument in the education sector.

References

- [1] Al Arkoubi, K., Bishop, J. W., & Scott, D. (2011). An Investigation of the Determinants of Turnover Intention among Drivers". Loyola University, Chicago, 5(2), 470-480.
- [2] Al Arkoubi, K., Bishop, J. W., & Scott, D. (2011). An investigation of the determinants of turnover intention among drivers". Loyola University, Chicago, 5(2), 470-480.
- [3] Al-Hamdan, Z., Manojlovich, M., & Tanima, B. (2017). Jordanian nursing work environments, Intent to Stay, and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 49(1), 103-110.
- [4] Allen, N. J. and Meyer, J. P. "The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization," *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18. 1990.
- [5] Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of occupational psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
- [6] Al-Omari, A. A., Qablan, A. M., & Khasawneh, S. M. (2008). Faculty members' intention to stay in Jordanian public universities. *Journal of Applied Educational Studies*, 1(1), 25-42.
- [7] Aziri, B. (2008). Human resource management, Job Satisfaction and motivation of employees. *Tringa Design, Gostivar*.

- [8] Bashir Ahmad, Muhammad Shahid, Zill-e-Huma, Sajjad Haider, (2012). Turnover Intention: An HRM Issue in Textile Sector, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Volume 3, No 12.
- [9] Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American journal of Sociology*, 66(1), 32-40.
- [10] Blau, G. (1993). Further exploring the relationship between job search and voluntary individual turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(2), 313-330.
- [11] Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of applied psychology*, 35(5), 307.
- [12] Breckler, S. J., & Wiggins, E. C. (1989). Affect versus evaluation in the structure of attitudes. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, 25(3), 253-271.
- [13] Brief et al., 1988, Should Negative Affectivity Remain an Unmeasured Variable in the Study of Job Stress?, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1988, Vol. 73, No. 2. 193-198, 0021-9010/88/SOC.75
- [14] Cavanaugh & Coffin, (1992). Job satisfaction of nursing staff working in hospitals *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 17, 1369-1376.
- [15] Chan, E. Y., & Morrison, P. (2000). Factors influencing the retention and turnover intentions of registered nurses in a Singapore hospital. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, 2(2), 113-121.
- [16] Crites Jr, S. L., Fabrigar, L. R., & Petty, R. E. (1994). Measuring the affective and cognitive properties of attitudes: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(6), 619-634.
- [17] Cropanzano, R., James, K., & Konovsky, M. A. (1993). Dispositional affectivity as a predictor of work attitudes and job performance. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 14(6), 595-606.
- [18] Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Harcourt brace Jovanovich college publishers.
- [19] Eberhardt, B.J., Pooyan, A. and Moser, S.B. (1995), Moderators of The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction And Nurses' Intention To Quit. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 394-406. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb028838>
- [20] Edwards, J. R., & Lambert, L. S. (2007). Methods for Integrating Moderation and Mediation: A General Analytical Framework Using Moderated Path Analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 12(1), 1-22.
- [21] Fabrigar, L.R., Wegener, D.T., MacCallum, R.C., & Strahan, E.J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 272-299.
- [22] George, J. M., & Bettenhausen, K. (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context. *Journal of applied psychology*, 75(6), 698.
- [23] Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of management*, 26(3), 463-488.
- [24] Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role Performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of management journal*, 50(2), 327-347.
- [25] Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 60(2), 159.
- [26] Herzberg, F., Mausnes, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). Job attitudes; review of research and opinion.
- [27] Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 97(2), 251.
- [28] Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M., & Paul, K. B. (1989). Construction of a Job in General scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 74(2), 193.
- [29] Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological bulletin*, 127(3), 376.
- [30] Kuean, W. L., Kaur, S., & Wong, E. S. K. (2010). The relationship between organizational commitment and intention to quit: The Malaysian companies

- perspectives. *Journal of Applied Sciences(Faisalabad)*, 10(19), 2251-2260.
- [31] Larrabee, J. H., Wu, Y., Persily, C. A., Simoni, P. S., Johnston, P. A., Marcischak, T. L., ... & Gladden, S. D. (2010). Influence of stress resiliency on RN job satisfaction and intent to stay. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 32(1), 81-102.
- [32] Locke, E. A. (1970). Job satisfaction and job performance: A theoretical analysis. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 5(5), 484-500.
- [33] Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of Job Satisfaction. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*.
- [34] Lofquist, L. H., & Dawis, R. V. (1969). Adjustment to work: A psychological view of man's problems in a work-oriented society.
- [35] Loveday, M. (1996), *Management Development Review*, MCB University Press.
- [36] Lynn, M. R., & Redman, R. W. (2005). Faces of the nursing shortage: influences on staff nurses' intentions to leave their positions or nursing. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 35(5), 264-270.
- [37] Lyons, T. (1971). Role Conflict, need for clarity, satisfaction, tension and withdrawal. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 6, 99-110.
- [38] Markowitz, G. A. (2012). Faculty Intent to Stay and the perceived relationship with supervisor at a career-focused university (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami).
- [39] Markowitz, G. A. (2012). Faculty intent to stay and the perceived relationship with supervisor at a career-focused university. University of Miami.
- [40] Martin, A. (2007), "Perceptions of Organisational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions in a Post-Merger South African Tertiary Institution", Thesis.
- [41] Metcalf, A. Y., Stoller, J. K., Habermann, M., & Fry, T. D. (2015). Respiratory therapist job perceptions: the impact of protocol use. *Respiratory care*, 60(11), 1556-1559.
- [42] Millar, M. G., & Tesser, A. (1986). Effects of affective and cognitive focus on the attitude-behavior relation. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 51(2), 270.
- [43] Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, R. W., Hand, H. H., & Meglino, B. M. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological bulletin*, 86(3), 493.
- [44] Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (2013). *Employee—organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. Academic press.
- [45] Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
- [46] Mullins, L. J. (2005). *Management and Organizational Behavior*. London: FT Pitman.
- [47] Netemeyer, R. G., Maxham III, J. G., & Lichtenstein, D. R. (2010). Store manager Performance and satisfaction: Effects on store employee Performance and satisfaction, store customer satisfaction, and store customer spending growth. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(3), 530.
- [48] Neumann, Y. (1978). Predicting faculty job satisfaction in university departments. *Research in Higher Education*, 9(3), 261-275.
- [49] Ohlin, J. B., & West, J. J. (1993). An analysis of the effect of fringe benefit offerings on the turnover of hourly housekeeping workers in the hotel industry. *International journal of hospitality management*, 12(4), 323-336.
- [50] Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1985). Cognition vs affect in measures of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Psychology*, 20(2), 241-253.
- [51] Porter, L. W. (1961). A study of perceived need satisfactions in bottom and middle management jobs. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 45(1), 1.
- [52] Porter, L. W., Lawler, E. E., & Hackman, J. R. (1975). *Behavior in organizations*.
- [53] Rosser, V. J., & Tabata, L. N. (2010). An examination of faculty work: Conceptual and theoretical frameworks in the literature. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 449-475). Springer, Dordrecht.
- [54] Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A. (2004). *Employee attitudes and Job Satisfaction*. Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business

- Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management, 43(4), 395-407.
- [55] Schleicher, D. J., Watt, J. D., & Greguras, G. J. (2004). Reexamining the job satisfaction-performance relationship: the complexity of attitudes. *Journal of applied psychology*, 89(1), 165.
- [56] Schwab, D. P., & Cummings, L. L. (1970). Theories of performance and satisfaction: A review. *Industrial Relations: A journal of economy and society*, 9(4), 408-430.
- [57] Scott, A., Gravelle, H., Simoens, S., Bojke, C., & Sibbald, B. (2006). Job satisfaction and quitting intentions: a structural model of British general practitioners. *British journal of industrial relations*, 44(3), 519-540.
- [58] Shields, M. A., & Ward, M. (2001). Improving nurse retention in the National Health Service in England: the impact of job satisfaction on intentions to quit. *Journal of health economics*, 20(5), 677-701.
- [59] Shore, L. M., & Martin, H. J. (1989). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in relation to work performance and turnover intentions. *Human relations*, 42(7), 625-638.
- [60] Snipes, R. L., Oswald, S. L., LaTour, M., & Armenakis, A. A. (2005). The effects of specific job satisfaction facets on customer perceptions of service quality: an employee-level analysis. *Journal of business research*, 58(10), 1330-1339.
- [61] Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American journal of community psychology*, 13(6), 693.
- [62] Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences* (Vol. 3). Sage.
- [63] Tekell, J. K. (2008). Affective and cognitive components of job satisfaction: scale development and initial validation. University of North Texas.
- [64] Tekell, J. K. (2008). Affective and cognitive components of job satisfaction: Scale development and initial validation. University of North Texas.
- [65] Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel psychology*, 46(2), 259-293.
- [66] Tharenou, P. (1993). A test of reciprocal causality for absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(3), 269-287.
- [67] Vaijayanthi P., Vinodhini R.L. (2021a). Measuring the Affect, Cognition and Evaluation of Job Satisfaction attitude – Development and Validation of the scale. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- [68] Vaijayanthi P., Vinodhini R.L. (2021b). Understanding the Job Satisfaction as an attitude. Manuscript in preparation.
- [69] Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*.
- [70] Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management journal*, 40(1), 82-111.
- [71] Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., & England, G. W. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire*. Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation.
- [72] Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. *Human resource management review*, 12(2), 173-194.
- [73] Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work.
- [74] Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of management review*, 7(3), 418-428.