PROFESSIONAL REVIEWS

Joanna Wyrwa, Jerzy Kaźmierczyk

Conceptualizing Job Satisfaction and Its Determinants: A Systematic Literature Review

WYRWA, Joanna — PhD, Faculty of Economics and Management, University of Zielona Góra. Address: 50 Podgórna str., 65-246 Zielona Góra, Poland.

Email: j.wyrwa@wez.uz.zgora.pl

Abstract

Job satisfaction is considered an important aspect of employee behavior. This article focuses on a critical analysis of the accompanying literature to determine the various factors that shape job satisfaction and to gauge their relative significance in conditioning employee behavior. The conceptualizations of job satisfaction in the existing literature are multitudinous, reflecting the breadth of critical perspectives on the subject. A systematic literature review, therefore, consisted of: (a) isolating databases and a set of publications; (b) selecting publications and developing a database; and (c) conducting bibliometric analysis, content analysis, and testing the relevance of results to further research. The review included publications from the years 2000–2018 and covered psychology, sociology, economics, and management science. Analysis of previous theoretical publications and empirical studies reveals that they are not without their cognitive and methodological limitations. Even at the level of definition, despite numerous critical attempts to clarify exactly what constitutes job satisfaction, an unambiguous and clear-cut conception has yet to surface. Equally, critical consensus is lacking among researchers over what contributes to job satisfaction, and divergent research approaches have been adopted as a result. Indeed, despite the rising popularity of job satisfaction studies, some of these factors have yet to be explored fully, while some research has yielded contradictory results regarding the strength of the influence of certain factors on job satisfaction. This paper fills this gap and, through a systematic analysis of the literature, indicates the direction in which current research is headed.

Keywords: job satisfaction; employee behavior; determinants; job satisfaction studies; workplace; organizational culture; job performance.

Introduction

Job satisfaction has been the subject of scientific interest since the 1930s and continues to be an important research topic in psychology, sociology, economics, and management science. As Kalleberg [1977: 142] states, "An understanding of the relationship of people to their work can never be accomplished using only the conceptual tools provided by sociological thought. Sociology needs to be supplemented by psychological theory in order to understand the reactions of individuals to their jobs and by economic theory to understand the structural labor market factors that govern the matching process". Indeed, the recent expansion of the field points to its enduring relevance and significance [Dormann, Zapf 2001; Lange 2009; Timming 2010; Jassem, Djebarni, Mellahi 2011; Marin-García, Bonavia, Losilla 2011; Westover 2012a; Hytti, Kautonen, Akola 2013; Millán

KAŹMIERCZYK, Jerzy —
PhD, Department of
Education and Personnel
Development, Poznań
University of Economics
and Business. Address: 10
Niepodległości str., 61-875
Poznań, Poland.

Email: jerzy.kazmierczyk@
ue.poznan.pl

et al. 2013; Tlaiss 2013; Westover 2013; Fiorillo, Nappo 2014; Shin, Koh 2015; Humpert 2016; Westover 2016; Judge et al. 2017; Pandey, Asthana 2017].

Since the 1990s, job satisfaction has experienced a renaissance in research. Interest in job satisfaction has increased in line with the changing labor market, nature of work, and approaches to work. Currently, a 'new wave' of research is emerging that favors the expansion of the scope of job satisfaction studies and a more profound exploration of the subject matter. Progress has equally been made in defining job satisfaction, from initially perceiving it solely in terms of satisfying needs to placing greater emphasis on cognitive processes [Weiss et al. 1967; Dave, Raval 2016;]. One particular avenue of this research is the analysis of the level of job satisfaction and its determinants. Various critical approaches have been used in these studies, a testament to the complexity of the problem at hand [Kalleberg 1977]: concepts presenting the process of how employee satisfaction is shaped are determined by a host of organizational, workplace-environmental, and individual factors.

To this point, numerous studies have been conducted to identify the factors that have the greatest impact on levels of job satisfaction, at both micro (referring to individual enterprises) and macro scales (referring to individual societies). In recent years, many models for shaping job satisfaction have been (and continue to be) developed: these mostly comprise 'attribute models' in which a set of distinguished factors, acting synchronously, either triggers or increases the feeling of job satisfaction. The makeup of these factor sets varies considerably, however, and there is still no consensus on their relative importance [Sousa-Poza, Sousa-Poza 2000; Nair 2007; Westover 2010; Springer 2011; Capecchi, Piccolo 2016; Wilczyńska, Batorski, Selet 2016; Sanchez-Sellero et al. 2018; Yuen et al. 2018]. At the root of this disparity lies the fact that work is not a monolithic whole but a system comprising many different elements, each of which is the source of a different aspect of job satisfaction [Thomas, Buboltz, Winkelspecht 2004].

Let us stress here that the category of 'work' itself may be interpreted differently depending on the context [Bos et al. 2009]. In economic terms, work is something that a person 'sells' on the labor market—in the form of physical and intellectual capabilities—with a view to producing specific goods and services that can be tangible or intangible. From a sociological and psychological perspective, however, work can be any purposeful or socially useful activity that warrants a person a specific position in society. While psychology focuses on the emotional aspects of a human being, sociology tends to explore the relation of contentment and satisfaction to a person's past, present, and expected future experiences as a member of a social group. Thanks to work, people have the opportunity to develop appropriate living conditions, personal strengths, and a defined role in society. Work also contributes to a sense of success, helps to define goals, and builds the skills needed to overcome obstacles. As a result, it can provide feelings of contentment and satisfaction on many different levels. In sum, for a fuller understanding of job satisfaction, both economic and socio-psychological aspects of work must be considered, emphasizing its multidimensional nature.

This article attempts to synthesize and systematize the various definitions of job satisfaction and analyze the determinants that shape it. We have considered it

important to present the factors influencing job satisfaction along with their characteristics. The article is conceptual, while the considerations contained within it are cognitive. It aims to shed light on the different ways of understanding job satisfaction, to present the results of previous research (taken from across the social sciences) on the determinants of employee satisfaction, and to discuss the methods of its measurement. To this end, the following research questions were formulated:

— What is the state of research into job satisfaction?
— What are the key factors that influence job satisfaction?

A systematic review of the literature, with elements of bibliometric analysis, was used to identify existing research directions and trends, which included the essence of the concept, the preconditions and determinants of employee satisfaction, and its impact on other variables.

Methodology

The study consisted of a systematic literature review with elements of bibliometric analysis. Opting for systematic review has not only allowed for a formalized objective synthesis and assessment of research to date [Columb, Lalkhen 2005], but more importantly, it has enabled the identification of both researched and as yet unexplored areas [Levy, Ellis 2006]. This, in turn, provided a framework for further research [Gimenez, Tachizawa 2012] whose future findings could be generalized in world literature [King, He 2005]. Systematic review (compared to traditional, which is often subjective and incomplete) is also advantageous as it poses research questions prior to commencing proper analysis, meaning it preemptively compiles a full list of relevant works along with the criteria for inclusion or exclusion of particular literature items.

The systematic literature review procedure comprised the following stages [Rowley, Slack 2004; Levy, Ellis 2006; Booth, Sutton, Papaioannou 2016]: defining research goals and selecting primary literature (stage one); selecting publications and developing a publication database (stage two); and analyzing the content and verifying the relevance of the obtained results to further research (stage three). Three international research databases were selected during stage one: EBSCO, ProQuest, and the Web of Science. The EBSCO and ProQuest databases contain journals and books from recognized international publishers and are equipped with advanced search engines that support keyword queries with many additional criteria. Furthermore, they are the recommended databases for running systematic reviews of social-sciences literature [Gur, Greckhamer 2018]. The Web of Science database was selected for bibliometric analysis, as it aggregates information on publications on the basis of their impact factor, topicality, and representativeness for specific countries, which guarantees not only scientific reliability but also robust evaluation of critical resonance in the scientific world.

Thorough verification of the publications included in the literature database was of crucial importance to the reliability of the systematic review. It required reading each publication and preparing a concise analysis report. The development of a publication database, therefore, consisted of three steps: (a) identifying the search criteria used to collect publications in the database; (b) identifying the inclusion criteria a priori limiting papers added sequentially to the database; and (c) searching for publications according to those criteria in the three aforementioned research databases. The selection of search criteria began with those related to the research model and the adopted cognitive context, namely determinants of job satisfaction. Taking into account not only the assumptions but also the practice of conducting a systematic literature review in research activities, we made decisions regarding the separation and application of the inclusion criteria for adding a publication to the database [Slavin 1995]. It was assumed that the search criteria should be included in the title, abstract, or keywords of the analyzed papers. To this end, we tested the research databases using a set of phrases that combined the following keywords: "job satisfaction", "determinants of job satisfaction", "measuring" and "research". With this, we were able to automate the search process at the expense of omitting the

broadest category of keyword occurrence anywhere throughout the main text. This assumption thus focused attention on those articles in which the keyword reflected the research category that was essential, rather than accessory, to the study.

Additionally, the search criteria were limited to publications within the social sciences. Knowledge disciplines often overlap and 'borrow' concepts from one another, making it necessary to exclude from our database any of those fields to which the concept of "job satisfaction" has been applied. Therefore, only scientific articles published in journal articles, conference proceedings, and chapters in scientific monographs were included in the database. Although each class of studies has a different level of rigor, due to the differences in the text processing system and the role of the review process, their inclusion in electronic databases acted as a simplified quality criterion. To ensure the appropriate level of quality, the next inclusion criterion imposed the requirement for publications to have been positively peer-reviewed. This criterion filters down the results by eliminating freely accepted scientific announcements or seminar presentations, for example. Moreover, our search was limited only to works available in their full version. Finally, a language condition was imposed whereby only publications available in English and Polish would qualify. The restriction to the English language is an expression of the selection of only those papers that have been subject to international assessment and can be found among international scientific papers. Only papers published between 2000 and 2018 were analyzed.

The database search yielded over 4,000 publications, which were then subjected to a further 'cleaning' process. After removing theoretical papers, duplicates, and those to which full access was limited (i. e. paywalled), the total reduced to nearly a thousand items. This was still too extensive, however, to run a detailed analysis of the texts. Taking into account the perceptual abilities and time limitations of the researchers, we decided to limit the literature database to papers from EBSCO and ProQuest. Finally, the systematic literature review was completed against a database of 855 publications. This publication database was then subject to further analysis in subsequent stages of the review.

The study also used the basic techniques of the bibliometric method. In particular, bibliometric analysis allowed: a time series analysis reflecting the number of publications in a selected research area; a citation analysis focused on publications with the highest impact factor; identification of relevant researchers; and classification of research sub-areas in a set of bibliometric data reflecting the selected research area. To implement the adopted assumptions of the systematic review, we also used backward citation analysis, which was carried out on the basis of bibliographic references found at the end of each study. This allowed us to identify the authors (and their specific papers) who have had an especially noteworthy impact on shaping the present state of knowledge of job satisfaction determinants.

In the last stage of our research, we conducted a qualitative analysis of the publications in terms of job satisfaction determinants. This stage included a detailed content analysis of entire texts in our publications database. We adopted the method of narration to describe the results, whose main purpose was to assess the existing achievements related to job satisfaction and to pinpoint the factors that shape it.

The use of a systematic literature review emerged from the need to underline the complexity of the issues raised. This method is justified in a situation where the research area is explored extensively, which makes it appropriate to present the synthesis of the results of literature studies. Nevertheless, this approach has certain limitations, stemming mainly from the imperfections of the methods of analysis used. At the stage of developing the literature database, these limitations may have had a bearing on the results obtained, but at the publication review stage, they were more attributable to the imperfections of content analysis, such as the subjectivism of the content researcher. It should also be noted that the results of the publication query are merely a 'snapshot' of the state of knowledge at a given point in time, with knowledge itself never being static, particularly in such a research-productive field.

The Concept of Job Satisfaction

In the literature, the terms "job satisfaction" and "fulfillment" ("contentment") are often used interchangeably [Robie et al. 1998]. According to Juchnowicz [2014: 12], however, these two attitudes have different meanings and different effects. In the case of job satisfaction, a positive attitude is conditioned by extrinsic factors: fair and equitable pay, appropriate conditions of material work environment, good relations with superiors and co-workers, and proper management style. Professional fulfillment, on the other hand, requires the added influence of intrinsic factors, such as opportunities to learn, task-based responsibilities, or recognition from superiors.

Another factor differentiating job satisfaction and job contentment is the time of their occurrence: satisfaction may only be temporary, whereas contentment tends to be experienced after a prolonged period of satisfaction. Job satisfaction implies a positive attitude of employees toward the tasks entrusted to them, their working conditions, and their superiors and co-workers. And while a necessary component, this attitude alone is not enough to achieve professional fulfillment. Employees satisfied with many facets of their job, such as fair pay or good working conditions, do not necessarily feel professionally fulfilled. Employees evaluate their work as satisfactory when it offers them the opportunity to use their skills and aptitudes in practice, confronts them with challenging tasks, gives them freedom of action, and provides them with feedback. Professional fulfillment, significantly, boosts self-esteem and satisfies higher-level needs, including self-realization. Therefore, professional fulfillment can be defined as a higher level of job satisfaction, requiring intellectual challenges, a sense of success, enjoyment from career development and self-realization, as well as full identification with the job or the organization [Juchnowicz 2014: 15].

Hoppock was one of the earliest proponents of job satisfaction, defining the concept as "any combination of psychological and environmental conditions resulting in the fact that a person could say with true conviction that he or she is satisfied with his or her job" [Hoppock 1935: 44]. This highlights the fact that satisfaction is conditioned by myriad factors, both internal and external to the individual, which require identification and measurement. It also reinforces the imperative of examining the conditions in which satisfaction arises.

The most frequently cited definition of job satisfaction, however, is that of Locke: it represents "a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the perception of one's work as fulfilling or enabling the fulfillment of significant values available at work, provided that these values are convergent with one's needs" [Locke 1976: 1319]. This view of the process underlying the variation in job satisfaction implies that two types of factors are operative: perceived job characteristics, which represent the amount of satisfaction available from particular dimensions of work, and work values, which represent the meanings that individuals attach to these perceived job characteristics [Kalleberg 1977: 127]. Unlike Hoppock, Locke emphasizes the importance of the individual's emotional state and subjective perception of his/her situation at work, which can assume an attitude of both extreme satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

In this sense, if we were to assume that satisfaction is merely an emotional response, it could only be understood by means of introspection, which is directly related to the need to seek to understand the content of mental processes. The positive or negative feelings that make it possible to judge whether or not (and how far) the job is satisfactory depend on the extent to which expectations coincide with the rewards received [Davis, Nestrom 1985: 109]; this compliance is particularly important when analyzed in relation to internal motivation [Statt 2004: 78]. This, in turn, leads to the conclusion that job satisfaction is a multidimensional system of interrelated psychological responses to work performed and that these responses are conditioned by cognitive, affective, or behavioral components [Hulin, Judge 2003]. This reflects a neutral approach to the discussed problem and emphasizes facets such as the subjectivity of the phenomenon in question, the cause-effect relationship between perception and emotion, the significance of the relationship between work values

and employee values, and the determination of the phenomenon as desirable (job satisfaction—desired state, positive state; lack of job satisfaction—negative state).

To some extent, then, this interpretation is the sweet spot between other ways of understanding this category [Wudarzewski 2013: 332–333]. The traditional approach to professional fulfillment, as proposed by Locke and Latham [1990: 240–246] and conceptualized as the principal dimension of effective human functioning at work, was based on the assumption that an individual, in order to feel job satisfaction and professional fulfillment, needs to be able to satisfy, whether at the organization or through work, the dimensions he or she considers important. Locke pointed to the conditions that must be fulfilled by a job in order to provide satisfaction to an employee [1976: 1328]. These include: intellectual challenge, within the employee's capacity; convergence of own goals with the organization's goals; lack of excessive physical overload (working within physical strength limits); fair pay matching the individual's aspirations; physical working conditions that enable the accomplishment of objectives and correspond with the employee's needs; respect in the eyes of some of the employees in the organization; support in combining individual and professional goals; and minimizing conflict and ambiguity of roles. Katz [1978] has also emphasized the importance of workplace characteristics, with particular reference to the goals and tasks entrusted to employees. In his view, the possibility and scope of decision-making and the nature of tasks are a more frequent reason for employee satisfaction than the level of pay and promotions (see: [Springer 2011: 166]).

It was Spector who first departed from the idea of the importance of needs in achieving employee satisfaction, focusing instead on the predominant role of cognitive processes in shaping attitudes to various aspects of work. Spector believed that job satisfaction refers to people's feelings about their job and its elements, and consequently to the evaluation of "to what extent employees like or dislike their job" [Spector 1997: 2]. Similarly, Nair [2007] defined satisfaction as an attitude based on an individual assessment of one's own workplace. It follows, then, that job satisfaction involves more than feelings alone; it also reflects the evaluation and perception of the value of one's own work.

Considering job satisfaction from the point of view of the attitude (rather than the feeling) toward work was also proposed by Vroom [1964], for whom employee satisfaction is a consequence of: the value of the expected reward, the effort to achieve the desired result, the perception of the subjective probability of success, the rightness of the reward received, and the comparison of the reward with social standards. According to this concept, people make choices based on the evaluation of likelihood that certain behaviors will trigger certain rewards. At work, people will perform their jobs in a way that leads to greater payouts or other benefits. Vroom's expectancy theory has been confirmed by the results of more recent empirical research (cf.: [Tubbs, Boehne, Dahl 1993; Van Eerde, Thierry 1996]).

Job satisfaction, then, has often been interpreted as a positive attitude of employees toward their duties, work environment, and co-workers, or as positive and negative feelings and attitudes that pertain to professional duties performed by an employee [Schultz, Schultz 2012: 288]. Job satisfaction has also been defined as the difference between what a person expects and what he or she actually experiences at work (according to his or her subjective evaluation) [Drenth, Thierry, De Wolff 1998: 278]. Viewed as such, job satisfaction is an intrinsic, subjective feeling of an employee and refers to a positive attitude toward the organization, co-workers, and the job itself. Job satisfaction has also been regarded as an approximation of utility [Clark, Oswald 1996]. This includes both the usefulness of the result and the usefulness of the process [Frey, Stutzer 2002]. The former refers to employee benefits earned from the effects of performing professional duties, whereas the latter refers to the conditions that lead to said performance, such as participation in decision-making or atmosphere in the workplace. Accordingly, employees strive to achieve the maximum degree of satisfaction of their own needs in their decisions around the allocation of professional skills and resources. The literature [Ramawickrama et al. 2017; Bugdol 2006] also mentions certain concepts according to which the sense of job satisfaction is

independently correlated with individual job facets. In this way, job satisfaction is a supreme concept that encompasses specific satisfactions derived from: pay, incentive schemes, interpersonal relations (including satisfactory relations with superiors and co-workers), the company's market position, opinions expressed about the organization by others, the organization itself, and the nature of work.

In another conventional theory, namely Job Characteristics Theory (JCT), Hackman and Oldham [1976] put forward five universal dimensions of work that positively correlate with job satisfaction: (a) task identity, the degree to which an employee can trace the results of his/her work from start to finish; (b) task significance, the extent to which work is perceived as important and meaningful; (c) skill variety, the extent to which work allows for carrying out different tasks using different abilities; (d) autonomy, the ability to plan and perform tasks at one's own discretion; and (e) feedback, the degree of information given about the results of the work performed. The first three factors correspond to the sense of meaningfulness of work, the next covers responsibility for outcomes, while the last relates to the knowledge of results and responsibilities for them [Hackman, Oldham 1976]; if a job meets these assumptions, it is more likely to be rewarding and motivating. Thus far, however, empirical research has only partially confirmed these assumptions.

Nonetheless, according to the tenets of JCT, in a group of employees that shows a strong desire for growth, specific properties shape the psychological conditions in which the individual feels the satisfaction and fulfillment needed to increase his/her motivation and performance. Benefits arising from work make the employee experience positive emotions when doing their job well. This, in turn, favors continued good performance in line with the expectation that it will lead to positive feelings. The stronger this need to perform well, the more positive the feelings that arise when a high level of performance is achieved or sustained. Subsequent meta-analyses of several hundred studies have shown that job characteristics are indeed related to job performance and satisfaction, but the consequences of specific characteristics are not identical [Schultz, Schultz 2012: 296–322]. By definition, JCT is limited, therefore, to the properties of the job itself, with far less attention paid to social relations and characteristics of the physical work environment.

In contrast to this unilateral focus on job characteristics, it is important to consider job satisfaction in the context of well-being in general. Herzberg, Mausner, Snyderman [1959] and later Wudarzewski [2013] have highlighted the need to conduct job satisfaction surveys in the context of three areas: organization, employee, and society. Organization research may concern efficiency levels with a particular emphasis on growth, internal motivation, reduction of absenteeism, or conflict, all of which may affect interpersonal relations and staff turnover. In turn, employee research points to a greater sense of happiness and increased self-realization, while societal research can be used to make better use of human resources or even increase human potential. Let us stress here that a number of different correlations may exist between these factors. The originality of Herzberg's concept lies in its splitting of the satisfaction and dissatisfaction dimensions into two distinct continuums. This theory [see also, Pauli 2010: 100] distinguishes two sets of factors in the workplace: hygiene and motivation. Hygiene factors are contextual, such as interpersonal relations, working conditions, organization and management, and pay. Hygiene factors affect job dissatisfaction, and although they may satisfy lower needs and eliminate dissatisfaction if high enough, they do not contribute to job satisfaction [Weiss 2002]. Factors related to job content, meanwhile, are referred to as "motivators": these include achievements, work content, recognition, responsibility, promotion, and growth opportunities. If high enough, they are able to meet higher-level needs and therefore favor job satisfaction. If low, however, they may also trigger dissatisfaction. Herzberg assumes that lack of satisfaction cannot be equated with dissatisfaction, and vice versa. Consequently, he proposes to concentrate efforts on enriching the job with motivating factors, which could lead to greater satisfaction and minimize the impact of hygiene factors, which are responsible for subjective states of dissatisfaction. A follow-up to Herzberg's two-factor theory is the three-factor model [Kozioł 2011; Koziol, Koziol 2020], which adds a set of dissatisfying demotivators into the existing mix.

From the 1960s onwards, job satisfaction has begun to be understood as an attitude that is in fact made up of two facets: cognitive and emotional, also known as affective [Zalewska 2003: 50; Judge, Klinger 2008; Judge, Heller, Klinger 2008; Springer 2011: 164; Haffer 2015: 157–158]. Both these elements have been incorporated by Berry [1998], for whom job satisfaction is an assessment expressed in the form of affective reactions and cognitive judgments about the extent to which the performed work is beneficial (or unfavorable) to the person. The strength of the cognitive aspect in shaping general job satisfaction is indicated by studies focusing on the relationship between cognitive models of conflict and dysfunctional relationships at work. For example, it has been proven that belief in the possibility of cooperation and pro-social attitudes leads to improved job performance [Halevy et al. 2014]. From the emotional/affective standpoint, researchers have most often focused on issues relating to the characteristics or nature of work, predispositions or personality traits of employees, and the subjective assessment of work-related values (Value Percept Theory) [Saari, Judge 2004: 396–398; Judge, Klinger 2008: 398–403]. According to Brief and Weiss [2002: 282–286], the emotional facet of job satisfaction may be heterogeneous, as it consists of emotional states experienced at work as well as emotional attitudes toward work. Some researchers have claimed that studying emotional satisfaction comes down to the evaluation of satisfaction/dissatisfaction, while others assume two dimensions—positive emotions (excitement and enthusiasm) and negative emotions (irritability and nervousness)—which are moderate in most cases. Emotional satisfaction may also be measured according to average mood and its variability, or by describing mood using three dimensions: energy, power, and pleasure [Wudarzewski 2013: 329–330]. Springer [2011] has revealed yet another component of employee satisfaction, namely the behavioral aspect, which consists of inclinations and actions taken as part of the performed work. It is worth emphasizing here that these various components interact with each other as employees themselves develop many partial attitudes (toward their profession, colleagues, or organization) that ultimately determine behavior.

In summary, the review of the literature on job satisfaction provides many definitions and approaches to the issue in question. An overview of selected job satisfaction concepts is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Selected Perspectives Related to Job Satisfaction
(definition of the "job satisfaction" category)

Author	Definition
R. Hoppock	A combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental factors that induce a person to give an honest answer to the question: 'Am I satisfied with my job?'
V. H. Vroom	Affective orientation of individual employees toward their currently assigned roles
B. Schneider, R. A. Snyder	Personal evaluation of current working conditions or effects that arise as a result of performing work
A. Bruggemann, P. Groskurth, E. Ulich	An attitude that refers to the job in all its facets and its evaluation in the form of satisfaction or dissatisfaction
E. A. Locke	Pleasant emotional state resulting from the individual's perception of his or her job as fulfilling or enabling the fulfillment of significant values available at work, provided that these values are convergent with his or her needs
C. J. Cranny, P. C. mith, E. F. Stone	Emotional reaction or feeling in relation to the job that arises as a result of comparing actual results with expected results or results considered to be correct
P. E. Spector	Attitude, specifically the way people think about their work and its various facets, which is related to the extent to which people like or dislike their job
A. P. Brief	Internal state expressed through emotional and/or cognitive evaluation of work experience; cognitive element is job satisfaction; emotional element is how one feels in the workplace, including in terms of comfort

Table 1

Author	Definition
L. Rosenstiel	A relatively stable variable; the result of the individual's work experience and how well the individual matches specific tasks
M. E. Sempane, H. S. Rieger, G. Roodt	Individual perception and evaluation of work; perception is influenced by factors such as needs, values, and expectations
H. M. Weiss	Attitude, specifically positive or negative judgment in relation to work or regarding the situation at work
M. Armstrong	Attitudes and feelings of employees about their job; positive and beneficial attitudes pertaining to work indicate job satisfaction; negative and unfavorable attitudes indicate lack of job satisfaction
R. W. Griffin	Attitude that reflects the extent to which a person enjoys or finds fulfillment in his or her job
G. S. Sureshchandar, C. Rajendran, R. N. Anantharaman	Extent to which employees believe that their needs are constantly met by the organization
S. P. Robbins, T. A. Judge	Having positive feelings about one's job, based on the evaluation of its characteristics

Source: own study based on literature review [Vroom 1964; Schneider, Snyder 1975; Cranny, Smith, Stone 1992; Spector 1997; Brief 1998; Armstrong 2000; Sureshchandar, Rajendran, Anantharaman 2001; Sempane, Rieger, Roodt 2002; Weiss 2002; Griffin 2010; Robbins, Judge 2013; Wudarzewski 2013: 334; Haffer 2015: 157].

Our review reinforces the contextual breadth and ambiguity around definitions of job satisfaction. No one universal definition or research operationalization abides. Currently, it is assumed that job satisfaction should be understood as the affective element of the individual's reaction to the confrontation between desired and achieved results at work. It is likewise considered a multidimensional construct[1] based on the affective reactions of employees to comparisons of desirable and actual working conditions [Fields 2002].

Determinants of Job Satisfaction: Research Perspectives

Research presenting the determinants of employee satisfaction has highlighted the role played by both objective (situational) and subjective (individual) factors [Piccolo et al. 2005; Nair 2007; Yang, Wang 2013; Arekar et al. 2016]. Objective factors influence basic satisfaction, are shaped by the employer, and relate directly to the work environment, including job content (intrinsic rewards) and working conditions (extrinsic rewards). Intrinsic rewards include compliance of tasks performed with one's interests, diversity of professional duties, ability to fully apply one's knowledge and skills, autonomy, and prestige of one's profession. Extrinsic rewards include stability of employment, pay, career growth opportunities, possibility of promotion, and interpersonal relations with co-workers.

It is assumed that the individual level of job satisfaction is determined by personality factors (ranging from 10% to 30%), situational issues related to the occupational field (40% to 60%), and the interaction between these two categories of variables (10% to 20%) [Makin, Cooper, Cox 2000: 86]. Personality factors include

---

[1]   Different ways of determining the essence of satisfaction encompass the following issues: (a) limitation to the sphere of feelings, or recognizing it as a specific attitude towards work [Springer 2011: 164; Juchnowicz 2014: 11]; (b) the relationship between satisfaction and fulfilment (contentment), where there is no unanimity as to whether they are the same thing or should be distinguished as two discrete concepts; and (c) collocating satisfaction with the employee's needs (as argued by Locke) or recognizing that cognitive processes have a dominant role in shaping attitudes towards work (as argued by Spector).

the individual's professional 'baggage' and his/her nature [Judge, Bono, Locke 2000]. In the first case, the wealth of professional experience determined by years in work and the frequency of employment changes should be taken into account alongside the nature of the professional career and its stage of development. Studies have shown, for instance, that employees who have changed employment several times tend to be significantly more satisfied with their job than people who have not made such changes during their professional career [Egan, Yang, Bartlett 2004: 283]. In addition, the noticeable increase in the level of satisfaction turned out to be higher in people who, along with having worked in different workplaces, had also worked in different jobs. As a result, it is assumed that diversity of individual professional experience contributes to increased job satisfaction. This type of correlation has been reported, among others, by Glisson and Durcik [1988: 75–76] and Ting [1997]. Moreover, research by Li, Liang, Crant [2010] showed that the relationship between the proactive personality (defined as the tendency to identify opportunities for, and implement, changes in the work environment [Crant 2000]) and job satisfaction. Proactive employees strive to intensify social relations with their superiors by asking questions and presenting their ideas and achievements, which in turn fosters commitment and a positive work atmosphere. Pro-organizational behavior is therefore moderated by the quality of professional relations with superiors as well as the sense of procedural fairness.

However, in professional terms, attention should equally be paid to: working conditions; job characteristics, including nature, type, and scope of duties; atmosphere in the workplace; organizational culture; quality of management system, as determined by the level of (in)efficiency of the administrative system; hourly workload; stress levels; pay and reward; co-workers (quality of interpersonal relations, skills of co-workers and supervisors); ambiguity and conflict; and the situation in the labor market [Gordon 1993: 644; Makin, Cooper, Cox 2000: 82–86; Küskü 2003: 348–352; Carvalho et al. 2018; Janićijević, Nikčević, Vasić 2018; Nazim, Mahmood 2018; Puni, Mohammed, Asamoah 2018; Abreu von Borell, Camfield, Rodrigues 2019]. The Person-Organization Fit model, for example, examines the interaction between the characteristics of the work environment and the employee's individual dispositions. Broadly speaking, this alignment refers to the degree of correspondence between the employee's values, beliefs, interests, and needs on the one hand, and the values, norms, and culture of the workplace on the other. The relationship between the perceived fit of a person within an organization and their job satisfaction has been firmly established in research: employees who rate their fit to the organization more highly experience greater joy at work than their colleagues who do not seem to fit in as well [Verquer, Beehr, Wagner 2003; Gregory, Albritton, Osmonbekov 2010].

Among the individual factors affecting job satisfaction, researchers have most often mentioned the following: gender, age, seniority, education, and job position (i.e., position within the organizational structure) [Clark, Oswald, Warr 1996; Tugade, Frederickson, Barrett 2004; Luthans, Avey, Patera 2008; Springer 2011; Qayyum 2013].

The relationship between gender and job satisfaction has been a popular research topic [Charles, Weaver 1978; Donohue, Heywood 2004; García-Bernal et al. 2005; Westover 2012b; García-Mainar, García-Martín, Montuenga 2016; Luo 2016; Djordjević, Ivanović-Djukić, Lepojević 2017; Escardíbul, Afcha 2017; Lup 2017]. Some scholars have argued for the existence of correlation, with evidence that women tend to achieve higher job satisfaction than men [Murray, Atkinson 1981; Clark 1996; Clark, Oswald, Warr 1996; Clark 1997; Wharton, Rotolo, Bir 2000]. Others like Forgionne and Peeters [1982: 101] have ventured the opposite. Elsewhere, representative employee studies have indicated that the reasons for significant differences between employee gender and job satisfaction cannot be determined [Brief, Rose, Aldag 1977: 645–646; Golembiewski 1977; Eskildsen, Kristensen, Westlund 2004; Schultz, Schultz 2012: 293; Singha, Raychaudhuri 2017: 212–214]. Various factors may be at the root of higher job satisfaction among women [Aguilar, Vlosky 2010]. These include lower initial expectations when it comes to work and higher levels of socialization, along with the capacity not to express dissatisfaction and to respect other values that are different for men. During this process, sensitivity, protectiveness, and friendship are emphasized. Research shows that, for women, the ability to com-

bine work with family needs plays a crucial role (e.g. convenient commuting or specific working hours may be more important than promotion or raise prospects), while men generally seek professional achievements, competition and the possibility of rising to prestigious ranks or higher earnings. Conversely, women tend to be paid less than men for the same work and find promotion more difficult, giving rise to the belief that women must put more effort into their work compared to men and demonstrate greater achievements to receive similar awards or distinctions. Failure to meet these needs manifests precisely in low job satisfaction among women [Schultz, Schultz 2012: 301]. In addition, Białas and Litwin [2013: 165] have reported the presence of gender in satisfaction research as a determinant that can strongly correlate with other factors. Studies have contended that women's job satisfaction is strongly influenced by other social stimuli, while autonomy at work is one of the most important determinants for men [Zalewska 2009]. Therefore, organizational or extrinsic determinants can significantly affect employee satisfaction for both genders.

Studies on the relationship between employee age and the perceived level of job satisfaction have generally been unambiguous. A number of researchers have shown that job satisfaction increases along with the age of employees in both women and men [Ang, Goh, Koh 1993; Schultz, Schultz 2012: 292; Hajdukova, Klementova, Klementova jr 2015]. It follows that young people feel the least satisfied of all groups at work, yet other scholars have observed no such correlation [Pook, Füstös, Liviu 2003]. Increased employee satisfaction with age may be due to young people's difficulties in finding professional fulfillment or landing challenging and interesting tasks in what may be their first job. When young people start their careers, they perform simple tasks that require minimal commitment and/or skill; conversely, colleagues with years of work experience have fuller skill sets and enjoy greater trust among their superiors and fellow team members. This leads the more experienced employees to perceive their competences as more advanced or more essential to success, increasing their sense of satisfaction as a result [Maureen, Westover 2018]. However, this relationship can also be U-shaped: where an initially high level of satisfaction characterizes employees aged around 20 before falling sharply to its lowest level around the age of 30, only to pick up gradually and reach its highest values at the age of 60 or above [Clark, Oswald, Warr 1996: 63].

Level of seniority is a factor of satisfaction that has only rarely been considered in research to this point. Empirical data has shown that the level of job satisfaction increases in line with the length of employment of an employee in a given organization [Jinnett, Alexander 1999; Johnson, Johnson 2000]. It can be assumed that people taking up a new job are satisfied with it and believe in the possibility of growth, and that they will often find the job interesting. However, if an employee does not progress over time, the feeling of stagnancy can also increase levels of employee dissatisfaction.

The same holds true for the correlation between education and job satisfaction. Research findings have confirmed that the higher the level of an employee's education, the higher his or her job satisfaction is likely to be (cf.: [Quinn, Baldi de Mandilovitch 1975; Larwood 1984]). Some researchers have also suggested that certain factors—such as working conditions, behavior of direct superiors, and pay—may disrupt the relationship between education and job satisfaction [Podsakoff, Mackenzie 1997]. Others, meanwhile, have argued that job satisfaction actually decreases with the level of education. This is because, as the level of education increases, the gap between the expected and actual conditions of the work environment expands significantly [Clark, Oswald 1996] (cf.: [Gazioğlu, Tansel 2003]).

The last individual factor is job position, meaning its position in the organizational hierarchy [Prabhu 2018]. Studies in this area have been scarce, but have tended to confirm its importance in influencing job satisfaction [Near, Rice, Hunt 1978]. Research has shown a significant positive relationship between these variables, i. e., the higher the position in the organizational hierarchy, the higher the level of job satisfaction [Robie et al. 1998]. A positive correlation between job satisfaction and job rank can be attributed to numerous aspects associated with a higher job position, such as improved working conditions, higher pay, better prospects of promotion and personal/professional growth, and greater autonomy of action [Cohrs, Abele, Dette 2006].

Turning to employee personality traits, these relatively consistent markers of behavior—and of how one reacts to and interacts with the working environment—are also important to the level of job satisfaction. Examples of these traits include levels of self-esteem, self-efficacy, and placement of control [Piccolo et al. 2005], as well as levels of emotional stability [Heller, Judge, Watson 2002], social and institutional trust, and alienation. Research has indicated, for example, that those employees characterized by an internal sense of control and a lower sense of alienation experience higher satisfaction related to the achievement of professional goals [Bruk-Lee et al. 2009].

However, when studying the individual in the workplace, it is difficult to separate the influence of individual and environmental factors, given that employees actively participate in the life of the organization, continually modifying it according to their own needs and expectations. Job satisfaction should be treated as a phenomenon that is largely subjective and extremely complex, especially given that its analysis calls for clear separation of the category of particular satisfaction from the overall satisfaction. In principle, the former is conditioned by specific work factors, whereas the latter is an expression of the general emotional attitude toward work and is not a simple sum of particular satisfactions [Judge, Klinger 2008; Satyanarayana, Narender 2008].

Among the organization-related factors that have a bearing on job satisfaction, the following have been classified as significant: working conditions, pay, promotion prospects, nature of tasks carried out, and organizational culture [Judge et al. 2009].

Working conditions are a factor that moderately affects the level of job satisfaction [Luthans 2011: 141–146]. Research has indicated that their importance can increase when conditions are extreme, i.e., either very good or very bad. Moreover, the results of studies involving over 98,000 employees of companies operating in 41 countries have shown that the internal characteristics of work (e. g., type of tasks, autonomy) are of greater importance to job satisfaction in more affluent countries, where people have access to a better social welfare system, the culture is more individualistic than collectivist, and the distance to authority is lower [Huang, Van de Vliert 2003]. Workplace atmosphere is another notable situational determinant of job satisfaction [Carr et al. 2003], often having a greater impact on the attitudes of employees than the applied standards or organizational and technical conditions created by the employer [Juchnowicz 2014]. The psychological contract, which covers mutual unwritten expectations between the employee and the employer, also plays an integral role in shaping levels of employee satisfaction [McDonald, Makin 2000; Wilkens, Nermerich 2011; Rayton, Yalabik 2014; Dwiyanti, Hamzah, Abas 2019]. Failure to fulfill this contract is often the trigger of emotional responses and employee attitudes toward the workplace.

Pay is one of the most significant variables in job satisfaction [Judge et al. 2010; Stringer, Didham, Theivananthampillai 2011; Sokolová, Mohelská, Zubr 2016; Addis, Dvivedi, Beshah 2018]. Its key role in building job satisfaction was confirmed by Warr [2008] in his research. According to some researchers, all financial rewards are the most basic factor affecting job satisfaction [Lambert, Hogan, Barton 2001]. This is in line with the idea of pay, which provides a sense of security, boosts self-esteem, and positions the employee in a social environment by means of providing financial benefits. However, Card et al. [2012] have evidenced that while earning a wage below the median reduces the level of job satisfaction, salaries well above the median do not lead to greater satisfaction. This means that once a certain level of income is reached, further salary increases do not translate directly into increased job satisfaction, which forces the employer to seek other motivators for high performance. Further studies have shown how pay schemes based on individual job performance allow employees to experience greater satisfaction compared to schemes based on temporary pay forms [McCausland, Pouliakas, Theodossiou 2005; Heywood, Wei 2006]. It is also important to include transparent rules in the setup of any pay scheme. This includes determining both the level of difficulty of work in individual positions and the elements of pay. These elements should be diversified in relation to the individual employees, while accounting for the outcomes of their work as well as the invariability of applied regulations from the long-term perspective [Clark, Oswald 1996; Ferrer-i-Carbonell 2005].

It is clear, then, that various social, psychological, and behavioral variables have been considered in the research around the determinants of job satisfaction. From an organizational standpoint, the crux of the matter has been workplace behavior, as reflected in the employee's job performance. Various empirical studies have confirmed that job satisfaction is a significant predictor of both civil behaviors, which go beyond the formal requirements of a given position (such as altruism, individual initiative, conscientiousness, or persistence) [Yoon, Suh 2003: 604–605; González, Garazo 2006: 39–41], and counterproductive behaviors that violate organizational norms (absenteeism, unproductiveness, embezzlement, fraud, low-quality output, etc.) [Mount, Ilies, Johnson 2006: 607–608; Tuna et al. 2016: 383–384]. Additionally, loyalty to the employer has been correlated with job satisfaction—especially in terms of employee retention and rotation—due to the benefits of long-term relationships developed among colleagues [Wright, Bonett 2007: 150–151; Lee, Way 2010: 350]. Other studies, meanwhile, have shown that job satisfaction can be positively linked to: job performance [Iaffaldano, Muchinsky 1985; Luthans et al. 2007; Wagner 2017; Wu, Chen, Chen 2017; Berliana, Siregar, Gustian 2018], identification with the organization [Amiot et al. 2006], mood [Judge, Llies 2004], organizational involvement [Porter, Steers, Mowday 1974; Kirkman, Shapiro 2001; Lee 2005; Agarwal, Sajid 2017], and engagement in work [Harter, Schmidt, Hayes 2002; Ollo-López, Bayo-Moriones, Larraza-Kintana 2016; Vorina, Simonič, Vlasova 2017]. At the same time, it has been argued that job satisfaction reduces anti-social behavior of employees, which may potentially undermine productivity [Chen, Spector 1992], intention to leave work [Lee, Mitchell 1994], absenteeism, fluctuation, and psychological problems, including occupational burnout [Andrisani 1978; Lee 1988; Wright, Bonett 2007].

While the literature often associates job satisfaction with the expected behaviors of employees, the findings of empirical research refer ambiguously to the nature, strength, and even the direction of this mutual relationship. On the one hand, for example, commitment to work or the organization is often perceived as a factor shaping the attitudes of employees, including job satisfaction [Schaufeli et al. 2002; Saks, Gruman 2014]. Schaufeli et al. [2002] have defined commitment to work as a positive, work-related state of mind that is reflected in vigor, dedication, and absorption. In today's organizations, employers expect that caring about an employee's satisfaction will translate into his/her positive behavior. First, they expect a satisfied employee to become more involved and perform better. Second, they expect satisfied employees to display lower absenteeism and greater loyalty, as well as more pro-social behavior. On the other hand, the chain of causality in this context remains unknown: is it a satisfied employee who works harder, or do they derive satisfaction from their own productivity? A number of empirical studies have been carried out to examine this chain [e. g., Abate, Schaefer, Pavone 2018], yet their results do not allow for unambiguous conclusions.

The most controversial of these chains is the correlation between employee satisfaction and employee performance. A positive, though weak, relationship between the two has been detected in the literature (e. g., [Schultz, Schultz 2012: 298]). Iaffaldano and Munchinsky [1985], however, have argued that this relationship is rather illusory: the correlation coefficient is, according to their calculations, only 0,17. Various attempts have been made to verify such a low correlation, including the work of Rehman and Waheed [2011], where a significantly stronger correlation was demonstrated (0,52). However, the overriding indication from the current studies is that job satisfaction (both overall and particular) does not always contribute to better work results and more efficient employees [Hellriegel, Slocum 2008]. Researchers do agree, however, as to the existence of a correlation between employee satisfaction and the performance of the organization as a whole. This has been confirmed by the results of the study carried out by the Institute of Work Psychology at the University of Sheffield [Armstrong 2000: 72], according to which satisfaction contributes to better company performance [Harter, Schmidt, Hayes 2002; Maharani, Troena, Noermijati 2013]. By contrast, other critics have argued that the relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance should be jettisoned in favor of organizational citizenship behaviors [Saari, Judge 2004: 398], which are manifested through conscientiousness, mutual help, altruism, and courtesy [Podsakoff et al. 2000; Zeinabadi 2010].

In a similar vein, Zhang and Zheng [2009: 335] introduced emotional involvement as a mediating variable between job satisfaction and employee involvement. And while an increase in satisfaction contributes, to a certain extent, to employee involvement and performance [Carmeli, Freund 2004], the reverse increases the risk of unfavorable outcomes such as increased employee turnover and absenteeism, plus more frequent workplace accidents. Although research opinions vary as to the exact correlation rate (from − 0,4 for employee turnover to − 0,24 for absenteeism) [Saari, Judge 2004: 399], the relationship is stronger than the equivalent for the positive effects of job satisfaction. According to some researchers, therefore, the various negative effects of employee dissatisfaction should not be separated out of analysis, but instead treated as a factor in their own right. A decrease in job satisfaction for one employee, for example, will result in an increase in absenteeism, while in others it may become a reason to leave the organization entirely. Indeed, the discrepancies in results presented by subsequent researchers suggest that the relationship between employee satisfaction and behavior can be influenced by other untested variables, such as cultural or personality factors, or the conditions of functioning in a specific labor market [Springer 2011: 165].

Increases in job satisfaction improve employee motivation and behavior [Mafini, Dlodlo 2014; Jusmin et al. 2016; Moloantoa, Dorasamy 2017; Ensour, Zeglat, Shrafat 2018]. Specifically, those employees who are more satisfied with their job will:

— better identify with company goals (because they see in their realization the possibility of meeting their own professional goals);
— show greater concern for the quality of their work;
— be more loyal to the organization and more engaged in their work;
— be less resistant to change;
— be more willing to cooperate with others.

It can be concluded from the available research that job satisfaction should only be seen in a positive light. However, in-depth analysis shows that a high level of job satisfaction is not always directly related to productive workplace behavior. Recent years have seen a surge in critical interest in exploring the negative phenomena and potential psychosocial threats that are present in every organization. Nielsen et al. [2011], for instance, have analyzed the relationship between perceived psychosocial threats (stressors) in the workplace and the job satisfaction of professionally active people, concluding that people who perceive work stress as high report lower levels of job satisfaction. Other research has emphasized that the stress experienced by an employee and its determinants affect not only the well-being and functioning of the individual but also the operation of the organization in which he/she is employed [Hoel, Sparks, Cooper 2001; Sadłowska-Wrzesińska 2014].

As the above review highlights, the literature presents various views on the sources and determinants of job satisfaction [Sousa-Poza, Sousa-Poza 2000]. The lack of agreement on the role of particular factors is palpable [Nair 2007: 38–47; Springer 2011: 166]. At the root of the problem is the fact that work is not monolithic; rather, it is a system composed of many different elements, each of which is the source of another aspect of fulfillment. Two core approaches are distinguishable, however: the first focuses on the analysis of overall satisfaction, and the second on the specific facets of satisfaction. One can therefore speak of overall (general) or particular (specific) satisfaction(s). Overall satisfaction implies a general emotional attitude towards work, without any necessary relation to specific work factors. Particular satisfaction, on the other hand, is a specific sense of pleasure related solely to the individual work factor in question. Ultimately, the literature proves the lack of correlation between the sum of these particular satisfactions and overall satisfaction, meaning that overall satisfaction does not equate to the sum of satisfactions derived from particular elements of a given job.

Conclusions

The article reviews selected conceptual and research perspectives regarding job satisfaction, developed against the backdrop of theoretical achievements across various disciplines on the subject between 2000 and 2018. The key point of departure was that the shaping of job satisfaction requires concrete empirical findings, given how the very definition of job satisfaction has evolved and how the different aspects of job satisfaction have been foregrounded accordingly. Despite such eager investigation, however, a single uniting definition for the concept remains absent in the literature. Any new research approach aimed at unravelling these ambiguities is faced with the difficult, potentially impossible task of setting a clear benchmark against which new data can be compared. This article attempts to specify the exact components within the category of job satisfaction, pointing to different ways of understanding the concept in the context of research opportunities and focusing primarily on those which are most often cited and most extensively considered in the literature: cognitive and emotional. In its infancy, the concept of job satisfaction was defined either as a short-term emotional reaction to the satisfaction of certain needs or as an "attitude" expressed in the form of persistent feelings toward work and at work. Subsequently, despite changes in nomenclature and approaches to job satisfaction, the concept in many definitions was found to relate only to affection, but examined on the basis of the cognitive aspect. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, this paradox gave rise to the need for consistency in how job satisfaction could be both defined and measured. In this period, definitions became available that emphasized the presence of emotional and cognitive aspects, while positing that the two may not necessarily coexist due to being influenced by different processes. It is worthy of note here that the common features found in most of these definitions are: (a) the presence of cognitive and emotional aspects; and (b) a degree of subjectivity arising from individual perceptions and feelings. On the other hand, the differences in adopted stances concern the scope of various situational components to which job satisfaction relates, along with the degree of persistence and the dynamics of response to the conditions of work.

Currently, the most popular definition of job satisfaction is that of an attitude that determines the degree to which employees find their work favorable or unfavorable. This definition, however, poses a problematic decision to the researcher: whether (and how) to evaluate cognitive assessments and judgments (what employees think about their work) on the one hand, and emotional reactions and feelings (how they feel at work) on the other hand. Given that cognitive and emotional assessments need not be harmonized (since they can be conditioned differently and lead to different outcomes), they require separate evaluation. Similarly, work should be approached as a multifaceted system (and not a monolithic whole), with each facet serving as a source of a different aspect of satisfaction. Ultimately, general and partial (particular) satisfaction with work can be distinguished and, depending on the definition of job satisfaction, different groups of determinants can be identified. A comparative analysis of employee preferences (in terms of factors in professional satisfaction) has proven that employees may be satisfied with one aspect of their work while being dissatisfied with another [Kalleberg 1977: 126; Judge et al. 2017]. These factors, in turn, comprise two groups: the subjective/ socio-demographic and the environmental. In other words, professional fulfillment experienced by employees depends both on individual personality factors (intrinsic needs/attitudes) and factors related to the functioning of the wider organization (extrinsic motivators).

In the authors' opinion, the systematization of knowledge about job satisfaction and its determinants is an important reference point for methodological considerations related to the measurement and shaping of job satisfaction under different organizational conditions. Satisfaction is conditioned by many factors, yet it is nevertheless reasonable, given its significance, to pursue research projects that try to investigate those factors that have the greatest impact on its level. Despite the popularity of job satisfaction studies, certain factors remain unexplored or the subject of contradictory findings. The conducted study provides a new contribution to the current state of knowledge while also leaving the door open for further research. Earlier studies focused largely on the analysis of only one or two factors, and in doing so, they impeded the observation of relation-

ships and correlations between various factors and their degree of impact on overall job satisfaction. Due to the complexity of the impact of both individual human characteristics and organizational/environmental traits, it is necessary to carry out multilevel studies that account for interrelations between the various factors in order to fully understand what precisely conditions job satisfaction. Therefore, further studies into satisfaction will help us gain a better insight into the causes of various employee behaviors, and thus manage human resources more efficiently.

This study is not without its limitations, which are associated with the methodology used. Firstly, the method is limited to the systematic literature review, omitting the requirement of triangulation of research methods. Secondly, publications included in the sample were drawn from the EBSCO, ProQuest, and the Web of Science databases, which includes the most valuable papers that account only for a small part of the whole body of knowledge on job satisfaction and its determinants. Although the research is based on the most recognized databases of scientific papers, it could be extended to other databases in the future. Additionally, the databases are biased towards papers written in English, while neglecting valuable publications in other languages. Thirdly, the analyses of abstracts and full texts are flawed with a high level of subjectivity. Issues may also arise in relation to the conceptualization of the review. When mixing studies based on different theories, the interpretation of their results can be problematic. It is especially difficult to synthesize highly differentiated studies. It would also be worth considering whether the researcher's affiliation to a specific scientific discipline determines detailed research problems as well as the directions and results of his research. All the more, the basic paradigms adopted by particular social sciences differ from each other and may dictate the method of analysis.

Nonetheless, our research has both theoretical and practical implications. First, it reinforces the key role of factors determining job satisfaction. Second, the results of the analysis not only summarize the current knowledge and research on job satisfaction but also indicate potential directions for future studies. It is extremely important to extend the research in this field, especially the distinction of the individual components of job satisfaction. We hope that this article will serve as a springboard for further discussion and debate around the current achievements of job satisfaction determinant research and how it can be made more beneficial to individuals and organizations alike.

Acknowledgements

References

Abate J., Schaefer T., Pavone T. (2018) Understanding Generational Identity, Job Burnout, Job Satisfaction, Job Tenure and Turnover Intention. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, vol. 22, no 1, pp. 1–12.

Abreu von Borell D., Camfield C. E. R., Rodrigues R. G. (2019) An Analysis of the Relationship between Personal Values and Satisfaction with Work. *Revista de Administração da UFSM*, vol. 11, no 5, pp. 1240–1256. DOI: 10.5902/ 19834659 16992.

Addis S., Dvivedi A., Beshah B. (2018) Determinants of Job Satisfaction in Ethiopia: Evidence from the Leather Industry. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, vol. 9, no 4, pp. 410–429. DOI: 10.1108/AJEMS-09-2017-0222.

Agarwal P., Sajid S. M. (2017) A Study of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention among Public and Private Sector Employees. *Journal of Management Research*, vol. 17, no 3, pp. 123–136.

Aguilar F. X., Vlosky R. P. (2010) Gender Differences in Determinants of Job Satisfaction among Cooperative Extension Workers in the United States. *Applied Economics Letters*, vol. 17, no 2, pp. 175–179. DOI: 10.1080/13504850701719959.

Amiot C. E., Terry D. J., Jimmieson N. L., Callan V. J. (2006) A Longitudinal Investigation of Coping Processes During a Merger: Implications for Job Satisfaction and Organizational Identification. *Journal of Management*, vol. 32, no 4, pp. 552–574.

Andrisani P. J. (1978) Job Satisfaction among Working Women. *Signs*, vol. 3, no 3, pp. 588–607.

Ang K. B., Goh C. T., Koh H. C. (1993) Research Notes, The Impact of Age on the Job Satisfaction of Accountants. *Personnel Review*, vol. 22, no 1, pp. 31–39. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/00483489310025184.

Arekar K., Jain R., Desphande B., Sherin P. (2016) Relationship Between Individual and Structural Determinants on Job Satisfaction-Analysis of Employee Turnover in the Indian Context. *The Journal of Developing Areas. Special Issue on Dubai Conference Held in April 2016*, vol. 50, no 6, pp. 387–398.

Armstrong M. (2000) *Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi* [Human Resources Management], Kraków: Dom Wydawniczy ABC, Oficyna Ekonomiczna (in Polish).

Berliana M., Siregar N., Gustian H. D. (2018) The Model of Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, vol. 8, no 6, pp. 41–46. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32479/irmm.7183.

Berry L. M. (1998) *Psychology at Work. An Introduction to Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Białas S., Litwin J. (2013) Kierunki badań nad satysfakcją z pracy [Job Satisfaction: Review and Suggestion for Future Research]. *Organizacja i Kierowanie = Organization and Management*, no 3 (156), pp. 161–172 (in Polish).

Booth A., Sutton A., Papaioannou D. (2016) *Systematic Approaches to a Successful Literature Review*, 2nd ed., Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Bos J. T., Donders N. C. G. M., Bouwman-Brouwer K. M., Van der Gulden J. W. J. (2009) Work Characteristics and Determinants of Job Satisfaction in Four Age Groups: University Employees' Point of View. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, vol. 82, no 10, pp. 1249–1259. DOI: 10.1007/s00420-009-0451-4.

Brief A. P. (1998) *Attitudes In and Around Organizations*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Brief A. P., Rose G. L., Aldag R. J. (1977) Sex Differences in Preferences for Job Attributes Revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 62, no 5, pp. 645–646.

Brief A. P., Weiss H. M. (2002) Organizational Behavior: Affect in the Workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, vol. 53, no 1, pp. 279–307.

Bruk-Lee V., Khoury H. A., Nixon A. E., Goh A., Spector P. E. (2009) Replicating and Extending Past Personality/Job Satisfaction Meta-Analyses. *Human Performance*, vol. 22, no 2, pp. 156–189. DOI: 10.1080/08959280902743709.

Bugdol M. (2006) *Wartości organizacyjne. Szkice z teorii organizacji i zarządzania* [Organizational Values. Studies on the Theory of Organization and Management], Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego (in Polish).

Capecchi S., Piccolo D. (2016) Investigating the Determinants of Job Satisfaction of Italian Graduates: A Model-Based Approach. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, vol. 43, no 1, pp. 169–179. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02664763.2015.1036844.

Card D., Mas A., Moretti E., Saez E. (2012) Inequality at Work: The Effect of Peer Salaries on Job Satisfaction. *American Economic Review*, vol. 102, no 6, pp. 2981–3003. DOI: 10.1257/aer.102.6.2981.

Carmeli A., Freund A. (2004) Work Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance: An Empirical Investigation. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, vol. 7, no 3, pp. 289–309. DOI: 10.1108/IJOTB-07-03-2004-B001.

Carr J. Z., Schmidt A. M., Ford J. K., De Shon R. P. (2003) Climate Perceptions Matter: A Meta-Analytic Path Analysis Relating Molar Climate, Cognitive and Affective States, and Individual Level Work Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 88, no 4, pp. 605–619. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.605.

Carvalho C. R. S. P. de, Castro M. A. R. da Silva L. P., Carvalho L. O. P. de. (2018) The Relationship Between Organizational Culture, Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *REBRAE,* vol. 11, no 2, pp. 201–215. DOI: 10.7213/rebrae.11.002.AO02.

Charles N., Weaver Ch. N. (1978) Sex Differences in the Determinants of Job Satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 21, no 2, pp. 265–274.

Chen P. Y., Spector P. E. (1992) Relationships of Work Stressors with Aggression, Withdrawal, Theft and Substance Use: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, vol. 65, no 3, pp. 177–184.

Clark A. E. (1996) Job Satisfaction in Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, vol. 34, no 2, pp. 189–217.

Clark A. E. (1997) Job Satisfaction and Gender: Why are Women So Happy at Work? *Labour Economics*, vol. 4, no 4, pp. 341–372.

Clark A. E., Oswald A. J. (1996) Satisfaction and Comparison Income. *Journal of Public Economics*, vol. 61, no 3, pp. 359–381.

Clark A., Oswald A., Warr P. (1996) Is Job Satisfaction U-Shaped in Age? *Journal of Occupational and Organtzational Psychology*, vol. 69, no 1, pp. 57–81. DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1996.tb00600.x.

Cohrs J. C., Abele A. E, Dette D. E. (2006) Integrating Situational and Dispositional Determinants of Job Satisfaction: Findings from Three Samples of Professionals. *The Journal of Psychology*, vol. 140, no 4, pp. 363–396. DOI: 10.3200/JRLP.140.4.363–395.

Columb M. O., Lalkhen A. G. (2005) Systematic Reviews & Meta-Analyses. *Current Anaesthesia & Critical Care*, vol. 16, no 6, pp. 391–394.

Cranny C. J., Smith P. C., Stone E. F. (1992) *Job Satisfaction: How People Feel about Their Jobs and How It Affects Their Performance*, New York: Lexington Books.

Crant J. M. (2000) Proactive Behavior in Organizations. *Journal of Management*, vol. 26, no 3, pp. 435–462.

Dave N. B., Raval D. (2016) A Review of Literature on Employees' Job Satisfaction and Contentment. *Journal of Management & Research*, vol. 6, no 2, pp. 32–38.

Davis K., Nestrom J. W. (1985). *Human Behavior at Work: Organizational Behavior*, 7th ed., New York: McGraw Hill.

Djordjević B., Ivanović-Djukić M., Lepojević V. (2017) Relationship of Ages and Gender of the Employees in Organisations in the Republic of Serbia and Their Job Satisfaction. *Economic Themes*, vol. 55, no 2, pp. 263–280.

Donohue S. M., Heywood J. S. (2004) Job Satisfaction and Gender: An Expanded Specification from the NLSY. *International Journal of Manpower*, vol. 25, no 2, pp. 211–234. DOI: 10.1108/01437720410536007.

Dormann C., Zapf D. (2001) Job Satisfaction: A Meta-Analysis of Stabilities. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 22, no 5, pp. 483–504. DOI: 10.1002/job.98.

Drenth P. J. D., Thierry H., De Wolff Ch. J. (eds) (1998) *Handbook of Work and Organizational Psychology: Organizational Psychology*, East Sussex: Psychology Press.

Dwiyanti R., Hamzah H. B., Abas N. A. H. B. (2019) Job Satisfaction, Psychological Contracts, and Turnover Intention: Role of Social Support as a Mediator. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, vol. 8, no 6, pp. 96–104. DOI: 10.20525/ijrbs.v8i6.319.

Egan T. M., Yang B., Bartlett K. R. (2004) The Effects of Organizational Learning Culture and Job Satisfaction on Motivation to Transfer Learning and Turnover Intention. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, vol. 15, no 3, pp. 279–301.

Ensour W., Zeglat D., Shrafat F. (2018) Impact of Job Satisfaction on Training Motivation. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, vol. 16, no 3, pp. 337–355.

Escardíbul J.-O. , Afcha S. (2017) Determinants of the Job Satisfaction of PhD Holders: An Analysis by Gender, Employment Sector, and Type of Satisfaction in Spain. *Higher Education*, vol. 74, no 5, pp. 855–875. DOI: 10.1007/s10734-016-0081-1.

Eskildsen J. K., Kristensen K., Westlund A. H. (2004) Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction in the Nordic Countries. *Employee Relations*, vol. 26, no 2, pp. 122–136.

Ferrer-i-Carbonell A. (2005) Income and Well-Being: An Empirical Analysis of the Comparison Income Effect. *Journal of Public Economics*, vol. 89, no 5−6, pp. 997–1019.

Fields D. L. (2002) *Taking the Measure of Work: A Guide to Validated Scales for Organizational Research and Diagnosis*, University of Georgia Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Fiorillo D., Nappo N. (2014) Job Satisfaction in Italy: Individual Characteristics and Social Relations. *International Journal of Social Economics*, vol. 41, no 8, pp. 683–704. DOI: 10.1108/IJSE-10-2012-0195.

Forgionne G. A., Peeters V. E. (1982) Differences in Job Motivation and Satisfaction Among Female and Male Managers. *Human Relations*, vol. 35, no 2, pp. 101–118.

Frey B. S., Stutzer A. (2002) What Can Economists Learn from Happiness Research? *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 40, no 2, pp. 402–435.

García-Bernal J., Gargallo-Castel A., Marzo-Navarro M., Rivera-Torres P. (2005) Job Satisfaction: Empirical Evidence of Gender Differences. *Women in Management Review*, vol. 20, no 4, pp. 279–288. DOI: 10.1108/09649420510599098.

García-Mainar I., García-Martín G., Montuenga V. M. (2016) Gender Differences in Occupations, Job Attributes, and Job Satisfaction. *Revista de Economía Aplicada*, vol. 24, no 71, pp. 39–67.

Gazioğlu S., Tansel A. (2003) Job Satisfaction, Work Environment and Relations with Managers in Britain. *ERC Working Papers in Economics*, vol. 03/04.

Gimenez C., Tachizawa E. (2012) Extending Sustainability to Suppliers: A Systematic Literature Review. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, vol. 17, no 5, pp. 531–543.

Glisson Ch., Durick M. (1988) Predictors of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Human Service Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 33, no 1, pp. 61–81.

Golembiewski R. (1977) Testing Some Stereotypes about the Sexes in Organizations: Differential Satisfaction with Work? *Human Resource Management*, vol. 16, no 2, pp. 30–32.

González J. V., Garazo T. G. (2006) Structural Relationships between Organizational Service Orientation, Contact Employee Job Satisfaction and Citizenship Behavior. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, vol. 17, no 1, pp. 23–50. DOI: 10.1108/09564230610651561.

Gordon J. R. (1993) *A Diagnostic Approach to Organizational Behavior*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gregory B. T., Albritton M. D., Osmonbekov T. (2010) The Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment on the Relationship between P–O Fit, Job Satisfaction, and In-role Performance. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, vol. 25, no 4, pp. 639–647. DOI: 10.1007/s10869-010-9156-7.

Griffin R. W. (2010) *Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami* [Basics of Organization Management], Warszawa: PWN (in Polish).

Gur F. A., Greckhamer T. (2018) Know Thy Enemy: A Review and Agenda for Research on Competitor Identification. *Journal of Management*, vol. 45, no 5, pp. 2072–2100. DOI: 10.1177/0149206317744250.

Hackman J. R., Oldham G. R. (1976) Motivation through the Design of Work: Test of a Theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, vol. 16, no 2, pp. 250–279.

Haffer R. (2015) Determinanty i następstwa satysfakcji pracowników w świetle teorii pozytywnego zarządzania [Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Satisfaction in the Light of Positive Management Theory]. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu = Research Papers of Wrocław University of Economics*, no 376, pp. 152–168 (in Polish).

Hajdukova A., Klementova J., Klementova J. jr (2015) The Job Satisfaction as a Regulator of the Working Behaviour. *Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 190, pp. 471–476. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.05.028.

Halevy N., Cohen T. R., Chou E. Y., Katz J. J., Panter A. T. (2014) Mental Models at Work: Cognitive Causes and Consequences of Conflict in Organizations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, vol. 40, no 1, pp. 92–110. DOI: 10.1177/0146167213506468.

Harter J. K., Schmidt F. L., Hayes T. L. (2002) Business-Unit-Level Relationship Between Employee Satisfaction, Employee Engagement, and Business Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 87, no 2, pp. 268–279. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268.

Heller D., Judge T. A., Watson D. (2002) The Confounding Role of Personality and Trait Affectivity in the Relationship between Job and Life Satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 23, no 7, pp. 815–835. DOI: 10.1002/job.168.

Hellriegel D., Slocum J. W., Jr. (2008) *Organizational Behavior*, Mason: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Herzberg F., Mausner B., Snyderman B. (1959) The Motivation to Work, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Heywood J. S., Wei X. (2006) Performance Pay and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, vol. 48, no 4, pp. 523–540.

Hoel H., Sparks K., Cooper C. L. (2001) *The Cost of Violence/Stress at Work and the Benefits of a Violence/Stress-Free Working Environment*, Geneva: Report Commissioned by the International Labour Organization (ILO).

Hoppock R. (1935) *Job Satisfaction*, New York; London: Harper and Brothers.

Huang X., Van de Vliert E. (2003) Where Intrinsic Job Satisfaction Fails to Work: National Moderators of Intrinsic Motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 24, no 2, pp. 159–179. DOI: 10.1002/job.186.

Hulin C. L., Judge T. A. (2003) Job Attitudes. Handbook of Psychology: Industrial and Organizational Psychology (eds. W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, R. J. Klimoski), New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 255–276. DOI: 10.1002/0471264385.

Humpert S. (2016) What Workers Want: Job Satisfaction in the U. S. *Management Research and Practice*, vol. 8, no 1, pp. 39–45.

Hytti U., Kautonen T., Akola E. (2013) Determinants of Job Satisfaction for Salaried and Self-Employed Professionals in Finland. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 24, no 10, pp. 2034–2053. DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2012.723023.

Iaffaldano M.T., Muchinsky P.M. (1985) Job Satisfaction and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 97, no 2, pp. 251–273.

Janićijević N., Nikčević G., Vasić V. (2018) The Influence of Organizational Culture on Job Satisfaction. *Economic Annals*, vol. LXIII, no 219 , pp. 83–114. DOI: 10.2298/EKA1819083J.

Jassem A., Djebarni R., Mellahi K. (2011) Determinants of Job Satisfaction in the UAE. *Personnel Review*, vol. 40, no 1, pp. 126–146. DOI: 10.1108/00483481111095555.

Jinnett K., Alexander J. A. (1999) The Influence of Organizational Context on Quitting Intention. *Research on Aging*, vol. 21, no 2, pp. 176–204.

Johnson G. J., Johnson W. R. (2000) Perceived Overqualification and Dimensions of Job Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Analysis. *The Journal of Psychology*, vol.134, no 5, pp. 537–555.

Juchnowicz M. (2014) *Satysfakcja zawodowa pracowników — kreator kapitału ludzkiego* [Professional Satisfaction of Employees — Creator of Human Capital], Warszawa: Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne (in Polish).

Judge T. A., Bono J. E., Locke E. A. (2000) Personality and Job Satisfaction: The Mediating Role of Job Characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 85, no 2, pp. 237–249. DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010 .85.2.237.

Judge T. A., Heller D., Klinger R. (2008) The Dispositional Sources of Job Satisfaction: A Comparative Test. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, vol. 57, no 3, pp. 361–372. DOI: 10.1111/j.1464-0597 .2007.00318.x.

Judge T. A., Hulin C. L., Reeshad S., Dalal R. S. (2009) Job Satisfaction and Job Affect. *The Oxford Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (ed. S. W. J. Kozlowski), New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 496–525.

Judge T. A., Klinger R. (2008) Job Satisfaction: Subjective Well-Being at Work. *The Science of Subjective Well-Being* (eds. M. Eid, R. J. Larsen), New York: Guilford Press, pp. 393–413.

Judge T. A., Llies R. (2004) Affect and Job Satisfaction: A Study of Their Relationship at Work and at Home. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 89, no 4, pp. 661–673.

Judge T. A., Piccolo R. F., Podsakoff N. P., Shaw J. C., Rich B. L. (2010) The Relationship between Pay and Job Satisfaction: A Meta-Analysis of the Literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 77, no 2, pp. 157–167. DOI: 10.1016/j.jvb.2010.04.002.

Judge T. A., Weiss H. M., Kammeyer-Mueller J. D., Hulin C. L. (2017) Job Attitudes, Job Satisfaction, and Job Affect: A Century of Continuity and of Change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 102, no 3, pp. 356–374. DOI: 10.1037/apl0000181.

Jusmin A., Said S., Bima M. J., Alam R. (2016) Specific Determinants of Work Motivation, Competence, Organizational Climate, Job Satisfaction and Individual Performance: A Study among Lecturers. *Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, vol. 4, no 3, pp. 53–59.

Kalleberg A. (1977) Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, vol. 42, no 1, pp. 124–143.

Katz R. (1978) The Influence of Job Longevity on Employee Reactions to Task Characteristics. *Human Relations*, vol. 31, no 8, pp. 703–725.

Keith D., Newstrom J. W. (1985) *Human Behavior at Work: Organizational Behavior*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

King W. R., He J. (2005) Understanding the Role and Methods of Meta-Analysis in IS Research. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, vol. 16, pp. 665–686.

Kirkman B. L., Shapiro D. L. (2001) The Impact of Cultural Values on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Self-Managing Work Teams: The Mediating Role of Employee Resistance. *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 44, no 3, pp. 557–569.

Kozioł L. (2011) Trychotomia czynników motywacji w pracy — zarys koncepcji [Trychotomy of Motivating Factors in the Workplace: Concept Outline]. *Zeszyty Naukowe Małopolskiej Wyższej Szkoły Ekonomicznej w Tarnowie = The Małopolska School of Economics in Tarnów Research Papers Collection*, vol. 19, no 2, pp. 45–54. DOI: 10.25944/znmwse.2011.02.4554 (in Polish).

Koziol L., Koziol M. (2020) The Concept of the Trichotomy of Motivating Factors in the Workplace. *Central European Journal of Operations Research*, vol. 28, no 2, pp. 707–715. DOI: 10.1007/s10100-019-00658-5.

Küskü F. (2003) Employee Satisfaction in Higher Education: The Case of Academic and Administrative Staff in Turkey. *Career Development International*, vol. 8, no 7, pp. 347–356. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430310505304.

Lambert E. G., Hogan N. L., Barton S. M. (2001) The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Turnover Intent: A Test of a Structural Measurement Model Using a National Sample of Workers. *The Social Science Journal*, vol. 38, no 2, pp. 233–250.

Lange T. (2009) Attitudes, Attributes and Institutions: Determining Job Satisfaction in Central and Eastern Europe. *Employee Relations*, vol. 31, no 1, pp. 81–97. DOI: 10.1108/01425450910916832.

Larwood L. (1984) *Organizational Behavior and Management*, Boston: Kent Publishing Company.

Lee Ch., Way K. (2010) Individual Employment Characteristics of Hotel Employees that Play a Role in Employee Satisfaction and Work Retention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 29, no 3, pp. 344–353.

Lee J. (2005) Effects of Leadership and Leader-Member Exchange on Commitment. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, vol. 26, no 8, pp. 655–683.

Lee T. W. (1988) How Job Dissatisfaction Leads to Employee Turnover. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, vol. 2, no 3, pp. 263–271. DOI: 10.1007/BF01014043.

Lee T. W., Mitchell T. R. (1994) An Alternative Approach: The Unfolding Model of Voluntary Employee Turnover, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 19, no 1, pp. 51–89.

Levy Y., Ellis T. J. (2006) A Systems Approach to Conduct an Effective Literature Review in Support of Information Systems Research. *Informing Science Journal*, vol. 9, pp. 181–212. DOI: 10.28945/479.

Li N., Liang J., Crant J. M. (2010) The Role of Proactive Personality in Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Relational Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 95, no 2, pp. 395–404. DOI: 10.1037/a0018079.

Locke E. A. (1976) The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (ed. M. D. Dunnette), Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 1297–1343.

Locke E. A., Latham G. P. (1990) Work Motivation and Satisfaction: Light at the End of the Tunnel. *Psychological Science*, vol. 1, no 4, pp. 240–246.

Luo Y. (2016) Gender and Job Satisfaction in Urban China: The Role of Individual, Family, and Job Characteristics. *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 125, no 1, pp. 289–309. DOI: 10.1007/s11205-014-0837-x.

Lup D. (2017) Research: Becoming a Manager Increases Men's Job Satisfaction, But Not Women's. *Harvard Business Review Digital Articles*, vol. 11, no 9, pp. 2–5.

Luthans F. (2011) *Organisational Behavior. An Evidence-Based Approach*, 12th ed., New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Luthans F., Avey J. B., Patera J. L. (2008) Experimental Analysis of a Web-Based Training Intervention to Develop Positive Psychological Capital. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, vol. 7, no 2, pp. 209–221. DOI: 10.5465/AMLE.2008.32712618.

Luthans F., Avolio B. J., Avey J. B., Norman S. M. (2007) Positive Psychological Capital: Measurement and Relationship with Performance and Satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 60, no 3, pp. 541–572.

Mafini C., Dlodlo N. (2014) The Relationship between Extrinsic Motivation, Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction Amongst Employees in a Public Organisation. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, vol. 40, no 1, pp. 1–13. DOI: 10.4102/ sajip.v40i1.1166.

Maharani V., Troena E. A., Noermijati N. (2013) Organizational Citizenship Behavior Role in Mediating the Effect of Transformational Leadership, Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance: Studies in PT Bank Syariah Mandiri Malang East Java, *International Journal of Business and Management*, vol. 8, no 17, pp. 1–12. DOI: 10.5539/ijbm.v8n17p1.

Makin P., Cooper C., Cox Ch. (2000) *Organizacja a kontrakt psychologiczny. Zarządzanie ludźmi w pracy* [Organization and Psychological Contract. Managing People at Work], Warszawa: PWN (in Polish).

Marin-García J. A., Bonavia T., Losilla J. M. (2011) Exploring Working Conditions as Determinants of Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Test Among Catalonia Service Workers. *Service Industries Journal*, vol. 31, no 12, pp. 2051–2066. DOI: 10.1080/02642069.2011.559226.

Maureen S. A., Westover J. H. (2018) Generational Differences in Work Quality Characteristics and Job Satisfaction. *Evidence-Based HRM*, vol. 6, no 3, pp. 287–304. DOI: 10.1108/EBHRM-03-2018-0020.

McCausland W., Pouliakas K., Theodossiou I. (2005) Some are Punished and Some are Rewarded: A Study of the Impact of Performance Pay on Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Manpower*, vol. 26, no 7/8, pp. 636–659. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720510628112.

McDonald D. J., Makin P. J. (2000) The Psychological Contract, Organisational Commitment and Job Satisfaction Of Temporary Staff. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, vol. 21, no 2, pp. 84–91. DOI: 10.1108/01437730010318174.

Millán J. M., Hessels J., Thurik R., Aguado R. (2013) Determinants of Job Satisfaction: A European Comparison of Self-Employed and Paid Employees. *Small Business Economics*, vol. 40, no 3, pp. 651–670. DOI: 10.1007/s11187-011-9380-1.

Moloantoa M. E., Dorasamy N. (2017) Job Satisfaction Among Academic Employees in Institutions of Higher Learning. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, vol. 15, no 3, pp. 193–200. DOI: 10.21511/ppm.15(3-1).2017.03.

Mount M., Ilies R., Johnson E. (2006) Relationship of Personality Traits and Counterproductive Work Behaviors: The Mediating Effects of Job Satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 59, no 3, pp. 591–622.

Murray M. A., Atkinson T. (1981) Gender Differences in Correlates of Job Satisfaction. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, vol. 13, no 1, pp. 44–55.

Nair P. K. (2007) A Path Analysis of Relationship among Job Stress, Job Satisfaction, Motivation to Transfer, and Transfer of Learning: Perceptions of Occupational Safety and Health Administration Outreach Trainers. *A Dissertation.* Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of Texas A&M University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Nazim F., Mahmood A. (2018) A Study of Relationship between Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Research in Social Sciences — JRSS*, vol. 6, no 1, pp. 165–181.

Near J. P., Rice R. W., Hunt R. G. (1978) Work and Extra Work Correlates of Life and Job Satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 21, no 2, pp. 248–264.

Nielsen M. B., Mearns K., Matthiesen S. B., Eid J. (2011) Using the Job Demands-Resources Model to Investigate Risk Perception, Safety Climate and Job Satisfaction in Safety Critical Organizations. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, vol. 52, no 5, pp. 465–475. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2011.00885.x.

Ollo-López A., Bayo-Moriones A., Larraza-Kintana M. (2016) Disentangling the Relationship between High-Involvement-Work-Systems and Job Satisfaction. *Employee Relations*, vol. 38, no 4, pp. 620–642. DOI: 10.1108/ER-04-2015-0071.

Pandey P., Asthana P. K. (2017) An Empirical Study of Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction. *Indian Journal of Commerce and Management Studies*, vol. 8, no 3, pp. 96–105. DOI: 10.18843/ijcms/v8i3/11.

Pauli U. (2010) Badanie satysfakcji pracowników jako źródło informacji menedżerskiej [Research on Worker Satisfaction as a Source of Information for Managers]. *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie = Cracow Review of Economics and Management*, no 828, pp. 95–110 (in Polish).

Piccolo R. F., Judge T. A., Takahashi K., Watanabe N., Locke E. A. (2005) Core Self-Evaluations in Japan: Relative Effects on Job Satisfaction, Life Satisfaction, and Happiness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 26, pp. 965–984. DOI: 10.1002/job.358.

Podsakoff P. M., Mackenzie S. B. (1997) Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Organizational Performance: A Review and Suggestions for Future Research. *Human Performance*, vol. 10, no 2, pp. 133–151.

Podsakoff P. M., MacKenzie S. B., Paine J. B., Bachrach D. G. (2000) Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, vol. 26, no 3, pp. 513–563. DOI: 10.1177/014920630002600307.

Pook L., Füstös J., Liviu M. (2003) The Impact of Gender Bias on Job Satisfaction. *Human Systems Management*, vol. 22, no 1, pp. 37–50.

Porter L. W., Steers R. M., Mowday R. T. (1974) Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover among Psychiatric Technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 59, no 5, pp. 603–609.

Prabhu V. (2018) Organizational Change and Proactive Personality: Effect on Job Performance and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, vol. 20, no 4, pp. 178–202. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33423/jabe.v20i4.356.

Puni A., Mohammed I., Asamoah E. (2018) Transformational Leadership and Job Satisfaction: The Moderating Effect of Contingent Reward. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, vol. 39, no 4, pp. 522–537.

Qayyum A. (2013) Job Satisfaction of University Teachers across the Demographics (A Case of Pakistani Universities). *Bulletin of Education and Research*, vol. 35, no 1, pp. 1–15.

Quinn R. P., Baldi de Mandilovitch M. S. (1975) *Education and Job Satisfaction: A Questionable Payoff*, Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Centre; The University of Michigan.

Ramawickrama J., Opatha H. H. D. N. P., Pushpa Kumari M. D. (2017) Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction, and the Facets of the Relationship between the Two Constructs. *International Business Research*, vol. 10, no 4, pp. 167–182. DOI: 10.5539/ibr.v10n4p167.

Rayton B. A., Yalabik Z. Y. (2014) Work Engagement, Psychological Contract Breach and Job Satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 25, no 17, pp. 2382–2400. DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2013.876440.

Rehman M. S., Waheed A. (2011) An Empirical Study of Impact of Job Satisfaction on job Performance in the Public Sector Organizations. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, vol. 2, no 9, pp. 167–180.

Robbins S. P., Judge T. A. (2013) *Organizational Behaviour*, 15th ed., Boston: Person.

Robie C., Ryan A. M, Schmieder R. A., Parra L. F., Smith P. C. (1998) The Relation Between Job Level and Job Satisfaction. *Group & Organization Management*, vol. 23, no 4, pp. 470–495.

Rowley J., Slack F. (2004) Conducting a Literature Review. *Management Research News*, vol. 27, no 6, pp. 31–39. DOI: 10.1108/01409170410784185.

Saari L. M., Judge T. A. (2004) Employee Attitudes and Job Satisfaction. *Human Research Management*, vol. 43, no 4, pp. 395–407.

Sadłowska-Wrzesińska J. (2014) Analysis of Psychosocial Risk in the Context of the Objectives of Macro-ergonomics. *Advances in Social and Organizational Factors* (ed. P. Vink), Kraków. Published by AHFE Conference, pp. 277–285.

Saks A. M., Gruman J. A. (2014) What do We Really Know about Employee Engagement? *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, vol. 25, no 2, pp. 155–182. DOI: 10.1002/hrdq.21187.

Sánchez-Sellero M. C., Sánchez-Sellero P., Cruz-González M. M., Sánchez-Sellero F. J. (2018) Determinants of Job Satisfaction in the Spanish Wood and Paper Industries: A Comparative Study across Spain. *Drvna Industrija*, vol. 69, no 1, pp. 71–80. DOI: 10.5552/drind.2018.1711.

Satyanarayana P., Narender K. (2008) From Work-Family Conflicts to Psychological Stress, Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction: A Proposed Integrative Model. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, vol. 12, no 2, pp. 49–63.

Schaufeli W. B., Salanova M., González-Romá V., Bakker A. B. (2002) The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory Analytic Approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, vol. 3, no 1, pp. 71–92.

Schneider B., Snyder R. A. (1975) Some Relationships Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 60, no 3, pp. 318–328.

Schultz D. P., Schultz S. E. (2012) *Psychologia a wyzwania dzisiejszej pracy* [Psychology and Work Today], Warszawa: PWN (in Polish).

Sempane M. E., Rieger H. S., Roodt G. (2002) Job Satisfaction in Relation to Organisational Culture. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, vol. 28, no 2, pp. 23–30.

Shin Y. B., Koh S. H. (2015) Information Processing Approach Model to Measure Important Determinants on Job Satisfaction. *The Business & Management Review*, vol. 6, no 2, pp. 93–103.

Singha P., Raychaudhuri S. (2017) Non IAS/IPS Sector: An Analysis of In-Depth Psychosocial Correlates behind the Job Satisfaction of the Employees. *Journal of Psychosocial Research*, vol. 12, no 1, pp. 207–215.

Slavin R. E. (1995) Best Evidence Synthesis: An Intelligent Alternative to Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, vol. 48, no 1, pp. 9–18.

Sokolová M., Mohelská H., Zubr V. (2016) Pay and Offer of Benefits as Significant Determinants of Job Satisfaction — A Case Study in the Czech Republic. *E + M Ekonomie a Management = E & M Economics and Management*, vol. 19, no 1, pp. 108–120. DOI: 10.15240/tul/001/2016-1-008.

Sousa-Poza A., Sousa-Poza A. A. (2000) Well-Being at Work: A Cross-National Analysis of the Levels and Determinants of Job Satisfaction. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, vol. 29, no 6, pp. 517–538.

Spector P. E. (1997) *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publicatios.

Springer A. (2011) Wybrane czynniki kształtujące satysfakcję pracownika [Chosen Factors Affecting Employees' Satisfaction]. *Problemy Zarządzania = Management Issues*, vol. 9, no 4 (34), pp. 162–180 (in Polish).

Statt D. A. (2004) *The Routledge Dictionary of Business Management*, Abingdon: Routledge Publishing.

Stringer C., Didham J., Theivananthampillai P. (2011) Motivation, Pay Satisfaction, and Job Satisfaction of Front-Line Employees. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, vol. 8, no 2, pp. 161–179. DOI: 10.1108/11766091111137564.

Sureshchandar G. S., Rajendran Ch., Anantharaman R. N. (2001) A Conceptual Model for Total Quality Management in Service Organizations. *Total Quality Management*, vol. 12, no 3, pp. 343–363. DOI: 10.1080/09544120120034492.

Thomas A., Buboltz W. C., Winkelspecht C. S. (2004) Job Characteristics and Personality as Predictors of Job Satisfaction. *Organizational Analysis*, vol. 12, no 2, pp. 205–219.

Timming A. R. (2010) Cross-National Variation in the Determinants of Job Satisfaction: How Far Do Our Results "Travel"? *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, vol. 13, no 4, pp. 525–545. DOI: 10.1108/IJOTB-13-04-2010-B004.

Ting Y. (1997) Determinants of Job Satisfaction of Federal Government Employees. *Public Personnel Management*, vol. 26, no 3, pp. 313–334.

Tlaiss H. A. (2013) Determinants of Job Satisfaction in The Banking Sector: The Case of Lebanese Managers. *Employee Relations*, vol. 35, no 4, pp. 377–395. DOI: 10.1108/ER-10-2011-0064.

Tubbs M. E., Boehne D. M., Dahl J. G. (1993) Expectancy, Valence, and Motivational Force Functions in Goal-Setting Research: An Empirical Test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 78, no 3, pp. 361–373. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.3.361.

Tugade M. M., Fredrickson B. L., Barrett L. F. (2004) Psychological Resilience and Positive Emotional Granularity: Examining the Benefits of Positive Emotions on Coping and Health. *Journal of Personality*, vol. 72, no 6, pp. 1161–1190. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2004.00294.x.

Tuna M., Ghazzawi I., Yesiltas M., Tuna A. A., Arslan S. (2016) The Effects of the Perceived External Prestige of the Organization on Employee Deviant Workplace Behavior. The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. 28, no 2, pp. 366–396. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-04-2014-0182.

Van Eerde W., Thierry H. (1996) Vroom's Expectancy Models and Work-Related Criteria: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 81, no 5, pp. 575–586.

Verquer M. L., Beehr T. A., Wagner S. H. (2003) A Meta-Analysis of Relations between Person–Organization Fit and Work Attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 63, no 3, pp. 473–489. DOI: 0.1016/S0001-8791(02)00036-2.

Vorina A., Simonič M., Vlasova M. (2017) An Analysis of the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement. *Economic Themes*, vol. 55, no 2, pp. 243–262.

Vroom V. H. (1964) *Work and Motivation*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wagner S. H. (2017) Exploring the Structure of Job Satisfaction and Its Impact on the Satisfaction-Performance Relationship. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, vol. 17, no 4, pp. 90–101.

Warr P. (2008) Work Values: Same Demographic and Cultural Correlates. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 81, no 4, pp. 751–775. DOI: 10.1348/096317907X263638.

Weiss D. J., Dawis R. V., England G. W., Lofquist L. H. (1967) Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, vol. 22, Washington, DC: University of Minnesota.

Weiss H. M. (2002) Deconstructing Job Satisfaction: Separating Evaluations, Beliefs and Affective Experiences. *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 12, no 2, pp. 173–194.

Westover J. H. (2010) Changing Job Quality and Job Satisfaction Determinants in Socialist and Post-Socialist Hungary. *International Journal of Social Economics*, vol. 37, no 2, pp. 84–100. DOI: 10.1108/03068291011007228.

Westover J. H. (2012a) Comparative Welfare State Impacts on Work Quality and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Social Economics*, vol. 39, no 7, pp. 503–525. DOI: 10.1108/03068291211231687.

Westover J. H. (2012b) The Job Satisfaction-Gender Paradox Revisited. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, vol. 3, no 2, pp. 263–277. DOI: 10.1108/20412561211260557.

Westover J. H. (2013) The Impact of Country Context on Employee Job Satisfaction: An Application of the World-Systems Framework. *International Journal of Management*, vol. 30, no 2, pp. 451–463.

Westover J. H. (2016) The International Political Economy of Worker Satisfaction: A Cross-National HLM Analysis. *Evidence-Based HRM*, vol. 4, no 2, pp. 116–143. DOI: 10.1108/EBHRM-03-2015-0006.

Wharton A. S., Rotolo T., Bir S. R. (2000) Social Context at Work: A Multilevel Analysis of Job Satisfaction. *Sociological Forum*, vol. 15, no 1, pp. 65–90.

Wilczyńska A., Batorski D., Sellens J. T. (2016) Employment Flexibility and Job Security as Determinants of Job Satisfaction: The Case of Polish Knowledge Workers. *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 126, no 2, pp. 633–656. DOI: 10.1007/s11205-015-0909-6.

Wilkens U., Nermerich D. (2011) "Love It, Change It, or Leave It" — Understanding Highly-Skilled Flexible Workers' Job Satisfaction from a Psychological Contract Perspective. *Management Revue*, vol. 22, no 1, pp. 65–83. DOI: 10.1688/1861-9908_mrev_2011_01_Wilkens.

Wright T. A., Bonett D. G. (2007) Job Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being as Nonadditive Predictors of Workplace Turnover. *Journal of Management*, vol. 33, no 2, pp. 141–160. DOI: 10.1177/0149206306297582.

Wu Ch.-H., Chen I.-S., Chen J.-Ch. (2017) A Study into the Impact of Employee Wellness and Job Satisfaction on Job Performance. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, vol. 10, no 2, pp. 253–269.

Wudarzewski G. (2013) Satysfakcja z pracy — konceptualizacja pojęcia w świetle badań literaturowych [Job Satisfaction — Conceptualization of the Notion in the Light of Literature Review]. *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Bankowej we Wrocławiu= The Wroclaw School of Banking Research Journal*, vol. 5, no 37, pp. 321–344 (in Polish).

Yang X., Wang W. (2013) Exploring the Determinants of Job Satisfaction of Civil Servants in Beijing, China. *Public Personnel Management*, vol. 42, no 4, pp. 566–587. DOI: 10.1177/0091026013502169.

Yoon M. H., Suh J. (2003) Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Service Quality as External Effectiveness of Contact Employees. *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 56, no 8, pp. 597–611.

Yuen K. F., Loh H. S., Zhou Q., Wong Y. D. (2018) Determinants of Job Satisfaction and Performance of Seafarers. *Transportation Research Part A*, vol. 110, pp. 1–12. DOI: 10.1016/j.tra.2018.02.006.

Zalewska A. (2009) Wiek, płeć i stanowisko pracy a zadowolenie z pracy [Gender, Age, Job Position, and Job-Related Subjective Well-Being]. *Psychologia Jakości Życia = Psychology of Quality of Life*, vol .8, no 1, pp. 1–20 (in Polish).

Zalewska A. M. (2003) Skala satysfakcji z pracy — pomiar poznawczego aspektu ogólnego zadowolenia z pracy [The Satisfaction with Job Scale — A measure of Cognitive Aspect of Overall Job Satisfaction]. *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Psychologica*, no 7, pp. 49–61 (in Polish).

Zeinabadi H. (2010) Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of Teachers. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science*, vol. 5, pp. 998–1003. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.225.

Zhang J., Zheng W. (2009) How Does Satisfaction Translate into Performance? An Examination of Commitment and Cultural Values. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, vol. 20, no 3, pp. 331–351.