

*Nebojša Janićijević\**  
*Panta Kovačević\*\**  
*Ivana Petrović\*\*\**

## **IDENTIFYING ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS OF JOB SATISFACTION: THE CASE OF ONE SERBIAN COMPANY**

.....

**ABSTRACT:** *This paper presents the results of exploratory research, the objective of which was to identify organizational factors of job satisfaction. A stratified random sample of 1,488 employees from a Serbian company answered a specially designed questionnaire, which asked them to rate the importance of and their satisfaction with fifty job different aspects. The survey results were analysed by means of three factor analyses, firstly using the data on the importance of job aspects, secondly using the data on satisfaction with the job*

*aspects, and thirdly using data on the gap between the importance and satisfaction ratings. By synthesizing the results of the three factor analyse, a total of six job satisfaction factors was obtained, three of which are identical to previously identified factors and can be found in job satisfaction theory, two of which are modifications of already identified factors, and one factor which is new in this field of research*

**KEY WORDS:** *job satisfaction, factors of job satisfaction, organization, factor analysis*

**JEL CLASSIFICATION:** M12, M10, M50

---

\* University of Belgrade, Faculty of Economics, Serbia, E-mail: jnebojsa@eunet.rs  
\*\* Singidunum University, Faculty of Media and Communications, Serbia,  
E-mail: pkovacev@f.bg.ac.rs  
\*\*\* University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philosophy, Serbia, E-mail: i.p@eunet.rs

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Job satisfaction consists of individuals' cognitive, affective, and evaluative reactions to their jobs (Locke 1969, 1976). Job satisfaction is complex, since it is the result of evaluation of different job aspects that an employee rates on a daily basis: the job itself, managers, pay, promotion opportunities, and co-workers (Kinicki et al. 2002). Complete information about job satisfaction is considered to be based on information about satisfaction with various aspects of work combined with their respective valences (Kovacevic and Petrovic 2006). Locke (1969) and Porter (1962) defined valence as a value, i.e., the importance of a job aspect that shows the extent to which the aspect 'satisfies' the employee.

An individual will be satisfied with a job to the extent to which the job provides those things or results that he/she considers important. Job satisfaction is an individual construct because it is an individual attitude based on personal experience. This is precisely what separates it from organizational climate, which represents the average individual or collective attitudes of employees towards working in an organization (Schneider, Erhart, and Macey 2001). This is why job satisfaction research is always conducted at the individual level, which is also the case in this paper. The importance and popularity of the job satisfaction concept stems from its assumed, although relatively insufficiently proven, effect on employees' performance (Judge et al. 2001). The implicit, common sense assumption that workers who are satisfied with their jobs will work better, take less days off, be less likely to quit, and, even more, will generally feel better has not been widely justified. The issue of a link between job satisfaction and behaviour at work has not been clarified and we are still not able to determine if job satisfaction influences behaviour at work or vice versa, if behaviour at work is a source of satisfaction, or whether there is any correlation at all (Kovacevic and Petrovic 2006; Staw 1986). However, the primary motive for exploring job satisfaction remains its assumed impact on productivity.

Numerous factors that affect job satisfaction at both the organizational and individual levels have been identified so far (Luthans 2005). Factors of job satisfaction identified at the organizational level include the compensation system, job characteristics, working conditions, leadership style, promotion opportunities, and co-workers (Smith et al. 1969). Factors identified at the individual level are matching of personal interests and job, years of service and age, position in hierarchy, and overall life satisfaction. Organizational job satisfaction factors are organizational elements that shape the work environment and that facilitate or prevent employees getting what is important to them from their jobs.

It is important for the management to know the organizational job satisfaction factors for at least two reasons. First, if they know the factors that determine employees' job satisfaction in an organizational context, the management of the organization will be able to raise the job satisfaction level by modifying these factors. Second, organizational factors are by definition more controlled by management than individual factors, and so are a more productive means of improving employee job satisfaction than attempting to impact individual factors.

The objective of this paper is to empirically identify the factors of organizational job satisfaction. The purpose of the paper is to group the relatively large number of job aspects that impact employee satisfaction into a smaller number of factors for management to manipulate, thereby impacting employee job satisfaction. Since research with a similar purpose has already been carried out, this paper will test those previous results and further develop them.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

A review of the literature reveals that most authors agree that job satisfaction is influenced by the job itself, compensation, supervision, promotion, working conditions, and the work group and relations within it (Luthans 2005; Scarpello and Campbell 1983).

According to many, the job itself is the most important source of job satisfaction. Several dimensions of the job are correlated with job satisfaction (Wong, Hiu, and Law 1998). Autonomy at work and feedback on results are very strongly intertwined with job satisfaction. Also, the creativity that a job allows an employee, and which is related to the job being interesting and challenging, is a very important factor in job satisfaction. Finally, a job that enables opportunities for growth is also mentioned as a job satisfaction factor.

In most studies, pay is an inevitable job satisfaction factor (Luthans, 2005). Pay is a multidimensional phenomenon and impacts job satisfaction in several ways (Carragher and Buckley 1996; Judge 1993). Although the amount of pay is the most obvious job satisfaction factor, it is certainly not the only aspect of compensation that influences job satisfaction. Besides the amount of pay, pay distribution, perceived fairness of compensation, and pay security are also important for job satisfaction. Likewise, pay is not only important in meeting employees' hygienic or existential needs (Herzberg 1964). It can affect employee satisfaction by

enabling them to meet their higher-order needs, since compensation also has a symbolic character. Compensation shows employees how much the management appreciates their contribution and effort. Finally, benefits are also one of the elements of the compensation system that affect job satisfaction, although their impact is somewhat smaller.

Managers and their supervision of employees are an important factor in employee satisfaction. This factor has two key dimensions. On the one hand, both technical and social and psychological support and help provided by managers are important for employee satisfaction. Employees want their managers to be available to help when needed in completing their tasks, but also to provide personal support and be open and friendly in their communication. The other dimension of managers and their supervision is the degree that employees are included in decision-making. Several researchers have shown a correlation between employee participation and job satisfaction (Miller and Monge 1986).

Employee promotion has slightly less value in employee satisfaction in contemporary organizations (Luthans 2005). In modern organizations that are ‘thinning’ the hierarchy and becoming more and more ‘shallow’, there is increasingly less room for the traditional type of promotion by climbing the hierarchy ladder. Instead of the traditional type of promotion, a space is being created for promotion through employees’ growth.

Relations between colleagues in a work group are a job satisfaction factor that has an asymmetrical impact (Luthans 2005): if the relations in a group are good, it will raise the level of job satisfaction to a relatively small degree, but if the relations between colleagues in a work group are bad, it will decrease the job satisfaction level to a greater extent and more significantly. Research has shown that a tightly connected work group can be a source of satisfaction for its members (Van der Vegt, Emans, and Vliert 2001). Employees expect their work group co-workers to be helpful and supportive and to create a pleasant atmosphere in the work group. Cross-cultural research has shown that collectivism in a national culture influences the importance of this job satisfaction factor (Janićijević 1998).

Working conditions are a typical hygiene factor with an asymmetrical impact on job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1964): if working conditions are good the employees will not be dissatisfied, but if they are bad the employees will be dissatisfied. Working conditions are considered to be the different dimensions of physical conditions at work, such as sanitation, noise, physical safety, etc.

By exploring the job satisfaction factors in the company we selected, we tried to determine if the factors of job satisfaction described here are really important, and if they needed modifying or supplementing.

### **3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1. The Sample**

The research was conducted using a sample of 1,488 employees from a large company in Serbia. This research therefore has the characteristics of a case study, which despite its limitations regarding generalization of conclusions still provides one very important advantage: the case study research method enables focus and an in-depth exploration of the observed phenomenon, as well as contextual analysis. Since the objective of this research is explorative identification of job satisfaction factors, a case study of satisfaction in one company is more suitable than comparative research into employee satisfaction in several companies. In addition, a sample taken from just one company alleviates the problem of the impact of certain company characteristics on job satisfaction.

The chosen company offers several advantages for this study. It is a very large company that enables good sampling, covering a relatively large and diversified sample of employees. Second, the chosen company is very heterogeneous according to several criteria, which enables including in the sample employees that differ according to the type of work they perform, their sex, education, and age, and the organizational units they belong to. Finally, this company is very successful and significant in Serbia, and for the past several years has been highly positioned in the list of companies nominated for ‘The Best Place to Work At’ prize.

A stratified random sample was used for the research. The sample was stratified according to sex, age, education, type of job, and organizational unit by taking a certain percentage of employees from each stratum.

The distribution and collection of questionnaires was designed to provide maximum anonymity and confidentiality to the subjects. They received envelopes addressed to one of the University of Belgrade’s faculties so they would be sure that the filled-in questionnaires would go directly to the University’s researchers, whereby the anonymity of the respondents was guaranteed.

The response rate was 75%. A response rate this high could be the consequence of several factors: employee confidence in the anonymity of the responses; the interest of the employees in the topic of research; or the involvement of the company's Department of Human Resources in the distribution of the questionnaires, so that the employees may have perceived filling in the questionnaires as a work requirement.

The distribution of the questionnaire matched the employee structure in all selected criteria. Thus the sample consisted of 73% male and 27% female respondents. The most numerous age group consisted of employees age 36–45 (38% of the total number of employees), followed by employees in the age group 45–55 (30% of the total number of employees). Most subjects in the sample had secondary education (65%), and 32% of the sample subjects had higher education.

### **3.2. The Research Instrument**

A specially designed questionnaire on job satisfaction was used for the purpose of this research. The use of a tailor-made instead of a standard questionnaire is justified by the exploratory nature of the research. The questionnaire was exhaustive, but also simple in structure. It contained 50 items that covered 50 job aspects, and the employees rated the importance of these aspects and their satisfaction with them. Starting from Locke's (1969, 1976) understanding of job satisfaction, we required the subjects to rate every single aspect according to two criteria: importance and degree of satisfaction. They were rated on a scale of 1 (not at all important/not at all satisfied) to 5 (very important/very satisfied). The questionnaire also contained questions on the respondent himself/herself. The purpose of filling in the questionnaire, the way in which it should be filled in, and the way the results would be disseminated were explained at the beginning of the questionnaire, together with a call for honesty and a guarantee of anonymity.

The key objective when designing the questionnaire was to identify the job aspects to be included. Several important rules were applied for the realization of this objective. First, the job aspects included in the questionnaire had to be organizational in character, that is, they had to be controlled by the organization and its management and not by the individual himself/herself. Second, the questionnaire was designed to be as representative as possible of all the organizational aspects of job satisfaction, encompassing all aspects of life and work within the company. Third, we included as many job aspects as possible in the research, since we intended to use factor analysis to identify job satisfaction factors.

The process of identifying the job aspects to be included in the questionnaire was long and consisted of three phases. In the first phase the initial list of job aspects was based on a literature review and the authors' previous research. This list was then modified by adding or deleting items based on previous research (Janićijević, 1998; Kovačević, Petrović, 2006; Petrović, Kovacević, Kutlešić, 2007). Thus, an initial list of 34 job aspects to be included in the research was created.

The second phase in designing the job aspects list was a total of 38 semi-structured interviews with employees (including managers) at the company premises. The objective was to verify the relevance of job aspects from the initial list and to modify the list by adding or deleting items in order to include all the job aspects important for employee satisfaction. The sample of employees and managers to be interviewed was created according to type of work, level in the hierarchy, sex, years of service, organizational unit, and territorial unit. At least one employee was interviewed from each of the defined strata. The interviews lasted for one hour. The semi-structured interview contained ten semi-open-ended questions about the company and the work within it. The questions covered the job itself, working conditions, organization, managers, interpersonal relations with colleagues, compensation, fringe benefits, training and development, and promotion. The questions were both direct (*What is important for you to be satisfied with your job?*) and indirect (*What is a good organization in your view? How would you describe a good manager? What in the company makes your colleagues satisfied, and what makes them dissatisfied?*).

The interviews resulted in modification of the initial job dimensions list in three different ways. First, some job aspects from the initial list were modified, because the interviews revealed that they did not have the same meaning for the employees as they did for the researchers who had previously used them. These aspects were modified to have the employees' meaning. Second, through the interviews a significant number of job aspects were added to the list that had not appeared in any previous research, at least not in this form and with this meaning, as interviewed employees showed that these aspects were significant for their job satisfaction. Finally, some job aspects were simply deleted from the list, since the interviews revealed that they carried no significance for employee satisfaction. As a result of this phase, a list of 42 job aspects was created.

The third phase in designing the list of job aspects consisted of an electronic survey of the employees in which they rated the importance of the 42 job aspects identified in the previous two phases. The questionnaire also contained an open-ended question on satisfaction with work in the company. The aim of this

questionnaire was another check of the job aspects to be included in the research. The survey was conducted by uploading the questionnaire onto the company's website and inviting all the employees to fill it in. Open access was provided and no passwords were required to fill in the questionnaire. Information was provided on the purpose of the questionnaire, the instructions for filling it in, and the way the results would be disseminated. The anonymity of the answers and the importance of truthful answering were especially emphasized.

The questionnaire was accessible for 30 days, and during that time 444 employees filled it in. Special attention was paid to the job aspects that the employees did not rate at all, as well as to those that were rated as extremely important or that had insufficient variability. In addition, the answers to the open-ended question were processed and used to add some other job aspects that the employees pointed to in their answers. The result of the third and final phase was a list of 50 job aspects.

The instrument was highly reliable, both for the importance and satisfaction assessments. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.961 for the importance assessments, and 0.968 for the satisfaction assessments.

### **3.3. Research Method**

The main objective of this research was explorative in character and consisted of identifying organizational factors of job satisfaction. The suitable research method for achieving this objective was factor analysis. However, this research was distinctive because it performed three factor analyses instead of one and the conclusions were based on a synthesis of the three analyses. The reason for this lies in Porter (1962) and Locke's (1969, 1976) understanding of job satisfaction, which was the foundation for this research. In their view, employee satisfaction is equally determined by satisfaction with particular aspects of work and the expectations that the organization members have of these aspects. Thus job satisfaction was operationalized as the gap between the importance that job aspects had for employees and their satisfaction with them. By surveying employees, three evaluations were received for each job aspect: ratings of importance, ratings of satisfaction, and ratings of the size of the gap between importance and satisfaction. In the first factor analysis, 50 job aspects were grouped into a smaller number of groups by means of importance rating, the second factor analysis grouped these 50 aspects based on the ratings of employee satisfaction with these job aspects, while the third factor analysis grouped job aspects based on the ratings of the gap between importance and satisfaction. Through analysis



and synthesis of the obtained factors in all of the three factor analyses we were able to comprehensively determine the factors of job satisfaction.

All of the three factor analyses were conducted using SPSS software. Factorization of matrix of intercorrelations was done using principal components extraction method with Varimax rotation. The number of extracted factors was defined according to the Kaiser criterion ( $\text{Lambda} > 1$ ). The factors that, individually, explain at least 5% variance were interpreted. Factor loadings of 0.400 and greater were considered relevant for interpretation.

#### **4. RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH**

The first research results were ratings of the importance of job aspects and employee satisfaction with job aspects in the company in which the research was conducted. The gap between importance and satisfaction was calculated for each aspect. This revealed that out of 50 job aspects, those associated with security and social relations between employees were the most important for the employees: regular and secure wages, secure employment, respect for employee rights, good relations and communication with colleagues, and a friendly work atmosphere. Neither the amount of salary nor the job itself was in the top 10 most important job aspects. The employees in the observed company were most satisfied with the job aspects that were related to security and social relations: regular pay, good relations between colleagues, but also respect for employee rights. The employees revealed that they were least satisfied with the job aspects emerging from human resources management: promotion, training and development, keeping employees informed, and fairness of the compensation system. The greatest gap between importance and satisfaction lies in the same job aspects: promotion, training and development, keeping employees informed, and fairness of the compensation system.

Since the objective of this research was to identify organizational factors of job satisfaction by means of factor analyses, the most important result of the research consisted of the results of the three conducted factor analyses of the job aspect ratings. The organizational factors of job satisfaction obtained individually by each of the three factor analyses will be presented first, and then these results will be compared and synthesized.

**4.1. The First Factor Analysis**

The first factor analysis was of the employees’ ratings of the importance of the 50 job aspects. Nine factors explained a total of 59.64% of the variance. Only six interpretable factors explaining 47.32% of the variance were included in analysis, and the final three factors were left out based on the percentage of the explained variance, the number of loaded items, and interpretability (Table 1).

**Table 1:** Organizational factors of job satisfaction measured based on ratings of importance

| <b>FACTOR 1: CONDITIONS OF WORK (11.055% variance)</b>                  |                |
|---|----------------|
| <b>Job aspect</b>   | <b>Loading</b> |
| Availability of information necessary to perform work well              | .642           |
| Absence of tension and pressure on employees                            | .616           |
| Clear work organization with precise division of work tasks             | .615           |
| Safe working conditions   | .595           |
| Physical working conditions   | .572           |
| Objective evaluation of individual performance                          | .538           |
| Absence of tension and pressure at work                                 | .521           |
| Promotion based on clear and known criteria                             | .503           |
| Respect for employee rights   | .501           |
| Clearly defined work tasks and responsibilities                         | .466           |
| Opportunity to take initiative at work                                  | .445           |
| Fair criteria in defining salaries                                      | .407           |
| <b>FACTOR 2: RELATIONS BETWEEN COLLEAGUES AT WORK (9.505% variance)</b> |                |
| <b>Job aspect</b>   | <b>Loading</b> |
| Friendly atmosphere at work   | .734           |
| Good communication between colleagues                                   | .705           |
| Good relations between colleagues                                       | .687           |
| Support provided by colleagues  | .675           |
| Absence of conflict between employees                                   | .581           |
| Competent and reliable colleagues                                       | .509           |
| Absence of tension and pressure on employees                            | .485           |
| Help and support from managers in performing work tasks                 | .411           |
|   |                |

IDENTIFYING ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS OF JOB SATISFACTION

| <b>FACTOR 3: THE JOB ITSELF (7.431% variance)</b>  |                |
|--|----------------|
| <b>Job aspect</b>  | <b>Loading</b> |
| Challenging and interesting job  | .753           |
| Dynamic job  | .730           |
| Stimulating job with few routine tasks   | .662           |
| Opportunities for travelling abroad on business  | .554           |
| Job content, activities within the work  | .442           |
| Opportunity to take initiative at work   | .437           |
| Opportunities for professional development and training  | .420           |
|  |                |
| <b>FACTOR 4: COMPANY'S SIGNIFICANCE (6.971% variance)</b>  |                |
| <b>Job aspect</b>  | <b>Loading</b> |
| Company in a field of business important to society  | .779           |
| Company's public image and reputation  | .729           |
| High degree of discipline  | .530           |
| Informing employees on general state of affairs in the company   | .471           |
| Informing employees on the news in different parts of the company  | .426           |
| Opportunities to get different benefits  | .420           |
|  |                |
| <b>FACTOR 5: MANAGERS (6.572% variance)</b>  |                |
| <b>Job aspect</b>  | <b>Loading</b> |
| Highly competent managers  | .716           |
| Managers who respect employees and are open to their suggestions   | .614           |
| Good organizational skills of the manager  | .581           |
| Availability of the manager to his/her subordinates  | .532           |
| Help and support from the managers in performing work tasks  | .426           |
|  |                |
| <b>FACTOR 6: COMPENSATION SYSTEM (6.378% variance)</b>   |                |
| <b>Job aspect</b>  | <b>Loading</b> |
| Compensation system in which the employees' salaries depend on their level of expertise                              | .616           |
| Compensation system that does not discriminate according to the part of the organization in which the employee works | .606           |
| Compensation system in which salaries depend solely on achieved results  | .582           |
| Salary equal to invested effort  | .584           |
| Fair criteria in defining salaries   | .489           |

Job aspects grouped in Importance Factor 1, which accounted for most of the variance in job aspects' importance percentage, have one characteristic in common: they all relate to conditions necessary for the employee to perform his/her work tasks effectively and successfully. Availability of information necessary for performing work, clear work organization, good working conditions, objective performance appraisal, clearly defined work tasks and responsibilities, respecting employee rights defined in the collective labour contract, and even promotion based on clear criteria and opportunity to take initiative at work are all necessary conditions for an employee to use his/her potential in the work place and successfully accomplish his/her work tasks. This factor shows just how important the need for security is to the employees.

Job aspects related to colleagues at work are grouped in Importance Factor 2. Good relations between colleagues, absence of conflict between colleagues, good communication and a friendly atmosphere at work, as well as support by competent and reliable colleagues in performing tasks are all important job satisfaction aspects. This factor is related to employees' need for relatedness and belonging (Alderfer 1969).

Importance Factor 3 of employee satisfaction relates to the job itself. It includes job aspects such as the challenging and dynamic character of the job, absence of routine in work, content of the job, and opportunity to take initiative at work and for further professional training. This factor of job satisfaction is related to employees' need for growth (Alderfer 1969).

The job aspects in the fourth group have two common characteristics, the significance and reputation of the company and keeping employees informed. It is important to the employees that the company they work in has a broader social significance, and that they are kept informed about everything related to the company.

The job aspects in Importance Factor 5 relate to managers. It is important to the employees that their managers are competent and have good organizational skills. It is also important that the managers are open to employees' suggestions and that they respect employees. Managers are also expected to provide help and support to the employees in performing tasks.

The last identified factor, Importance Factor 6, relates to the compensation system, and comprises job aspects that correspond not to the amount of pay but to the fairness of the reward system: fair criteria for determining salary, salary that

corresponds to invested effort, results, and expertise, and a non-discriminatory compensation system.

**4.2. The Second Factor Analysis**

The second factor analysis was of employee ratings of satisfaction with job aspects. This factor analysis identified eight factors, which explained 62.6% of variance. The first six factors explaining 57.59% of variance were included in the analysis, as we decided to disregard the last two factors based on the percentage of the explained variance, the number of loaded items, and interpretability (Table 2).

**Table 2:** Organizational factors of job satisfaction, measured based on ratings of satisfaction with job aspects

| <b>FACTOR 1: REWARDING RESULTS AND CREATING CONDITIONS FOR ACHIEVING THEM (13.763% variance)</b>                     |                |
|--|----------------|
| <b>Job aspect</b>  | <b>Loading</b> |
| Compensation system in which salaries depend solely on achieved results  | .737           |
| Fair criteria for determining salaries   | .711           |
| Compensation system in which salaries depend on level of expertise   | .708           |
| Salary equal to invested effort  | .680           |
| Compensation system that does not discriminate according to the part of the organization in which the employee works | .680           |
| Amount of salary   | .639           |
| Promotion based on clear and known criteria  | .613           |
| Opportunities for professional growth and training   | .544           |
| Objective evaluation of individual performance   | .534           |
| Quality introductory training  | .529           |
| Appreciation and acknowledgement by the managers of a job well done  | .424           |
| Clear work organization with precise division of work tasks  | .417           |
| Good cooperation between different organizational units  | .411           |
|  |                |
| <b>FACTOR 2: MANAGERS (10.824% variance)</b>   |                |
| <b>Job aspect</b>  | <b>Loading</b> |
| Help and support by the managers in performing work tasks  | .748           |
| Availability of the manager to his/her subordinates  | .746           |
| Good organizational skills of the manager  | .724           |

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| Manager who respects the employees and is open to their suggestions       | .720           |
| Highly competent managers   | .704           |
| Appreciation and acknowledgement by the managers of a job well done       | .523           |
| Opportunities for taking initiatives at work                              | .424           |
| Absence of tension and pressure at work                                   | .412           |
| Absence of tension and pressure on the employees                          | .410           |
| <b>FACTOR 3: RELATIONS BETWEEN COLLEAGUES (10.469% variance)</b>          |                |
| <b>Job aspect</b>   | <b>Loading</b> |
| Good communication between colleagues                                     | .855           |
| Friendly atmosphere at work   | .842           |
| Good relations between colleagues   | .809           |
| Absence of conflict between employees                                     | .778           |
| Support provided by colleagues  | .696           |
| Competent and reliable colleagues   | .647           |
| High degree of employee discipline  | .410           |
| <b>FACTOR 4: COMPANY AS A SUPPORT (10.466% variance)</b>                  |                |
| <b>Job aspect</b>   | <b>Loading</b> |
| A company that employees can rely on if they get into trouble             | .726           |
| Opportunities to get different benefits                                   | .648           |
| Company cares about its employees   | .608           |
| Employees kept informed about the general state of affairs in the company | .605           |
| Company in a field of business important to society                       | .600           |
| Company's public image and reputation                                     | .592           |
| Respecting employees' rights defined in the Collective Labour Contract    | .521           |
| Informing employees on the news in different parts of the company         | .486           |
| Job that does not require overtime work                                   | .455           |
| <b>FACTOR 5: JOB ITSELF (6.904% variance)</b>                             |                |
| <b>Job aspect</b>   | <b>Loading</b> |
| Dynamic job   | .792           |
| Challenging and interesting job   | .781           |

IDENTIFYING ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS OF JOB SATISFACTION

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| Stimulating job with few routine tasks                            | .655           |
| Job content, activities within the work                           | .547           |
|   |                |
| <b>FACTOR 6: BASIC WORK CONDITIONS (5.164% variance)</b>          |                |
| <b>Job aspect</b>   | <b>Loading</b> |
| Safe working conditions   | .727           |
| Physical working conditions                                       | .711           |
| Availability of the necessary work assets and equipment           | .620           |
| Availability of information necessary for performing quality work | .469           |

The first identified Satisfaction Factor relates to creating the conditions for employees to achieve results at work, as well as to rewarding the employees for results (Table 2). From the organizational perspective standpoint, three types of aspects may be observed within this factor: 1) aspects related to the system of compensation, or rewarding of employees (including the amount of pay); 2) aspects related to training and development of employees, as well as to their promotion; and 3) aspects related to clear and effective work organization in the company. Thus employees establish a connection between satisfaction with rewards and creating the conditions for completion of tasks and achieving the results that are rewarded. These conditions consist of effective organization and human resources management. In this respect, this factor has a common characteristic with the first factor of importance, because it too includes job dimensions related to the conditions for effective completion of tasks - with one difference, which is that these conditions relate to information and working conditions.

Satisfaction Factor 2 includes job aspects that refer to managers (Table 2). According to this factor, employees' satisfaction with their job depends on the managers' competence, their availability and the support they provide to employees, their openness to employees' suggestions, and their providing expert help to employees in performing work. It is interesting that the opportunity to take initiative at work is a job aspect that is included in this factor. This could mean that employees relate the opportunity to take initiative at work to satisfaction with managers and their management style. It is also interesting that absence of tension and pressures on the employees is related to good managers.

Satisfaction Factor 3 of job satisfaction relates to colleagues at work (Table 2). This factor corresponds to Importance Factor 2 of the job aspect importance ratings. It shows that good relations between colleagues, which create a friendly atmosphere at work, stand out in employee satisfaction.

Satisfaction Factor 4 could be called ‘Company as a support’ or ‘Company support’ (Table 2). Satisfaction with company as a support covers respecting employee rights and ‘caring’ for the employees through providing them with different benefits and necessary information on the work of the company, and it also covers the company as a support in case of personal hardship, the company’s significance, and the company’s public reputation.

Satisfaction Factor 5 relates to the job itself (Table 2) and corresponds to Importance Factor 3 (Table 1). This factor includes aspects such as the challenging and dynamic nature of the work, absence of routine tasks, and job content.

Finally, Satisfaction Factor 6 (Table 2) partly corresponds to Importance Factor 1 (Table 1). This is the reason we gave it the same name: ‘Basic working conditions’. It should be pointed out that some job aspects, such as promotion, performance appraisal, and absence of tension and pressure, are present in Importance Factor 1, but are absent in the corresponding Satisfaction Factor 6.

#### **4.3. The Third Factor Analysis**

The third factor analysis was performed using the gap between importance ratings of job aspects and ratings of employee satisfaction with job aspects (Table 3). As a result, eight factors were identified explaining a total of 60.796% of variance in the gap between importance of job aspects and satisfaction with job aspects. Based on the percentage of the explained variance, the number of loaded items, and their interpretability, the first five factors, which explain 47.097% of variance, were included in the analysis.

**Table 3:** Organizational factors of job satisfaction, measured based on the gap between importance of job aspects and satisfaction with job aspects

| <b>FACTOR 1: REWARDING RESULTS AND CREATING CONDITIONS FOR ACHIEVING THEM (12.047% variance)</b> |                |
|--|----------------|
| <b>Job aspect</b>  | <b>Loading</b> |
| Salary equal to invested effort  | .719           |
| Fair criteria in determining salaries  | .710           |
| Compensation system in which salaries depend solely on achieved results                          | .709           |
| Promotion based on clear and known criteria  | .663           |
| Compensation system in which salaries depend on level of expertise                               | .659           |
| Objective evaluation of individual performance   | .606           |



IDENTIFYING ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS OF JOB SATISFACTION

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| Amount of salary   | .602           |
| Compensation system that does not discriminate according to the part of the organization in which the employee works | .582           |
| Company cares about its employees  | .428           |
| Appreciation and acknowledgement by the managers of a job well done  | .427           |
| Clear work organization with precise division of work tasks  | .406           |
| <b>FACTOR 2: PSYCHOLOGICAL, SOCIAL, AND PHYSICAL SAFETY AT WORK (10.004 % variance)</b>                              |                |
| <b>Job aspect</b>  | <b>Loading</b> |
| Physical working conditions  | .619           |
| Job that does not require overtime work  | .563           |
| Safe working conditions  | .559           |
| Absence of tension and pressure at work  | .556           |
| Opportunity to get different benefits  | .547           |
| A company that employees can rely on if they get into trouble  | .545           |
| Absence of tension and pressure on employees   | .545           |
| Respect for employee rights  | .497           |
| Informing employees of the general state of affairs in the company   | .484           |
| Availability of information necessary for performing quality work  | .470           |
| Informing employees of the news in different parts of the company  | .466           |
| Company cares about its employees  | .454           |
| <b>FACTOR 3: RELATIONS BETWEEN COLLEAGUES (9.754% variance)</b>  |                |
| <b>Job aspect</b>  | <b>Loading</b> |
| Good communication between colleagues  | .818           |
| Friendly atmosphere at work  | .812           |
| Good relations between colleagues  | .789           |
| Absence of conflict between employees  | .745           |
| Support provided by colleagues   | .639           |
| Competent and reliable colleagues  | .588           |
| <b>FACTOR 4: MANAGERS (8.037% variance)</b>  |                |
| <b>Job aspect</b>  | <b>Loading</b> |
| Highly competent managers  | .691           |
| Availability of the manager to his/her subordinates  | .669           |

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| Help and support by the managers in performing work tasks            | .664           |
| Manager who respects employees and is open to their suggestions      | .660           |
| Good organizational skills of the manager                            | .647           |
| Appreciation and acknowledgement by the managers for a job well done | .433           |
| <b>FACTOR 5: THE JOB ITSELF (6.895% variance)</b>                    |                |
| <b>Job aspect</b>  | <b>Loading</b> |
| Dynamic job  | .762           |
| Challenging and interesting job                                      | .759           |
| Stimulating job with few routine tasks                               | .729           |
| Job content, activities within the work                              | .489           |

The first and the most important Gap Factor in factor analysis of the gap between importance and satisfaction (Table 3) corresponds in many ways to Satisfaction Factor 1, rewarding results and creating conditions for achieving them (Table 2). This was why we gave it the same name. This factor includes 11 job aspects related to the following: 1) fairness of the compensation system (fair criteria, non-discriminatory compensation, salary that corresponds to invested effort, results, and expertise); and 2) conditions of work (objective performance appraisal, clear organization, care of employees, promotion based on clear criteria). It is interesting that managers' appreciation and acknowledgement of work well done are included in this factor, as it means that employees view this appreciation as a kind of reward.

The second factor in the gap analysis includes several job aspects that relate to the psychological, social, and physical safety of employees at work. In an organizational sense, three types of job satisfaction component were distinguished here. The first type relates to physical conditions and safety at work. The second type relates to social aspects of employee safety: employee rights, employee benefits, the company as a support for employees in case of hardship, and that the company care about its employees. The third type of job aspect relates to keeping employees informed. These can all be regarded as components of employee safety. It is interesting that this factor shares some job aspects with Importance Factor 1, 'Working conditions' (Table 1), as well as with Satisfaction Factors 'Basic working conditions' and 'Company as support' (Table 2).

Gap Factor 3 includes job aspects related to relations between colleagues and work atmosphere (Table 3). This factor is present in all of the three factor analyses.

Gap Factor 4 in the gap factor analysis (Table 3) is also in the previous analyses (Tables 1 and 2) and relates to managers, their expertise, and their attitude towards employees.

The final factor, Gap Factor 5, includes job dimensions related to the content and characteristics of the job itself (Table 3). This factor is also found in each factor analysis (Tables 1 and 2): hence it confirms that job content and characteristics are an important employee satisfaction factor.

## **5. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS**

The objective of this paper is to identify organizational factors of employee job satisfaction through explorative research. For this purpose 50 job aspects important for employee satisfaction were identified in one company, based on the literature, interviews, and an internet survey. The employees were then asked to rate the importance of and their satisfaction with the identified job aspects on a 5-point scale. Since each job aspect was rated based on its importance and the satisfaction it provides, it was possible to calculate the gap between these two ratings for each aspect. The gap was taken as an indicator of real job satisfaction level. Factor analysis was used to obtain a smaller number of aspect groups based on certain organizational factors of job satisfaction. As each job aspect had three ratings (importance rating, satisfaction rating, and gap between importance and satisfaction rating) it was possible to perform three factor analyses and compare their results.

The factor analysis based on the gap between importance and satisfaction resulted in eight organizational factors of job satisfaction, five of which were retained, while the factor analyses based on the satisfaction ratings of job aspects and on the importance ratings of job aspects grouped all job aspects into eight and nine factors respectively, six of which were retained in each analysis. By comparing the retained factors in all of the three factor analyses and by synthesizing them, we obtained results that provide a wider picture of the organizational factors of job satisfaction.

At first glance, by reviewing Tables 1, 2, and 3, it is apparent that there is a great degree of agreement between the results of all three factor analyses with respect to the criteria defined by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957). The number of retained factors is almost the same, i.e., five factors in the third, and six factors in both the first and the second analyses. There is the same type of factor in all of the

three analyses – three factors appear in all of them – while two factors appear in two out of three analyses, and the same aspects of job satisfaction are loaded on these factors. The structure of factor loadings on corresponding factors is similar.

The three factors that appear in almost identical form in all three analyses are ‘Managers’, ‘Relations between colleagues’, and ‘The job itself’. We can therefore conclude that these are indisputable organizational factors of job satisfaction. These three factors have appeared in earlier job satisfaction research (Luthans 2005), which means that in this respect our research confirms previous results. However, in neither of the analyses are these three factors Factor 1, i.e., the factor explaining most of the variability of the observed phenomenon.

The factor ‘Managers’ corresponds in large part to the factor that has been identified as an important source of employee satisfaction in most earlier research. When the content of the factor ‘Managers’ is analysed, it is notable that in all of the three factor analyses it includes only one job aspect that can be found included in the literature (Luthans 2005). ‘Managers’ includes only job aspects that are related to managers’ competencies, their availability, and readiness to help with advice and suggestions and provide help and support to employees. Another dimension of this factor identified in earlier research (e.g., Miller and Monge 1986) relating to the involvement of employees in decision-making did not appear in this research. No job aspects relating to employee participation were included in the questionnaire because the employees did not mention it at any point during the designing of the questionnaire. It was therefore concluded that this job aspect was not important to the employees. This can be explained, at least in part, by Serbian history and culture (Hofstede 2001), in which strong leadership which provides protection, help, and care is preferred to being included in decision-making.

The factor ‘Relations between colleagues’ includes the same job aspects in all three factor analyses. They indicate that it is important for employee satisfaction that colleagues are competent and reliable and have good communication, without conflict, resulting in a friendly work atmosphere. This factor has also appeared with very similar content in earlier job satisfaction studies (Luthans 2005). However, in the organization in which this research was conducted the emphasis on the social component of relations between colleagues is greater than in previous research. ‘Relations between colleagues’ is the second or third factor according to the percentage of the explained variance, which is somewhere between 9% and 10% in all three analyses. This factor includes six or seven job aspects, which also include the aspects that, when observed individually, belong

to the group of aspects with the highest ratings of importance: good relations between colleagues (third out of 50 aspects in importance), good communication with colleagues (sixth out of 50 aspects in importance), and friendly work atmosphere (seventh out of 50 aspects in importance). In accordance with some earlier research, we may assume that in collectivist cultures such as Serbia (Hofstede 2001) the importance of social relations within the collective, and therefore within this factor, is higher than in individualist cultures. Factors 'Managers' and 'Relations between colleagues' may at the theoretical level be related to Alderfer's Relatedness Needs (Alderfer, 1969).

In all of the three factor analyses the factor 'The job itself' grouped the same job aspects, and referred to the challenging and dynamic characteristics of a job and to the absence of routine tasks. This factor has appeared in earlier studies and has been measured by The Job Descriptive Index (JDI), a well-known standardized job satisfaction instrument. However, while in previous research this factor is almost always the most important (Luthans, 2005), in this research it does not have such great significance. Individually observed, job aspects grouped in this factor are, according to the employees' importance ratings, in the lower part of the list. It seems that the creativity of the job is not as important to the employees in this company as some other factors. This is understandable, considering the nature of the work, which for most employees means following defined rules and procedures.

The analysis of organizational factors of job satisfaction becomes even more interesting when factors appearing in just one or two factor analyses or factors appearing in different forms are analysed. The first group of such factors relates to rewarding employee results and to creating conditions for employees to achieve these results. The first factor in the factor analyses based on satisfaction ratings of job aspects and on the gap between importance and satisfaction ratings of job aspects has the same name, 'Rewarding results and creating conditions for achieving them', but the content is somewhat different. Nevertheless, the key job aspects included in these two factors that explain most of the variance in the two factor analyses are the same. There are two groups of aspects in this factor: the first contains job aspects related to the compensation system in the narrow sense of the phrase. Fairness is the most prominent feature of the compensation system as a Satisfaction Factor. According to Adams' Equity Theory (Adams 1965; Adams & Freedman 1976; Haesevoets et al. 2013), perceived fairness is the key to employee motivation and satisfaction. The results of this research confirm that in order for the compensation system to generate employee satisfaction the rewards must depend on the employees' work, achieved performance, and competence,

and must not be differentiated according to the organizational unit in which the employee works. Promotion based on clear and known criteria is also included in this factor, which could mean that employees perceive job promotion as a reward for accomplished performance. The second sub-group of job aspects included in the factor 'Rewarding results and creating conditions for achieving them' is related to conditions that, in the view of the employees, should exist in order for them to be able to achieve results for which they are rewarded. These conditions, based on the second factor analysis of satisfaction ratings, are somewhat broader and include objective performance appraisal, opportunities for training and development, and good work organization within the company. According to the third factor analysis of the gap between satisfaction and importance ratings, conditions for successfully achieving performance are somewhat narrower and are only related to objective performance appraisal and good work organization, while training and education are not present as a condition. Promotion based on clear and fair criteria, which also appeared in the factor analysis based on gaps, could also be treated as part of the conditions necessary for achieving performance. In the first factor analysis, based on the importance ratings of job aspects, compensation system appears as Factor 6. This factor groups three dimensions related to the wages system in the narrower sense. Theoretically, these two factors relate to Alderfer's Existence Needs (Alderfer 1969) and correspond to supervision and co-workers' facets in the standardized job satisfaction instrument, the JDI.

Another group of factors that are related to the same field and appear in all three factor analyses, although in somewhat different form, are the factors related to working conditions. This group includes three factors. In factor analysis of importance ratings of job aspects, Factor 1, which explains the highest percentage of the variance, is related to work conditions, and groups as many as ten job aspects. It is called 'Conditions of work'. In the third factor analysis of the gap between job aspects' importance and job aspects' satisfaction, the second factor, which includes 11 dimensions and explains as much as 10% of the variance, also belongs to the same field and is called 'Psychological, social, and physical safety at work'. In the second factor analysis of job aspects satisfaction ratings, the last retained factor, Factor 6, which explains the smallest part of variance in this analysis and which groups only four job aspects, is named 'Basic working conditions. There are numerous similarities between and overlapping of these three factors, but there are also differences between them that meant they had to be named differently. The first two factors in this group, 'Conditions of work' and 'Psychological, social, and physical safety at work', share 6 out of 10 and 11 job aspects respectively. The job aspects that overlap in these two factors are related

to safety and physical working conditions, absence of tension and pressure on employees, respecting employee rights, and availability of information necessary for performing work. But there are significant differences in both the remaining job aspects and the relative importance of the shared job aspects, which is why these two factors are not considered to be the same. In the 'Conditions of work' factor, the job aspects that dominate indicate that employee satisfaction includes the necessary organizational conditions for performing work tasks. Thus the three aspects with the highest factor loading on this factor are availability of information necessary for performing work, absence of tension and pressure, and clear work organization with precise task division. Aspects related to safety and physical working conditions come afterwards. This factor includes aspects that indicate organizational systems that should also contribute to favourable conditions for performing work tasks, such as objective performance appraisal and promotion based on clear criteria. In addition to respecting employee rights, this factor includes clearly defined work tasks, which intensifies the impression that this factor is actually describing the conditions necessary for the employee to perform his/her work in peace and without tension.

Unlike the 'Conditions of work' factor, the factor that we named 'Psychological, social, and physical safety at work' includes job aspects that strongly emphasize the safety of employees in their workplace. In this factor, unlike the previous one, the three job aspects with the highest factor loadings are physical working conditions, safe working conditions, and absence of overtime work. When absence of tension and pressure on the employees, respect for employees' rights, and company that employees can rely on are added to this, then the true nature of this factor can be revealed as comprising physical as well as social and psychological safety. Therefore it is important that employees feel safe in their workplace, so in order for them to be satisfied the organization must provide a work environment in which the employees feel safe. In this factor there are no job aspects from the previous factor, 'Conditions of work', which indicated conditions for performing work tasks such as objective performance appraisal and clearly defined work organization. Whereas information availability, which had the highest factor loadings in the 'Conditions of work' factor, has a factor loading between 0.4 and 0.5 in the 'Psychological, social, and physical safety at work' factor. Still, similarities in some job aspects with the previous factor, 'Conditions of work', indicates that this safety is a prerequisite for effectively performing work tasks. The third factor included in the group of factors that have similarities or overlap is named 'Basic work conditions'. This factor was also differentiated in the second factor analysis performed on the basis of satisfaction ratings. In satisfaction analysis, this factor explains the smallest percentage of the

variance and includes four dimensions: physical working conditions, safety at work, availability of information necessary for performing tasks, and availability of work assets. Thus we are again talking about the factor which relates to conditions of work, but this time these conditions are narrowed down to four job aspects: hence the name. In addition, there are no aspects here that relate to work organization, appraisal, or promotion.

The third and final group of factors that have similarities or overlap but are differentiated in different factor analyses includes the factors 'Company as a support' and 'Company's significance'. 'Company as a support' came fourth in the factor analysis of job aspect satisfaction ratings, explaining over 10% of the variance and including nine items. 'Company's significance' was differentiated in factor analysis based on the job aspect importance ratings with nearly 7% of the explained variance and included five items. There are similarities between these two factors that enable their synthesis, but there are also differences between them that should be kept in mind. The main similarity lies in the obvious fact that for employee satisfaction the kind of a company the employee works in is important; that is, that the company or organization per se is a source of employee satisfaction. The main difference between these two factors lies in the reasons why the company in itself is important for employee satisfaction.

Two types of job aspect are noticeable in the factor 'Company as a support'. More numerous job aspects, which also show higher loadings, indicate that it is important to employees that their company protects them, cares for them, and helps them if necessary: 'A company that employees can rely on if they get in trouble', 'Opportunities for gaining different benefits', 'Company cares about its employees', 'Informing employees', 'Respecting employees' rights', and 'No overtime work'. The other job aspects group included in this factor has lower factor loadings and consists of two aspects: 'Company in a field of business important to society' and 'Company's public image and reputation'. Both these groups of job aspects included in the factor 'Company as a support' may be observed as typical of collectivist national cultures. Collectivism as a value assumes that the members of a social group, such as a nation or organization, have the right to expect the social group to protect them and care for them, and will in return give their complete loyalty to the group (Hofstede, 2001). For this reason it is very important to the members of a collectivist culture such as Serbia that an organization demonstrates practically that it cares for, protects, and helps its members. Since members of a collectivist culture have a strong need to identify with the collective or organization they belong to, it is completely understandable that a company's reputation and its significance to society are very important



to them. The more significant and the more distinguished the company is, the easier it is to identify with it. In addition, the more significant and the more distinguished the company is, the easier it is for it to protect its employees, which is especially important at times of economic crisis.

The factor 'Company's significance' is specific to the organization in which this research was conducted and was differentiated in the factor analysis of job aspect importance ratings. It also contains two groups of aspects. The first group has already been mentioned: 'Company in a field of business important to society' and 'Company's public image and reputation'. The aspect 'High degree of employee discipline' is added to them. It is obvious that a high degree of employee discipline is a necessary element of a respectable and significant company. The other job aspects group included in this factor refers to two forms of keeping the employees informed. All that is said about the collectivist nature of the previous factor also applies to this factor.

A synthesis of the results of the three factor analyses indicates that six main organizational factors of job satisfaction can be identified. Three out of six factors appear in all three factor analyses and they are indisputable: 'Managers', 'Relations between colleagues', and 'The job itself'. These factors have also appeared in similar form and with similar content in other research (Luthans 2005), so in that respect this research has confirmed, but has also to a certain extent modified, the results of previous research. However, the analysis of the overlapping of the results of the three factor analyses has indicated that with a certain amount of imprecision and generalization, another three important organizational job satisfaction factors can be identified: 1) 'Rewarding results and creating conditions for achieving them'; 2) 'Working conditions and safety at work'; and 3) 'Significant company as a support'. These three factors overlap to a certain degree with two job satisfaction factors that have appeared in earlier research, while one of them is new. 'Rewarding results and creating conditions for achieving them' and 'Working conditions and safety at work' contain elements of two factors that are standard in the literature: 'Pay' and 'Working conditions'. However, our two factors are also somewhat specific, so we conclude that they are standard but modified organizational job satisfaction factors.

Our research has confirmed the findings of previous research that payment of employees is, without a doubt, an important organizational job satisfaction factor. But what is new in this research is that payment as an organizational factor of job satisfaction is always related to organizational conditions for earning it. Employees expect not only to be fairly and substantially rewarded but also to be

provided by the organization with conditions for achieving results that will be rewarded. In this respect, the factor 'Rewarding results and creating conditions for achieving them' is different than the standard job satisfaction factor identified in the literature and most often called 'Pay'. This factor usually includes only the amount of pay and other benefits, as well as fairness in their proportioning, such as the two-item pay satisfaction subscale in the Job Diagnostic Survey, (Hackman and Oldham 1975) and the pay subscale in the Job Descriptive Index (Lake et al. 2010; Smith et al. 1987). However, it does not include organizational conditions for achieving performance, which is its inherent part in our research. The structure of pay satisfaction found in this research differs even from Heneman and Schwab's multidimensional construct of pay satisfaction comprised of five facets, i.e., pay level, pay rises, benefits, pay structure, and pay administration (Heneman and Schwab 1985), and its later confirmed four-dimensional structure in which pay structure and administration items loaded the same factor (Heneman and Judge 2000; Judge and Welbourne 1993). The novelty and contribution of our research is that these employees relate performance rewards to the conditions for achieving them.

The factor 'Working conditions and safety at work' confirms the factor that is usually identified in research as 'working conditions' (Luthans 2005). But, unlike the 'standard' factor, the factor that we have identified contains some additional elements that refer to employee safety. Employees expect not only favourable physical working conditions but conditions that provide their safety. Moreover, under the term 'safety' employees consider not only physical safety but social and psychological safety as well. These additional elements of the 'Working conditions' factor are caused by both the high level of uncertainty avoidance in Serbian national culture and by the traumatic experience of employees in the process of transition.

The factor that we named 'Significant company as a support' has not appeared in research so far in this particular form. Its emergence can be explained by collectivism in Serbian national culture (Hofstede, 2001) and by the legacy of the Yugoslav socialist regime. The main feature of collectivism is precisely that the members of a social group, such as a company's collective, expect the social group to take care of them, especially in times of difficulty, while they in return are loyal to the group. It is very important for employees to feel protected by their company and to feel that they can identify with it. In addition, one of the characteristics of socialism as the established social system in Yugoslavia was precisely the obligation of companies to care for their employees.

It is interesting that only one of the 'standard' job satisfaction factors identified in earlier research did not find a place in this research: 'Promotion'. Only two aspects that refer to promotion and employee development were included in the 50 job aspects in the questionnaire. This fact, as well as the fact that these two aspects are at the very bottom of the importance ratings scale (46<sup>th</sup> and 48<sup>th</sup> out of 50, respectively) indicates that promotion and development are not so important to employees. Therefore it is not surprising that these two job aspects were grouped under the factor 'Rewarding results and creating conditions for achieving them', and not separately. Even earlier research in Serbia (Janićijević 1998) indicates that the job aspects that correspond to the needs of development and learning receive lower importance ratings than the dimensions that correspond to existential and social needs. The cause for this could again be the national culture, with its very prominent collectivist and egalitarian values.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH**

The objective of this research, conducted by surveying employees in a large and complex organization, was to identify organizational job satisfaction factors. By filling in a specially designed questionnaire, the employees rated the importance of 50 job aspects and satisfaction with these aspects. Three factor analyses, performed on the basis of ratings of importance, satisfaction, and the gap between the two, resulted in three factors that were repeated in all three analyses, and so therefore are undoubted organizational job satisfaction factors: 'Managers', 'Relations between colleagues', and 'The job itself'. Other factors were also identified that overlap and repeat in factor analyses in such a way that, by synthesizing them, three more organizational job satisfaction factors can be identified: 1) 'Rewarding results and creating conditions for achieving them'; 2) 'Working conditions and safety at work'; and 3) 'Significant company as a support'. This provides a list of six organizational factors of employee job satisfaction.

The results of this research repeat and confirm previous research in the field of job satisfaction, but also introduce new findings. The first three factors that appear in all of the three factor analyses are standard factors that have also appeared in previous research (Luthans 2005). But some elements specific to this research appear in all three identified factors. The factors 'Rewarding results and creating conditions for achieving them' and 'Working conditions and safety at work' appear only partially in previous research. They contain certain elements of the previously identified factors 'Pay' and 'Working conditions', but they also contain new elements that differentiate them from these previously identified

factors. The last factor, 'Significant company as a support', is entirely new and has not appeared in earlier research. The factor 'Promotion', which is a standard factor in other research, was not identified in this research. We assume that the Serbian national culture is the main reason for the specific characteristics of the factors identified in this research, as well as the transition process that all Serbian companies have undergone.

This paper has specific theoretical and practical implications. The key theoretical implication of the paper is the finding that, owing to a specific institutional or cultural context, some standard organizational job satisfaction factors can be found in modified form and completely new and specific job satisfaction organizational factors can be identified. The theoretical implication of this paper is the confirmation of the relevancy of the three important organizational job satisfaction factors.

The practical implications of this paper consist of recommendations to management with respect to the factors that can provide employee job satisfaction. The identified job satisfaction factors in the Serbian company represent the basis for a programme of activities for improving employee satisfaction. Managers can focus their efforts precisely in increasing employee satisfaction, since they now know which job factors, or job dimensions, have the greatest potential for improving employee satisfaction. Managers of other Serbian companies can find useful guidelines in the results of this research for increasing their employees' level of job satisfaction, although with limitations that emerge from the specific characteristics of the particular company in which the research was conducted and the sector in which the company operates. Wider implications for managers in other national contexts are limited by the impact of the institutional and cultural environment of Serbian companies. The identified factors of employee satisfaction are certainly impacted by the level of development and the state of the Serbian economy, as well as the transition process that is still underway in Serbia. The uncertainty of the economic context and the process of transition in Serbia is why job dimensions related to employee safety are rated highly. Serbian national culture also conditions job satisfaction factors, which limits the possibility of using the results of this study in other national cultures. Serbian national culture is characterised by a high degree of power distance, collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and the presence of 'feminine' values (Hofstede 2001). Such a mix of national cultural values must have a particular impact on employees' needs and motives, and thus on the possibility of satisfying them (Hofstede 1980). For example, the relative importance of job dimensions related to social relations and employees' need to belong in a Serbian company could

be explained by collectivism and 'feminine' values in Serbian culture. Also, a high level of uncertainty avoidance, together with the already mentioned process of transition, intensifies the importance of job dimensions related to employee safety. This impact must be considered a limiting factor in any attempt to use the results of this research in companies in other national contexts.

The results of the research presented in the paper indicate the need for further research of organizational factors of employee satisfaction. After this exploratory case study research, it would be very useful to conduct comparative research on a larger sample of companies in order to test this research's results and generalize its conclusions. Such research would make it possible to identify the impact of different characteristics of companies, industrial sectors, and national contexts of organizational job satisfaction factors. Additional exploratory research is also a possible option in order to identify potential new factors that were not taken into account in this research due to its limitations. Finally, it would be useful to examine the relationship between organizational and personal job satisfaction factors.

The research presented in this paper had a certain methodological limitation, which stems from the objective of the paper and its exploratory case study nature. It is precisely the nature of the methodology applied in this research that reduces the possibility of comparing the results of this study and generalizing the conclusions reached. If research were conducted in another company in another industrial sector in another national context or with a different research instrument, the results would surely be different. The characteristics of the organization in which the research was conducted, the industrial sector that the organization belongs to, and the institutional and cultural national context all limit the generalization of the research results. However, the presented case study clearly illustrates the superiority of exploring job satisfaction in a specific company by applying the described method. The ad hoc job satisfaction scale developed for the company in question gave a much richer overview of employee job satisfaction than we could have expected based on any of the standardized job satisfaction instruments.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in Social Exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, pp.267-299. DOI:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2
- Adams, J. S. & Freedman, S. (1976). Equity Theory Revisited: Comments and Annotated Bibliography. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 9, pp.43-90. DOI:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60058-1
- Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An Empirical Test of a New Theory of Human Needs. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 4, (2) pp.142-175. DOI:10.1016/0030-5073(69)90004-X
- Carraher S.M. & Buckley M.R. (1996). Cognitive Complexity and the Perceived Dimensionality of Pay Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81 (1), pp.102-109.
- Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60 (2), pp.159-170.
- Haesevoets, T., Reinders Folmer, C., De Cremer, D. & Van Hiel, A. (2013). Money Isn't All That Matters: The Use of Financial Compensation and Apologies to Preserve Relationships in the Aftermath of Distributive Harm. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 35, pp.95-107. DOI:10.1016/j.joep.2013.02.003.
- Heneman, H. G., III & Judge, T. A. (2000). Compensation attitudes: A review and recommendations for future research. In S. L. Rynes and B. Gerhart (Eds.), *Compensation in Organizations: Progress and Prospects*, (pp.61-103). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Heneman, H. G., III & Schwab, D. P. (1985). Pay Satisfaction: Its Multidimensional Nature and Measurement. *International Journal of Psychology*, 20(2), 129-141. DOI: 10.1080/00207598508247727
- Herzberg, F. (1964). The Motivation-Hygiene Concept and Problems of Manpower. *Personnel Administrator*, 27, pp.3-7
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 9, 42-63.
- Janićijević N. (1998). Cultural Determinants of Employees' Needs and Job Satisfaction. First International Conference: *Performance Measurement - Theory and Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Churchill College, Cambridge University.
- Judge, T.A. (1993). Validity of the Dimensions of the Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire: Evidence of Differential Predictions. *Personnel Psychology*, 46 (2), pp.331-355. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00877.x

## IDENTIFYING ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS OF JOB SATISFACTION

Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Bono, J.E. & Patton, G.K. (2001). The Job Satisfaction – Job Performance Relationship: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127 (3), pp.376-407. DOI:10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376

Judge, T. A. & Welbourne, T. M. (1993). Dimensionality of the Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire: A Confirmatory Factor Analytic Investigation (*CAHRS Working Paper #93-09*). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cahrswp/264>

Kinicki A. J., Schriesheim C. A., McKee-Ryan F. M., & Carson K. P. (2002). Assessing Construct Validity of the Job Descriptive Index: Review And Meta Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (1), pp.14-32. DOI:10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.14

Kovačević, P. & Petrović, I. (2006). Managers' job satisfaction: Construct validation. In B. Cerović, (Ed.), *Privatisation in Serbia: Evidence and Analyses*, (pp. 287-304). Beograd: Centar za izdavačku delatnost Ekonomskog fakulteta,

Lake, C. J., Gopalkrishnan, P., Sliter, M. T., & Withrow, S. (2010). The Job Descriptive Index: Newly updated and available for download. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 48(1), pp.47-49.

Locke, E.A. (1969). What is Job Satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4 (4), pp.309-336. DOI:10.1016/0030-5073(69)90013-0

Locke E.A. (1976). The Nature and Cause of Job Satisfaction. In M.D. Dunette (Ed). *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Chicago: Rand McNally.

Luthans F. (2005). *Organizational Behavior*, 10<sup>th</sup> ed. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Irwin.

Miller K.I. & Monge P.R. (1986). Participation, Satisfaction and Productivity: A Meta Analysis Review. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(4), pp.727-753. DOI:10.2307/255942.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957). *The Measurement of Meaning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Petrovic, I., Kovacevic, P., Kutlesic, V. (2007). Correlates of General Managers' Job Satisfaction Within a Transition Economy, *APA (American Psychological Association) 115th Annual Convention*, San Francisco, California.

Porter, L.W. (1962). Job Attitudes In Management: Perceived Deficiencies in Need Fulfillment as a Function of Job Level. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 46, 375-384. DOI:10.1037/h0047808

Scarpello V. & Campbell J.P. (1983). Job Satisfaction: Are All Parts There? *Personnel Psychology*, 36(3), pp.577-600. DOI:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1983.tb02236.x

Smith, P. C., Balzer, W., Brannick, M., Chia, W., Eggleton, S., Gibson, W. & Whalen, M. (1987). The Revised JDI: A Facelift For an Old Friend. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 24(4), pp.31-33.

Smith P.C., Kendall L.M. & Hulin C.L. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Schneider B, Erhart M.G. & Macey W.H. (2001) Organizational Climate Research: Achievements and the Road Ahead. In N.M. Ashkanasy, C.P.M. Wilderom and M.F. Peterson (Eds.), *The Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate* (pp.29-49). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Staw B. (1986). Organizational Psychology and the Pursuit of the Happy/Productive Worker. *California Management Review*, 28(4), pp.40-53.

Van der Vegt, G., Emans, B. & Vliert V.E. (2001). Patterns of Interdependence in Work Teams: A Two-Level Investigation of the Relations with Job and Team Satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(1), pp.51-69. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00085.x

Wong, C.S, Hiu, C. & Law K., (1998) A Longitudinal Study of the Job Perceptions and Job Satisfaction Relationship: A Test of Three Alternative Specifications, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 71(2), pp.127-146. DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1998.tb00667.x

Received: November 21, 2014

Accepted: March 24, 2014