

Job Satisfaction Among Malaysian Employees: An Application of Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey in the South East Asian Context

(Kepuasan Kerja dalam Kalangan Pekerja Malaysia: Aplikasi Kajiselidik Kepuasan Kerja Spector dalam Konteks Asia Tenggara)

R Zirwatul Aida R Ibrahim

(School of Social and Economic Development, Universiti Malaysia Terengganu)

Keis Ohtsuka

(College of Arts, Victoria University)

Mazidah Mohd Dagang

Azlina Abu Bakar

(School of Social and Economic Development, Universiti Malaysia Terengganu)

ABSTRACT

Job satisfaction explains individuals' reactions towards their jobs. Many studies find that job satisfaction is a well-known construct that is widely used to study work-related well-being; and contributes significantly to employees' overall quality of life. The current paper examines job satisfaction among Malaysian employees using the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS). In particular, the present study compares the job satisfaction levels of Malaysian samples with those of a previously reported study involving samples from Singapore and the United States. Results of one sample t-test reveals statistically significant differences in pay, promotion, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, supervision, co-workers and nature of work subscales. No cultural influence exists between Malaysian and Singapore samples in terms of perceived operating conditions satisfaction. Similarly, no statistically significant difference exists between Malaysian and the United States perception towards the communication facet. Furthermore, the results of factor analysis support the previous study, suggesting possible cultural differences in the understanding of, and consensus regarding, the structure of the job satisfaction scale.

Keywords: Job satisfaction; Malaysia; Spector; South East Asia

ABSTRAK

Kepuasan kerja menerangkan tentang reaksi individu terhadap kerjanya. Ia merupakan antara konstruk utama yang selalu digunakan untuk mengkaji kesejahteraan individu dan konstruk yang menyumbang secara signifikan terhadap kualiti hidup pekerja. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengenal pasti kepuasan kerja dalam kalangan pekerja Malaysia dengan menggunakan kajiselidik kepuasan kerja (JSS). Secara khususnya, kajian ini membandingkan kepuasan kerja pekerja Malaysia dengan pekerja Singapura dan Amerika Syarikat. Ujian t satu sampel menunjukkan terdapat perbezaan yang signifikan berdasarkan sub-skala upah, kenaikan pangkat, faedah sampingan, ganjaran kontigensi, penyeliaan, rakan sekerja dan sifat pekerjaan. Tidak terdapat pengaruh budaya terhadap perbezaan persepsi kepuasan kondisi operasi antara sampel pekerja Malaysia dengan Singapura, begitu juga dengan persepsi aspek komunikasi. Seterusnya, analisis faktor juga mengukuhkan lagi dapatan kajian lepas yang menunjukkan terdapat perbezaan budaya dalam kefahaman dan persetujuan tentang struktur skala kepuasan kerja.

Kata kunci: Kepuasan kerja; Malaysia; Spector; Asia Tenggara

INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is important for employee well-being. It is a significant predictor of psychological well-being and a widely acknowledged construct linked to work related well-being (Brough & O'Driscoll 2005; Doef & Maes 1999; Ilies & Schwind 2007; Rathi & Rastogi 2008). Murphy and Cooper (2000) find that the majority of employees spend between one and two thirds of their waking time in the workplace. Thus, job satisfaction has a major impact on employee well-being in the workplace, as well as at home.

Job satisfaction represents the affective reactions of employees towards their jobs (Parasuraman & Simmers 2001) or employees' positive feeling towards their jobs. A comprehensive definition of job satisfaction given by Locke (1969) includes individuals' cognitive, affective and evaluative reactions towards their jobs. Locke (1969) defines job satisfaction as the pleasurable emotional state resulting from achieving one's job values, whereas job dissatisfaction is an unpleasant emotional state resulting from frustration in achieving one's job values. Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959) define job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in terms of motivator and hygiene factors. They conclude that growth, responsibility, recognition

and achievement are among the factors contributing to employees' job satisfaction. Meanwhile, company policy, salary, and relationships with employer and peers are leading factors to job dissatisfaction. In reviewing the definitions of job satisfaction, the most comprehensive definition, and the one that is most suited for the Malaysian context, is the definition proposed by Spector (1997: 2), who defines job satisfaction as:

It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs. As it is generally assessed, job satisfaction is an attitudinal variable. In the past, job satisfaction was approached by some researchers from the perspective of need fulfillment- that is, whether or not the job met the employee's physical and psychological needs for the things provided by work, such as pay. However this approach has been de-emphasized because today most researchers tend to focus attention on cognitive rather on underlying needs.

Various theories are forwarded in job satisfaction literature. For example, Maslow (1954) suggests that individuals need to satisfy their basic needs (food, cloth and shelter) in order to achieve the higher needs in their lives until they achieve their self-actualization. Researchers normally investigate the factors that are affecting the level of satisfaction of employees based on the theory of necessity. Under Herzberg's (1968) theory, employees who are satisfied with both motivation (i.e., nature of their jobs, achievement in the work, promotion opportunities, and chances for personal growth and recognition) and hygiene factors (i.e., company policies, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions) are satisfied employees, while those who are dissatisfied with both factors would more likely to be poor performers. The present study examines the level of job satisfaction among Malaysian employees. Furthermore, the study makes comparisons between the levels of Malaysian job satisfaction and those from previously reported samples from both the United States and Singapore (Spector & Wimalasiri 1986). The study of Spector and Wimalasiri (1986) is selected because the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), which was originally developed in the US, was then administered in Singapore, a country which is in close geographic proximity to Malaysia and shares a similar history, ethnicity, religion, language and economic development. Although the JSS was originally developed for application in human services in public and nonprofit organizations (Spector 1985), Spector (1997) finds the JSS is also suitable for general use and not restricted to a specific organizations. Previous Malaysian studies on job satisfaction employ instruments such as the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall & Hulin 1969) when focusing on small and medium industries and tourism industry (Abdullah et al. 2007; Yew 2007); the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham 1975) when examining nursing, private and public sectors (Pearson & Chong 1997; Samad 2006; Shamsuri 2004); and the Job Stress Questionnaire in relation to teachers (Ahsan, Abdullah, Fie & Alam 2009). Although the JDI and JSS are used globally for job satisfaction as well as

individually dimensions, the JDI mainly concentrates on five facets (i.e., work, supervision, pay, co-workers and promotion) (Spector 2008) and some items may not apply to all employees (Cook et al. 1981). Unlike the JDI, the JSS examines five facets that focus on job designs and characteristics (i.e., skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback).

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

A sample of 1165 participants (551 men (47.3%) and 614 women (52.7%)) are selected from the Malaysian manufacturing sectors participating in this study. A basic understanding of the manufacturing industry in Malaysia is important as the contribution of this sector to Malaysia economic growth is crucial. The sector accounts for 48.1% of total gross domestic product (GDP) (Economy of Malaysia 2011). Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 59 years, with 24.1% between age 18 and 29; 46.4% between 30 and 39; 27.3% between 40 and 49; and 2.2% between 50 and 59. Out of 1165 respondents, 511 (43.9%) were assembly or frontline employees; 412 (35.4%) were supervisors; 239 (20.5%) were from management levels; and 3 respondents (.3%) of unknown positions. The majority of respondents (510 or 45.3%) had only completed a secondary school education (Malaysia Certificate Examination, MCE). These three job categories represent the dominant positions in the manufacturing sector, with the general proportion of assembly employees, supervisors and managers at 3:2:1, respectively. These are the principal groups of employees that play critical roles in the respective organizations (De La Rosa 2008).

MEASURE

In this study, the JSS of Spector (1985) is employed to measure job satisfaction. The JSS consists of 36 items that are used to assess total job satisfaction using 9 subscales (each consisting of 4 items). These subscales include pay, promotion, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, supervision, co-workers, operating procedures, nature of work and communication. Respondents rate the favorable and unfavorable aspects of their jobs ranging from 1 (disagree very much) to (6 agree very much). Higher scores on the JSS indicate higher levels of job satisfaction. The internal consistency of total job satisfaction in this study was .84. Prior to the data collection, the original English version of the JSS was translated into Malay, which was then checked through back to back translation for equivalency in consultation with two independent experts. Both translation processes were carried out in consultation with staff from University Malaysia Terengganu in the departments of Psychology and Counseling; and English. No translation errors were detected that could change the meaning of important items, indicating the compatibility

between the original English questionnaires with the back translation version. The Cronbach's alpha of the Malay version in the pilot study was .76.

PROCEDURE

During the initial stage of data collection, the researcher contacted the listed organizations in the 2008 Federation of Malaysian Manufacturers Directory by random selection. The researcher began by creating a list of all organizations with 500 or more employees (261 companies). Using systematic random sampling, every fifth organization in the list was contacted. All of these organizations either declined to participate or did not respond. Repeating the procedure resulted in receiving consent from only two organizations. Due to concerns about the time constraints and difficulties in recruiting a sufficient number of participants, respondents were selected from 12 manufacturing companies situated in the East (Pahang and Terengganu) and West Coast (Selangor, Johor, Malacca, Negeri Sembilan and Kedah) of Peninsula Malaysia by approaching the top management team members (Chen et al. 2009), managers or employees with whom the researcher had professional connections or personal contacts (Lu, Gilmour, Kao & Huang 2006). Furthermore, using purposive and professional connection strategies are justified because the random approach led to a very low response rate from Malaysian organizations that had been involved in previous studies (Idris, Dollard & Winefield 2010). The return rate of the questionnaire

was 63% (1220 returned out of 1950 questionnaires distributed). Excluding incomplete questionnaires, 1165 useable questionnaires were coded for analysis.

RESULTS

After comparing the Malaysian samples of this study with the United States and Singaporean samples, one sample t-test demonstrated statistically significant differences in the subscales of pay, promotion, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, supervision, co-workers and nature of work. However, no statistically significant difference exists between Malaysian and Singaporean samples in terms of the perceived operating conditions satisfaction; and no statistically significant difference between Malaysian and United States' perceptions towards communication. Spector and Wimalasari (1986) observe different patterns of satisfaction among all facets in the United States and Singapore samples, but not total satisfaction. Overall, the total job satisfaction of the Malaysian sample is the lowest when compared against the other two samples.

Table 1 shows the comparisons of job satisfaction and its subscales for the samples obtained from the United States, Singapore and Malaysia. Differences are found to exist between the job satisfaction and all subscales among Malaysian employees and Singaporean and/or American employees, with the exception of satisfaction with fringe benefits.

TABLE 1. Mean and standard deviations for Malaysian sample compared with the US and Singaporean data reported by Spector and Vimalasari (1986)

Subscales	United States			Malaysia (<i>N</i> = 1165)		Singapore (<i>N</i> = 182)	
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Pay	3418	11.0	5.2	12.8	4.2	14.0	4.5
Promotion	3403	11.6	5.1	14.1	3.6	13.4	4.2
Benefits	3400	13.2	5.2	13.7	3.5	13.4	4.3
Contingent rewards	3416	13.6	5.1	12.5	3.6	14.2	4.2
Supervision	3407	19.8	4.6	15.8	3.9	17.3	4.5
Co-workers	3423	18.7	3.7	17.5	3.1	17.0	3.9
Operating procedures	3418	12.9	4.7	13.5	3.0	13.4	3.6
Nature of work	3423	19.2	4.4	17.8	3.1	17.1	4.3
Communication	3420	14.2	5.0	14.2	3.7	14.9	4.4
Total satisfaction	3412	134.2	28.2	132.3	20.0	134.7	25.6

Note: The Malaysian results from the current study are shown between the United States and Singapore to highlight areas of similarity.

Table 2 indicates that the correlations among subscales range between .07 and .57. The JSS measures distinct facets with Spector (1985) reporting low to medium correlations among subscales ranging from .10 to .59. The principle components analysis using varimax rotation reveals nine eigenvalues greater than one. This result resembles Spector and Vimalasari (1986), who compare the United States and Singapore samples.

Table 3 provides a summary of Malaysian data with eight factor solution. Factor analysis reveals 36 items loaded on the eight dimensions. In the previously reported Singaporean data, all pay items loaded on Factor 4. For Malaysian data, supervision items loaded on Factor 7. Table 4 shows details of the eight factor solution of the 36 items using varimax rotation.

TABLE 2. Pearson correlations among JSS subscales in Malaysian data

Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Pay	1.00								
2. Promotion	.45								
3. Benefits	.45	.32							
4. Contingent rewards	.57	.30	.42						
5. Supervision	.34	.27	.22	.39					
6. Co-workers	.19	.19	.21	.25	.40				
7. Operating procedures	.28	.07	.26	.30	.24	.24			
8. Nature or work	.26	.36	.21	.16	.30	.37	.16		
9. Communication	.37	.16	.34	.44	.48	.48	.35	.28	1.00

Note: N = 1165. All are significant at $p < .01$

TABLE 3. Summary of Malaysian eight factors

Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Pay		2			2			
Promotion	3							1
Benefits		1			2	1		
Contingent rewards	1			1	1	1		
Supervision								4
Co-workers			1	2			1	
Operating procedures		1			2	1		
Nature of work		1	2			1		
Communication		3	1					

Tables 5 and 6 show how the Malaysian data can be represented in the four factor and three factor solutions as suggested by Spector and Vimalsari (1986) in their study regarding the samples from the United States and Singapore. Factor 2 of the Malaysian data moderately matches with Factor 2 in the Singaporean data. Although the Malaysian data do not have a similar loading pattern with the United States data, items in Factors 2 and 4 of the Malaysian data are similar to items loaded on Factor 1 of the United States data. Table 7 shows details of 36 JSS items in the four and three factor loading solutions.

Four factor and three factor solutions also portray the spread of items across the subscales, especially in relation to the Malaysian and Singaporean data. In four factor loading, Singapore and the United States share almost the same pattern concerning on the loading of contingent rewards, supervision and co-workers. Nonetheless, Singapore data more or less correspond with Malaysian pattern in term of pay, promotion and fringe benefits loading. The four factors loading reasonably indicate that items of pay, promotion, and fringe benefits are loaded in group across three samples. The three factor solution presents the most spread of items across the subscales, especially in regards to Malaysian data. Spector and Wimalasiri (1986) also claim that this is the less meaningful facet towards the United States data loading.

DISCUSSION

This study examines the application of the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) in the Malaysian context. Besides examining the job satisfaction levels of Malaysian employees, a comparison of the mean scores of the JSS subscales and job satisfaction among Malaysian employees is made with the mean scores of the JSS subscales and job satisfaction among employees in the United States and Singapore. Internal consistencies of the JSS, particularly total satisfaction, indicate comparable results across the three samples. Furthermore, a pattern of factor analysis solutions on 8, 4, and 3 factor loadings solutions are reported showing cultural differences in the underlying structure of the JSS.

Malaysian employees' perceptions of job satisfaction reveal differences with those of the United States and Singapore. Using the same job satisfaction measurement, Simonetti and Weitz (1972) find that individuals' attitudes towards job satisfaction components differ according to job level and occupation. However, Malaysian employees' total job satisfaction is found to be the lowest among the three groups, but this difference may be due to sector variations (i.e., Malaysian manufacturing sector vs. US public and non-profit and Singaporean public and private sectors). Jung, Moon and Hahm (2007) also report that job satisfaction may differ across economic

TABLE 4. Job Satisfaction items and subscales in Malaysia

Job satisfaction items and subscales in Malaysia		Loading on 8 factors							
		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
Pay									
1.	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	.67							
10.	Raises are few and far between. *(R)				.52				
19.	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me. *(R)				.41				
28.	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increment.	.74							
Promotion									
2.	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job. *(R)								.73
11.	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	.52							
20.	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	.50							
33.	I am satisfied with chances for promotion.	.69							
Fringe Benefits									
4.	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive. *(R)				.59				
13.	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.				.40				
22.	The benefit package we have is equitable.								
29.	There are benefits we do not have which we should have. *(R)	.58				.50			
Contingent rewards									
5.	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	.69							
14.	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated. *(R)						.44		
23.	There are few rewards for those who work here. *(R)				.68				
32.	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be. *(R)					.55			
Supervision									
3.	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.								.55
12.	My supervisor is unfair to me. *(R)								.50
21.	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates. *(R)								.64
30.	I like my supervisor.								.48
Co-workers									
7.	I like the people I work with.			.73					
16.	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. *(R)							.50	
25.	I enjoy my coworkers.			.69					
34.	There is too much bickering and fighting at work. *(R)		.51						

Continued

Continue

Job satisfaction items and subscales in Malaysia		Loading on 8 factors							
		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
Operating procedures									
6.	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.		.50						
15.	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.					.47	-.73		
24.	I have too much to do at work. *(R)								
31.	I have too much paperwork. *(R)								
Nature of work									
8.	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless. *(R)		.62						
17.	I like doing the things I do at work.								
27.	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.			.50			-.60		
35.	My job is enjoyable.			.47					
Communication									
9.	Communications seem good within this organization.						.60		
18.	The goals of this organization are not clear to me. *(R)		.52						
26.	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization. *(R)		.45						
36.	Work assignments are not fully explained. *(R)		.56						

Note: *(R) indicates the item requires reverse score. Item is numbered according to the original JSS.

TABLE 5. Summary of Malaysian four factors

Subscale	1	2	3	4
Pay	1	2		1
Promotion		3		1
Benefits		2		2
Contingent rewards	2	1		1
Supervision		2		2
Co-workers		2		2
Operating procedures	3			1
Nature of work	1		3	
Communication	2		1	1

TABLE 6. Summary of Malaysian three factors

Subscale	1	2	3
Pay	2	2	
Promotion	1	2	1
Benefits	2	2	
Contingent rewards	3	1	
Supervision	2		2
Co-workers	2		2
Operating procedures	4		
Nature of work	1		3
Communication	3		1

sectors. Based on the World Bank country classification, both Singapore and the United States are high income countries (World Bank 2010). Malaysia, a middle high income country in the World Bank classification, appears to exhibit more similarities with Singapore data due to its cultural similarities. Although differences are reported in many aspects of job satisfaction in all three samples, Bokti and Talib (2009) report similar findings from a Malaysian sample regarding job satisfaction levels and the most satisfied aspect. Both studies report that Malaysian employees are most satisfied with the nature of their work.

Since Spector (1985) indicates eight interpretable factor solutions, this study replicates the data rotation in the Malaysian context, similar to the rotation method used in relation to the Singaporean data (Spector & Wimalasiri 1986). Following the rotation of the United States data, results perfectly fit the subscales, with the exception of contingent rewards where each two items are loaded in pay and supervision subscales. Malaysian data are found to be the same as Singapore with an unequal distribution of items across dimensions occurring. However, pay, fringe benefits and nature of work fit well in the Singaporean data; and supervision in the Malaysian data.

Malaysian factor loadings show that negative items are loaded differently from positive items in three and four factor solutions. Malaysian employees are less likely to indicate their agreement by disagreeing with negatively worded items than by agreeing to positive items (Benson & Hocevar 1985). Takalkar and Coover (1994) report that ethnic Indian employees do not perceive a few items from “operating procedures subscale” negatively. Thus, Malaysian responses to the JSS are not free from cultural bias in term of interpretation of the questionnaire items. This may imply that a different conception of construct exists in collectivistic and individualistic societies (Nauta, Liu & Li 2010; Liu & Spector 2005; Liu, Spector & Shi 2007). In addition, Astrauskaite, Vaitkevicius and Perminas’s (2011) findings explain that the lack of participants’ understanding and consensus concerning job satisfaction and its dimensions contribute to unexpected item loadings.

The present study supports the finding of Spector and Wimalasiri (1986) where cultural differences are found to be underlying the structure of the JSS. Although the Malaysian population consists of Malay, Mandarin and Tamil speakers, the JSS has already been translated into Malay language as majority of the assembly employees speak Malay, with low English competency. Additionally, the working population in this study comprises a modern generation of individuals that are fluent in the Malay language. Thus, the translation of the JSS into the Malay language is suitable for respondents in this study.

The current results contribute to the corpus of literature on job satisfaction assessment by employing the JSS in the Malaysian context; and comparing the results of the JSS with data from the United States and Singapore. This study reveals close similarities between Malaysian and Singaporean data; and low comparability with data from the United States. These findings suggest similarities in cultural understandings among Malaysia and Singapore employees. Another contribution of this study relates to the data from a large sample size, which significantly supports the psychometric evaluation of the JSS.

From practical and managerial perspectives, the current study provides organizations concerning the reliable construct of job satisfaction. The employee satisfaction survey can be conducted periodically by employers, particularly human resource managers. By using this measurement, managers can capture a comprehensive dimension of job satisfaction. However, the findings suggest the possibility of differential interpretation of the items is worthy of attention.

Future Malaysian research in this area may contribute to establishing the validity of JSS-Malay version by making a comparison between factor loadings of JSS-Malay version with the original scale developed by Spector (1985). Subsequent findings could provide further evidence concerning the influence of culture on the JSS structure; and contribute to advancing theories regarding employee job satisfaction in the context of South East Asia.

TABLE 7. Job Satisfaction items and subscales in Malaysia

Job satisfaction items and subscales in Malaysia	Loading on 4 factors			Loading on 3 factors		
	F1	F2	F3	F1	F2	F3
Pay						
1. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.		.71			.60	
10. Raises are few and far between. *(R)				.55	.36	
19. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me. *(R)	.52			.65	.77	
28. I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increment.		.71				
Promotion						
2. There is really too little chance for promotion on my job. *(R)			.55	.33		.39
11. Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.		.48				
20. People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.		.46			.50	
33. I am satisfied with chances for promotion.		.66			.72	
Fringe Benefits						
4. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive. *(R)		.47	.62	.45		
13. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.		.53			.56	
22. The benefit package we have is equitable.				.36	.50	
29. There are benefits we do not have which we should have. *(R)						.45
Contingent rewards						
5. When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.		.62	.72	.62	.61	
14. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated. *(R)			.61	.47		
23. There are few rewards for those who work here. *(R)		.51		.53		
32. I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be. *(R)						
Supervision						
3. My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.		.67	.37	.67		.52
12. My supervisor is unfair to me. *(R)		.57		.62		
21. My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates. *(R)				.52		
30. I like my supervisor.	.60					
Co-workers						
7. I like the people I work with.			.62	.57		.63
16. I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. *(R)	.59					
25. I enjoy my co-workers.		.48	.65	.47		.68
34. There is too much bickering and fighting at work. *(R)						
Operating procedures						
6. Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.			.52	.47		
15. My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	-.36			-.33		
24. I have too much to do at work. *(R)	.51			.57		
31. I have too much paperwork. *(R)	.43			.38		

Continued

Continue

Job satisfaction items and subscales in Malaysia	Loading on 4 factors			Loading on 3 factors			
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F1	F2	F3
Nature of work							
8. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless. *(R)	.41				.50		.38
17. I like doing the things I do at work.			.46				.62
27. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.			.61				.49
35. My job is enjoyable.			.60				
Communication							
9. Communications seem good within this organization.			.40				.50
18. The goals of this organization are not clear to me. *(R)	.52				.67		
26. I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization. *(R)				.48	.55		
36. Work assignments are not fully explained. *(R)	.66				.61		

Note: *(R) indicates the item requires reverse score. Item is numbered according to the original

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to acknowledge the approval from the Human Research Ethic Committee, Faculty of Arts, Education and Human Development, Victoria University, Melbourne which makes data for use of this study possible.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M.A., Khalid, H.N., Shuib, M., Nor, N.M., Muhammad, Z. & Jauhar, J. 2007. Job satisfaction amongst employees in small and medium industries (SMIs) in the manufacturing sector: A Malaysian case. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Business* 8: 39-66.
- Ahsan, N., Abdullah, Z., Fie, D.Y.G. & Alam, S.S. 2009. A study of job stress on job satisfaction among university staff in Malaysia: Empirical study. *European Journal of Social Science* 8: 121-131.
- Astrauskaite, M., Vaitkevicius, R. & Perminas, Aidas. 2011. Job satisfaction survey: A confirmatory factor analysis based on secondary school teachers' sample. *International Journal of Business and Management* 6(5): 41-50.
- Benson, J. & Hocevar, D. 1985. The impact of item phrasing on the validity of attitude scales for elementary school children. *Journal of Educational Measurement* 22: 231-240.
- Bokti, N.L.M. & Talib, M.A. 2009. A preliminary study on occupational stress and job satisfaction among male navy personnel at a naval base in Lumut, Malaysia. *The Journal of International Social Research* 2: 299-307.
- Brough, P. & O'Driscoll, M.P. 2005. Work-family conflict and stress. In *Research Companion to Organizational Health Psychology*, edited by A. Antoniou & C. Cooper, 346-365. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publisher.
- Chen, W.-Q., Siu, O.-L., Lu, J.-F., Cooper, C.L. & Phillips, D.R. 2009. Work stress and depression: The direct and moderating effects of informal social support and coping. *Stress and Health* 25: 431-443.
- Cook, J.D., Hepworth, S.J., Wall, T.D. & Warr, P.B. 1981. *The Experience of Work*. New York: Academic Press.
- De La Rosa, G.M. 2008. *Job demands, control and support: Looking at engagement*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Bowling Green State University.
- Doef, M.V.D. & Maes, S. 1999. The job demand-control (-support) model and psychological well-being: A review of 20 years of empirical research. *Work and Stress* 13: 87-114.
- Economy of Malaysia. 2011. Available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economy_of_Malaysia.
- FMM Directory of Malaysian Industries. 2008. Kuala Lumpur: Federation of Malaysian Manufacturers.
- Hackman, J.R. & Oldham, G.R. 1975. Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 60: 159-170.
- Herzberg, F. 1968. *Work and the Nature of Man*. New York: World Publishing.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B.B. 1959. *The Motivation to Work*. 2nd edition. United States of America: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Idris, M.A., Dollard, M.F. & Winefield, A.H. 2010. Lay theory explanations of occupational stress: The Malaysian context. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal* 17: 135-153.
- Ilies, R. & Schwind, K.M. 2007. Employee well-being: A multilevel model linking work and non-work domains. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 16: 326-341.
- Jung, K., Moon, M.J. & Hahm, S.D. 2007. Do age, gender and sector affect job satisfaction? Result from the Korean labor and income panel data. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 27(2): 125-146.
- Liu, C. & Spector, P.E. 2005. International and cross cultural issues. In *Handbook of Work Stress*, edited by J. Barling, E.K. Kelloway & M.R. Frone, 487-515. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Liu, C., Spector, P.E. & Shi, L. 2007. Cross-national job stress: A quantitative and qualitative study. *Journal of Organisational Behavior* 28: 209-239.
- Locke, E.A. 1969. What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 4: 309-336.
- Lu, L., Gilmour, R., Kao, S.F. & Huang, M.T. 2006. A cross-cultural study of work/family demands, work/family conflict, and well-being: The Taiwanese vs. British. *Carrer Development International* 11: 9-27.
- Maslow, A.H. 1954. *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Murphy, L.R. & Cooper, C.L. 2000. *Healthy and Productive Work*. London: Taylor and Francis Inc.
- Nauta, M.M., Liu, C. & Li, C. 2010. A cross-national examination of self efficacy as a moderator of autonomy/job strain relationships. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 59: 159-179.
- Parasuraman, S. & Simmers, C.A. 2001. Type of employment, work-family conflict and well-being: A comparative study. *Journal of Organisational Behavior* 22: 551-568.
- Pearson, C.A.L. & Chong, J. 1997. Contributions of job content and social information on organizational commitment and job satisfaction: An exploration in a Malaysian nursing context. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 70: 357-374.
- Rathi, N. & Rastogi, R. 2008. Job satisfaction and psychological well-being. *The Icfai University Journal of Organizational Behavior* 7: 47-57.
- Samad, S. 2006. The contribution of demographic variables: Job characteristics and job satisfaction on turnover intentions. *Journal of International Management Studies* 1: 1-12.
- Shamsuri, N.A. 2004. *Organizational justice as a determinant of job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A study among lecturers and assistant registrars in Universiti Utara Malaysia*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Simonetti, S.H. & Weitz, J. 1972. Job satisfaction: Some cross-cultural effects. *Personnel Psychology* 25: 107-118.
- Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M. & Hulin, C.L. 1969. *Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Spector, P.E. 2008. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Research and Practice*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Son.
- Spector, P.E. 1985. Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 13: 693-713.
- Spector, P.E. 1997. *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Spector, P.E. & Wimalasiri, J. 1986. A cross-cultural comparison of job satisfaction dimensions in the United States and Singapore. *International Review of Applied Psychology* 35: 147-158.
- Takalkar, P. & Coover, M.D. 1994. International replication note: The dimensionality of job satisfaction in India. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 43: 415-426.
- World Bank. 2010. Available at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/CLASS.XLS>
- Yew, L.T. 2007. Job satisfaction and affective commitment: A study of employees in the tourism industry in Sarawak, Malaysia. *Sunway Academic Journal* 4: 27-43.

R Zirwatul Aida R Ibrahim (corresponding author)
School of Social & Economic Development
Universiti Malaysia Terengganu
21030 Mengabang Telipot
Kuala Terengganu, Terengganu, MALAYSIA
E-Mail: zirwatul@umt.edu.my

Keis Ohtsuka
College of Arts
Victoria University
PO Box 14428, Melbourne, Vic 8001, AUSTRALIA
E-Mail: keis.ohtsuka@vu.edu.au

Mazidah Mohd Dagang
School of Social & Economic Development
Universiti Malaysia Terengganu
21030 Mengabang Telipot
Kuala Terengganu, Terengganu, MALAYSIA
E-Mail: mazidah@umt.edu.my

Azlina Abu Bakar
School of Social & Economic Development
Universiti Malaysia Terengganu
21030 Mengabang Telipot
Kuala Terengganu, Terengganu, MALAYSIA
E-Mail: azlina@umt.edu.my

