



Małgorzata Dobrowolska

Uniwersytet Śląski

E-mail: malgorzata.dobrowolska@us.edu.pl

Alternative job satisfaction – presentation of the author's research

Abstrakt

Functioning of man in working conditions in a cognitive perspective is making decisions, doing a specific job and getting results. All of these three components are present in each work, but work in conditions of alternative employment sets different requirements to an individual with respect to the above-mentioned three components of work. In this article attention will be paid in particular to the third of these three components - the results of the work. These are the results that are critical for job satisfaction and its individual components. These three elements of human activity employed both on a permanent and temporary basis are present in nearly every motivation model (cf. Porter, Lawler 1967 and others). At the same time new categories of description and explanation of human behaviour spring up, since employment conditions are changing. Flexible employment is one of the most characteristic changes in the present times with regard to the relationship between an employee and an employer. The article presents the results of the author's research on the sample of flexible employees.

Key words: job satisfaction, flexible forms of employment

JOB SATISFACTION IN THEORY

Zalewska (2006) accomplished a synthesis of knowledge on job satisfaction. Initially the literature of the subject indicates, that research carried out stressed factors of work environment (Herzberg, Mausner, Snyderman, 1959). Since the eighties personal sources of satisfaction has been emphasized (Bono, Judge, 2003; Judge, Heller, Mount, 2002; Spector, 1997; Staw, Ross, 1985). The major emphasis was on a transactional model of life and for years it has been an explanation of conditions of job satisfaction (Zalewska, 2001, 2002, 2003). This is a subjective system of attitudes, expressing an attitude to various areas of life, including job satisfaction. This attitude contains two separate with respect to each other elements: emotional and cognitive one. Evaluation of work is evaluation of work in general and its particular components - co-workers, working conditions, and an evaluation of the components which are independent of each other and do not represent a sum of elements in the assessment of global satisfaction level (Brief, 1998), thus multidimensional approach to satisfaction. Personality trait moderates processing of emotional and cognitive information. It should be emphasised that, "research on satisfaction require combining process and differential

approach, since personal trait may be moderators between various evaluations and relationships between them and other variables (Rusting, 1998)” (all after: Zalewska, 2006, pp. 290-292).

Drzewiecka (2010) describes attempts to find relationships between satisfaction with life and job satisfaction (Zalewska, 2003). She defines job satisfaction as intensity of positive and negative subjective experience and opinions on one's own work (Zalewska, 2003). Research by DeVaus and McAllister (1991) has not confirmed a relationship between the level of job satisfaction and sex, it has been proven, that a certain part of satisfaction is genetically determined (Ilies, Arvey, Bouchard, 2006), while differences in satisfaction is mostly due to one's personality (Ilies, Judge, 2003), followed by low level of difficulty of work among beginners, as well as age, which correlates with the work in general (Schultz, Schultz, 2002). More experience and a higher level of seniority leads to reduced levels of satisfaction (Joseph, Simmons, Abramowicz, Girardi, 2002). A positive correlation appears between job satisfaction and salary (Szaban, 2003) conditions of work, organization and management (Steihardt, Dolbier, Gottlieb, McCalister, 2003), managing style (Cicero, Pierro, van Knippenberg, 2007), and high concern for employees (Thompson, 2009). Dissatisfaction generates increased absenteeism and fluctuation, reduced staff loyalty, low or lack of involvement (Soriano, 2008; Lok, Crawford, 2004) and decrease in performance. Conversely, high job satisfaction involves increased creativity and innovativeness, greater commitment, productivity growth (after: Drzewiecka, 2010, p. 82).

Lipinska-Grobelny, Głowacka (2009) emphasize the fact that fair and dignified treatment (Spector, 1997), as well as other variables related to experience of justice itself affect satisfaction, which translates into greater productivity, motivation, smaller willingness to participate in conflicts, lower absenteeism and smaller number of sick leaves (Bretz, Boudreau, Judge, 1994; Lee and others, 1996, Steel, Rentsch, 1995). Summing up, there are four most common models of determinants of job satisfaction: environmental factors, personality trait, life quality transactional model and model of adjustment of an individual and environment, that is a state in which professional competencies and expectations towards job are in accord with the requirements and what a job has to offer. Adjustment translates to the experience of job satisfaction and this, in turn, into a higher level of commitment and the effectiveness at work (p. 181-182). Job satisfaction is related to specificity of tasks, characteristics of an employee, adaptation of an employee to his post (Brief, 1988; Spector, 1997; Zalewska, 2003). In the adjustment model, otherwise known as the adaptation model, or the model of suitability, individual-and-environmental adjustment, that is about adjustment of an individual to environment, there is a correlation between characteristic features of a job and an individual when it comes to job satisfaction (Skłodowski, 2002). Professional suitability was included to this concept showing relationship with job satisfaction (Borucki, 1977). Harrison (1987) mentions two adjustments: instrumental one, regarding compatibility between competences and requirements; and incentive one; relating to satisfaction of needs and adequate rewards. These issues are addressed by the Holland theory (1997) associated with the four personality types and environments (pp. 182-183).

Furnham and Schaeffer (1984) demonstrated that high cohesion and diversity indicators of the Holland concept are related to satisfaction as well as the relationship between adjustment of a profession with absenteeism and a level of experienced stress. Eliot and Smart (1988) confirmed that persons performing work consistent with their own skills are satisfied with promotion opportunities, wages and additional benefits. Assouline, Meir (1987) confirmed a relationship between satisfaction and compliance, stability and success factors, which were explained by well-being factors (p.185). The author (*ibid*, s. 188) confirmed the above, also in her own research, and claims that the greatest job satisfaction is related to high adjustment to one's profession.

Summing up, definitions of job satisfaction can be divided into two groups, the ones emphasizing job characteristics and its conditions and the ones related to a general satisfaction with life and its areas. The English term satisfaction means to meet one's needs, satisfaction expressed as an emotional state, which makes it difficult to understand clearly the term of satisfaction. There is satisfaction caused by quantity and quality of work, temporary and permanent satisfaction, satisfaction related to the involvement, achieved performance, development of competence and personality as well as particular aspects of work, such as remuneration, relations with supervisors and colleagues, plus cognitive satisfaction, satisfaction related to estimations and an emotional attitude linked with the experience of work. Factors affecting job satisfaction can be divided into three major groups: - personal one - needs, social-and-demographic data, such as age, sex, experience, and others; social one - organizational climate, compliance with ethics, relationship with a superior, colleagues, customers; and organisational one - job content, salary, level of differentiation, opportunity for promotion, organisational form and other (Gros, 2003).

At this point it is worthwhile to return to one more theory, which has become a construct in empirical research with an application of a tool based on the job characteristics theory (Hackman, Oldman, 1976). This theory is based on the research in measurement of job characteristics that might correlate with satisfaction of employees. According to this theory specific job characteristics constitute psychological conditions required to increase motivation, productivity and job satisfaction, if an employee has a strong need for growth. Positive characteristics of job contribute to the fact that an employee experiences positive emotions while doing his job well. This situation is conducive to further good performance, as one expects that good results will lead to positive feelings. The individual motivation for good task performance depends on growth and development needs. The stronger the need, the more important positive feelings generated by good job are. There are five axial properties of work: diversity, i.e. the use of various skills and abilities for the work. The more challenging the work is, the more important for an employee it is; ability to identify tasks, i.e. comprehensive nature of work, production of an entire product or service, instead of only a part of it; validity, understood as importance of work for life and well-being of co-workers and consumers; autonomy, i.e. independence of an employee at performing and planning work; feedback, understood as information obtained by an employee concerning efficiency and quality of work done.

Due to characteristics of alternative jobs, one can show in them all the above properties of work. This theory is one of the cognitive approaches to the phenomenon of motivation in the perspective of satisfaction.

In order to determine a level of satisfaction derived from performed tasks 14-item scales was used in the empirical part.

The scales were taken from "Work Diagnostic Questionnaire Research" (Hackman and Oldham, 1976). Work diagnostic questionnaire survey allowed for identification of a satisfaction level with respect to various aspects of work performed. The following aspects of satisfaction have been taken into account: satisfaction from professional development (4 items: 3, 6, 10, 13), from social development (3 items: 4,7,12), satisfaction from salary: 2,9), satisfaction from certainty of employment (2 items: 1, 11), satisfaction with superiors (3) items: 5, 8, 14). In the research of flexible employees the terms appearing in the original survey, such as - *boss* and *work* - have been replaced by *supervision* and *order* respectively, to render characteristics of alternative jobs (cf. Ellington J. I, Gruys M. L, Sackett P. R, 1998). All the job satisfaction elements are assessed using a seven-grade scale, lower level of which designate lack of satisfaction, and higher ones are characteristic for high satisfaction. Cronbach's reliability alpha ratios for satisfaction measures of social development, professional development, salary received, certainty of employment and superiors were respectively: 0.84, 0.64, 0.86, 0.73 and 0.87 (Hackman and Oldham, 1976).

When it comes to measuring and diagnostic capacities of job satisfaction, there is also a popular Job Description Form by Neurberger, Allerbeck (1978) available, which was adopted to the Polish conditions by Zalewska (2001). It includes questions on subjective assessment of general job satisfaction and satisfaction with seven components: co-workers, superiors, content work, working conditions, organization and management, development and remuneration, and additional questions concerning satisfaction with different aspects of life and work. Reliability of the Polish version ranges from 0.84 to 0,92.

Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, Webster (1988) created a tool called Job affect Scale (JAS) to measure experienced positive or negative affect, adapted to the Polish conditions by Zalewska (2002) and named as Skala Afektu w Pracy (Affect at Work Scale).

If we were to analyse job satisfaction from the perspective of a regulator of human behaviour in organizations, the conclusion might be that it reduces variability of the motivational area (for example it reduces excessive expectations and moderates claims); stabilises decision-making processes of an individual and strengthens behavioural standards; inhibits expansionary behaviour of an employee. However, in situations requiring rapid changes and immediate mobilisation of effort satisfied individuals may not choose the so-called fighting strategies, but opportunistic defence strategies. It is therefore a good regulator of human behaviour, when an organization has optimum operating conditions, and its internal and external balance is secured. However, when signals of threats and change are in place that destabilise relations between an organisation and environment or destabilise internal

interpersonal relations (which undoubtedly is the case in peripheral employment - in this case the very appearance of temporary workers in an organisation), satisfaction may be a negative phenomenon that inhabits an adequate behavioural reaction. Instead of prevention or fighting a threat, one can observe preservative tendencies aiming at defence of status quo. In such the case resourcefulness in taking difficult and brave or even risky measures, which allows one to reach a higher level of effective operating is obtained at high price of discomfort. These are, therefore, peculiar psychological costs of such participation. They are related to satisfaction, but this is satisfaction of higher order, often postponed in time, so it is far from promoting stagnancy and looking for minimum requirements (compare: Ratajczak, 1992).

Had these phenomena be compared to characteristics of flexible employment, which in its nature has a changeable place of work, and therefore cyclical interruptions of balance between an individual and an organisation and destabilisation of professional relations, job satisfaction obtained through job discomforts might be satisfaction with resourcefulness of an individual who is able to be effective in difficult conditions.

PRESENTATION OF THE AUTHOR'S RESEARCH

Psychological variable is categorised as a subject-and- organizational determinant of behaviour of employees in a situation of a non-traditional employment.

The average score on the scale of job satisfaction in the analysed group of flexible employees was 69.77 with the variable scope ranging from 14 to 98. The median was 72, which means that half of the analysed scores below 72 points. Skewness has a value below zero, which means that the distribution is left-slanting - to many high scores. Kurtosis is slightly above zero, which indicates that the distribution is slender - little too much value clustered around the average. Analysis of job satisfaction with an emphasis on forms of employment has shown that there is a statistically significant relationship between these variables. The assumptions of homogeneity of variance and normality of distribution have been met (after removal of outliers, with the result on the scale satisfaction below 17 points) . The variance analysis has shown that a form of employment significantly differentiates the test results on the scale of job satisfaction: $F(8,2097) = 9.55; p < 0.001$. The results of the survey show that the highest results on the scale of job satisfaction are achieved by the self-employed (an average 76.04), while the lowest results are achieved by seasonal workers (on average 65.62). Average scores in the groups of: working for a limited period of time, working part-time, self-employed and those employed in the social economy are among the high scores, therefore evaluation of job satisfaction in these groups may be regarded as expressing satisfaction with working conditions. In the remaining groups the average scores are among the average results. It is symptomatic that none of the groups exhibits low scores, which mean that none of the flexible forms of employment declared dissatisfaction with flexible work.

High scores on the scale of job satisfaction are achieved by the self-employed and working part-time. On the other hand the lowest scores were observed in the

group of seasonal workers, temporary workers and teleworkers, which in the case of both the higher and lower scores may result from the very characteristics of employment conditions, favourable vs. non-favourable experience of job satisfaction.

The scale of job satisfaction consists of five subscales. The first is the scale of satisfaction with professional development. The average score on the scale of a professional development in the analysed group of flexible employees was 19.82 with the variable scope ranging from 4 to 28. The median was 20, which means that half of the analysed scores below 20 points. Skewness has a value below zero, which means that the distribution is left-slanting - to many high scores. Kurtosis is slightly above zero, which indicates that the distribution is slender - little too much value clustered around the average.

Another sub-scale is the scale of satisfaction with social development. The average score on the scale of social development in the analysed group of flexible employees was 15.56 with the variable scope ranging from 3 to 21. The median was 16, which means that half of the analysed scores below 16 points. Skewness has a value below zero, which means that the distribution is left-slanting - to many high scores. Kurtosis is positive, which indicates that the distribution is slender - little too much value clustered around the average.

Another analysed sub-scale is the scale of remuneration satisfaction. Average score on a scale of remuneration satisfaction in the group of flexible workers was 8.75 with a variable ranging from 2 to 14. The median was 9, which means that half of the analysed scores below 9 points. Skewness has a value below zero, which means that the distribution is left-slanting - to many high scores. Kurtosis is negative, which indicates that the distribution is flattened - too much extreme values.

One of the sub-scales of job satisfaction is a scale of satisfaction with certainty of employment. The average score on a scale of satisfaction with certainty of employment analysed in the group of flexible workers was 10.58 with the variable ranging from 2 to 14. The median was 11, which means that half of the analysed scores below 11 points. Skewness has a value below zero, which means that the distribution is left-slanting - to many high scores. Kurtosis is positive, which indicates that the distribution is slender - little too much value clustered around the average.

The last of the sub-scales on the job satisfaction scale is satisfaction with superiors. The average score on the scale of satisfaction with superiors in the group of flexible workers was 15.06 with the variable ranging from 3 to 21. The median was 16, which means that half of the analysed scores below 16 points. Skewness has a value below zero, which means that the distribution is left-slanting - to many high scores. Kurtosis is positive, slightly above zero - slightly more values are concentrated around the average value.

The variable of job satisfaction correlates significantly with sex, age, education, profession, industry, place of residence. There is no relationship between this variable and the sector, seniority, number of employers, duration of contracts, marital status, number of children.

The relation analysis performed by Mann Withney U test has shown that there is a statistically significant relationship between sex and the results on the scale of job satisfaction: $U = 468166$; $p < 0.001$. Women achieve higher results on the scale of job satisfaction ($M = 710$; $SD = 14.857$) than men ($M = 68.67$; $SD = 15.012$). Age differentiates significantly the results of the respondents on the scale of job satisfaction, the results of Kruskal-Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 13.391; $p < 0.001$. The oldest employees (41- 65 years) receive the highest scores (median = 74). The second place, in terms of the median, belongs to the youngest age group, 18- 30 years (median = 71). Whereas the lowest results are obtained by the respondents at the age of 31 - 40 years: the median = 69. Job satisfaction is also affected by education (relationship confirmed by the Kruskal Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 63.215; $p < 0.001$). The higher education, the higher the results on the scale job satisfaction: in the group of the respondents with primary education the median = 66. In the group of persons with secondary education = 69. However, in the group of the respondents with university degree = 74. Analysis performed by the Kruskal - Wallis test has revealed a statistically significant relationship between profession and job satisfaction: Chi-square (df 4) = 84.167; $p < 0.001$. Greater satisfaction is felt by people on more prestigious, high positions than low-level employees. The median values in each of the said groups are as follows: managers, CEOs, business owners = 80; experts and free lancers = 74; technicians and officials = 73; trade employees and services = 69; workers = 66. Industry also differentiates significantly the results of the test on the scale of job satisfaction - the result of the Kruskal-Wallis test: Chi-square (df 4) = 64.421; $p < 0.001$. The highest median was obtained in such groups as: other industry = 80; public administration = 73; heavy industry = 72. Slightly lower median results occurred in the group of the respondents working in services = 69, and the lowest in group of the respondents working in trade = 68. A statistically significant correlation between the place of residence and job satisfaction has also been shown. The result of the Kruskal - Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 21.603; $p < 0.001$. The highest scores are obtained by urban dwellers (median = 74), rural residents core slightly less (median = 71), and the lowest score belongs to people in small cities (median = 70).

According to the obtained results, overall satisfaction with work is exhibited mostly by women, the group of the oldest employees aged 41 - 65, holding a university degree, higher positions in the hierarchy of an organisational structure, people working in the public administration and from big cities.

Below you will find interpretations for each of the sub-scales of the job satisfaction. The first sub-scale of satisfaction with professional development significantly correlates with sex, age, education, profession and place of residence. No relationship has been identified with the remaining social-and-demographic factors.

The relation analysis performed by Mann - Withney U test has shown that there is a statistically significant relationship between sex and the results on the scale satisfaction with professional development: $U = 465829.5$; $p < 0.001$. Women experience greater satisfaction on the scale of satisfaction with professional development ($M = 20.38$; $SD = 4.579$) than men ($M = 19.38$; $SD = 4.626$). Age differ-

entiate significantly the results of the respondents on the scale of satisfaction with professional development, the result of the Kruskal-Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 20.005; $p < 0.001$). The oldest employees (41- 65 years) receive the highest scores (median = 20). Whereas in the remaining age groups the median was 20. The satisfaction with professional development is also affected by education (relationship confirmed by the Kruskal -Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 57.005; $p < 0.001$). The higher education, the higher the results on the scale of satisfaction with professional development: in the group of the respondents with primary education the median = 18. In the group of the respondents with secondary education the median = 20. Whereas in the group of the respondents holding a university degree the median = 21. Analysis performed by the Kruskal - Wallis test has proved the existence of a statistically significant relationship between profession and satisfaction with professional development: Chi square (df 4) = 82.414; $p < 0.001$. Greater satisfaction is felt by people on more prestigious, high positions than low-level employees. The median values in each group are as follows: managers, CEOs, business owners = 22; experts and free lancers = 21; technicians and civil service officers = 21; trade and service employees = 20; workers = 18. A statistically significant correlation between the place of residence and satisfaction with professional development has also been shown. The result of the Kruskal -Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 24.802; $p < 0.001$). While the highest results are generated by big city dwellers: the median = 21. In the remaining groups the median was 20.

Satisfaction with professional development correlates significantly with sex, age, education, occupation, and place of residence. No other relation has been identified with the remaining independent socio-demographic variables.

Analysis of the relation performed by U Mann - Withney test has shown that there is a statistically significant relationship between sex and the results on the scale of satisfaction with social development: $U = 462641.5$; $p < 0.001$. Women have slightly higher results on the scale of satisfaction with social development ($M = 15.99$; $SD = 3.021$) than men ($M = 15.24$; $SD = 3.307$). Age significantly differentiates the results of the respondents on the scale of satisfaction with social development, the result of the Kruskal-Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 13.632; $p < 0.001$). The oldest and the youngest employees gain the highest scores (median = 16). In the age group 31 - 40 years the median = 15. The satisfaction with social development is also affected by education (relationship confirmed by the Kruskal -Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 51.933; $p < 0.001$). In the group of the respondents with primary education the median = 15. Whereas in the group of the respondents holding a university degree the median = 16. Analysis performed by the Kruskal - Wallis test has proved the existence of a statistically significant relationship between profession and satisfaction with social development: Chi-square (df 4) = 70.682; $p < 0.001$. Greater satisfaction is felt by people on more prestigious, high positions than low-level employees. The median values in each of the said groups are as follows: managers, CEOs, business owners = 18; experts and free lancers = 16; technicians and officials = 16; trade employees and services = 15; workers = 15.

A statistically significant correlation between the place of residence and satisfac-

tion with social development has also been shown. The result of the Kruskal - Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 37.750; $p < 0.001$). While the highest results are generated by big city dwellers: the median = 17. In the group of villagers the median was 16, and that the inhabitants of small towns the median was 15.

Satisfaction with remuneration significantly correlates with education and post in the organization, the remaining variables show no dependency.

The satisfaction with remuneration is also significantly affected by education (relationship confirmed by the Kruskal-Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 29.006; $p < 0.001$). In the group with primary education the median = 8. In the group of the respondents with secondary education the median was 9. Whereas in the group of the respondents holding a university degree the median = 10. Analysis performed by the Kruskal - Wallis test has proved the existence of a statistically significant relationship between profession and remuneration satisfaction: Chi-square (df 4) = 38.374; $p < 0.001$). Greater satisfaction is felt by people on more prestigious, high positions than low-level employees. The median values in each of the said groups are as follows: managers, CEOs, business owners = 10; experts and free lancers = 10; technicians and officials = 9; trade employees and services = 8; workers = 8.

Satisfaction with certainty of work in a significant way correlates with education, occupation and sector. There was no relation with other socio-demographic variables.

Satisfaction with certainty of work is significantly statistically affected by education (the relationship confirmed by the Kruskal -Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 48.493; $p < 0.001$). In the group with primary education the median = 10. In the group of the respondents with secondary education the median was 11. Whereas in the group of the respondents holding a university degree the median = 12. Analysis performed by the Kruskal - Wallis test has proven the existence of statistically significant relationbetween profession and satisfaction with certainty of work: Chi-square (df 4) = 62.210; $p < 0.001$. Greater satisfaction is felt by people on more prestigious, high positions than low-level employees. The median values in each of the said groups are as follows: managers, CEOs, business owners = 12; experts and free lancers = 12; technicians and officials = 11; trade employees and services = 11; workers = 10. Also a sector of employment significantly differentiates the results on the scale of satisfaction with certainty of employment (the results of the Kruskal -Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 15.848; $p < 0.001$). The highest results are scored by the employed in the private sector: the median = 12. For the respondents employed in the private and social sector the median is 11.

Analysis of the relationship in the last sub-scale of satisfaction with superiors has showed statistically significant correlation with sex, age, education, profession, and sector. The relation analysis performed by Mann-Withney U test has shown that there is a statistically significant relationship between sex and the results on the scale satisfaction with superiors: $U = 475765.5$; $p < 0.001$. Women have slightly higher results on the scale of satisfaction with superiors ($M = 15.46$; $SD = 3.732$) than men ($M = 14.74$; $SD = 3.800$).

Age differentiates significantly the results of the respondents on the scale of satisfaction with superiors, the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 16.093; $p < 0.001$). The oldest and the youngest employees gain the highest scores (median = 16). In the age group 31 - 40 years the median = 15. Satisfaction with superiors is also affected by education (the relationship confirmed by the Kruskal Wallis test: Chi-square (df 2) = 53.034; $p < 0.001$). In the group of the respondents with primary and secondary education the median = 15. Whereas in the group of the respondents holding a university degree the median = 16. Analysis performed by the Kruskal - Wallis test has proved the existence of a statistically significant relationship between profession and satisfaction with superiors: Chi-square (df 4) = 75.319; $p < 0.001$). Greater satisfaction is felt by people on more prestigious, high positions than low-level employees. The median values in each of the said groups are as follows: managers, CEOs, business owners = 17; experts and free lancers = 16; technicians and officials = 16; trade employees and services = 15; workers = 14.

CONCLUSION

Summing up, the specific subscales of job satisfaction, professional development satisfaction is characteristic mostly for women, the oldest employees, when it comes to the age groups and people holding a university degree, with more prestigious positions and located high in the hierarchy, residing in big cities.

Individuals satisfied with social development are also women, the oldest and the youngest, the respondents holding a university degree, the respondents placed higher in the organisational hierarchy and big city dwellers. People satisfied with remuneration hold a university degree and more prestigious positions. Satisfaction with certainty of work is a characteristic feature of the respondents holding a university degree, holding higher posts in the organizational structure, from the public sector. The last of the analysed sub-scales, namely the scale of satisfaction with superiors is a characteristic feature mainly for women, the oldest and the youngest employees, the respondents holding a university degree and with more prestigious positions in the organization. A common feature for the specific sub-scales of satisfaction and a general result for the entire scale relationship with holding a university degree and a practised profession on higher organizational positions in the hierarchy.

Job satisfaction is a classic problem of work and organisation psychology, however in this paper the problem has been analysed without a dominant rule of a technocratic approach to a man perceived as an object of the influence, not a subject of work. Job satisfaction used to be treated mainly as a tool to boost productivity. However, from the perspective of humanist psychology, satisfaction is understood as welfare of an individual related to the fact of one's employment (*well-being, happiness*) with prevailing sense of hope, optimism and peace. It is treated as an objective in itself.

REFERENCES

1. Bandura, B. (1977). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-42.
2. Bono, J.E., Judge, T.A. (2003). Core self-evaluations: A review of the trait and its role in job satisfaction and job performance. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, 5-19.
3. Bretz, R.D. Jr., Boudreau, J.W., Judge, T.A. (1994). Job search behaviour of employed managers. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 275-301.
4. Lee, R.T., Ashforth, B.E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimension of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 123-133.
5. Brief, A., Burke, M., George, J., Robinson, B., Webster, J., (1988). Should negative affectivity remain an unmeasured variable in the study of job stress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(2), 193-198.
6. Staw, B.M., Bell, N.E., Clausen, J.A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 56-77.
7. Judge, T.A., Locke, E.A., Durham, C.C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19, 151-188.
8. Judge, T.A., Locke, E.A., Durham, C.C., Kluger, A.N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 17-34.
9. Spector, P.E., Jex, S.M. (1991). *Relations of job characteristics from multiple data sources with employee affect, absence, turnover intentions, and health*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 46-53.
10. Diener, E., Larsen, R.J., Emmons, R.A. (1984). Person & Situation interactions: Choice of situations and congruence response models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 580-592.
11. Magnusson, D. (1998). The logic and implications of a person-oriented approach. W: R.B. Cairns, L.R. Bergman, J. Kagan (red.), *Methods and models for studying the individual* (s.33-64). California: Sage.
12. Brief, A.P. (1998). *Attitudes in and around organizations*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
13. Zalewska, A. (2003). *Dwa światy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SWPS Academica.
- Skłodowski, H. (2002). *Podstawy teoretyczne przystosowania zawodowego i ich praktyczne wykorzystanie do tworzenia narzędzi badawczych oraz diagnozy*. W: H. Skłodowski, T. Kucharski (red.), *Kwestionariusze do badania predyspozycji i umiejętności zawodowych. Niezbędne przy wyborze zawodu i kierunku studiów*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Borucki, Z. (1977). *Krytyczna analiza teorii przystosowania zawodowego* R.V. Dawisa, L.H. Lofquista i D.J. Weissa. *Przegląd psychologiczny*, 20(3), 469-481.
14. Holland, J.L. (1997). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments*. Odessa, Florida: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
15. Furnham, A., Schaeffer R. (1984). Person environment fit, job satisfaction and mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 57, 297-307.
16. Elton, C.F., Smart, J.C. (1988). Extrinsic job satisfaction and person-environment congruence. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 32, 226-238.
17. Gros, U. (2003). *Zachowania organizacyjne w teorii i praktyce zarządzania*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
18. Cicero, L., Pierro, A., van Knippenberg, D. (2007). Leader group prototypicality and job satisfaction: The moderating role of job stress and team identification. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 11(3), 165-175.
19. De Vaus, D., McAllister, I. (1991). *Gender and Work Orientation. Values and Satis-*

- faction in Western Europe. *Work and Occupations*, 18(1), 72-93.
20. Drzewiecka, M. (2010). Percepcja stylu kierowania przełożonego a zadowolenie z pracy wśród pracowników call center. *Psychologia jakości życia*, 9(1), 81-97.
 21. Ellingson, J. E., Gruys, M. L., Sackett, P. R. (1998). Factors related to the satisfaction and performance of temporary employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 913-921.
 22. Fried, Y., Ferris, R.G., (1995). 'Supervisors' role conflict and role ambiguity: differential relations with performance ratings of subordinates and the moderating effect of screening ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 282-291.
 23. Gerhart, B.A., (1988). Sources of variance in incumbent perceptions of job complexity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 154-162.
 24. Hacket, G., Betz, N.E. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 18, 326-339.
 25. Hackman, J.R., Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
 26. Hall, D.T., Foster, L.W. (1977). A psychological success cycle and goal setting: Goals, performance, and attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 20, 282-290.
 27. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Snyderman, B.B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
 28. Ilies, R., Arvey, R., Bouchard, J. (2006). Darwinism, behavioural genetics, and organizational behavior: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(2), 121-141.
 29. Ilies, R., Judge, T. (2003). On the heritability of job satisfaction: the mediating role of personality. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 750-759.
 30. Joseph, J., Simmons, B., Abramowicz, K., Girardi, T. (2002). *Career plateauism: End of the road or just another fork?* *Journal of Management & Organization*, 8, 2, 14-21.
 31. Judge, T.A., Heller, D., Mount, M.K. (2002). Five-Factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 530-541.
 32. Larsen, R.J., Ketelaar, T., (1991). Personality and susceptibility to positive and negative emotional states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 132-140.
 33. Levy, P.E., Baumgardner, A.H., (1991). Effects of self-esteem and gender on goal choice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12, 529-541.
 34. Lipińska-Grobelny, A., Głowacka, K. (2009). Zadowolenie z pracy a stopień dopasowania do zawodu. *Przegląd psychologiczny*, 52(2), 181-194.
 35. Lok, P., Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: a cross-national comparison. *Journal of Management Development*, 23(4), 321-338.
 36. Nollen, S. D. (1996a). *Managing contingent workers: how to reap the benefits and reduce the risks*. New York: American Management Association.
 37. Nollen, S. D. (1996b). *Negative aspects of temporary employment*. *Journal of Labor Research*, 17, 567-582.
 38. Porter, L.W., Lowler, E. E., (1967). The effect of performance on job satisfaction. *Industrial Relations*, 7, 20-28.
 39. Ratajczak, Z. (1992a). Wpływ stanów emocjonalnych na zachowanie pracownika w sytuacji zagrożenia. W: T. Tyszka (red.), *Psychologia i bezpieczeństwo pracy*. Warszawa: Instytut Psychologii PAN.
 40. Ratajczak, Z. (1992b). Wsparcie społeczne w warunkach zagrożenia funkcjonowania człowieka w środowisku pracy. *Psychologiczne problemy funkcjonowania człowieka w sytuacji pracy*, 10, 19, UŚ. Katowice.
 41. Ratajczak, Z. (1992c). Źródła informacji o zagrożeniach i warunki skuteczności jej oddziaływania. W: T. Tyszka (red.), *Psychologia i bezpieczeństwo pracy*. Warsza-

wa: Instytut Psychologii PAN.

42. Schultz ,D.P., Schultz, S.E. (2002). *Psychologia a wyzwania dzisiejszej pracy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
43. Soriano, D. (2008). Can Goal Setting and Performance Feedback Enhance Organizational Citizenship Behavior? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 22(1), 65-66.
44. Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
45. Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
46. Staw, B.M., Ross, J. (1985). Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to job attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 469-480.
47. Steinhardt, M., Dolbier, C., Gottlieb, N., McCalister, K. (2003). The relationship between hardiness, supervisor support, group cohesion, and job stress as predictors of job satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 17, 382-389.
48. Swann, W.B., Jr., Stein-Seroussi, A., Giesler, R.B. (1992). Why people self-verify. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 392-401.
49. Szaban, J. (2003). *Miękkie zarządzanie. Ze współczesnych problemów zarządzania ludźmi*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo WSPiZ im. Leona Koźmińskiego w Warszawie.
50. Thompson, S. (2009). *Organization-Worker Relationship*. Research Starters Sociology, 1-6.
51. Zalewska, A. (2001a). „Arkusze Opisu Pracy” O. Neunergera i M. Allerbeck – adaptacja do warunków polskich. *Studia Psychologiczne*, 39(1), 197-217.
52. Zalewska, A. (2001a). „Arkusze Opisu Pracy” O. Neunergera i M. Allerbeck – adaptacja do warunków polskich. *Studia Psychologiczne*, 39(1), 197-217.
53. Zalewska, A. (2001b). Reactivity and job satisfaction at a new workplace. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 32(3), 167-174.
54. Zalewska, A. (2001b). Reactivity and job satisfaction at a new workplace. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 32(3), 167-174.
55. Zalewska, A. (2002). „Skala Afektu w Pracy” – wstępne wyniki prac nad adaptacją techniki. *Studia Psychologiczne*, 40(4), 173-192.
56. Zalewska, A. (2003). *Dwa światy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SWPS Academica.
57. Zalewska, A.M. (2006). Zadowolenie z pracy w zależności od reaktywności i wartości stymulacyjnej pracy. *Przegląd psychologiczny*, 49(3), 289-304.