



Tailoring Job Satisfaction: A Custom Scale for the IT Sector

Pooja Menghani^{1*}, Dr. Sangeeta Jain², Dr. Vivek Sharma³

1. Research Scholar, IMS, Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya, Indore, MP, India
poojamenghani1412@gmail.com ,
2. Professor, IMS, Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya, Indore, MP, India ,
3. Professor, IMS, Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya, Indore, MP, India

Abstract: In this case, the study seeks to design a reliable and dependable job satisfaction questionnaire specific to the IT employees. It is important to acknowledge that the context of this study is rather special, and so our ultimate objective is to develop a credible & reliable tool for assessing JS in the IT workforce. The scale development process involved multiple steps: The first step involves identifying the goal of the assessment and the domain, the second is the literature search and evaluation of the available instruments, the third step is idea generation and item development, and final step is choosing the proper response format. The initial item pool in this study had first, been subjected to content validity through the view of the experts, secondly faces pilot testing which was done with a small sample of IT professionals. The validity of the scale was checked through the convergent validity and the discriminant validity test while the internal consistency estimate was checked through Cronbach alpha test. Therefore, the final scale of 24 items again yielded desirable psychometric properties with Cronbach's alpha of 0. A total of 89, signifying acceptable internal consistency, and the validity coefficients were also satisfactory, therefore, this tool can form the basis of future research and practice special to IT organisations.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, IT Sector, Scale Development, Employee Well-being, Psychometric Validation, Organizational Performance

----- X -----

INTRODUCTION

Satisfaction at the workplace is one of the variables that have a significant impact on the performance and health of the worker in any organization or industry that he or she is working for. It is described as the affective outcome in terms of positive emotion that results from an individual's evaluation of the job or job experiences (Locke, 1976). However, in this case, the subject that can be taken to particularly concern the IT sector is the job satisfaction since such a context appears to remain heavily focused, pressured and dynamically remodeled. Contented employees can easily rate the workplace and their performance inclinations higher than those of their dissatisfied counterparts, which plays a significant role in retaining competitiveness in the technological industries. On the other hand, dissatisfaction can result to higher turnover rates which will be prevalent among employees, low production levels and high operational expenses that are likely to compromise an organization's growth and efficiency.

In this study, following the measures used in previous studies, job satisfaction is defined categorically as a boastful or positive affective state that flows from an individual's evaluation of his or her job or job experiences. These include pay satisfaction, promotion, recognition of performance, exercise of communication, training and development, flexibility, organisational culture, cooperation, and distribute of work. By including these detailed aspects of the concept in the definition of the scale, the measure created

can incorporate all the presented aspects on job satisfaction as it is experienced by IT professionals.

The primary purpose of work satisfaction scale construction is to build an accurate and reliable index consistent with the particularities of the IT industry employees. Because the nature of work and the demands of IT employees are quite distinct from those of managers or employees in other industries, basic job satisfaction indices may not be sufficient to describe the various factors influencing job satisfaction of IT specialists. Through making it a sector-specific scale, this scale is an attempt for a more correct and appropriate measure of job satisfaction since the shortcomings of the general scale fail to give organisational solutions and interventions the ideal support and understanding they require in case of the IT sector. Finally, it ends with betterment of health and performance of the employees and more efficiently functioning of the organisations through revealing information that could contribute to proper human resource management strategies and policies for IT skilled employees.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational commitment and job satisfaction studies have been of great interest to researchers of diverse disciplines since they are instrumental in explaining workers' performance, retention, and productivity. According to Locke (1976), job satisfaction refers to the overall enjoyable or positive feelings arising from the evaluation of the job or experiences at work encompassing both the affective and cognitive aspects which are positive. Spector, (1997) also adds to the foregoing definition of job satisfaction by stating it is the psychological state that results from the overall assessment of the individual's job experience in terms of its validation and personal satisfaction. For the purpose of this research, job satisfaction among employees will be defined, especially earning it in the context of the IT sector especially due to the high stressful adoption technological changes and the implications of its effects on raised stress levels in the employees.

Previous research indicates that, there are several factors that defines the level of job satisfaction. To support, Robbins, (1996) defines job satisfaction as a state of mind where people have positive or negative feelings about their jobs, and brings out the importance of individual perception. Cranny et al. , (1992) defined the job satisfaction as an emotional positive or negative reaction to the assessment of the organisation and the job in meeting the variables that are deemed important. This is a multiple dimensional model of job satisfaction, which includes compensation, promotions, recognition, relationship, communication, training and development, career mobility, flexibility of work, organizational culture, teamwork, work load.

From the perspective of the IT arena, promotion, social influence by electronic gadgets and internet, knowledge update, technological changes, target completion pressure, performance pressure, etc. , are some of the critical determinants for job satisfaction. Research has established that IT workers have peculiar job satisfaction variables vis-a-vis workers in other industries. For example, Heneman and Judge (2000) and Milkovich &Wigdor (1991) have highlighted the work of compensation and the fact that the organizational culture in IT needs to reflect the pay determinants that are fairly and competitively attractive to MNEs' employees. Cable and DeRue (2002) and Judge et al. (1995) underlined how Promotion Opportunities and Career Advancement are elements that are conducive to motivation, and they represent priorities in the context of IT specialists.

The other element is recognition of efforts in line with the Eisenberger et al. , (1986) and Oldham and Cummings, (1996) explanation. Hardware and software engineers place a high priority on receiving recognition for work performed, which in turn greatly boosts the satisfaction received from employment profiles. Because positive relationship and cooperation are also essential in the workplace, as identified by Dutton and Heaphy (2003) and Heaphy and Dutton (2008), the investigation of essential and positive communication amongst workers is important. Several researchers have noted that the key to understanding communications, as mentioned in the studies by Farh et al. (1997), and Hollenbeck et al. (1998), are important in determining ambiguities and the speed in which organizational projects can be completed as well as issues of coordination among organization teams.

By using the examples of skills, knowledge, and competencies, it is possible to state that the training and development opportunities are particularly urgent in the context of the IT sector since it is characterized by a high level of changes. Tannenbaum et al. (1991) and Salas et al. (2012) point out that through cumulative training and skill acquisition, satisfaction comes from occupied and updated individual workers in the course of the job. Thirdly, the other preceding features which integrated by Hall and Mirvis (1995) and Arthur et al. (1989) reveal that career development is vital to long-time content in an occupation, giving IT professionals direction on how they might move up in their places of work.

Career-vice balance or work-life balance discussed by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) and Kossek and Ozeki (1998) may represent a significant issue at the present stage of the IT sector, given that extended working hours and strict per-project/campaign timetables can make employees burnt-out. Elements such as organizational culture, teamwork, employee engagement which have been discussed by Hofste (1980) and Schein (1990), Hackman (2002) as well as Kahn (1990) also helps to a great extend in defining job satisfaction. A healthy working environment that fosters togetherness and worker participation can help the IT professionals in an organization feel valued and appreciated, thereby giving them a reason to stay.

While there is quite a rich literature dealing with job satisfaction, there are still some deficiencies within the scales used to assess this construct, especially the scales, which can be applied to the IT industry. Most existing measures of job satisfaction are global and do not capture any organizational or employment context, thereby not entering into the factual IT employment conditions or employment relations. For instance, the traditional scales may not capture the spirit that emphasises the learning processes as a key intervention variable or the effect of technological developments or stress factors peculiar to information technology projects. Specificity is an essential element that is lacking in such studies, which results in assessment of job satisfaction of IT professionals inadequately or in an incorrect manner.

Besides, it is also possible to note that the use of existing scales may not adequately take into consideration emerging influences related to the IT industry, including the values, meaningful occurrence in society, work-life balance obtained through technology, and other similar aspects. The reason for these unexplored items is that they are studied because they bring out the picture of the structural job satisfaction in the IT sector. For example, relevant technology impact means the joy that is gained from accomplishing something valuable during one's work, whether it is creating products and systems that can improve life quality because of their sustainability, or because they are used in medicine or schools. Employment satisfaction differs from work-life balance in that it focuses on a favourable disposition of the working

context towards personal life and vice versa in a mutually beneficial way.

We opine that future research should develop a new job satisfaction scale in the context of the IT sector, to fill the gaps identified above. The items on this scale should include the original dimensions of job satisfaction as well as new dimension prevalent in the current workforce. It should be generated through the process of item development, qualification of expert in the specific field, pilots, and reliability as well as validity analyses. In doing so, it will offer a better reflection of the phenomenon by considering the opinions of IT professionals to enhance the measurement of job satisfaction of workers, enhancing organisations' abilities to evaluate the needs of their human capital.

Also, it is noteworthy that despite the availability of a large number of studies focused on the identification of factors affecting job satisfaction, there is a decreasing trend of research in using standardized instruments to measure job satisfaction in organizations. Indeed, establishing such a scale will help the practical implementation of more efficient human resource management practices, and therefore improve levels of employee satisfaction that in turn boosts organizational performance.

METHODOLOGY

Determine the Purpose and Scope

The purpose of developing the job satisfaction scale is to create a tool specifically designed to measure the job satisfaction of IT professionals. Given the unique challenges and dynamics within the IT sector, such as rapid technological advancements, high-performance demands, and the necessity for continuous learning, existing generic job satisfaction scales do not fully capture the specific factors that influence job satisfaction in this industry. The intended scope of this scale is to provide a comprehensive, reliable, and valid measure that can be used by organizations to assess and improve the job satisfaction of their IT workforce, ultimately leading to enhanced employee well-being and organizational performance.

Reviewing Existing Literature

The process of reviewing existing job satisfaction scales and relevant literature involved a systematic approach to identify key components of job satisfaction specific to the IT sector. We conducted a thorough literature review using academic databases such as Google Scholar, JSTOR, and PubMed to find studies related to job satisfaction, particularly focusing on those relevant to the IT industry. Key search terms included "job satisfaction," "IT sector," "job satisfaction scales," and "employee well-being." The review also included seminal works on job satisfaction definitions and theories by researchers such as Locke (1976), Spector (1997), Robbins (1996), and Cranny et al. (1992). This comprehensive review helped identify common components of job satisfaction, such as compensation, promotion, recognition, relationships, communication, training and development, career advancement opportunities, work-life balance, organizational culture, teamwork, and workload.

Generating Potential Items

Based on the literature review, we generated an initial pool of potential items to be included in the job satisfaction scale. The generation process involved identifying frequently mentioned components of job

satisfaction and creating statements that reflect these components. For example, items related to compensation were derived from studies by Heneman and Judge (2000) and Milkovich and Wigdor (1991), while items on promotion opportunities were inspired by Cable and DeRue (2002) and Judge et al. (1995). We also incorporated items related to recognition, relationships, communication, training and development, career opportunities, work-life balance, organizational culture, teamwork, employee engagement, and workload based on relevant studies. Additionally, we included unexplored items specific to the IT sector, such as the meaningful impact of technology, work-life harmony, continuous learning culture, impactful feedback and recognition, employee autonomy in project selection, and work-life technology support. This process resulted in an initial pool of 60 items.

Refining the List

The initial list of items was refined through a two-step process involving expert consultations and pilot testing. First, we sought feedback from a panel of experts, including HR professionals, IT managers, and academics specializing in organizational behavior and psychology. These experts evaluated the relevance, clarity, and comprehensiveness of each item, providing suggestions for modifications or deletions. Items that were deemed redundant, ambiguous, or irrelevant were removed or revised based on expert feedback.

Next, we conducted a pilot test with a small sample of IT professionals to further refine the list. Participants were asked to complete the initial scale and provide feedback on item clarity, wording, and comprehension. Based on their responses, we identified and addressed any potential issues, such as unclear wording or difficulty in understanding certain items. This iterative process of expert consultation and pilot testing resulted in a refined list of 45 items that were clear, relevant, and comprehensive.

Determining the Response Format

For the response format, we chose a Likert scale, which is widely used in job satisfaction research due to its simplicity and effectiveness in capturing respondents' attitudes and perceptions. The Likert scale format allows respondents to indicate their level of agreement with each statement on a five-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." This format was selected because it provides a nuanced understanding of respondents' job satisfaction levels and is easy for participants to use. Additionally, the Likert scale aligns well with the nature of the construct and the research objectives, facilitating straightforward data analysis and interpretation.

Developing the Final Scale

The final scale was developed by incorporating the refined list of items and the chosen response format. The scale includes 24 items, each designed to measure a specific aspect of job satisfaction. Clear instructions were provided to respondents, explaining how to complete the scale and the purpose of the survey. Instructions emphasized the importance of honest and thoughtful responses to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data collected. The final scale also included demographic questions to gather information on respondents' age, gender, job role, years of experience, and other relevant background information.

Testing the Scale

The final scale was tested with a representative sample of IT professionals to evaluate its reliability and validity. We administered the scale to a sample of 400 IT employees from various organizations, ensuring diversity in terms of job roles, experience levels, and organizational contexts. Data collection was conducted through online surveys to facilitate broad participation and ease of access.

To assess the reliability of the scale, we calculated Cronbach's alpha, which measures the internal consistency of the items. A Cronbach's alpha value of 0.70 or higher is generally considered acceptable, indicating that the items within the scale are consistent and measure the same underlying construct. In our study, the scale demonstrated a Cronbach's alpha of 0.89, indicating high internal consistency.

To evaluate the validity of the scale, we conducted construct validity assessments, including convergent and discriminant validity. Convergent validity was assessed by examining the correlation between the job satisfaction scale and other related constructs, such as overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Discriminant validity was assessed by examining the correlation between the job satisfaction scale and unrelated constructs, such as job stress and turnover intentions. The results indicated satisfactory levels of convergent and discriminant validity, confirming that the scale accurately measures the construct of job satisfaction.

Additionally, we conducted exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to identify the underlying dimensions of job satisfaction captured by the scale. The EFA revealed several distinct factors, such as compensation, promotion, recognition, relationships, communication, training and development, career opportunities, work-life balance, organizational culture, teamwork, employee engagement, and workload. These factors aligned well with the components identified in the literature review, further validating the scale's structure and content.

In conclusion, the development and validation of the job satisfaction scale for the IT sector involved a systematic and rigorous process of item generation, expert consultation, pilot testing, and reliability and validity assessment. The final scale, comprising 24 items, demonstrated strong psychometric properties, making it a robust tool for measuring job satisfaction among IT professionals. This scale provides organizations with a valuable instrument to assess and improve employee satisfaction, ultimately enhancing organizational performance and employee well-being.

SCALE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Content Validity

The content validity was assessed based on the input from a group of ten professionals working in the field and/or deeply acquainted with the practices in human resources and information technologies as well as scholars studying organizational behaviorism and psychology from the Universities of Essex and Cambridge. These experts excluded unrelated items and observed the relevance, clarity and comprehensiveness of the items from the list of 60 items. They were asked to rate each item on a three-point scale: This assesses the relevance of the information with options as follows: 1 (Not related), 2 (Slightly Related) and 3 (Highly Related). Observations made on the respective items with an average score of less than 2 on the scale. The total count was 85 where 5 of them were revised or deleted. In the

light of the feedback received, fifteen items were excluded because they seemed repetitive, or they did not make much sense while several others were rephrased for enhanced comprehension. This practice led to the fine-tuning of the list of 45 items as instruments truly representing the dimensions of job satisfaction in the IT domain.

Pilot Test

To achieve the above objective, a pilot test was conducted on a sample of fifty IT professionals from different companies. Finally, the participants were requested to fill in the 45-item scale improved for the final version and to express their opinion on issued items concerning the clarity of the wording, and the overall intelligibility of the items. Specific issues pointed out by the feedback were some dilemmas relating to item vagueness and overlap. For example, the participants suggested that some of the objects pertaining to 'work and family interface' and 'organizational climate' were not entirely distinct from one another. According to this response, 10 of these items were subjected to further modifications in an effort to enhance the clarity of the items while 5 of the items were deleted since they were considered to be too repetitive. Before the pilot test was done, the 40 remaining items were made clear to them and checked if they are relevant enough.

Assessing Reliability

Reliability analysis entails internal consistency, and to achieve this, the study applied internal reliability analysis through Cronbach's alpha. The refined 40-item scale was further developed and pre-tested on a sample of 100 respondents and then got supplemented with additional 100 respondents. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was determined to be 0 in both the overall and for each sub scale. 92 thus demonstrating that the test-retest reliability coefficients were high suggesting good internal consistency of the scale. Subscale alphas were also calculated: Employee motivation categories consist of compensation (0.85), promotion (0.83), recognition (0.86), relationships (0.88), communication (0.84), training and development (0.87), career opportunities (0.89), work/home interface (0.90), organizational climate (0.91), teamwork (0.88), involvement (0.85), and workload. These values ensured that the items loading showed that the items within each subscale were gauging the respective construct.

Assessing Validity

Internal validity assessment was done by evaluating convergent validity as well as discriminant validity. Convergent validity of the job satisfaction scale was done through calculating the relationship between the job satisfaction scale and an existing job satisfaction index. Their estimated values are presented in Table 1, and the variable coefficients range from 0.76 to 0.91. H655 indicated the convergent validity with an eigenvalue of 76, which is a satisfactory value. The Discriminant validity was checked where the job satisfaction scale was administered and correlated with job stress measure and the result was a correlation of -0.34 , thus proving that the scale introduced here effectively to measure job satisfaction apart from the job stress. As these analysis have shown, the scale effectively assesses job satisfaction, thus supporting the identification of the construct.

Polishing and Anchoring the Scale

As a result of the reliability and validity analyses, more changes were made to the scale that has been used in this study. Regarding items that had low reliability coefficients, the authors either reviewed or omitted them from final analysis depending on whether they had low item-total correlations or high factor loadings. The process of measurement further culminated in the exclusion of 10 items and the final scale comprising of 30 items. All the items were revised ever for their clarity and for the reasons that they justified including them in the final scale, and the constructed scale showed very high psychometric properties.

Further Validation

With a view to test the objectivity of the construct of the scale, the same was again given to a sample of 100 IT professional from different organizations that included both Small-scale as well as Large-scale organizations. This was because the present study had a larger sample size and, therefore, the results were more generalizable when testing the scale's psychometric properties. CFA was also arranged to decide on the typified factor pattern from the previous exploratory factor analysis. The substantive model fit indices such as CFI, TLI and RMSEA yielded satisfactory values equal to 0.95 or above and 0.05 respectively which gives a testimony to ratify the factor structure of this model as being a true representation of the data. The internal consistency as well as the validity of the scale was hence ascertained, Cronbach alpha was above 0.90 for total RAI score and for all four subscales.

Documenting the Scale

The final scale comprises 30 items, divided into 12 subscales: motivators (3 items) which includes compensation (3 items), promotion (3 items), and recognition (3 items) together with objective (3 items), rejuvenation (3 items), relationships (3 items), communication (3 items), training and development (3 items), plans for the future (3 items), work and family balance (3 items) and structured culture (3 items) together with a determinant (3 items which includes teamwork (3 Overall, respondents are given a 5-point Likert scale which has categorization that varies from 1 representing strongly disagree to 5 representing strongly agree. The mode of scoring encompass, addition of the scores of each subscale in a manner that gives subscale scores, thus determining an overall job satisfaction score by addition of the subscale scores. The scale displayed measure reliability in terms of internal consistency where the value of Cronbach's alpha stood at 0.92, and also implicit construct validity was established, implying that the scale will serve as a reliable and valid scientific measure to capture the generalised job satisfaction among IT employees. This will be of great help in future uses of the scale as the following information is clearly explained; the items in the scale; response format; scoring; psychometric properties.

RESULTS

Reliability Assessment

The reliability of the job satisfaction scale was assessed using Cronbach's alpha to measure internal consistency. The overall Cronbach's alpha for the final 30-item scale was 0.92, indicating excellent reliability. The Cronbach's alpha values for each subscale are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Cronbach's Alpha for Subscales

Subscale	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Compensation	3	0.85
Promotion	3	0.83
Recognition	3	0.86
Relationships	3	0.88
Communication	3	0.84
Training and Development	3	0.87
Career Opportunities	3	0.89
Work-Life Balance	3	0.90
Organizational Culture	3	0.91
Teamwork	3	0.88
Employee Engagement	3	0.85
Workload	3	0.87

All subscales demonstrated Cronbach's alpha values above 0.80, indicating high internal consistency for each subscale.

Validity Assessment

The validity of the scale was evaluated through convergent and discriminant validity assessments.

Convergent Validity: Convergent validity was assessed by correlating the job satisfaction scale with an established job satisfaction measure. The correlation coefficient was 0.76, indicating strong convergent validity.

Discriminant Validity: Discriminant validity was assessed by examining the correlation between the job satisfaction scale and a measure of job stress. The correlation coefficient was -0.34, demonstrating that the job satisfaction scale measures a construct distinct from job stress.

Table 2: Correlation Coefficients for Validity Assessment

Validity Type	Correlation Coefficient
Convergent Validity	0.76
Discriminant Validity	-0.34

Factor Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to identify the underlying dimensions of job satisfaction.

The EFA revealed several distinct factors, aligning with the components identified in the literature review. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed on a larger sample to verify the factor structure.

Table 3: Fit Indices for Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Fit Index	Value
CFI	0.95
TLI	0.94
RMSEA	0.05

The CFA results supported a good model fit, with CFI and TLI values above 0.90 and an RMSEA value below 0.08, indicating that the factor structure is a valid representation of the data.

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics for the final 30-item job satisfaction scale are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction Scale

Subscale	Mean	Standard Deviation
Compensation	3.8	0.7
Promotion	3.6	0.8
Recognition	3.9	0.6
Relationships	4.0	0.7
Communication	3.7	0.8
Training and Development	3.8	0.7
Career Opportunities	3.6	0.8
Work-Life Balance	3.9	0.7
Organizational Culture	4.1	0.6
Teamwork	4.0	0.7
Employee Engagement	3.8	0.7
Workload	3.7	0.8

Summary of Psychometric Properties

The job satisfaction scale demonstrated strong psychometric properties, with high internal consistency, robust construct validity, and a well-supported factor structure. The reliability and validity assessments indicate that the scale is a reliable and valid tool for measuring job satisfaction in the IT sector.




Figure 1: Path Diagram of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The path diagram in Figure 1 illustrates the factor structure of the job satisfaction scale, with each factor representing a distinct dimension of job satisfaction. The standardized factor loadings indicate strong relationships between the items and their respective factors, further validating the scale's structure.

In conclusion, the job satisfaction scale developed and validated in this study provides a comprehensive and reliable measure of job satisfaction tailored to the IT sector. Its strong psychometric properties make it a valuable tool for organizations aiming to assess and enhance the job satisfaction of their IT professionals.

DISCUSSION

The findings of the present study establish that the proposed job satisfaction scale is quite sound and applicable for measuring job satisfaction in the IT workforce. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the total scale as well as the or-GIT strength, or-GIT weakness, and overall GIT strength and weakness subscales are all high and comparable to those reported in previous studies, (Spector 1997; Robbins 1996). Based on the results presented, the scale has high convergent validity established by the reading derived from the comparison with the existing measure of job satisfaction, and the discriminant validity shown by the negative correlation of the measure read with the measure of job stress. These results align with prior studies pointing that job satisfaction involves more aspects (Cranny et al. , 1992; Locke, 1976).

The findings of this work have implications for the IT sector since the subject of the study is a type of

technology work. Given that the IT professionals bear certain conditions within their work environment that is characterised by high responses to changes, high performance demands, the development of the IT specific job satisfaction questionnaire yielded a better understanding of their job satisfaction needs. This scale can be used to determine where organisations may need to intervene in their staff to help them improve their work balance, career growth and acknowledgement of their efforts in work thus leading to a overall improvement in the employees. By this approach, one may achieve low turnover rates among the employees, better engagement, and eventual cultivation of favourable organisational culture.

Nevertheless, this study has some riders. At the same time, the authors raise the issue of generalizability by admitting that although the sample may be quite diverse, it may not cover all sub-sectors of the IT industry. A related course of future studies should also act to cross-check the scale in other segments of IT sub-sectors and regional areas to positiveness. Furthermore, there could exist some opportunities for future longitudinal research wherein more profound peculiarities of changes in job satisfaction with reference to temporal shifts of work conditions and organizational regulations could be revealed.

Therefore, to sum up the discussion, the proposed job satisfaction scale is beneficial for the IT sector since it can be effectively used in the organizations to increase their understanding of the issues connected with employees' satisfaction. More empirical studies are needed to generalize it and to showcase richer and more extensive views about the factors influencing job satisfaction in the context of a constantly growing and developing IT sector.

CONCLUSION

The present work identified the research needs and gaps, and further created and confirmed an IT job satisfaction measure that showed adequate reliability as well as validity. Due to the coverage of various aspects of job satisfaction such as compensation, promotion, recognition, interpersonal relationships, organizational communication, training, career opportunities, flexibility between personal and work life, organizational culture, collaboration, motivation, and job load that the scale collects a broad spectrum of job satisfaction in the IT industry.

Key findings

By assessing the validity and reliability co-efficients the saturation, it is clarified that the scale is bringing beneficial psychometric properties like internal consistency and construct validity which makes the measurement of job satisfaction among IT professionals light and appropriate. This new scale helps in great measure to both research and practice since it presents an instrument that has been designed to meet the requirements and cope with the problems of the special realm of trade – the IT sector. This scale assists organizations in recognizing the potential for organizational improvement, improving the well-being of their employees, and improving general performances. Further follow-up studies should refine and reintroduce this tool for different contexts in IT professions.

References

1. Akgunduz, Y., & Sanlier, N. (2014). Organizational climate and job satisfaction: A research on the

- public employees. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 150, 1002-1010.
2. Al Ariss, A., & Syed, J. (2017). Professional diaspora and talent management: A grounded lens on the Lebanese context. *Journal of Business Research*, 74, 60-69.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.11.015>
 3. Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., & Lentz, E. (2013). The relationship between work-family conflict and employee retention: A theoretical and empirical overview. In *The Oxford handbook of work and family* (pp. 299-318). Oxford University Press.
 4. Anderson, N. R., & West, M. A. (1998). Measuring climate for work group innovation: Development and validation of the team climate inventory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(3), 235-258.
 5. Arif, M., & Akbar, M. M. (2021). The impact of leadership style on organizational climate and employee engagement: A study of banking sector in Pakistan. *Business and Economic Review*, 13(1), 93-118. <https://doi.org/10.22547/BER/13.1.5>
 6. Arora, S., & Rangnekar, S. (2015). Social intelligence: A key to personal and professional success. *Journal of Management and Research*, 5(2), 39-45. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jmr.v5i2.7848>
 7. Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(4), 644-675.
 8. Beidel, D. C., Turner, S. M., & Morris, T. L. (2000). Behavioral treatment of childhood social phobia. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68(6), 1072-1080.
 9. Bernal, J., González-Tirados, R. M., & Rodríguez-Sánchez, A. M. (2018). Organizational climate and organizational justice: The mediator role of trust in the supervisor. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 2257. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02257>
 10. Boles, J. S., Dean, D. H., & Snell, S. A. (2015). Organizational culture and effectiveness: A study of values, attitudes, and organizational outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(7), 1496-1501.
 11. Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. S. (1999). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI). In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 343-362). Jossey-Bass.
 12. Bozeman, B., & Pandey, S. K. (2019). The effects of organizational climate on public sector innovation: The mediating role of job satisfaction and work engagement. *Public Management Review*, 21(3), 384-408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2018.1468424>
 13. Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2011). Emotional intelligence: Implications for personal, social, academic, and workplace success. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(1), 88-103.
 14. Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 279-307.
 15. Bucic, T., Robinson, L., & Pforr, C. (2019). Organizational culture, climate and hospitality employee

- turnover intentions: Finding the missing link. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 77, 95-107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.06.002>
16. Cacioppo, J. T., & Hawkley, L. C. (2009). Perceived social isolation and cognition. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 13(10), 447-454.
 17. Cameron, K. S., & Caza, A. (2004). Contributions to the discipline of positive organizational scholarship. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(6), 731-739.
 18. Caruso, D. R., Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (2009). Relation of an ability measure of emotional intelligence to personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 93(5), 507-516.
 19. Chartrand, T. L., & Bargh, J. A. (1999). The chameleon effect: The perception-behavior link and social interaction. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 76(6), 893.
 20. Chen, Y., & Song, Y. (2019). The impact of organizational climate on employee innovative behavior: The mediating role of psychological safety. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(3), 386-399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2018.02.002>
 21. Choi, J. N., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1998). A validation study of a measure of organizational learning capacity and a proposed typology. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34(2), 213-236.
 22. Chow, I. H. S., Hui, C., & Choi, S. L. (2015). Temporary workers and job satisfaction: The moderating role of organizational climate. *Personnel Review*, 44(2), 276-295. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-04-2013-0059>
 23. Chow, I. H., Hui, C., & Choi, S. (2015). Organizational climate and employee outcomes: Exploring the moderating effect of employment type. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(1), 27-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.06.020>
 24. Ciarrochi, J. V., Chan, A. Y. C., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28(3), 539-561. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(99\)00119-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00119-1)
 25. Ciarrochi, J., Chan, A. Y. C., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28(3), 539-561.
 26. Clark, S. C. (2016). Work/life 'balance' and the wellbeing of academics: The importance of subjective control. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(1), 87-105.
 27. Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,
 28. Davis, J. H., Mayer, R. C., & Schoorman, F. D. (2016). Work climate, affective commitment, and voluntary turnover: A conservation of resources approach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(2), 187-204. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2032>

29. Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), 618-634.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1986.4306232>
30. Dishion, T. J., Ha, T., & Véronneau, M. H. (2016). An ecological analysis of the effects of deviant peer clustering on sexual promiscuity, problem behavior, and childbearing from early adolescence to adulthood: An enhancement of the life history framework. *Developmental Psychology*, 52(10), 1619-1633.
31. Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2002). On the universality and cultural specificity of emotion recognition: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(2), 203-235.
32. Erez, M., & Gati, E. (2019). Employee proactive behavior and its impact on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(2), 135-148.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2324>
33. Farrell, D., Rusbult, C. E., Spiess, J., & Zink, J. (2012). Employing corporate social responsibility to build employer brand equity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 349-363.
34. Feldman, R. (2012). Parent-infant synchrony and the construction of shared timing; physiological precursors, developmental outcomes, and risk conditions. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 53(2), 122-131.
35. Furnham, A., Eracleous, A., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2011). Personality, motivation and job satisfaction: Herzberg meets the Big Five. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(8), 679-694.
36. Furnham, A., Eracleous, A., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2011). Personality, motivation and job satisfaction: Herzberg meets the Big Five. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(8), 679-694.
37. Gallup. (2019). State of the American workplace: Employee engagement insights for U.S. business leaders. Gallup Press.
38. Gallup. (2019). The impact of leadership on organizational climate. *Gallup Business Journal*.
<https://www.gallup.com/workplace/249695/impact-leadership-organizational-climate.aspx>
39. Gentzler, A. L., Stone, L. B., & Huffman, L. C. (2015). An exploration of synchrony in romantic couples' coping with stress. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 32(3), 297-314.
40. Goldenberg, A., Halperin, E., van Zomeren, M., & Gross, J. J. (2017). The process model of group-based emotion: Integrating intergroup emotion and emotion regulation perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 21(4), 377-407.
41. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam.
42. Goleman, D. (1998). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, 76(6), 93-102.
<https://hbr.org/2004/01/what-makes-a-leader>

43. Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. Bantam Books.
44. Grawitch, M. J., Gottschalk, M., & Munz, D. C. (2020). Teamwork and communication as predictors of employee well-being and job satisfaction: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 25(3), 172-183. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000159>
45. Güleriyüz, G., & Akpınar, A. (2020). The impact of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviors: The mediating role of organizational climate. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 11(2), 253-267. <https://doi.org/10.20409/berj.2020.237>
46. Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). Work redesign. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
47. Hawkins, P. (2010). Leadership Team Coaching: Developing Collective Transformational Leadership. Kogan Page.
48. Hildebrandt, T., McCall, C., & Singer, T. (2010). Differential effects of attention-, compassion-, and socio-cognitively based mental practices on self-reports of mindfulness and compassion. *Mindfulness*, 1(3), 128-141.
49. Judge, T. A., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz Jr, R. D. (2001). Job and life attitudes of male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 5-17.
50. Judge, T. A., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz Jr, R. D. (2001). Job and life attitudes of male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 5-17.
51. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376-407.
52. Kim, J. Y., & Park, Y. A. (2020). The effect of servant leadership on organizational climate and job satisfaction: Focused on nursing organizations. *Journal of Korean Academy of Nursing Administration*, 26(1), 80-90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jkana.2020.26.1.80>
53. Kim, J. Y., Lee, J., Chung, Y. J., & Kim, K. H. (2017). Development and validation of a job-related affective evaluation scale using electroencephalography. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 357.
54. Koenig, G., Lafontaine, D., & Pochet, P. (2018). Organizational climate and employee motivation: An empirical study. *Personnel Review*, 47(5), 1114-1134. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2017-0073>
55. Kokko, K., Korkalainen, A., Lyytinen, H., & Leppanen, P. H. (2016). Neural mechanisms of social communication are influenced by communication context and social facility. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 10, 427.
56. Kuipers, B. S., Higgs, M., Kickert, W., & Tummers, L. (2019). The effects of feedback from supervisors on employee satisfaction and commitment in public sector organizations. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 42(2), 134-146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2018.1489044>
57. Lee, J., & Kim, H. (2020). The influence of organizational culture and climate on creativity and

- innovative behavior in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 45, 148-158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.03.001>
58. Liao, Y., Shonkoff, E. T., & Dunton, G. F. (2017). The acute relationships between affect, physical feeling states, and physical activity in daily life: A review of current evidence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 677.
59. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
60. Matsumoto, D. (2002). *The handbook of culture and psychology*. Oxford University Press.
61. Matthews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R. D. (2002). *Emotional intelligence: Science and myth*. MIT Press.
62. Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3-31). Basic Books.
63. Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3-31). Basic Books.
64. Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3-31). Basic Books.
65. Mayer, J. D., Roberts, R. D., & Barsade, S. G. (2008). Human abilities: Emotional intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59, 507-536. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093646>
66. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological inquiry*, 15(3), 197-215.
67. Mishra, K., Boynton, L., & Mishra, A. (2013). Driving employee engagement: The role of leadership style, generational cohorts, and job tenure. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(3), 358-365.
68. Nielsen, M. B., Nielsen, G. H., & Notelaers, G. (2015). Workplace bullying and organizational climate: A conceptual framework and empirical investigation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(3), 499-517. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12094>
69. Prati, L. M., Douglas, C., Ferris, G. R., Ammeter, A. P., & Buckley, M. R. (2003). Emotional intelligence, leadership effectiveness, and team outcomes. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 11(1), 21-40. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb028956>
70. Ramzan, M., Arif, M., & Zafar, A. (2018). Impact of organizational culture and climate on employees' job satisfaction: Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Business and Economics*, 9(3), 77-91. [https://doi.org/10.15341/jbe\(2155-7950\)/09.03.2018/005](https://doi.org/10.15341/jbe(2155-7950)/09.03.2018/005)
71. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial*

Psychology, 21(7), 600-619.

72. Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185-211. <https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG>
73. Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 361-388. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143809>
74. Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy
75. Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.