

Preparation and Validation of Iranian Police Job Satisfaction Inventory (IPJSI)

Ebrahim Alizadeh *
PhD student of Psychometry
Allame Tabatabaei University

Ali mohammad Rezaei, Ph.D.
Department of Educational Psychology
Semnan University

Ali mohammad Ahmadvand, Ph.D.
Department of Management
Emam Hossein University

Hamid Reza Hatami, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
Emam Hossein University

Objectives: The present research aims to prepare an Iranian Police Job Satisfaction Inventory (IPJSI) by using Confirmative Factor Analysis as well as to evaluate the validity and reliability of it. **Method:** A Group consisting of 2933 Iranian police employees chosen by Stratified Random Sampling method from a number of police departments throughout the country completed the IPJS inventories. Validity of the model was examined using a structural validation method (Confirmatory Factor Analysis). Reliability of the IPJSI proposed was also investigated by using Test-Retest method along with internal consistency method of Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient. **Results:** The confirmative factor analysis indicated that 45 questions of the proposed inventory formed 15 distinct factors. Test-retest method, the reliability factors of the IPJSI were identified as ranging between 0.61 to 0.84 for all the existing subscales and 0.73 for whole Inventory. Otherwise, using the internal consistency method of Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient, the reliability factors of the proposed IPJSI were calculated ranging between 0.57 to 0.70 for all the existing subscales and 0.91 for whole Inventory. **Discussion:** Iranian organizations are recommended to use IPJSI instead of prevalent Job Satisfaction Inventories such as Job Descriptive Index Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Unfortunately, such tools are not able to assess the police staff's Job Satisfaction correctly.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Validation, Police, Iran.

Job Satisfaction means quality of human resources, which would face good results for an organization in case of having suitable management. It means an individual's overall view of his/her job that leads to increase in productivity, organization commitment, quality and quantity of work, and makes good human relationship at workplace, and creates appropriate relationships, and at the same time, increases morality and interest in work within organizations (Robbins, 1999). According to the researches carried out in this regard, job satisfaction leads to a lot of behavioral and organizational outcomes. Results of the researches also show that there are some correlations between job satisfaction and job function (Spector, 1997), body and

mental health (Coll & Freeman, 1997), job exhaustion (Razza, 1993), role ambiguity, role conflict (Sager, 1994; Jackson & Randal, 1985; Fisher & Gitelson, 1983), and absence (Farrell & Stamm, 1988), job leave (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Arnold & Feldman, 1982; Bluedorn, 1982; Mobley, 1982). Due to the importance role which staff's job satisfaction play in an organization's productivity (Chandan, 1977), this concept now have a special place in the superior models, which define characteristics and standards of an excellent organization. In business excellence models of "European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM)", which is deemed to be the main criterion for winning the prize of productivity and quality among Iranian organizations, the same character can be seen. Furthermore, organizations should constantly review and assess their evaluation of their staff's job satisfaction in different aspects at regular time intervals (Najmi and Hosseini, 2004). These aspects are as follows:

*Corresponding author: Ebrahim Alizadeh
PhD student of Psychometry, Allame Tabatabaei
University, Tehran, Iran.
Email: Ab-alizade@yahoo.com

1- Career development, 2-Organization communication, 3- Empowerment, 4- Equal opportunities, 5-Involvement, 6-Leadership, 7- Opportunity to learn and make assessment, 8-- Recognition, 9-Target setting and appraisal, 10-- Organization's values, mission, vision, policy and strategy, 11- Organization administration, 13- Employment conditions, 14-Facilities and services, 15- Health and safety conditions, 16- Job security, 17-Pays and benefits, 18- Peers' relationships, 19- Management of changes, 20-Work environment. Evaluating and measuring staff's job satisfaction lead to special considerable outcomes. Besides, paying attention to technical issues provides chances to make an exact and comprehensive plan for improving staff's job satisfaction as well as function of an organization. Obviously, using non-credible tools and acceptable reliability would divert an organization's senior management from its false way to determine staff's satisfaction and priorities. At the present time, Iranian organizations use some prevalent Job Satisfaction Inventories such as Job Descriptive Index (Smith & et.al, 1969), Inventory of Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lofquist & Dawis, 1969), Measurement Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1985). It is unfortunately said that these tools are not able to apply a correct appraisal of Iranian police staff's job satisfaction to business excellence models, as these inventories are not designed to be used in this model. So, an Iranian police needs a native inventory so as to be able to clarify the differences existing between staffs and organization units in relation to their job satisfaction as well as to determine the situation and trend of indexes.

Considering the points aforementioned, now we are able to know the reason to design a satisfaction inventory for Iranian police staffs. The present paper describes the designing process of this inventory.

Method

The statistic population considered to validate the final inventory consists of all employed Iranian police staffs in 2008. Regarding geographic distribution of Iranian police staffs throughout Iran, some staffs were determined (at the needed ratio) to be present in the statistical sample in all provinces, so the stratified random sampling method has been used (Hamidzadeh, 1995). As current formulas cannot be used in order to validate the models using factors analysis method, we have used some methods to determine the sample size based on factor analysis method (Kline, 1994). So, the minimum sample size to be determined was 2020 persons (at a specified ratio; 20 persons for each question). But due to the dense statistical population within the provinces, the

inventories were distributed among the staff in much larger numbers (3020), and at last, 2933 inventories were completed. Among these, about 97 percent, which were without any defect, were collected and set as base for data analysis. Based on the descriptive findings relevant to the respondents to the inventory, males and females formed 96 and 4 percent of the statistical population, respectively. Their average age was 35, with the standard deviation of 7.42 year. Average record of service work was 13.3 year, with the standard deviation of 7.9 year.

Inventory designing

Preparation and validation of the job satisfaction inventory consists of four stages as following:

In the first stage, we were obligated to define subscales for job satisfaction. For this purpose, factors and indexes of job satisfaction designed by Alizadeh (2005, 2006) were used. His design was based on perception measures along with the criteria of seven models of European Foundation for Quality Management as well as, a model for appraisal of staff's view of results of people results. The model consists of 20 factors each having three indexes. It was handed over to some of Iranian police experts for revision. They increased the number of model indexes from 60 to 99. Twenty fold factors and 99 fold indexes will be explained here: the first factor (career development): its satisfactory value shows needed facilities and opportunities to progress at job level consisting of five indexes: 1- clearance, 2- notification, 3- guidance, 4- job rotation, and 5- promotion equality chance.

The second factor (organization communication): it refers to staff's satisfaction from the way and quality of talk (transferring idea and understanding intensions) between staff and superior managers of the company, which consists of six indexes: 1-management commitment, 2-face to face meeting, 3- respecting ideas, 4-notification, 5- responsibility to answer, and 6-trust. The third factor (empowerment): it means skill, acknowledgement, information, required authority (power) and support all should be available to staff in a suitable way so that they could do their activities to create a defined efficiency. It, consists of six indexes: 1- pattern making, 2- support, 3- job proportion, 4- data propagation, 5- preparing resources and 6- job identity.

The Fourth factor (equal opportunities in organization): it refers to the point whether regulations and rules on organization's benefits and advantages, regardless of job positions, are equally performed and implemented for all staff. The factor, consisting of proficiency, acknowledgment, information, required authority and support, should be available to staff in a suitable way so that they could perform all required

activities to reach their purpose of working. This factor has five indexes: 1-education equality 2- employment equality, 3- Meritocracy, 4- equality in obeying the law, 5- equal distribution. The fifth factor (involvement): it refers to satisfaction from encouraging, persuading and contribution of staff to decision making and being involved in activities related to organizational benefits. It consists of four indexes: 1-participating in decision making processes, 2- target setting, 3- team forming and 4- finding a way to get out of difficulty.

The sixth factor: (leadership): it refers to staff's satisfactory of function and behavior of their immediate superiors in every work unites. It consists of six indexes: 1- fair behavior, 2- humility, 3- courtesy, and 4- determining requirements, 5- pattern and 6- checking difficulties. The seventh factor (opportunity to learn and make assessment): It refers to staff's satisfaction of available opportunities created by organization so that susceptible and interested staff could perform works in a way that they didn't do before. So they would be able to actualize their potential talents and abilities. This factor consists of three indexes 1- team work, 2- challenged obligations and 3- free will. The eighth factor (recognition): it refers to staff's satisfaction of the way and quality of encouragement and recognition of organization in lieu of their function. This factor consists of four indexes: 1- function, 2- proportionate, 3- continuity and 4- comprehensiveness. The ninth factor (target setting and making appraisal): it refers to target setting and appraisal of staff's function. It consists of four indexes: 1- clearness of standards, 2- notification of standards, 3- fair appraisal and 4- feedback. The tenth factor (organization's values, mission, vision, policy and strategy): it refers to staff's satisfaction of the quality and way of meeting organization's values, mission, vision, policy and strategy. It consists of six indexes: 1- clearness, 2- view of future, 3- sustainable development, 4- being applicability, 5- management commitment and 6- defining responsibility. The eleventh factor (training and development): it refers to organization's planned attempts to simplify staff's learning on job skills, to develop it, and also to insist upon using them in their daily activities. It consists of six indexes: 1- quality of courses, 2- adaptation to job requirements, 3- sustainability, 4- quality of tools, 5- development of skills and 6- training for work. The twelfth factor (organization's administration): it refers to staff's satisfaction of administrative and personnel services offered to staff (employment, extending work contract, changing contract conditions, displacement and transferring, mission, issuing orders, promotions and pay conformity, meeting discipline obligations, calculating overtime work, mission pay). It consists of

four indexes: 1- notification, 2- quickness, 3- accuracy, and 4- communication.

The thirteenth factor (employment condition): it refers to staff's satisfaction from adaptation of job to their personal traits. It consists of five indexes: 1- adaptation of job to acknowledge, 2- adaptation of job to individual's personality, 3- adaptation of job to individual's interests, 4- adaptation of job to working group ideas, and 5- adaptation of job to individual's wishes. The fourteenth factor (facilities and services): it refers to staff's satisfactory of organization's facilities and services (recreational facilities, loans, traveling as tourist and pilgrim, medical services, assistance, consumer cooperative). It consists of four indexes 1- sufficiency, 2- comprehensiveness, 3- regularity and 4- quickness. The fifteenth factor (health and safety conditions): it refers to staff's satisfaction of bodily and mental health as well as safety conditions. It consists of five indexes: 1-office furniture, 2- safety training, 3- role balance, 4- role clearness, and 5- role conflict. The sixteenth factor: (job security): it means gaining satisfaction by having a secured job that is possessed by an employee for several years so that it would not be cut due to an unexpected event. It consists of three indexes: 1- organization's viewpoint, 2- job prestige, 3- job continuity. The seventeenth factor (pay and benefits): it refers to staff's satisfaction of monthly pay and benefit, leaving with pay, life insurance as well as other cash and non-cash benefits. It consists of four indexes: 1- sufficiency, 2- equality, 3- fairness and 4- justifiability. The eighteenth factor (peers' relationships): it refers to staff's satisfaction of making relationships and maintaining positive interactions with colleagues. It consists of six indexes: 1- honesty, 2- support, 3- courtesy, 4- forgiveness, 5- humility and avoiding curiosity. The nineteenth factor: (management of change): it refers to staff's satisfaction of quality and way of organization's programs for making changes. It consists of six indexes: 1- clear records, 2- defect of problem, 3- appraisals, 4- notification, 5- being based on program, and 6- support. The Twentieth factor (work environment): it refers to staff's satisfaction of suitable temperature degree, cleanness, light, sound, paint, largeness and situation of workplace. It consists of seven indexes: 1- temperature, 2- cleanness, 3- light, 4- sound, 5- paint, 6- largeness, and 7- facilities. In the second stage, only one statement was written so as to evaluate each index of the model. The statements for every factor were randomly inserted into the inventory. The draft inventory had 99 items according to likert scale, and volunteers should choose one from four options. The scores 4, 3, 2, and 1 were defined as absolutely agree, agree, disagree and absolutely disagree, respectively. In the third stage, the primary inventory was

completed by 200 staff who were chosen using random sampling method. They were requested to state their comments on intelligibility of statements. After collecting the inventories and their analysis in primary form of statements, some adjustments were performed. Consequently, some changes were made in writing structure and word ordering of them. In the fourth stage, using the data acquired by analyzing the primary inventory, the intermediate inventory was designed, and the process of validating the inventory was started by distributing them among the final statistical population.

In order to make a distribute, complete and collect the final inventories suitably and correctly, the volunteers in provinces were justified during a one-day training workshop. They were also given some necessary guide directions. According to this method, the inventories were handed over to the volunteers after they came to start the job. No explanation on inventory was given to them as some explanations were presented in the first part of the inventory. They were recommended to carefully read the inventory, and all of the questions and then to choose the correct answer. Also there was no time limitation for completing the inventory. After collecting and reviewing the inventories, at last 2933 inventories were coded and input to computer and then analyzed using the statistical softwares SPSS 10 and LIZREL 8 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993).

Results

The research findings are available in two parts. some findings relevant to reliability of the designed inventory, and other findings relevant to validity of the designed inventory.

Internal consistency

In order to determine the rate of internal consistency for each factor to evaluate Iranian police staff's job satisfaction, the alpha coefficient method was used, as the inventory did not have true or false choices and volunteers were obligated to choose their answers from four leveled answers. As a result, this method was identified to be suitable to conduct such a research. Before calculating the internal consistency coefficient, three indexes were decided to be maintained for each factor and the other indexes, which had low discriminative coefficient in comparison with the other ones had omitted so as to prepare a small model with the lowest index rate. In other words, the present research tried to shorten the final model and also and at the final inventory by maintaining the reliability and validity at a suitable and acceptable rate, as a large number of the staff had no motivation, patience and enough time to complete long

inventories (Russell, Peplau, and Ferguson, 1978). Therefore, shortening inventory led to increase in efficiency of applicability and distinctively as well as to strengthen it by maintaining the reliability at a suitable level (Anastasi, 1982). Also as an accepted rule, management and administration models which have minimum indexes were considered as more applicable and economical.

So, among the 99 indexes designed for all the factors, 54 were omitted from the model and inventory due to their low convergence into the indexes. The omitted indexes are as follows:

- 1- The indexes clearness and notification from the factor "career development".
- 2- The indexes management commitment and face to face meeting and information from the factor "organization communication".
- 3- The indexes data propagation, preparation of resources, and job identity from the factor "empowerment".
- 4- The indexes education equality and employment equality from the factor "equal opportunities in organization".
- 5- The index "finding a way to get out of difficulty" from the factor "involvement".
- 6- The indexes humility, courtesy and checking difficulties the factor "leadership".
- 7- The index comprehensiveness from the factor "recognition".
- 8- The index fair appraisal from the factor "targets setting and making appraisal".
- 9- The indexes clearness, management commitment and defining responsibility from the factor "organization's values, mission, vision, policy and strategy".
- 10- The indexes quality of courses, sustainability and quality of tools from the factor "training and development".
- 11- The index accuracy from the factor "organization's administration".
- 12- The index adaptation of job to individual's knowledge and adaptation of job to individual's interests from the factor "employment condition".
- 13- The index regularity from the factor "facilities and services".
- 14- The indexes office furniture in workplace and role balance from the factor "health and safety conditions".
- 15- The index fairness from the factor "pay and benefits".
- 16- The indexes support, forgiveness, and avoiding curiosity from the factor "peers' relationships".
- 17- The indexes support, notification and appraisal from the factor "management of change".
- 18- The indexes temperature, cleanness, largeness and facilities from the factor "work environment".

Before calculating alpha coefficient for the whole inventory, reviewing the discriminative coefficient of it indicated that the five factors: 1- the organization's values, mission, vision, policy and strategy, 2- organization's administration, 3- employment condition, 4- health and safety conditions, and 5- job security, have much lesser discriminative coefficients and cannot be distinguished between the staffs having high and low job satisfaction. In other words, these factors do not affect Iranian police staff's job satisfaction, so, are omitted to calculate the internal consistency of the whole inventory. After omitting those indexes that have no effect on Iranian police staff's job satisfaction, internal consistency coefficient was calculated for each factor. Results obtained related to the reliability in internal consistency method is as follows: the reliability for the factor "career development" is 0.57, for the factor "organization Communication", 0.63; for the factor "empowerment", 0.57, for the factor "creating equal opportunities in organization" 0.57, for the factor "involvement", 0.58, for the factor "leadership", 0.69 for the factor "opportunity to learn and make appraisal", 0.57, for the factor "recognition", 0.69, for the factor "target setting and making appraisal" 0.58, for the factor "training and development", 0.60, for the factor "facilities and services", 0.67, for the factor "pay and benefits", 0.70, for the factor "peers' relationships", 0.63, for the factor "management of change", 0.69, and for the factor "work environment" 0.56. So, all of the indexes designed in Iranian police staff's job satisfaction model, had a suitable consistency (all of the 15 factors having 45 indexes), totally were analyzed to determine the internal consistency. Consistency coefficient of the whole inventory was calculated 0.91.

Reliability in test-retests method

Test-retest is the simplest and most logical method for evaluating test reliability (Saif, 2005). In this method, a test is performed in two stages for same persons and then, the results are correlated (Allen & Yen, 1979). For this purpose, final version of inventory is completed by 46 staffs (chosen randomly) after a two-week interval. Then, Pearson coefficient among the scores obtained from the two tests are calculated so as to make an evaluation.

Accordingly, the obtained reliability coefficient is as follows: reliability coefficient for the factor "career development" is 0.65, for the factor "organization Communication", 0.79, for the factor "empowerment", 0.66, for the factor "creating equal opportunities in organization" 0.78, for the factor "involvement", 0.61, for the factor "Leadership", 0.78, for the factor

"opportunity to learn and make appraisal", 0.72, for the factor "recognition", 0.80, for the factor "target setting and making appraisal" 0.74, for the factor "training and development", 0.72, for the factor "facilities and services" 0.84, for the factor "pay and benefits", 0.75, for the factor "peers' relationships", 0.71, for the factor "management of change", 0.72, for the factor "work environment", 0.63, and finally for the whole inventory is 0.73 ($p < 0.001$).

Factorial validity

Factorial validity is a form of structural validity which is calculated by Factor analysis. In this way, it is possible to detect the factors or main structures of a tool (Allen & Yen, 1979). The basic assumption for using this method is existing a basic pattern or special model for determining relationship between variables. The relationship appears in form a factor in the assumed model. Also, correlations existing between variables are related to the structure reflecting them. So, in order to accept the validity of a model and, thus, validate the variables of the relevant structure, it is necessary to verify the coordination among them. Among different methods for studying the internal structure of a collection of variables, confirmative factors analysis is probably the most useful one that is based on parameter estimating and hypothesis testing, in relation to numbers of basic factors of the relationships existing between collections of variables (Hooman, 2001). Before carrying out the factor analysis for determining the suitability of indexes of each inventory scale for factor analysis, the correlation coefficient criteria for every question along with total score of relevant scale are used. The collected data showed that all of the indexes could discriminate between staff in terms of their job satisfaction as the number of factors were predicted in advance of doing factor analysis. In other words, inventory questions are prepared and designed according to a theatrically frame of 20 factors. Of these, 5 factors are omitted due to having low discriminative coefficients, and then the obtained data are analyzed so as to evaluate the fitness of the 15 factors existing in the model. To determine the fitness of the model by using confirmative factor analysis method, the correlation matrix of inventory was calculated. Also, in data analysis for all 15 factors, 3 variables were defined as free and the others were considered as fixed. In order to estimate parameter of indexes and model factors of correlation matrix in the next stage, Maximum Likelihood Method was used. Eigen values estimated by maximum likelihood indicated that all of the indexes have noticeable correlation with its factor and are able to assess their factors well. It should be explained that factor loading

of most of the items in the inventory was larger than 0.35. This ensures all subjects' success in assessing their factors.

Table 1

Goodness of fit statistics of the model and Iranian police job satisfaction inventory

Goodness of fit statistics	Amount
Minimum Fit Function Chi – Square	9006
Root Mean Square Residual(RMR)	0.09
Standardized Root Mean Square Residual(SRMR)	0.09
Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)	0.86
Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index(AGFI)	0.84
Normed Fit Index (NFI)	0.94
Non – Normed Fit Index (NNFI)	0.95
Incremental Fit Index (IFI)	0.95
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	0.95
Parsimony Normed Fit Index (PNFI)	0.91
Root Mean Square Error of Approximation(RMSEA)	0.059

It is noteworthy that confirmative factor analysis used to determine how much models are fitted to data and how much covariance of the variables and several goodness of statistical fit are available. These statistics test all parameters, and, at the same time, determine which model is better to explain the relationships existing between the observed variables and latent traits (Hooman, 2008). Table. 1 shows the goodness of fit statistics of the proposed IPJSI.

Here are some explanations for the indexes and related interpretations:

1- Minimum Fit Function Chi–Square index: Minimum Fit Function Chi–Square quantity is an index for null hypothesis of the model to be acceptable in statistical population. It means that model is not acceptable for the data related to the statistical population. So, high and low quantity indicates bad fitness and good fitness, respectively. Minimum Fit Function Chi–Square index is influenced by sample size, as if it increases, Chi–Square reaches a meaningful level and as a result, and the model will be rejected. If sample size is decreased, it is possible for the models with absolute differences to be acceptable. So, when sample size is among 75 to 200, Chi–Square index is a reasonable quantity for fitness. For models with bigger size, Chi–Square index is statistically meaningful and the issue is different from the situation in which confirmative analysis with high size is recommended to be carried out (Hooman, 2008 & 2001). So, it is suggested to use Minimum Fit Function Chi–Square index as a guide (Kline, 1994). In this research, Chi–Square index calculated using LIZREL software is 9006.

2- RMR index: this index is the second root of mean square root of differences implicit and observed correlations. For this index varying between zero and one, there would be no cut of point and so its figure should be small as much as possible (Kline, 1994). In

this research, RMR index has been calculated using LIZREL software is 0.09.

3-SRMR index: This index is more meaningful when amounts are standard as in this case, it has a common metric scale and the remaining have approximately same meaning. SRMR index is equal to the difference in mean between forecasted and observed variance. Also, the covariance in model is based on the standard remaining and it is equal to zero when the model is totally fitted. Having zero is nearly impossible in the actual situation; this index should be near to zero as much as possible. In this research, SRMR index calculated using LIZREL software is 0.09.

4- GFI index: This index is equal to sum of square roots of differences between observed variations. For this index whose quantity varies between zero and one, there would be no statistical test and as much as the index gets closer to one, fitness becomes better and the model has better fitness to the existing data (Kline, 1994). This index can be considered as a characteristic similar to square root coefficient of correlation in multiple regressions (Hooman, 2001). In this research, GFI index calculated using LIZREL software is 0.86.

5- AGFI index: quantity of this index is similar to GFI between zero and one, since it more reveals its fit model (Hooman, 2008). In this research, AGFI index calculated using LIZREL software is 0.84.

6- NFI index: If this index is among 0.90 to 0.95, we can consider it as acceptable. It would be also excellent at the amount 0.95. Being affected by the model parameters are counted as one of its defect, so whenever more parameters are added, the index will be bigger. In this research, NFI index calculated using LIZREL software is 0.94.

7- NNFI index: This index is described as NFI. If it is among 0.95 to 0.90, it will be acceptable. In this

research, NNFI index calculated using LIZREL software is 0.95.

8- IFI index: This index is similar to NFI index. In this research, IFI index calculated using LIZREL software is 0.95

9- CFI index: Actually this index compares fitness of the present model with the null model, in which available latent variables in the model are assumed to be uncorrelated together. In this research, CFI index calculated using LIZREL is 0.95.

10-PNFI index: Like IFI, this index should be near to one as much as possible so that the desired model can be accepted. In this research, PNFI index calculated using LIZREL software is 0.91.

11- RMSEA index: For models with suitable fitness, it is less than 0.05, so whenever it is more than 0.08, it indicates reasonable errors for approximation at a variable statistical population. Models whose RMSEA is 0.1 (or more), have weak fitness. As a cut of point, 0.06 (or less) is acceptable for model fitness. This index is less affected by sample size and so is more noticeable. In this research, RMSEA index calculated using LIZREL software is 0.059.

Discussion

Regarding internal consistency coefficient of the three items for each factor, the obtained coefficient was notable, as Hair & et.al (1998, page 118) believe that Alpha coefficient more than 0.6 for scales in their development process would be satisfactory and acceptable. Also we should pay attention to the fact that internal consistency coefficient is affected by number of questions. Increase in number of questions leads to increase in amount of the coefficient (Pashasharifi, 1998). So referring to the obtained findings, we may conclude that collection of each factor has an acceptable internal consistency. Besides, findings of the research indicated that the reliability of the inventory was acceptable in the test-retest method. The obtained results of Factorial validity shows that the whole goodness of fit indexes has got suitable situation and IPJSI of factorial 15 and 45 items are saturated and all issues have factor loading whereas predictable. Due to its characteristics, IPJSI is distinguished from other job satisfaction inventories in Iran. Firstly, the designed inventory covers all views and effective fields on job satisfactory factors related to the "European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM)". Secondly, every statements of inventory are acquired by a defined index and so management of job satisfactory is based on the theory frame. Also, the existing inventory is a native one and ensures more correlation and coordination with Iranian police's situation.

Finally, considering the results obtained related to the reliability and validity for inventory and referring to performing time (maximum 15 minutes), performance method (individually and in group) and simple scoring and review of the results as one of the most important advantages of tools for measurements, it can be said that the proposed inventory is a fairly suitable tool for measuring Iranian police staff's job satisfaction although it should be further developed in the future

References

- Alizadeh, E. (2005). *The Construction and validation job satisfaction model staffs sepah bank on the basis of EFQM*. Unpublished report. Iran: Sepah Bank.
- Alizadeh, E. (2006). The Construction and validation job satisfaction model staffs sepah bank on the basis of EFQM. *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Human Resources Development*. PP 292-299. Iran: Tehran.
- Allen, M & Yen, W. (1979). *Introduction to Measurement Theory*. Monterey, CA: Brook/Cole.
- Anastasi, A. (1982). *Psychological Testing (5 the Ed.)*. New York: Mac Millan.
- Arnold, H.J., & Feldman, D.C. (1982). A multivariate analysis of the determinants of job turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(3), 350-360.
- Bluedorn, A.C. (1982). A unified model of turnover from organization. *Human Relation*, 35(2):135-153.
- Chandan, J.S. (1997). *Organizational Behavior*. New Dehli Vikas Publishing House LTD, pp206.
- Coll.K.M. & Freeman.B. (1997). Role Conflict among Elementary School Counselors. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling*, 31, 251-261.
- Cotton, J.L., & Tuttle, j.f. (1986). Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implication for research. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(1), 55-70.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1970). *Essentials of Psychological Testing (3 rd Ed.)*. New York: Harper and Row International.
- Farrell, D., & Stamm, C.L. (1988). Meta-analysis of the correlates of employee absence. *Human Relation*, 41,211-227.
- Fisher, D., & Gitelson, R. (1983). " A Meta-Analysis of the Correlates of Role Conflict and Ambiguity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 320-333.
- Hair, J.F. & Anderson, R.E., & Tatham, R.L., & Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis (Fifth Edition)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hamidzadeh, M. (1995). *Applied Statistics*. Iran: Majed.
- Hooman, H.A. (2001). *Multivariate Data Analysis in Scientific Research*. Iran: Parsa.
- Hooman, H.A (2008). *Structural Equation Modeling with Lisrel Application*. Iran: Samt.
- Jackson, S.E., & Randal.S.S.(1985). "A Meta-Analysis and Conceptual Critique of Research on Role Ambiguity and Role Conflict in Work Settings," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 36, 16-78.

- Jöreskog, K. & Sörbom, D., (1993), *LISREL 8: Structural Equation Modelling with the SIMPLIS Command Language*, SSI Inc., Chicago.
- Kline, P. (1994). *An Easy Guide to Factor Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Lofquist, L.H., & Dawis, R.V. (1969). *Adjustment to work: A psychological view of man's problems in a work-oriented society*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Mobley, W.H. (1982). *Employee Turnover: Causes, Consequences, and Control Reading, MA*. Addison-Wesley.
- Najmi, M & Hosseini, S. (2004). *Models of "European Foundation for Quality Management, From Idea to Application*. Iran: Ronas.
- Pashasharifi, H. (1998). *Principles of Psychometric*. Iran: Roshd.
- Razza, N. (1993). Determinants of direct-care staff turnover in group homes for individual with mental retardation. *Mental Retardation*, 31, 284-291.
- Robbins, S. (1999). *Organizational Behavior, Concepts Controversies Applications*. Prentice Hall.
- Russell, D., & Peplau, L.A., & Ferguson, M.L. (1978). Developing a measure of loneliness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 42, 290 – 294.
- Sager, J.K. (1994). "A Structural Model Depicting Salespeople's Job Stress. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22, 74-85.
- Saif, A.A. (2005). *Educational Measurement, Assessment and Evaluation*. Iran: Doran.
- Smith, P.C. & Kendal, M., & Hulin, C.L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713.
- Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction*, Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage.

Received: 21 / 10/ 2013

Accepted: 27 / 01/ 2014