

## **Job Satisfaction, Job Fairness, and Job Evaluation as an Initial Step of Reward Management System Development: The Implementation of Quality of Work Life Concept**

**L. Verina Halim Secapramana<sup>a\*</sup>**  
**Heidi Patricia<sup>b</sup>**  
**Eko Nugroho<sup>c</sup>**

<sup>a,b,c</sup>Master of Professional Psychology Program, Faculty of Psychology, University of Surabaya, Indonesia

### **Abstract**

Quality of work life is an important concept that determines happiness in human life as well as job satisfaction that supports to increased motivation, organizational commitment, and work productivity. One factor that affects the level of job satisfaction is job fairness. Distributive and procedural justice are strong predictors of the fairness felt by employees. The intervention aims to increase fairness and job satisfaction through job evaluations that produce job grading as the beginning of the reward management system. This intervention is also an implementation of the concept of quality of work life that will be applied in the company. This study applies an action research using quantitative and qualitative methods at the same time (mix-method). A total of 79 job holders in 13 divisions at a head office became participants. In the pre-assessment stage, measurement of quality of work life is carried out, in the assessment stage, job satisfaction and job fairness measurements are taken. The results revealed that in the intervention stage a job description is reviewed as part of the job analysis and job evaluation using the Hay method to produce job grading can significantly increase the mechanisms of rewards system. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

### **Keywords**

Quality of work life; job satisfaction; job fairness; job evaluation; job grading; hay method

Received: 9 September 2019; Accepted: 12 November 2019; Published Online: 31 December 2019

DOI: 10.21776/ub.apmba.2019.008.02.1

### **Introduction**

Quality of life is an important factor that determines human happiness. Work is also an important part of modern human life. If the average work time is seven to eight hours a day, it means that one third of our lives are spent at work. So you can imagine what will happen in our lives if we cannot

feel happiness in daily activities at work. Work and organization in the context of modern life are relatively more complex than before. People not only need to pay for their daily lives, but also look for other things in their work life, such as work environment, job fairness, opportunities to develop themselves, relationships with superiors and co-workers, social activities,

\*Corresponding author Email: [verina@staff.ubaya.ac.id](mailto:verina@staff.ubaya.ac.id)

all of which are closely related relation to quality of work life. Salmani (in Farabakhs, 2012) stated Qulaity of work life as workers' reactions to their work and how the context of work and mental health at work, experience in organizations, and opportunities to develop individual self can be adjusted to personal needs. Layer, Karwowski, and Furr (2009) indirectly describe the quality of work life as individual workers' perceptions of the level of supervision, empowerment, job satisfaction, and opportunities for learning in an organization. These two meanings reveal the importance of an individual's perception of a job, and also the role of the organization in the individual being felt in his work, as stated by Hackman and Oldhams (in Rethinam & Ismail, 2008), namely the interaction between the work environment and individual personal needs. Greenberg and Baron (in Farahbakhsh, 2012) say that not only for the personal interests of individual workers, but Quality of Work life is also the most important contributing factor to organizational development, so as to create a more democratic work atmosphere and increase organizational work performance. Companies with a good quality of work life will look more attractive for workers to join or survive in an organization (Kanten & Sadullah, 2012).

Quality of work life is a construct that is multidimensional in nature. According to the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living Conditions (2002), dimensions included in it are: job satisfaction, job involvement, motivation, productivity, health, safety and well-being, job security, competence development, and the balance between work and personal life (Rethinam & Ismail, 2008). This research will focus on the dimensions of job satisfaction, based on pre-assessment results. Job satisfaction felt by employees should be one of the

important considerations of the company because of its strong correlation with commitment to the organization, the quality and quantity of work productivity (Ganguly, 2010; Celik, 2011; Chitra & Mahalakshmi, 2012). Job fairness is an important factor that determines job satisfaction. VanYperen, et. al .. (2000) and El-Hajji (2011) stated that when employees consider a decision as fair, it will have an impact on the emergence of satisfaction and increase a sense of acceptance and motivation to produce a better work performance.

PT. X as one of the developing companies is a private company engaged in manufacturing, especially in the field of building construction. Along with the reasonably high economic growth and rapid development of the construction sector, particularly infrastructure and property development, this company participated in the business of providing construction materials such as ready-to-use concrete, Masonry and Machine-Breaking Stone / Base Coarse concrete products, as well as other building materials made from cement. It has several branch offices namely in Gresik, Tuban, Solo, Makassar, Purwokerto, Yogyakarta, Pandaan, and Semarang. The company realizes the importance of applying the concept of quality of work life as one of the capital to prepare themselves in global competition, while responding to changes that occur in meeting human needs in this modern era. The management also realizes the importance of giving rights and rewards in accordance with the productivity demanded by employees so there is a mutual relationship exist. In fact, employees are more concerned with demands rather than fulfilling the responsibilities imposed by the company. Employees always demand salary increases, incentives, and bonuses, without being followed by increased performance. Thus the employees still need to be educated.

The company also continues to strive to always improve the existing system and values.

Regarding the issue of job satisfaction and reward systems, information was obtained from the Head of Staff Section, that there was often talk among employees about the injustice of reward. Preliminary data collection shows that there is no standard, especially in the financial sector such as the amount of salary earned when compared with other positions, benefits, bonuses, and non-financial fields such as promotion, so that there is a lack of job satisfaction felt by employees. From these statements, it can be concluded that in order to achieve employee job satisfaction, one important thing that needs to be considered is fairness in the payroll structure which is reflected in the reward system applied by the organization (Corominas, Coves, Lusa, & Martinez, 2008). The company is currently changing the reward system of the company. The current system still provides rewards based on the length of work of employees, so that rewards in the form of Umroh are given to employees who are already senior. The company realizes the importance of rewards to support increased performance, so that system changes are arranged, and that rewards are given to employees who do have good performance.

Based on these considerations, this research will focus on developing a reward management system by providing logical considerations in reward system related to a sense of justice and job satisfaction. Low job satisfaction will result in low employee motivation to produce good performance, because the work environment is considered ineffective to develop its potential (Freedman in Danish & Usman, 2010; Khalid, Salim & Locke, 2011, Galanou et al, 2014). Quality of work life is a concept that

is closely related to the welfare of members of the organization as a whole, which leads to job satisfaction as a result, and includes the effects of the workplace on job satisfaction, satisfaction in life, personal happiness and subjective well-being (Otto and Bourget, 2006, referring to Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel et al. 2001). For this reason, job evaluation needs to be done first as one method that can be used to manage salary structure.

## Research Methods

This research focuses on developing a reward management system to meet job satisfaction, which begins with a job evaluation at the head office. This study uses an action research approach, which is a method designed with the aim of improving an implementation process and consists of the stages of action, evaluation, and critical reflection (Koshy, Koshy, & Waterman, 2011). Arnold, Cooper, and Robertson (2004, referring to Lewin, 1946) used the term action research to describe research in which researchers and research subjects jointly participated. Action research is intended not only to solve problems faced by research subjects, but also to increase knowledge about the topic being studied.


The population in this study were all management staff and employees of the central office (positions of Head of Department, Section Chief, and Team Leader in 13 divisions). The research sample was determined by the incidental sampling method with 79 positions.

This research consists of three stages. The pre-assessment stage was carried out by measuring quality of work life through questionnaires, FGDs and SWOT analysis. The assessment phase carried out measurements of job satisfaction and job

fairness. At the intervention stage a job evaluation is performed as one method for managing salary structure, which includes 3 measurement factors, namely know-how, accountability, and problem solving. As a final result, data and formulations are obtained to improve the existing management reward system, so that it is more directed at efforts to improve the

welfare of employees and members of the organization, as an implication of the concept of quality of work life. Thus this study uses a mixed method design, which is a merger between quantitative and qualitative research methods.

The flow of the research process can be described as shown in Figure 1.



**Figure 1. Flow of the Research Process**

## Results and Discussion

### *Results of the Pre-assessment Phase*

**Table 1. QWL Pre-assessment Category Results Per Dimension on the Employees**

Dimension	Health & Well Being		Job Security		Job Satisfaction		Competency Development		Work & Non-work Life Balance	
Category	Frequency	%	Frqc	%	Frqc	%	Frqc	%	Frqc	%
Very High	15	13.04	31	26.96	24	20.87	93	80.87	23	20
High	33	28.7	47	40.87	18	15.65	16	13.91	18	15.65
Moderate	29	25.22	32	27.83	29	25.22	2	1.74	32	27.83
Low	25	21.74	1	0.87	25	21.74	3	2.61	19	16.52
Very Low	13	11.3	4	3.48	19	16.52	1	0.87	23	
Total	115	100	115	100	115	100	115	100	115	100
Total QWL Value per Dimension	62.09		77.39		60.52		94.26		59.83	

From the measurement of the level of Quality of work life at this pre-assessment stage, it was concluded that job satisfaction is the second lowest QWL dimension after work and non-work life balance (60.52), so

it should be a priority in improving organizational systems as a whole, using the reference concept of Quality of Work life from EWON (2002).

**Table 2. Validity and Reliability of Job Satisfaction Measurement Tool**

No	Aspect	Reliability Alpha Cronbach	Information	Follow up	Reliability Result
1	Salary	0.610	Good	Maintained	0.702 (Good)
2	Promotion	0.406	Moderate	Maintained	
3	Supervision	0.579	Moderate	Eliminating items 5 & 23	
4	Benefit	0.448	Moderate	Maintained	0.692 (Good)
5	Contingency Reward	0.441	Moderate	Maintained	
6	Operational condition	0.491	Moderate	Maintained	
7	Co-workers	0.594	Moderate	Eliminating item 34	0.718 (Good)
8	Nature of work	0.674	Good	Eliminating item 19	
9	Communication	0.654	Good	Maintained	
10	General satisfaction	0.340	Low	Eliminating this aspect	

The total items that passed the validity and reliability tests on the job satisfaction scale were 24 items from the previous 40 items.

The total items that passed the validity and reliability tests on the job fairness scale were 12 items from the previous 15 items.

### *Results of the Assessment Phase*

**Table 3. The Job Satisfaction Level**

Category	Ideal Norm		Group Norms	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frqy	Percentage
Very Low	0	0 %	0	0 %
Low	1	1.3 %	9	11.69 %
Moderate	16	20.78 %	48	62.34 %
High	48	62.34%	16	20.78 %
Very High	12	15.58 %	4	5.19 %
TOTAL	77	100%	77	100 %

The majority of employees have a level of job satisfaction that is classified as moderate / sufficient, which is as much as 62.34%.

There are 25.97% of employees who are satisfied with their work.

**Table 4. Validity and Reliability of the Job Fairness Measurement Tool**

No	Aspect	Alpha Cronbach Reliability	Information
1	Distributive justice	0.736	Good
2	Procedural justice	0.727	Good
3	Interactional justice	0.660	Good

**Table 5. The Results of Job Fairness Level**

Category	Ideal Norms		Group Norms	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Very Low	0	0 %	1	1.3 %
Low	1	1.3 %	8	10.39 %
Moderate	18	23.38 %	44	57.14 %
High	46	59.74 %	21	27.27 %
Very High	12	15.58 %	3	3.90 %
TOTAL	77	100%	77	100 %

The majority of employees, as many as 57.14% felt that PT. X treats employees fairly enough.

Job Grades of the company is divided into several groups

**Table 6. The Job Grades Before Intervention**

Classification	Range	Grade
I	A up to I	9 grades
II	A up to H	8 grades
III	A up to E	5 grades
IV	A up to D	4 grades
V	A up to C	3 grades
<b>Total</b>		29 grades

The division of classes/levels/levels according to their position in accordance

with the rules of the company Chapter II article 2 on payroll is as below.

**Table 7. Grade Category and Job Level**

Job Level	Minimum Education Level	Job Grade
General Assistance, Test Objects Officer, Housekeeper, and other positions that do not require special skills / education	Senior High School / equivalent	IA
Pool Driver, C Pump Helper, Security Officer, Cement Checker Officer, and other auxiliary jobs	Senior High School / equivalent	IA
Operator Officer: Wheel Loader, Carmix, Truck Trailer, Tronton Truck, Mixer Truck, Bulk Carrier, Bull Dozer, ForkliftPrimary / Scunder Crusier	Senior High School / equivalent	IB
Officers: Administration, Sales, Billing, Field, Laboratory, Slump, Maintenance, Hardware, Batching Plant Operators	Senior High School / equivalent	IC
Lead Staff : Team leader, Head of Section / Plant Professional staff / talent	D3 – S1	II A up to III A

**Table 8. Correlations between Job Satisfaction and Job Fairness**

	Total JS	Total JF
Total JF	Pearson Correlation .809**	
	Sig. (2-tailed) .000	
	N 77	

It can be seen in the table above that job satisfaction is closely and positively related to work justice with the strength of the relationship of 0.809 and a significance

value smaller than 0.05, which is equal to 0.000. That is, if someone feels satisfied with their work then the perceived work justice will also be high, and vice versa.

**Table 9. Frequency Distribution of Job Satisfaction**

Category	Salary		Promotion		Supervision		Benefit		Contingency Reward		Operational Condition		Co-workers		Nature of Work		Communication Aspects	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Very high	5	6.5%	5	6.5%	26	33.8%	5	6.5%	7	9.1%	2	2.6%	15	19.5%	20	26%	7	9.1%
High	14	18.2%	35	45.5%	44	57.1%	41	53.2%	35	45.5%	21	27.3%	14	18.2%	14	18.2%	35	45.5%
Moderate	44	57.1%	32	41.6%	5	6.5%	27	35.1%	25	32.5%	49	63.6%	45	58.4%	40	51.9%	31	40.3%
Low	12	15.6%	4	5.2%	1	1.3%	3	3.9%	8	10.4%	4	5.2%	0	0%	2	2.6%	2	2.6%
Very low	2	2.6%	1	1.3%	1	1.3%	1	1.3%	2	2.6%	1	1.3%	3	3.9%	1	1.3%	2	2.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the supervision aspect has the highest percentage with the acquisition of high and very high categories, which is 90.9%. That is, in working at PT.X, employees feel that there is supervision from superiors, guidance in doing work, and discussions conducted with superiors in the context of self-development which are very helpful to employees in achieving job satisfaction. The salary aspect has the highest percentage with the acquisition of low and very low

categories, which is equal to 18.2% and the contingency award aspect has the second largest percentage with the acquisition of low and very low categories, amounting to 13.0%. That is, there are some people who feel that the amount of salary or awards received have not been in accordance with the performance given to the company, although most aspects of salary are still at a moderate level (57.1%) towards high (24.7%) and aspects of medium contingency rewards (32.5%) towards high (54.6%).

**Table 10. Frequency Distribution of Job Fairness**

Category	Distributive Justice Aspect		Procedural Justice Aspect		Interactional Justice Aspect	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Very High	5	6.5%	4	5.2%	9	11.7%
High	1	1.3%	6	7.8%	15	19.5%
Moderate	61	79.2%	48	62.3%	48	62.3%
Low	5	6.5%	15	19.5%	3	3.9%
Very Low	5	6.5%	4	5.2%	2	2.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>



Based on the table above it can be seen that the aspect of interactional justice has the largest percentage with the acquisition of high and very high categories, amounting to 31.2%. That is, employees feel that interactions built with coworkers, superiors, and subordinates in the company get positive feedback that builds personal and work development. The procedural justice

aspect has the highest percentage with the acquisition of low and very low categories, which is 24.7%. This means that there are some employees who feel that the bureaucracy, procedures, and systems implemented by the company do not support the creation of fair treatment for all employees.

**Table 11. Correlations between Aspects with Total Job Satisfaction**

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>Correlation with total job satisfaction</b>
Salary	0.792
Promotion	0.755
Supervision	0.594
Benefit	0.705
Contingency Reward	0.605
Operational condition	0.245
Co-workers	0.548
Nature of work	0.712
Communication	0.733

The table 11 above shows that all aspects are highly correlated with job satisfaction, except aspects of operational conditions which only have sufficient correlation, with a correlation value of 0.245. The biggest correlation that has a big factor in

determining the level of job satisfaction owned by employees of PT. X is the salary factor ( $r = 0.792$ ), promotion ( $r = 0.755$ ), and communication ( $r = 0.733$ ).

**Table 12. Correlations between Aspects with Total Job Fairness**

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>Correlation with total job fairness</b>
Distributive justice	0.784
Procedural justice	0.896
Interacional justice	0.766

The table above shows that all aspects of work justice are closely and positively correlated with the value of work justice. The highest correlation level was obtained between aspects of procedural justice with a total value of work justice, which was 0.896 and followed by distributive justice aspects with a correlation of 0.784. This reflects that the employees at PT. X is more likely to regard procedural justice as a stronger predictor of work justice.

The explanation of differences in reasons for employees with high and low job satisfaction levels, shows that employees with high categories are more concerned with non-material factors such as psychological satisfaction when successfully completing responsibilities / trust given by others. This type of job satisfaction is referred to as job satisfaction from the cognitive aspect, namely employee confidence in work and work situations (Rethinam and Ismail, 2008). If reviewed according to Herzberg's two factor theory, then the employee this type forms more satisfaction because of intrinsic factors, such as acceptance, recognition, personal growth, and the nature of work (Simpson in Georgakopoulos, Sotiropoulos, & Dimitris, 2010).

In the type of employee who has a low level of satisfaction, is more likely to perceive satisfaction based on material fulfillment factors or physical factors. In accordance with Maslow's theory, employees of this type will be satisfied with meeting basic needs, namely physical and material needs (Galanouw, Georgakopoulos, Sotiropoulos, & Dimitris, 2010). If assessed according to Herzberg's two factor theory, employees with this type form more satisfaction due to hygiene factors, namely such as working conditions, supervision, salary, and colleague relations (Simpson in Galanouw,

Georgakopoulos, Sotiropoulos, & Dimitris, 2010). This hygiene factor raises motivation and satisfaction which is more temporary.

The close relationship between the aspects of financial reward and procedural justice with the level of job satisfaction and work justice shows that although there are only 36.6% of employees who feel less satisfied and 11.69% of employees who feel less in accordance with the company's treatment of them, but this needs to be addressed further. This is due to the perception of dissatisfaction or injustice that is felt by someone will have an impact on decreasing commitment to the organization, as well as decreasing the quality and quantity of work productivity (Ganguly, 2010; Celik, 2011; Chitra & Mahalakshmi, 2012)

The results of the assessment of the rewards system implemented in the organization today indicate that the reward system is established based on the Directors' Decree. For permanent employees, the distribution of basic salary is determined by the group and sub-level groups. Every year there is an index of base salary increase of 6% because it follows the policies of the previous principal company. the amount of the fixed allowance consisting of general allowances, section position allowances (for the minimum position of Team Head), and attendance allowance is determined by company provisions through the Personnel. However, the magnitude of the benefits and the percentage increase in these benefits do not yet have a strong, logical, systematic, objective, and transparent basis for consideration.

Promotion policies are implemented according to company requirements (if there is a request from the leadership of the division), viewed based on individual performance track records, and sufficient

work time. Employees with the same position, even though they have different work performance, do not have different rewards. Giving different rewards is only determined based on the length of work associated with increasing sub-level groups every 3.5 years.

The explanation related to the award system above shows that the company's remuneration structure is less accountable because it has not been based on strong, logical, systematic, transparent, and patterned considerations. This is the cause of the emergence of employee issues that feel the giving of salaries between individuals is unfair and equal. This issue has an impact on declining perceptions of work justice and job satisfaction and will indirectly have an impact on the quality of work life of employees (quality of work life). A good quality of work life is important to maintain to support the emergence of motivation, satisfaction, and work productivity (Freedman in Danish & Usman, 2010; Khalid, Salim, & Loke, 2011; Galanou, et. Al. 2014).

#### *Results of the Intervention Phase*

In carrying out a job evaluation, researchers first examine the job description owned by the company. According to Poels (1997), the initial stage in the job evaluation process is to carry out a job analysis in order to determine the extent to which the job is

describing the criteria in the job evaluation. It is obtained from the analysis of documents that the existing job description has just been compiled and revised in 2015, however, not all positions that will be subject to job evaluation have a complete job description data. For this reason, researchers need to review all of the existing job descriptions.

In this study, the method used in job evaluation is the Hay method. Hay method was formulated based on the scheme analysis method but its weight was patented so that it was easier to apply. The use of the Hay method is due to the reason that PT. X has never done a job evaluation before so there is no standard factor that is used to determine the weight of the position. In addition, the lack of time owned by the top leaders of PT. X to jointly with researchers to formulate a compensable factor that is in line with company values, make the researchers and management have to discuss and then decide to use the Hay method. It is actually standardized; has included 4 traditional factors in job evaluation i.e skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions. It has been used in many types of organizations and has been tested in various parts of the world; and always in the process of undergoing evaluation and development by Hay Group itself as a composer.

**Table 13. Job Evaluation Results with the Hay Method**

No	Job Level	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	Range
1	Squad Chief	123	338	216
2	Section Chief	352	536	185
3	Head of Division	608	752	145

The table above shows that among each level of position there are figures not included in any level. This is because in the process of determining the weights using the Hay method, the number that the researcher sets is the middle number which is the

standard point and the assumption that the position holder is doing his job well (on average), and has not been determined in actual performance. Given these conditions, researchers arrange the range of each grade with the following calculation:

**Table 14. Proposed Grade Division for Each Job Category**

<b>Company Grade</b>	<b>Job Level</b>	<b>Score/Weight based on Job Evaluation</b>	<b>Grade Proposed</b>
IIIB up to	Head of Division	573 - 752	IIIB up to IIIE
IIA up to IIIA	Section Chief	346 - 572	IIIE up to IIIA
IIA up to IIIA	Squad Chief	123 - 345	IIA up to IID

The table above shows the range grade category for each level of position. This research proposed the new grade based on the Decree of the Board of Directors, while the old one was not yet detailed in categorizing the grade for each level. At the Squad Chief's level, the score range is 123-

345 with grades IIA up to IID. At the Section Chief level, the range is 346-572 with grades IIIE up to IIIA. At the Division Head level, the score range is 573-752 with a grade IIIB and above. Here is the range of each grade that is proposed by this research.

**Table 15. Proposed Design of Job Grading Research Systems**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Range of Weight/Score</b>	<b>Job Level</b>
IIA	123 – 178	Squad Chief
IIIB	179 – 234	
IIC	235 – 290	
IID	291 – 345	
IIIE	346 – 391	
IIIF	392 – 437	Section Chief
IIIG	438 – 482	
IIIH	483 – 527	
IIIA	528 – 572	
IIIB	573 above	Head of Division

## Conclusions and Suggestions

Based on the results of the initial assessment analysis related to job satisfaction and job fairness, the factor which is the reason for the low level of employee job satisfaction at PT. X is the hygiene factor (in Herzberg's two factor theory) or the financial reward factor. Perceptions of low categorized justice are based more on procedural justice factors that employees feel are not in line with expectations because the company is perceived as not implementing procedures and systems objectively and transparently; employees are not too involved in decision making and the results of decisions are not explained in detail and transparently.

Based on the results of interviews related to the payroll system, the results show that so far the salary or reward system does not have a strong basis for consideration so often issues of injustice arise. In addition, the system of giving benefits in a company is only based on personal considerations from the Personnel without any clear standards.

Based on the results of the job analysis, the results show that the current job description does not describe the job description and responsibilities of the job holder in detail, because there are many repetitions of words and they are not accompanied by job specifications.

Based on the results of the job evaluation and grading system compiled by researchers using the Hay method, it can be seen that the weight of each position is adjusted to the roles, responsibilities, problem solving abilities, and technical knowledge demanded for the job in accordance with the job description that has been reviewed. The results of this weighting are based on a

standard value (middle value / average value).

The suggestions that can be delivered related to this research are as follows:

1. To improve and develop the reward system, the HRD needs to convince top management that the results of this job evaluation have been evaluated and included points of the evaluation results so that it makes it easier for top management to discuss the steps of implementing the new reward system.
2. The HRD should inform the results of the research in detail and convey the impact and benefits of the job evaluation process within the company.
3. The HRD should form a team of experts to conduct further analysis and evaluation of the results of the job evaluation. This follow-up analysis is intended for companies to assess the suitability of determining compensatory factors with company values, values assigned to each position, strategic plans for utilizing job evaluations, and other long-term strategic matters that need to be considered by the company.
4. HRD should develop a system to assess work performance of each job holder in an objective and systematic manner so that the results of job evaluation can be applied in the payroll structure more fairly and equally because it is in accordance with individual work performance.
5. Job grading design proposed by researchers is expected to be an input in developing and updating the reward system that applies in the company. Adjustment between the previous grade and the results of the study can be done with a nominal calculation process that is valued at each

level of position in accordance with the calculation below so that there will be no employee feels disadvantaged.

$$\text{Score/ Weight} \times \text{Rp. A} = \text{Rp. B}$$

Notes :

Rp. A is the nominal amount of money determined by the company to appreciate each level of position

Rp. B is the employee's salary

Nominal amount of money at Rp. A above can be adjusted and differentiated according to the position level. The difference in nominal amount of money at each level of position will help the company in valuing employees who have decreased the grade of the current grade set by the company so that employees do not feel disadvantaged and remain motivated.

6. The renewal of the grading system that will be applied by the company should be followed by informing the procedures and details to the employees so that there is no misunderstanding and still maintaining transparency and objectivity. The current grading system can be utilized by companies in the process of transition to a more ideal grading system and in line with company expectations.

7. For further research, researchers and companies need to ensure the active involvement of stakeholders, starting from the top level to the operational level. Researchers need to ensure that executive direction on employee goals, processes, steps and involvement is well understood and implemented by all levels of employees. This involvement will greatly assist the smooth implementation of research and the accuracy of research results which will be used as a basis for establishing baselines, drafting intervention designs, as well as long-term strategic planning.

## Notes on Contributors

**L. Verina Halim Secapramana**, She is a Associate Professor, Department of Industrial and Organizational Psychology Universitas Surabaya, Indonesia.

**Heidi Patricia** Is a Student, Master of Professional Psychology Program, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Surabaya; Indonesia.

**Eko Nugroho**, He is a Lecturer of Faculty of Business and Economics Universitas Surabaya, Indonesia.

## References

- Arnold, Silvester, Patterson, Robertson, Cooper, & Burnes. (2005). *Work Psychology: Understanding Human Behavior in the Workplace*. 4<sup>th</sup>. Ed. England : Prentice Hall, Pearson Education Limited.
- Chitra, D. & Mahalaskhmi, V. (2012). A study on employees' perception on quality of work life and job satisfaction in manufacturing organization: An empirical study. *International Journal of Trade and Commerce*, 1(2), 175-184.
- Corominas, A., Coves, A. M., Lusa, A., & Martines, C. (2008). ISOS: A job evaluation system to implement comparable worth. *Intangible Capital*, 4(1), 8-30.
- Danish, R. Q. & Usman, A. (2010). Impact of reward and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation: An empirical study from Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(2), 159-167.
- El-Hajji, M. A. (2011). Wage consistency in the context of job evaluation: An analytical view. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(10), 31-37.

- Farahbakhsh, S. (2012). The role of emotional intelligence in increasing quality of work life in school principals. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 31-35.
- Galanou, E., Georgakopoulos, G., Sotiropoulos, I., & Dimitris, V. (2010). The effect of reward system on job satisfaction in an organizational chart of 4 hierarchical level: A qualitative study. *Canadian Social Science*, 6(5), 102-123.
- Ganguly, R. (2010). Quality of worklife and job satisfaction of a group of university employees. *Asian Journal of Management Research*, 209-216.
- Kanten, S. & Sadullah, O. (2012). An empirical research on relationship quality of work life and work engagement. *Social and Behavioral Science*, 62, 360-366.
- Khalid, K., Salim, H. M., & Loke, S. (2011). The impact of rewards and motivation on job satisfaction in water utility industry. *International Conference of Financial Management and Economics*, 11, 35-41.
- Koshy, Elizabeth, Koshy, & Waterman. (2011). *Action Research in Healthcare*. London : Sage Publication.
- Layer, Karwowski, & Furr (2009). The effect of cognitive demands and perceived quality of work life on human performance in manufacturing environments. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* 39(2):413-421· March 2009.
- Poels, F. (1997). *Job evaluation and remuneration strategies: How to set up and run an effective system*. London: Kogan Pages.
- Rethinam, G. S. & Ismail. M. (2008). Construct of quality of work life: A perspective of information and technology professionals. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 58-69.
- Sirgy, M. J., Reilly, N. P., Wu, J., dan Efraty, D. (2008). A work-life identity model of well-being: Towards a research agenda linking quality of work-life (QWL) programs with quality of life (QOL). *Applied Research Quality-of-Life*, 3, 181-202.
- VanYperen, N. W., Hagedoorn, M., Zweers, M., & Postma, S. (2000). *Social Justice Research*, 13(3), 291-312.

