PREDICTORS OF JOB SATISFACTION OF THE PERSONNEL WORKING IN TURKISH SPORTS MEDIA

Kubilay ÖCAL[1]

Ünal KARLI[2]

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the job satisfaction level of personnel working in sports media and to determine the predictive values of demographic variables {Media Segment, Position, In-service Education, Experience (Master, Intern, & Assistant), Education level, Job Selection Condition, Turnover (Non, Moderate,& High), Age (Young Adulthood, Middle, & Late Adulthood) on their intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction levels.

The sample of the research was composed of 144 media workers from 7 national broadcast and 9 national print media organizations. Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (short-form; Weiss, et al., 1967) were used as data collection instrument. In the statistical analysis of the study descriptive statistics and hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to the data.

According to the results, Model 1(Media Segment and Position); Model 2 (Media Segment, Position, In-service Education, Experience Dummy I (Master vs. Intern), Experience Dummy II (Master vs. Assistant); Model 3 (Media Segment, Position, In-service Education, Experience Dummy I (Master vs. Intern), Experience Dummy II (Master vs. Assistant), Education level, Job Selection Condition) were significant determinants of intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction. On the other hand, the variables of Model 4 (Media Segment, Position, In-service Education, Experience Dummy I (Master vs. Intern), Experience Dummy II (Master vs. Assistant), Education level, Job Selection Condition, Turnover Dummy I (Non vs. Moderate), Turnover Dummy II (Non vs. High), Age Dummy I (Middle vs. Young Adulthood), Age Dummy II (Middle vs. Late Adulthood) did not provide significant value as indicators to predict job satisfaction.

Result showed that position, in-service education and job selection condition were most prominent predictors of job satisfaction in sport media. This result provided valuable information for candidate employees and managers who will be interested in seeking career opportunities media sector.

Key Words: Job Satisfaction, Sport Media, Personnel.

TÜRK SPOR MEDYASINDA ÇALIŞAN PERSONELİN İŞ DOYUMUNU YORDAYAN FAKTÖRLER

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı; spor medyasında çalışan personelin iş doyum düzeylerini belirlemek ve medya kısımlaması, pozisyon, hizmet içi eğitim, deneyim (uzman, stajyer ve asistan), eğitim seviyesi, iş seçim koşulu, iş değişimi (hiç, orta ve yüksek), yaş (genç yetişkin, orta yetişkin ve ileri yetişkin) değişkenlerinin içsel doyum, dışsal doyum ve genel iş doyumunu ne derece yordadıklarını ortaya koymaktır.

Araştırmanın örneklemi 7 ulusal televizyon kanalından ve 9 ulusal gazeteden seçilen 144 spor servisi çalışanından oluşmaktadır. Katılımcılara Weis ve diğ. (1967) tarafından geliştirilen Minnesota İş Doyumu Anketinin kısa formu uygulanmıştır. Elde edilen veriler öncelikle tanımlayıcı istatistik ve hiyerarşik regresyon analizi ile çözümlenmiştir.

Bulgular, spor medyası çalışanlarını içsel is doyumu, dışsal iş doyumu ve genel iş doyum düzeylerini Model 1[medya kısımlaması, pozisyon], Model 2 [medya kısımlaması, pozisyon, hizmet içi eğitim, deneyim kategorik kodlama I (uzman-stajyer), deneyim kategorik kodlama II (uzman-asistan)], Model 3 [medya kısımlaması, pozisyon, hizmet içi eğitim, deneyim kategorik kodlama I (uzman-stajyer), deneyim kategorik kodlama II (uzman-asistan), eğitim seviyesi, iş seçim koşulu] anlamlı düzeyde yordarken, Model 4 [medya kısımlaması, pozisyon, hizmet içi eğitim, deneyim kategorik kodlama I (uzman-stajyer), deneyim kategorik kodlama II (uzman-asistan), eğitim seviyesi, iş seçim koşulu, iş değişimi kategorik kodlama I (hiç-orta), iş değişimi kategorik kodlama II (hiç-yüksek), yaş kategorik kodlama I (orta, genç yetişkin), yaş kategorik kodlama II (orta, ileri yetişkin)] ise anlamlı düzeyinde yordamamıştır.

Çalışmanın sonuçları, pozisyon, hizmet içi eğitim ve iş seçim koşulları gibi değişkenlerin iş doyumunu yordama düzeyleri açısından öne çıktığını gösterirken aynı zamanda medya alanında kariyer yapmak isteyecek adaylara ve yöneticilere önemli ipuçları vermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İş Doyumu, Spor Medyası, Personel.

[1] Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, School of Physical Education and Sports

[2] [2]Abant İzzet Baysal University, School of Physical Education and Sports

INTRODUCTION

In order to increase the organizational performance and effectiveness of the human resources of an organization and to manage the turnover and absenteeism rates in an organization, it is vital to understand the needs and the factors that affect the satisfaction levels of the employees with their job.

Conceptually, job satisfaction, which was defined in various forms by researchers, such as “an affective reaction to one’s job resulting from the incumbent’s comparison of actual outcomes with those that are desired” (Cranny, Smith, and Stone, 1992) and as “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating one’s job values” (Locke, 1969), has been subject to variety of research studies in the area of management and organizational behavior.

Vast amount of researches have scrutinized job satisfaction for years, which focused on the different aspects of target labor group, occupation and the job satisfaction’s relationship with performance and turnover (Al-Ajmi, 2006; Barrick & Mount, 1991; Belfieid & Harris, 2002; Clark, 1996; Clark & Oswald, 1996; Connolly & Viswesvaran, 2000; Coomber & Barriball, 2007; Furnham, Petrides, Jackson, & Cotter, 2002; Heywood & Wei, 2006; Hochwarter, 1999; Hodson, 1989; Janssen, 2001; Johnson, 2001; Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2001; McCausland, Pouliakas & Theodossiou, 2005; Mobley, 1982; O’Brien & Dowling, 1981; Oshagbemi, 1998; Rambur, McIntosh, Palumbo, & Reinier, 2005; Sarker, Crossman, & Chinmeteepituck, 2003; Sloane & Williams, 2000; Sousa-Poza & Sousa- Poza, 2000; Thomas, Sorensen & Yim, 2009).

Parallel to the job satisfaction researches carried out in different industries, also the sport industry got its share from job satisfaction studies. Job satisfaction as a research topic, held its popularity for long years in national and international sport related literature. There are various studies proposed to identify the job satisfaction levels of personnel working in diverse careers such as personnel of private health and fitness clubs (Karlı, 2004), physical educators (Koustelios, Theodorakis, & Goulimaris, 2004; Koustelios & Tsigilis, 2005; Yaman, 2009), coaches working in different sport branches(Dixon & Sagas, 2007; Li, 1993; Ulucan, Erol, Bektaş, & Yılmaz, 2011; Yerlisu & Çelenk, 2008), referees (Can, Soyer, & Yılmaz, 2010; Savucu, Zirek, Devecioğlu, & Çınar. 2008), personnel of sport governing bodies (Mirzelioğlu, Doğu, Mirzelioğlu, 2003; Ramazanoğlu, 2006), and academicians whose major study area were physical education and sports (Dolaşır & Dolaşır, 2006).

Even, that much research have been conducted on multifarious careers in sport industry, there is limited number of research studies both in national and international literature, which aimed to investigate the job satisfaction levels of sport media personnel, who are the essential component of the sport industry as transmitters of the core product to the spectators and fans (Hardin & Shain, 2005; Reinardy, 2007; Smucker, Whisenant, & Pederson, 2003). Even though, sport media is one of the most important component of the dynamic, multibillion dollar sport industry (Pederson, Miloch, & Laucella, 2007) on an account of its power to reach millions of people all around the world in seconds, the personnel of this sector did not get sufficient interest and attention from the scholars working on job satisfaction, work performance, or job attitudes. Also,

the scholars of sport management in Turkey have failed to notice employees of sports media, too. The national literature almost lacks of scientific research which focused on the national sport media personnel's job satisfaction levels.

Therefore, the main purpose of this study was to determine the job satisfaction level of personnel working in sports media and to determine demographic variables (media segment, age, education level, experience, turnover, position, job selection condition and in-service education) predictive value on their job satisfaction level.

METHOD

Research Sample

The sample of this research was generated according to the Sports Industry Segmentation model of Pedersen et al. (2007), which stated that media organizations includes sports broadcasters, executive sports editors, and sportswriters. A clustered sample which consisted of 144 participant was taken from 7 national broadcast (i.e. TGRT, Star, Kanal D, ATV, Kanal 7, CNN Türk, TRT) and 9 national print media organizations (i.e. Pas, Şok, Star, Milliyet, Hürriyet, Zaman, Türkiye, Yeni Şafak, Akşam), (see Table 1.).

Table 1. Demographics of the Subject Group

		N	%
Media Segment	Broadcast	98	68.1
	Print	46	31.9
Age	Young Adulthood	65	45.1
	Middle Adulthood	61	43.8
	Late Adulthood	16	11.1
Education Level	Non-University	61	42.4
	University	83	57.6
Experience	Intern	33	22.9
	Assistant	45	31.3
	Master	66	45.8
Turnover	Non	32	22.2
	Moderate	60	41.7
	High	52	36.1
Position	Manager	20	13.9
	Staff	124	86.1
Job selection condition	Intentionally	119	82.6
	Situational	25	17.4
In-service Education	Effective	86	59.7
	Non-Effective	58	40.3

Data Collection Instrument

The data collection instrument of this research composed of two main sections. In the first section, there were items gathering demographic information about media segment (print and broadcast); age (young adulthood, middle adulthood, and late adulthood); education level (university graduate and non university graduate); experience (intern, assistant, and master); turnover (non, moderate, and higher); position (manager and staff); job selection

condition (intentionally and situational) and in-service-education (effective and non-effective). The second section of the questionnaire was comprised of Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Davis, England, & Lofquist, 1967) which initially was adapted into Turkish culture by Oran (1989), was used as data collection instrument. The questionnaire, which could be scored on three scales (intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction and general satisfaction), consisted of 20 items focusing on intrinsic and extrinsic reinforcement factors of employee attitude. The evaluation of items performed via 5 point Likert-type scale with response alternatives ranging from "Very Dissatisfied" (weighted 1) to "Very Satisfied" (weighted 5).

Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis of the research study comprised of two main sections. In the first part, researchers conducted confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for the evaluation of construct validity of the scale. Then, in the second section, main analysis of the study was conducted.

Also, the first part of the analysis composed of two stages, in which CFA was conducted to the form in which four sub-factor structure (administration, prestige, independence and materiality) was displayed by Öcal and Koçak (2010) and where CFA was conducted for generally accepted version (two sub-factor; intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction) of the scale which was adapted by Oran (1989). CFA was conducted employing the maximum likelihood method by using the AMOS 18 program on MSQ.

In the second part of the statistical analysis, descriptive statistics and hierarchical regression was conducted to determine the job satisfaction levels of the subjects and to determine the predictive values of demographic variables on intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction of the subject group.

RESULTS

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results of the Version Displayed by Öcal and Koçak (2010)

Table 2.Summary of Goodness of Fit Statistics for the four structure model of Job Satisfaction

Model	χ^2	*df*	χ^2 /*df*	CFI	NNFI	RMSEA
Hypothesized model	354	164	2.2	.83	.80	.90
Modified model	291	163	1.8	.89	.87	.74

In four factor structure CFA resulted in significant χ^2value (354), *df* was 164, and the fit indicates were; CFI value of .83, NNFI value of .80 and RMSEA value of .90 and this indicates poor fit (MacCallum, Browne & Sugawara1996). Furthermore modification indices were checked and the pairs with high error covariance were connected (ε1- ε 2). After the second run RMSEA value decreased to .074 which indicates adequate fit (Jaccard & Wan, 1996). This result supported with NNFI value of .87 and CFI value of .89, (Table 2.).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results of the Version Displayed by Oran (1989)

Table 3.Summary of goodness of fit statistics for the two structure model (intrinsic, extrinsic) of Job Satisfaction

Model	χ^2	*df*	χ^2 /*df*	CFI	NNFI	RMSEA
Hypothesized model	353	134	1.8	.79	.76	.107
Modified model	227	129	2.6	.90	.90	.73

In two factor structure CFA resulted in significant χ^2value (227), *df* was 129, and the fit indicates were; CFI value of .79, NNFI value of .76 and RMSEA value of .107 and this indicates poor fit (MacCallum, Browne & Sugawara1996). Furthermore modification indices were checked and the pairs with high error covariance's were connected (ε2-ε3, ε4-ε10, ε6-ε10, ε7-, and ε8ε13-ε14). After the second run RMSEA value decreases to .073 which indicate adequate fit (Jaccard & Wan, 1996). This result supported with NNFI value of .90 and CFI value of .90, (Table 3.). On the contrary, CFA resulted in still significant χ^2value (227) and *df* was 129. But χ^2statistics did not taken into consideration since it is very sensitive to sample size. Final CFA model for intrinsic and extrinsic factors with standardized estimates ranged between .77 and .22.

Table 4.Summary of goodness of fit statistics for the overall job satisfaction

Model	χ^2	*df*	χ^2 /*df*	CFI	NNFI	RMSEA
Hypothesized model	453	170	2.7	.75	.72	.108
Modified model	298	164	1.8	.91	.90	.76

For total scale measuring overall job satisfaction CFA resulted in significant χ^2value (453), *df* was 170, and the fit indicates were; CFI value of .75, NNFI value of .72 and RMSEA value of .108 and this indicates poor fit (MacCallum, Browne & Sugawara1996). Furthermore modification indices were checked and the pairs with high error covariance's were connected (ε2-ε3, ε4-ε11, ε5-ε6, ε7-, and ε8-ε13, ε9-ε10 and ε11-ε20). After the second run RMSEA value decreased to .076 which indicates adequate fit (Jaccard & Wan, 1996). This result supported with NNFI value of .90 and CFI value of .91. On the contrary CFA resulted in still significant χ^2value (298) and *df* was 164, (Table 4.). But the researcher did not considered χ^2statistics since it is very sensitive to sample size. Final CFA model for Overall Job Satisfaction with standardized estimates ranged between .78 and .22.

According to these analyses, the final decision, for the analysis which performed in the second part, was to use the original version of Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire with two sub-factors which provided better CFA scores with two factor structures (intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction).

Descriptive statistics of the Subjects Job Satisfaction Levels

Table 5. The job satisfaction levels of the subjects according to their media sector

	MEDIA SEGMENT	
	Print-Press Media Mean ± Sd.	Broadcasting Media Mean ± Sd.
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	**3.89±.61**	**3.92±.47**
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	**3.47±.80**	**3.51±.74**
Overall Job Satisfaction	**3.53±.62**	**3.56±.50**

Table 5 shows that mean and standard deviation of intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction scores of employees working in two media segment. According to the results Broadcasting Media employee's scores are slightly higher than Print-Press Media employee's scores.

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results

Table 6. Hierarchical regression analysis summary for job satisfaction scores.

	Extrinsic job satisfaction				Intrinsic job satisfaction				Overall job satisfaction			
Step and predictor variables	**R^2**	**aR^2**	**sr^2**	**β**	**R^2**	**aR^2**	**sr^2**	**β**	**R^2**	**aR^2**	**sr^2**	**β**
MODEL 1	**.06***	**.06***			**.06***	**.06***			**.06***	**.06***		
Media Segment			.00	.05			.01	.09			.01	.07
Position			.06	.24			.05	.22			.05	.23
MODEL 2	**.18***	**.12***			**.15***	**.09***			**.17***	**.11***		
Media Segment			.01	.12			.02	.16			.02	.15
Position			.04	.21			.03	.18			.04	.20
In-service Education			.10	.33			.06	.26			.09	.30
Experience D I (Master vs. Intern)			.01	-.12			.04	-.24			.02	-.18
Experience D II (Master vs. Assistant)			.01	-.15			.01	-.13			.01	-.14
MODEL 3	**.23***	**.04***			**.20***	**.04***			**.23***	**.05***		
Media Segment			.01	.09			.02	.13			.01	.12
Position			.04	.22			.03	.19			.04	.21
In-service Education			.07	.29			.04	.22			.06	.26
Experience D I (Master vs. Intern)			.00	-.05			.02	-.16			.01	-.10
Experience D II (Master vs. Assistant)			.01	-.11			.01	-.10			.01	-.11
Education Level			.00	-.01			.00	-.01			.00	-.02
Job selection condition			.04	-.21			.04	-.22			.05	-.24
MODEL 4	**.25***	**.02**			**.21**	**.02**			**.24**	**.01**		
Media Segment			.05	.25			.03	.15			.04	.22
Position			.05	.25			.04	.18			.05	.25
In-service Education			.00	-.08			.02	.23			.01	-.13
Experience D I (Master vs. Intern)			.01	-.12			.01	-.19			.01	-.13
Experience D II (Master vs. Assistant)			.00	.01			.00	-.15			.00	.00
Education Level			.03	-.17			.05	.01			.05	-.24
Job selection condition			.00	-.07			.00	-.24			.00	.02
Turnover D I (Non vs. Moderate)			.00	-.04			.00	.10			.00	-.03
Turnover D II (Non vs. High)			.00	.07			.02	-.04			.01	.11
Age D I (Middle vs. Young adulthood)			.01	-.13			.00	.02			.00	-.06
Age D II (Middle. vs. Late adulthood)			.00	.04			.01	.07			.00	.05

*p<.05

Extrinsic Satisfaction

Multiple correlation coefficient between the linear combination of two predictors (Media Segment and Position) and extrinsic job satisfaction level is .24 and Model 1 significantly predict extrinsic job satisfaction, F(2,125) = 3.93, p<.05, R^2= .06, R^2_{adj}= .06. The combination of these two predictors accounts for 6% of variance in model for extrinsic job satisfaction levels. In this model, inconsequential contribution Media Segment of to the variance in extrinsic job satisfaction (sr^2=.00) was negligible with insignificant result of *t* (142) = .85, p>.05. On the other hand position uniquely explained 6% (sr^2 = .06) of variance in model for extrinsic job satisfaction level having significant contribution to the prediction equation, t (142) =2.71, p<.05, (Table 6.).

In Model 2, multiple correlation coefficients between the linear combination of three predictors, the combination of in-service education, Experience Dummy I (Master vs. Intern) variable, Experience Dummy II (Master vs. Assistant) variable and extrinsic job satisfaction increased to .43. Model 2 significantly predict extrinsic job satisfaction, F (3, 122) = 6.22, p<.05, R^2= .18, R^2_{adj}= .12. The combination of five predictors accounts for 18% of variation in extrinsic job satisfaction levels. Based on these result, in-service education appear to offer highest predictive power beyond that contributed by demographic characteristic. In this model, in-service education uniquely explained 10% (sr^2 = .10) of variance in model for extrinsic job satisfaction level having significant contribution to the prediction equation, t (142) =3.82, p<.05, (Table 6.).

In Model 3, after controlling for the effects of variables in Model 2, multiple correlation coefficient between the linear combination of 2 variables (education level and job selection condition) and extrinsic job satisfaction level increased to .48 and step 3 significantly predict extrinsic job satisfaction level, F (2,120) =3.24, p<.001, R^2= .23, R^2 *adj*= .04. In this model in-service education uniquely explained 7% (sr^2 = .07) of variance in model for extrinsic job satisfaction level having significant contribution to the prediction equation, t (142) =-4.16, p<.05, (Table 6.).

In Model 4, after controlling for the effects of variables in Model 3, multiple correlation coefficients between the linear combination of 4 variables [Turnover Dummy I (Non vs. Moderate); Turnover Dummy II (Non vs. High); Age Dummy I (Middle vs. Young Adulthood); Age Dummy II (Middle vs. Late Adulthood)] and extrinsic job satisfaction level increased to .50. But this increase cannot provide significant chance in Model 4, F (4,116) =.857, p>.05, R^2= .25, R^2 *adj*= .02, (Table 6.).

Intrinsic Satisfaction

Multiple correlation coefficient between the linear combination of 2 predictors (Media Segment and Position) and intrinsic job satisfaction level is .24 and Model 1 significantly predict intrinsic job satisfaction, F(2,125) = 3.95, p<.05, R^2= .06. R^2 *adj*= .06. The combination of these two predictors accounts for 6 % of variation in intrinsic job satisfaction levels. In this model, position uniquely explained 5% (sr^2 = .05) of variance in model for extrinsic job satisfaction level having highest significant contribution to the prediction equation, t (142) =-2.81, p<.05, (Table 6.).

In Model 2, multiple correlation coefficients between the linear combination of three predictors, the combination of in-service education, Experience Dummy I (Master vs. Intern) variable, Experience Dummy II (Master vs. Assistant) variable and intrinsic job satisfaction increased to .39. Model 2 significantly predict intrinsic job satisfaction, F (3, 122) = 4.49, p<.05, R^2= .15, R^2 *adj*= .09. The combination of five predictors accounts for 15% of variation in intrinsic job satisfaction levels. In this model, as highest predictive power, in-service education uniquely explained 6% (sr^2 = .06) of variance in model for intrinsic job satisfaction level having significant contribution to the prediction equation, t (142) =2.84, p<.05, (Table 6.).

In Model 3, after controlling for the effects of variables in Model 2, multiple correlation coefficient between the linear combination of 2 variables (education level and job selection condition) and intrinsic job satisfaction level increased to .44 and model 3 significantly predict intrinsic job satisfaction level, F (2,120) =3.25, p<.05, R^2= .20, R^2 *adj*= .04. In this model job selection condition uniquely explained 4% (sr^2 = .04) of variance in model for intrinsic job satisfaction level having significant contribution to the prediction equation, t (142) =-2.5, p<.05, (Table 6.).

In Model 4, after controlling for the effects of variables in Model 3, multiple correlation coefficients between the linear combination of 4 variables [Turnover Dummy I (Non vs. Moderate); Turnover Dummy II (Non vs. High); Age Dummy I (Middle vs. Young Adulthood); Age Dummy II (Middle vs. Late Adulthood)] and intrinsic job satisfaction level increased to .46. But this increase cannot provide significant chance in Model 4, F (4,116) =.675, p>.05, R^2= .21, R^2 *adj*= .02, (Table 6.).

Overall Satisfaction

Multiple correlation coefficient between the linear combination of 2 predictors (Media Segment and Position) and overall job satisfaction level is .25 and Model 1 significantly predict overall job satisfaction, F(2,125) = 3.93, p<.05, R^2= .06. R^2 *adj*= .06. The combination of these two predictors accounts for 6% of variation in overall job satisfaction levels. In this model, position uniquely explained 5% (sr^2 = .05) of variance in model for overall job satisfaction level having significant contribution to the prediction equation, t (142) =2.71, p<.05, (Table 6.).

In Model 2, multiple correlation coefficients between the linear combination of three predictors, the combination of In-service education, Experience Dummy I (Master vs. Intern) variable, Experience Dummy II (Master vs. Assistant) variable and overall job satisfaction increased to .42. Model 2 significantly predict overall job satisfaction, F (3, 122) = 6.50, p<.05, R^2= .17, R^2 *adj*= .11. The combination of five predictors accounts for 17% of variation in overall job satisfaction levels. Based on these result, in-service education appear to offer highest predictive power beyond that contributed by demographic characteristic. In this model, in-service education uniquely explained 9% (sr^2 = .09) of variance in model for overall job satisfaction level having significant contribution to the prediction equation, t (142) =3.56, p<.05, (Table 6.).

In Model 3, after controlling for the effects of variables in Model 2, multiple correlation coefficient between the linear combination of 2 variables (education level

and job selection condition) and overall job satisfaction level increased to .48 and step 3 significantly predict overall job satisfaction level, F (2,120) =4.23, p<.05, R^2= .23, R^2 *adj*= .05. In this model job selection condition uniquely explained 5% (sr^2 = .05) of variance in model for overall job satisfaction level having significant contribution to the prediction equation, t (142) =-2.89, p<.05, (Table 6.).

In Model 4, after controlling for the effects of variables in Model 3, multiple correlation coefficients between the linear combination of 4 variables [Turnover Dummy I (Non vs. Moderate); Turnover Dummy II (Non vs. High); Age Dummy I (Middle vs. Young Adulthood); Age Dummy II (Middle vs. Late Adulthood)] and overall job satisfaction level increased to .49. But this increase cannot provide significant chance in Model 4, F (4,116) =.269, p>.05, R^2= .24, R^2 *adj*= .01, (Table 6.).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Job satisfaction has been one of the most widely examined concepts in the study of management and organizational behavior on an account of having humanitarian, economic and theoretical perspective together (Balzer et al., 1997). To influence high population around physical activity, it is important to reach large number of people (Cavill & Bauman, 2004). According to Flora (2000) mass media is a useful tool for influencing people to influence health related social norms. Broadcast, print and more recently electronic media can be used for realizing such aims. For that global purpose, to improve positive attitudes on sports and physical activities sports media employees have important responsibilities. In order to fulfill their responsibilities successfully, sport media employees should have higher job satisfaction. The present research was designed to investigate the predictors of job satisfaction of employees working in sports media. For this purpose 144 media workers were taken from 7 broadcast and 9 print media organization. A hierarchical regression analysis was employed in order to determine how well demographic variables, such as media segment, age, education level, experience; turnover, position, job selection condition and in-service education predict the intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction concentrates on two main values, intrinsic values and extrinsic values. Intrinsic work values refer to the immaterial aspects of jobs such as variety and autonomy. On the other hand extrinsic work values refer to the material or instrumental work aspects, such as salary and opportunity for promotion (Taris & Feij 2001).

In this study, in-service education, position and job selection condition are three main attention taking variables we should elaborate on when job satisfaction in media is in question.

In-service education is a service orientation program which will enhance the competitive position of media employees as it provides cross-training opportunities for employees to improve their professional competencies. According to Lee et al., (1999); service orientation at the organizational level influences the level of the employee's job satisfaction organizational commitment, service image, and business performance. Thus in-service education provides easy adaptation for rapid changes in organization. In this study in-service education arise most important

predictor in Model 2 and Model 3. According to Kim et al. (2005), organizations should provide service orientation programs to improve the organizational commitment of employees and reduce intention to leave and turnover.

Supported with various sources, this study shows that job satisfaction is directly correlated with position in sports media. According to the results there are big gaps between managers and employees according to their economic and social status. Few of the editors would have managerial position in media sector. Reporters and other employees in non-managerial positions have higher turnover rate and low level of satisfaction. So getting higher positions in sport media is more challenging process and these push employees to find opportunities in different firms or different sectors. According to Chelladurai and Haggerty (1991) when organizational rewards are low, members tend to emphasize the intrinsic rewards of work as opposed to extrinsic rewards such as pay and status or rank. Sport media is proposing the opposite of this theory. The main reason of the higher turnover rate is the reason for finding opportunity to have higher payment. This reason also degrees organizational commitment in sport media.

Results pointed out that, job selection opportunity is the third important predictor of job satisfaction in sport media. According to the result 17.4% of the employees in sport media selected their job un-intentionally. Job selection according to the situational factors degrees the level of person organization fit. But, we should not ignore the reality that person organization fit had a unique impact on job satisfaction and intent to quit (Lauver & Brown, 2001). Result of the study provides some valuable information for candidate employees and managers who interested in this sector. According to Cable and DeRue (2002) and Saks and Ashforth (2002), person-job fit is correlated with higher job satisfaction and lower intentions to quit. But there is male domination in the sports media; only 8 (5.2%) females were participated in this study over 16 sports media department. In spite of the fact that we are watching female narrators on various sports programs on TV which does not changes the condition behind the scene. According to Schell and Rodriquez (2000) females have not yet completely broken through the gender barrier that exists in the sports industry including sport media.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Ajmi, R. (2006). The Effect of Gender on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Kuwait. *International Journal of Management, 23*(4) 838–844.
2. Balzer, W. K., Smith, P.C., Kravitz, D. A., Lovell, S. E., Paul, K. B., Reilly, B. A. & Reilly, C. E. (1990). *User's Manual: Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) Scales*, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, KY.
3. Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1–26.
4. Belfield, C. R., & Harris, R. D. F. (2002). How Well Do Theories of Job Matching Explain Variations in Job Satisfaction Across Education Levels? Evidence for UK Graduates. *Applied Economics, 34*(5) 535–548.
5. Cable, D. M., & DeRue, D. S. (2002). The Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Subjective Fit Perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 875–884.
6. Can, Y., Soyer, F., & Yılmaz, F. (2010). Examining the Relationship between the Levels of Professional Burnout and Job Satiety of Handball Referees. *Selçuk University Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science*, *12* (2), 113–119.
7. Cavill, N. & Bauman, A (2004). Changing the Way People Think About Health-Enhancing Physical Activity: Do Mass Media Campaigns Have a Role? *Sports Science, 22* (8)771–790.
8. Chelladurai, P., & Haggerty, T.R. (1991). Measures of Organizational Effectiveness of Canadian National Sport Organizations. *Canadian Journal of Sport Sciences, 16*(2), 126–133.
9. Clark, A. E. & Oswald, A. J. (1996). Satisfaction and Comparison Income. *Journal of Public Economics*, *61*, 359–81.
10. Clark, A. E. (1996). Job Satisfaction in Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, *34*, 189–217.
11. Connolly, J., & Viswesvaran, C. (2000). The Role of Affectivity in Job Satisfaction: A Meta-Analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29*, 265–281.
12. Coomber, B., & Barriball, K. L. (2007). Impact of Job Satisfaction Components on Intent to Leave and Turnover for Hospital-Based Nurses: A Review of the Research Literature. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, *44*, 297–314.
13. Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C. & Stone, E., F. (1992). *Job Satisfaction: How People Feel about their Jobs and How It Affects Their Performance*. New York: Macmillan.
14. Dixon, M.A., & Sagas, M. (2007). The Relationship between Organizational Support, Work-Family Conflict, and the Job-Life Satisfaction of University Coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *78*(3), 236–247.
15. Dolaşır, S., & Dolaşır, S. (2006). Job Satisfaction of Instructors Working in Ankara University School of Physical Education and Sport. *Spormetre,* 4(3) 103–109.
16. Flora, J. (2000). The Stanford Community Studies: Campaigns to Reduce Cardiovascular Disease. In R. Rice & C. Atkin (Eds.), Public Communication Campaigns.193–214. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
17. Furnham, A., Petrides, K. V., Jackson C. J., & Cotter, T. (2002). Do Personality Factors Predict Job Satisfaction? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33, 1325–1342.
18. Hardin, M., & Shain, S. (2005). Female Sports Journalists: Are We There Yet? "No". *Newspaper Research Journal*, *26*(4), 22–35.
19. Heywood, J., S. & Wei, X. (2006). Performance Pays and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48(4), 523–540.
20. Hochwarter, W. A., Perrewe, P. L., Ferris, G. R., & Brymer, R., A. (1999). Job Satisfaction and Performance: The Moderating Effects of Value Attainment and Affective Disposition. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54, 296–313.
21. Hodson, R. (1989). Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction. *Sociological Quarterly,* 30 (3), 385–399.
22. Jaccard, J., & Wan, C. K. (1996). *LISREL Approach to Interaction Effects in Multiple Regressions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
23. Janssen, O. (2001). Fairness Perceptions as a Moderator in the Curvilinear Relationships between Job Demands, and Job Performance and Job Satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 1039–1050.
24. Johnson, J. W. (2001). The relative importance of task and contextual performance dimensions to supervisor judgments of overall performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 984-996.
25. Karlı, Ü., & Koçak, S. (2004). Job Satisfaction Levels of the Personnel among the Selected Private Health and Fitness Centers in Turkey. *Hacettepe Journal of Sport Sciences*, *15*(3), 125–136.
26. Kim, W.G, Leong, J.K. & Lee, Y.K. (2005). Effect of service orientation on job satisfaction organizational commitment, and intention of leaving in a casual dining chain restaurant. *Hospitality Management*, 24(2), 171–193.
27. Koustelios, A, Theodorakis, N., & Goulimaris, D. (2004). Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict and Job Satisfaction Among Physical Education Teachers in Greece. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(2), 87–92.
28. Koustelios, A., & Tsigilis, N. (2005). The Relationship between Burnout and Job Satisfaction Among Physical Education Teachers: A Multivariate Approach. *European Physical Education Review*, 11(2), 189–203.
29. Lambert, E. G., Hogan N, L., & Barton, S. M. (2001). The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Turnover Intent: A Test of a Structural Measurement Model Using A

National Sample of Workers. *The Social Science Journal*, 38, 233-250.

30. Lauver, K. J., Brown A. K. (2001). Distinguishing between employees' perceptions of person–job and person–organization fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 454–470.
31. Lee, Y.K., Park, D.H. & Yoo, D. (1999). The structural relationships between service orientation, mediators, and business performance in Korea hotel firms. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 4 (1) 59–70.
32. Li, M. (1993). Job Satisfaction and Performance of Coaches of the Spare-Time Sports Schools in China. *Journal of Sport Management*, 7, 132-140.
33. Locke, E. A. (1969). What is Job Satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 309–36.
34. MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W. & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power Analysis and Determination of Sample Size for Covariance Structure Modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 130–149.
35. McCausland, W. D., Pouliakas, K., & Theodossiou, I. (2005). Some Are Punished and Some Are Rewarded: A Study of the Impact of Performance Pay on Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Manpower,* 26 (7/8), 636–659.
36. Mirzelioğlu, N., Doğu, G., & Mirzelioğlu, D. (2003). Analysis of Job Satisfaction Levels of the Administrators at the Central Office of General Directorate of Youth and Sports. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 11(3), 29–34.
37. Mobley, W. (1982). *Employee Turnover Causes, Consequences, and Control.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
38. O'Brien, G. E. & Dowling, P. (1981). Age and Job Satisfaction. *Australian Psychologist*, 16, 49–61.
39. Öcal, K., & Koçak, S. (2010). Adaptation of Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) with Sport Media Employees. *11th International Sport Sciences Congress*. *Abstract Book*. 134–136
40. Oran, B. N. (1989). *Job Satisfaction of a Group of Academic Staff in Marmara University*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Marmara University, Istanbul.
41. Pedersen, P. M., Miloch, K. S., & Laucella, P. C. (2007). *Strategic sport communication*, US. Human Kinetics.
42. Ramazanoğlu, F. (2006). Job Satisfaction of Personnel of Youth and Sports Province Organization. *Fırat University Journal of Social Science*, 16(2), 291–299.
43. Rambur, B., McIntosh, B., Palumbo, M. V., & Reinier, K. (2005). Education as a Determinant of Career Retention and Job Satisfaction Among Registered Nurses. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 37(2), 185–192.
44. Reinardy, S. (2007). Satisfaction vs. Sacrifice: Sports Editors Assess the Influences of Life Issues on Job Satisfaction. *Journalism & Mass Communication*, 84(1), 105–121.
45. Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (2002). Is Job Search Related to Employment Quality? It all Depends on Fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 646–654.
46. Sarker, S. J., Crossman, A., & Chinmeteepituck, P. (2003). The Relationships of Age and Length of Service with Job Satisfaction: An Examination of Hotel Employees in Thailand. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18 (7), 745–758.
47. Savucu, Y., Zirek, O., Devecioğlu, S., & Çınar, V. (2008). Investigating the Job Satisfaction Levels of Basketball Referees. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 3(4), 168–176.
48. Schell, L. A., & Rodriguez, S. (2000). Our Sporting Sisters: How Male Hegemony Stratifies Women in Sport. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 9(1), 15–34.
49. Sloane, P. J., & Williams, H. (2000). Job Satisfaction, Comparison Earnings and Gender. *Labour*, 14, 473–502.
50. Smucker, M.K., Whisenant, W.A., & Pederson, P.M. (2003). An Investigation of Job Satisfaction and Female Sports Journalists. *Sex Roles,* 49, (7/8), 401–407.
51. Sousa-Poza, A., & Sousa-Poza, A. (2000). Taking Another Look at the Gender/Job Satisfaction Paradox, *Kyklos*, 53, 135-52.
52. Taris R. & Feij F.A. (2001). Longitudinal Examination of the Relationship between Supplies-Values Fit and Work Outcomes. *Applied Psychology*, 50 (1), 52–81.
53. Ulucan, H., Erol, A.E., Bektaş, F., &Yılmaz, İ. (2011). Investigation of the Job Satisfaction Levels of the Trainers Working at the Infrastructures of Professional Football Clubs in Turkey. *Selçuk University Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science*, 13(2), 226–232.
54. Weiss, D. J. R., Davis, R. V., England, G.E., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation 22 (Work Adjustment Project Industrial Relations Center University of Minnesota).
55. Yaman, Ç. (2009). Job Satisfaction Levels of Formative Physical Education Teachers. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6 (1), 683–711.
56. Yerlisu, T., & Çelenk, B. (2008). Determination of Job Satisfaction Level of Volleyball Trainers Coaching League Teams. *Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, *6*(2), 87–93.