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Abstract
This study is based on the relation of the concepts of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction that are such important for organizations. The study is conducted at the Selcuk University on a sample of research assistants with the aim to define the highest and lowest experienced levels of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction factors, to find the communication satisfaction and job satisfaction factors which are considered as most important by the subjects, determine the nature and extent of the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. Spector’s (1977) Job Satisfaction Survey and Downs’ and Hazen’s (1977) Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire was used at the survey. 164 research assistants – from Selçuk University – filled the questionnaires. The total communication satisfaction scores of the research assistants who have been considered, indicates that they were experiencing an average communication satisfaction. The highest scoring communication satisfaction factors were in sequential order, “horizontal communication”, “media quality” and “organizational integration”, on the other hand the factors “communication climate”, “personal feedback” and “organizational perspective” scored as the factors with the lowest experienced satisfaction. It has been found that they were mostly representing an average level of job satisfaction. The highest job satisfaction factors arranged in order were “nature of work”, “coworkers” and “the supervision”, on the other hand “pay”, “fringe benefits” and “contingent rewards” were the least satisfying factors. In the study, it has been also found that there existed a positive, strong and meaningful relation between the total communication satisfaction score and job satisfaction. In addition, meaningful relations have been found between almost all of the communication factors and the job satisfaction factors.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION AND JOB SATISFACTION: A SURVEY AMONG SELCUK UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

1. INTRODUCTION

Effective communication is key to organizational accomplishment. Therefore communication should have been located by organizations in their strategic planning process (Hargie et al., 2002; Azhar, 2006). Today’s business world is trying to reduce and control costs. At the same time managers focus on competing globally, improving quality and service. These organizational purposes are being driven by improved information and communication technologies (Igbaria and Guimaraes, 1999; Kurland and Bailey, 1999; Townsend et al., 1998; Vivien and Thompson, 2000). As a result of global competition, economic pressures and unpredictable changes in the business world employment practices have to be re-designed (Vivien and Thompson, 2000).
Analyzing communication effectiveness can play a useful role in determining the organization’s communication strategy (Hargie et al., 2002). Different studies have implicated that effective communication is related to job satisfaction (Ehlers, 2003; Goris et al., 2000; Kongchan, 1985; Goldhaber et al., 1978; Marrett et al., 1975), motivation (Chiang, 2003), job performance (Alexander et al., 1989; Pincus, 1986), productivity (Chang, 2006; Clampitt & Downs, 1993; Clampitt, 1983), work values (Raile, 2005), organizational climate (Muchinsky, 1977), leadership styles (Ulloa-Heath, 2003; Oh et al., 1991), organizational identification (Nakra, 2006), and organizational commitment (Nuss, 2006; Varona, 1996; Potvin, 1991).

Employee communication satisfaction is important because it plays a central role for employees’ organizational effectiveness. Contrary, if organizational communication is inadequate (employee communication satisfaction is supposed as low) it results low organizational commitment, more absenteeism, greater employee turnover, and more less productivity (Hargie et al., 2002). Consequently, communication and communication satisfaction audits are try to investigate strengths and weakness of organizational communication to improve organizational effectiveness (Gray, 2004).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Communication Satisfaction

Communication satisfaction is the summing of an person’s satisfaction which is saturated from information flow and relationship variables (Pincus, 1986). According to Keyton (1991) communication satisfaction is a global communication dimension which has influenced by different variables. The measurement of employee communication satisfaction has been an significant element of organizational communication audits (Gray, 2004).

Authors have created different measurements such as Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (Downs and Hazen, 1977), Organizational Communication Scale (Roberts & O’Reilly, 1979), and International Communication Association Communication Audit (Goldhaber and Krivonos, 1977), to analyze communication practices in organizations.

Communication satisfaction construct has been applied in three discrete areas which are interpersonal, group and organizational communication satisfaction (Hecht, 1978). For instance, Hecht (1978) developed an instrument for measuring interpersonal relationships named The Interpersonal Communication Relationship Inventory. Interpersonal Communication Relationship Inventory has been qualified for use in various organizations (Wheeless et al., 1984). Nevertheless, the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire has been one of the most widely employed instrument in different sectors and organizations (Greenbaum et al., 1988).

Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) which was developed by Downs and Hazen (1977) has been the most frequently used instrument for measuring the organizational communication effectiveness. Communication satisfaction construct is multidimensional and comprehend eight dimensions which are supervisory communication, subordinate communication, communication climate, personal feedback, organizational perspective, organizational integration, horizontal communication and media quality. CSQ has used different researchs especially in the field of organizational communication. CSQ has been internally consistent and reliable across all organizations (Greenbaum et al., 1988).
Downs and Hazen’s (1977) and Downs’ (1990) researchs implicated that communication satisfaction is a multidimensional construct. According to these researchers communication satisfaction is an individual’s satisfaction with different facets of communication in the organization. Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire’s dimensions are explained below:

1. Communication climate comprehends the extent to which communication in the organization motivates employees to meet organizational goals. Also this dimension makes employees identify with the organization. It involves judgments of whether people’s attitudes towards communication are healthy in the organization.

2. Supervisory communication encompasses both the upward and downward facets of communicating with supervisors. Three of the principle items contain the degree to which a superior is open to ideas, the degree to which the executive listens and pays attention, and the degree to which direction is offered in solving job-related problems.

3. Organizational integration focuses on the extent to which employees receive information about their immediate work environment and comprehends information received by employees and their opportunities to participate in the system.

4. Media quality is related with the measurement of the helpfulness, clearness and amount of information connected with channels such as publications, memos, and meetings.

5. Co-worker communication measures the degree to which horizontal and informal communication is accurate and free flowing.

6. Organizational perspective involves the measurement of the satisfaction with information about the organization as a whole such as its goals and performance, and financial standing.

7. Personal feedback comprehends the extent to which individuals think that their efforts are recognized, and their supervisors realized their problems, and the measures by which they are being estimated are objective.

8. Relationship with subordinates concerns with the openness of individuals to downward communication and their receptiveness and potentiality to send good information upward. Though Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire was developed 30 years ago, it has been as one of the most important measurements for communication satisfaction. It has been supported because of a high degree of validity and reliability throughout various organizations. The Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire has been applied to a great extent in the U.S., England, Japan, Spain, Nigeria, Netherlands, Australia, Thailand, Korea, China, and Guatemala (Nakra, 2006).

2.2 Relationship Between Communication Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction

Researchers interest in the topic of job satisfaction began in the early 20th century. Some activities thorough World War II brought an academic perspective to job satisfaction (Hull, 2004). Job satisfaction is one of the most investigated topics in organizational psychology (Bailey, 2002; Higgins, 2004; Shekleton, 2004; Baysinger, 2004; Landy, 1978). Also job satisfaction is continuing to be a central topic of interest in American business and industry (Matzaganian, 2004). The reason of academic interest in Job satisfaction is that is linked to life satisfaction, self

Especially, interest of job satisfaction developed with Elton Mayo’s study at the Western Electronic Hawthorne at Chicago, Illinois. The Hawthorne study was one of the primary research about employee motivation and job satisfaction. In addition this study implicated that employee’ perceptions and job satisfaction related to job performance and organizational climate. And these variables had a significant effect on employee productivity (Mayo, 1933 quoted Evans, 1996).

Job satisfaction has been defined by scholars and researchers in different ways. According to Locke (1976) job satisfaction is an enjoyable or positive emotional expression which results from the employee’s job or job experience (Gratto, 2001). Another definition of job satisfaction is a person’s attitude or affective reaction that can be positive or negative toward his or her work place (Nkereuwem, 1990).

Job satisfaction is crucial to nearly every employer in the United States due to the fact that it makes a better working environment (Nemiroff & Ford, 1976; Pettit et al., 1997). Many researchers have been investigating the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. In fact that relationship is rather strong (Ehlers, 2003; Pettit et al., 1997; Miles, 1996; Clampitt & Downs, 1993; Muchinsky, 1977; Falcione, 1974a; Falcione, 1974b; Nicholson, 1980; Duke, 1981). Table 1 includes a summary of these researches and findings.

Ehlers (2003) conducted a research among 166 city employees. He aimed to investigate the relationships between communication satisfaction of employees with horizontal communication, supervisors, and upper management, job satisfaction and absenteeism. According to results of this study, there are significant, positive relationships between the dimensions of communication satisfaction that horizontal communication, supervisors, and top management with job satisfaction.

Goris et al. (2000) employed their study in two different companies. This research’ sample constituted of 612 employees (102 managers and 510 non-managers). According to the results of this study, upward communication is a main predictor of both job satisfaction along with pay and promotion, while lateral communication is a predictor of job quantity and overall job performance. Also findings indicated that downward communication is a moderator on the prediction of job quantity, overall performance and overall job satisfaction. In addition downward communication is predictor of satisfaction with work, satisfaction with pay, and satisfaction with co-workers in low-job congruence conditions.

Pettit et. al (1997) examined the effect of organizational communication on the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. Their results showed that organizational communication has strong support as a predictor of job satisfaction and weak support as a moderator of the job performance-job satisfaction relationship. 302 employees from two manufacturing firms consisted the sample. Findings indicated that lateral communication moderated the link between satisfaction with pay and performance, while accuracy of information moderated to association between satisfaction with work and performance. Communication dimensions which were the greatest predictives for job satisfaction were
accuracy of information, desire for interaction, communication load, trust in superior, influence of superior, and satisfaction with communication.

**Table 1. Researchs About Communication Satisfaction And Relationship Between Communication Satisfaction-Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher(s)</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad (2006)</td>
<td>Two Different State Universities</td>
<td>252 Academic staff</td>
<td>Downs and Hazen’s eight factors were confirmed using factor analysis. While academic staff indicated low satisfaction from organizational integration, personal feedback, communication climate, and organizational integration factors, on the other hand, they reported high satisfaction from subordinate and supervisory communication, media quality, and horizontal communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheil (2003)</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>210 Lecturer</td>
<td>Variables of age, supervisor’s gender, ethnicity, and quality of leadership have been found as significantly predicting communication satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehlers (2003)</td>
<td>Manufacturing Firms</td>
<td>166 Different level of employees</td>
<td>Significant correlations have been found between horizontal communication which is a communication satisfaction factor and the nature of the work, pay, promotion, supervision and coworkers which are job satisfaction factors. In addition, there are significant correlations between supervisory communication and all of job satisfaction factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goris <em>et. al.</em> (2000)</td>
<td>Manufacturing Firms</td>
<td>360 employees</td>
<td>Downward communication was significantly predictive to job satisfaction factors of nature of the work, pay, and coworkers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettit <em>et. al.</em> (1997)</td>
<td>Manufacturing Firms</td>
<td>302 Workers</td>
<td>Dimensions of communication satisfaction, trust to superior, desire for interaction, and perceived communication load were predictive for job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pincus (1986)</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>327 Nurses</td>
<td>The communication satisfaction dimensions of supervisor communication, communication climate, personnel feedback, and top management communication correlated significantly with job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldhaber, <em>et. al.</em> (1978)</td>
<td>Different Organizations at Various Sectors</td>
<td>3931 Employees at Various Levels</td>
<td>Job satisfaction’s most important predictives were, the variables of organizational communication relationships, amount of information received, and employee age. Job satisfaction’s most important predictive was especially superior-subordinate relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muchinsky (1977)</td>
<td>Government Agency</td>
<td>695 Employees at Various Levels</td>
<td>Positive and significant relationships between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction dimensions of promotion, nature of work, coworkers, pay have been found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pincus (1986) used a modified version of Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire to investigate the relationship between communication satisfaction with both job satisfaction and job performance. Pincus applied the CSQ and a job performance questionnaire to a sample of nurses. The results showed that communication satisfaction related to both job satisfaction and productivity. According to these results the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction was stronger than that the relationship between productivity.

Goldhaber et al. (1978) used ICA Communication Audit for measuring the organizational communication effectiveness and to investigate the relationship between communication effectiveness and job satisfaction as an organizational outcome. The data were collected from 16 different organizations consisting of three health care organizations (N=1522), five educational organizations (N=1330), three organizations from private sector (N=665), and five governmental organizations (N=414). Research was conducted between the years 1974-1976. Total population of these organizations was 15,163. Sample included approximately 6402 employees with a return rate exceeding 60% (N=3931).

Findings implicated that organizational communication relationships were most important contributors to job satisfaction. Factors related to superior-subordinate relationships and system involvement accounted most of the job satisfaction variance. Goldhaber et al. (1978) summarized the conclusions of their research: (1) Variables named organizational communication relationships, amount of information received, and the age of the employee were most important contributors to job satisfaction, (2) especially superior-subordinate relationships and involvement within a worker’s system, were the most crucial contributors of job satisfaction.

Muchinsky (1977) explained his study’s purpose as to investigate the relationships among organizational communication, organizational climate, and job satisfaction. His sample consisted of 695 employees from a public organization. Results implicated that communication dimensions of trust, influence, desire for interaction, accuracy, directionality-lateral, and satisfaction with communication correlated significantly with most of the job satisfaction dimensions. Especially satisfaction with communication significantly correlated with all of the dimensions of job satisfaction.

Based on the literature review five research questions were introduced for this study:

- **RQ1**: What is the respondent’s level of communication satisfaction?
- **RQ2**: What is the respondent’s level of job satisfaction?
- **RQ3**: What are the series of importance factors of communication satisfaction perceived by research assistants?
- **RQ4**: What are the series of importance factors of job satisfaction perceived by research assistants?
- **RQ5**: Is there a relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction?

### 3. METHODOLOGY

To examine the communication satisfaction and job satisfaction levels of the research assistants’ who are working at Selçuk University, the relationship of these two variables was studied using the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (Downs and Hazen, 1977) and Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1997). Different analysis such as descriptive statistics, regression, and correlation were used for responding the various research questions.
3.1 Samples

Six hundred (600) research assistants from seventeen (17) faculties consisted the population of the study. The survey was sent as a web link via e-mail to five hundred and five (505) e-mail addresses which belongs to research assistants. A hundred and sixty three (163) surveys have been completed and returned to the researcher. Thus, study’s return rate is 32%. The sample consisted of 104 (63.8%) male respondents and 59 (36.2%) females. Respondents’ mean of ages is 29.26 and working period as a research assistant 5.44 years. Nine (5.6%) respondents had bachelor’s degree, one hundred and eighteen (72.8%) master, and thirty five (21.6%) doctor’s degree.

3.2 Measurement

The instrument used for his study is: (1) Downs and Hazen’s (1977) Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire and (2) Spector’s (1997) Job Satisfaction Survey.

3.2.1 Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire

The Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Downs and Hazen (1977) has been widely used in the investigation of communication satisfaction. The questionnaire was constructed to state individual’s degree of communication satisfaction through fifty-one items. To assess the communication satisfaction, a zero-to-ten point scale which ranged between “very dissatisfied” and “very satisfied” is used. There were two open ended questions for suggestions to improve communication satisfaction and productivity. Except these, items related to communication satisfaction are extracted from the questionnaire in this research. Also items which belongs to the dimension of downward communication (relationship with subordinates) is extracted because research assistants don’t have subordinates. The Communication satisfaction questionnaire which has been used in this research includes thirty-five questions. These questions belong to these communication satisfaction dimensions: Communication Climate, Supervisory Communication, Organizational Integration, Media Quality, Co-worker Communication, Organizational Perspective, Personal Feedback, and Relationship with Subordinates.

The Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire was conducted two times during one week to the same sample for test-retest reliability analysis. Results of the analysis showed that the reliability coefficient between the two administrations was .94. Downs and Hazen (1977) applied item validity analysis for proving instrument’s validity. Results showed that items significantly differentiated between satisfied and dissatisfied employees.

3.2.2 Job Satisfaction Survey

Job satisfaction survey (JSS) was developed by Paul E. Spector (1985 quoted by Ladner, 2004), Department of Psychology, University of South Florida. The Job Satisfaction Survey has 36 items which belong to nine dimensions. These dimensions are Pay, Promotions, Supervision, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards (performance rewards), Operating Conditions, Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Communication. Each dimension contained four items and the total score was computed using 36 items. Certain items indicate negative statements because
they were reversed scored. The instrument uses one-to-seven point Likert scale, from one as “strongly disagree” and seven being “strongly agree”.

The Job Satisfaction Survey’s internal consistency reliability is quite high. The coefficient alphas ranged from .60 for the coworker dimension to .91 for the total instrument. Instrument’s validity has been provided by comparison of different studies on the same sample. Five of the factors of the JSS which were pay, promotion, supervision, coworkers, and nature of work correlated fairly high with factors of the Job Descriptive Index. The correlations between the two instruments ranged from .61 for coworkers to .80 for supervision. In addition there is also high correlations between JSS and Job Diagnostic Survey (Spector, 1997 quoted McGehee, 2003).

4. FINDINGS

To get answers to the research questions, descriptive statistics, multiple linear regression analysis and pearson correlation analysis were performed.

4.1 Level of Respondent’s Communication Satisfaction

Descriptive statistics was performed in relation to the first research question. By using descriptive statistics, arithmetic mean of overall communication satisfaction and its dimensions was obtained. Results of analysis revealed that the most satisfied communication satisfaction factors were horizontal communication (mean=5.96), media quality (mean=5.26), and organizational integration (mean=5.25), on the other hand the least satisfied factors were communication climate (mean=4.44), personal feedback (mean=4.60), and organizational perspective (mean=5.04). Also analysis showed that research assistants’ have average level satisfaction in view of the overall communication satisfaction (mean=5.08). Table 2 indicates the mean, median and standart deviation of overall communication satisfaction and it’s dimensions.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics Relating to Communication Satisfaction (n= 164)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Communication Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Climate</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Communication</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Integration</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Quality</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Communication</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Perspective</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Feedback</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Level of Respondent’s Job Satisfaction

Descriptive statistics was performed again to implicate research assistant’s degree of job satisfaction. According to results of descriptive statistics, as from overall job satisfaction (mean=3.90), research assistants were satisfied at average degree. Nature of work (mean=5.23), coworkers (mean=4.54), and supervision (mean=4.45) were the most highly satisfied factors of job satisfaction while pay (mean=2.91), fringe benefits (mean=2.96), and contingent rewards (mean=3.58) were the least satisfied factors. Table 3 includes mean, median, and standard deviations related to job satisfaction variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Conditions</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Importance Sequence of Communication Satisfaction Dimensions

Results of the multiple linear regression analysis revealed that, as presented in Table 4, all of the communication satisfaction dimensions significantly contributed to overall communication satisfaction ($R^2=1.00$, $p<.001$). Seven communication satisfaction factors explained a 100% variance of the overall communication satisfaction. Beta values indicated that the most important communication satisfaction dimensions were respectively supervisory communication ($\beta=.205$), media quality ($\beta=.196$) and organizational perspective ($\beta=.158$). Thus, these were the most important dimensions according to the research assistants.
Table 4. Results of Regression Analysis Related to Predictives of Communication Satisfaction Dimensions That Are Contributing to Overall Communication Satisfaction (n= 164)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Climate</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.146***</td>
<td>87.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Communication</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.205***</td>
<td>98.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Integration</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.143***</td>
<td>76.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Quality</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.196***</td>
<td>93.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Communication</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.126***</td>
<td>107.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Perspective</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.158***</td>
<td>94.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Feedback</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.126***</td>
<td>107.211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²= 1.00  
Adjusted R²= 1.00  
F= 170085.3***

Note ***= p< .001

4.4 Importance Sequence of Job Satisfaction Dimensions

Multiple linear regression analysis again was applied for investigating most important job satisfaction factors that predict overall job satisfaction (R²=1.00, p<.001).

Table 5. Results of Regression Analysis Related to Predictives of Job Satisfaction Dimensions Contributing to Overall Job Satisfaction (n= 164)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.167***</td>
<td>86.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.174***</td>
<td>77.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.226***</td>
<td>99.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.129***</td>
<td>72.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.199***</td>
<td>80.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Conditions</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.155***</td>
<td>86.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.184***</td>
<td>80.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.175***</td>
<td>86.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.189***</td>
<td>77.488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²= 1.00  
Adjusted R²= 1.00  
F= 40182.383***

Note ***= p< .001
As appeared on Table 5, nine job satisfaction factors significantly predict overall job satisfaction. All of the factors explain 100% variance of the overall job satisfaction. When examined for Beta values, it appeared that most important job satisfaction factors were respectively supervision (β=.226), contingent rewards (β=.199), communication (β=.189), and coworkers (β=.184). It has been concluded that these factors were the most important job satisfaction factors perceived by research assistants.

4.5 Correlations Between Communication Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction

To reveal correlations between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction pearson correlation analysis was performed. According to results of analysis, overall communication satisfaction and nearly all of the communication satisfaction dimensions significantly correlated to overall job satisfaction and it’s dimensions. Results indicated that there were correlations between variables and it’s dimensions range of .156 and .778.

Table 6. Results of Correlation Analysis Between Communication Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.263***</td>
<td>.251***</td>
<td>.219***</td>
<td>.245***</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.225***</td>
<td>.260***</td>
<td>.266***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.263***</td>
<td>.515***</td>
<td>.471***</td>
<td>.489***</td>
<td>.335***</td>
<td>.446***</td>
<td>.512***</td>
<td>.578***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.652***</td>
<td>.778***</td>
<td>.510***</td>
<td>.648***</td>
<td>.288***</td>
<td>.411***</td>
<td>.630***</td>
<td>.697***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>.558***</td>
<td>.551***</td>
<td>.475***</td>
<td>.537***</td>
<td>.300***</td>
<td>.343***</td>
<td>.542***</td>
<td>.583***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Conditions</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.164*</td>
<td>.156*</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>.483***</td>
<td>.453***</td>
<td>.347***</td>
<td>.455***</td>
<td>.198*</td>
<td>.290***</td>
<td>.377***</td>
<td>.459***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>.456***</td>
<td>.392***</td>
<td>.373***</td>
<td>.419***</td>
<td>.305***</td>
<td>.286***</td>
<td>.354***</td>
<td>.443***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communic.</td>
<td>.631***</td>
<td>.620***</td>
<td>.588***</td>
<td>.568***</td>
<td>.310***</td>
<td>.482***</td>
<td>.573***</td>
<td>.661***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.700***</td>
<td>.690***</td>
<td>.582***</td>
<td>.657***</td>
<td>.321***</td>
<td>.506***</td>
<td>.646***</td>
<td>.723***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Table contains correlation coefficients.
Note 2: ***= p≤.005, **= p≤.01, *=p<.05

As seen on Table 6, overall communication satisfaction significantly and positively correlated with job satisfaction factors of supervision (r=.697), communication (r=.661), contingent rewards (r=.583), promotion (r=.578), coworkers (r=.459), nature of work (r=.443), and pay (r=.266). Similarly, overall job satisfaction significantly and positively correlated with communication satisfaction factors of communication climate (r=.700), supervisory
communication (r=.690), media quality (r=.657), feed-back (r=.646), organizational integration (r=.583), organizational perspective (r=.506), and horizontal communication (r=.321).

Also, overall communication satisfaction significantly and positively correlated to overall job satisfaction which showed a relatively high correlation coefficient (r=.723). Variables that have the highest correlations to each other were supervision and supervisory communication (r=.778), overall job satisfaction and overall communication satisfaction (r=.723), overall job satisfaction and communication climate (r=.700), supervision and overall communication satisfaction (r=.697), overall job satisfaction and supervisory communication (r=.690), and communication and overall communication satisfaction (r=.661).

5. CONCLUSION

This study revealed research assistants’ communication satisfaction and job satisfaction levels, the importance sequence of communication and job satisfaction factors and the relations of these two variables to each other. It has been concluded that the most satisfied communication satisfaction factors were horizontal communication, media quality and organizational integration, on the other hand the least satisfied factors were communication climate, personal feedback and organizational perspective. Analysis also showed that research assistants were average level satisfied in relation to overall communication satisfaction.

In overall job satisfaction, research assistants were satisfied at average degree. Factors of job satisfaction, namely nature of work, coworkers, and supervision were the most highly satisfied while pay, fringe benefits, and contingent rewards were the least satisfied factors.

Communication satisfaction factors which were perceived as most important by research assistants were respectively (1) supervisory communication, (2) media quality, and (3) organizational perspective. On the other hand job satisfaction factors which perceived most important by research assistants are respectively (1) supervision, (2) contingent rewards, (3) communication and (4) coworkers.

Pearson correlation analysis revealed explicit correlation between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. Overall communication satisfaction and nearly all of the communication satisfaction dimensions significantly correlated to overall job satisfaction and it’s dimensions. Overall communication satisfaction significantly and positively correlated with job satisfaction factors of supervision, communication, contingent rewards, promotion, coworkers, nature of work, and pay. Similarly, overall job satisfaction significantly and positively correlated with communication satisfaction factors of communication climate, supervisory communication, media quality, feed-back, organizational integration, organizational perspective, and horizontal communication.

At the same time, overall communication satisfaction significantly and positively correlated to overall job satisfaction which showed a quite high correlation coefficient. Variable peers that have the strongest correlations are in order (1) supervision and supervisory communication, (2) overall job satisfaction and overall communication satisfaction, (3) overall job satisfaction and communication climate, (4) supervision and overall communication satisfaction.
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