 Anthropologist, 20(3): 636-642 (2015)

Job Satisfaction of Physical Education Lecturers Working in Turkey

Mehmet Dalkilic[1], Zafer Cimen[2] and Fikret Ramazanoglu[3]

[1]Kilis December 7 University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Kilis,Turkey
[2]Gazi University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Ankara, Turkey
[3]Sakarya University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Sakarya, Turkey

KEYWORDS Sports. Instructor. Administrator. Job Dissatisfaction. Productivity

ABSTRACT Of the 314 lecturers interviewed in this study, 229 physical education lecturers, 46 of whom were females and 183 of whom were males working in 7 universities in different regions of Turkey participated in the research which aimed to determine the job satisfaction levels of the lecturers from the perspective of various factors. Of the total 314 lecturers, 7 (3.1%) were professors, 20 (8.7 %) were associated professors, 63 (27.5 %) were assistant professors, 48 (21.0 %) were instructors, 44 (19.2 %) were lecturers, and 47 (20.5 %) were research assistants. In consequence, job satisfaction differs significantly in parallel to the rise in academic titles and in the years of teaching; moreover, the job satisfaction of participants who work in the most developed region of Turkey is the highest.

INTRODUCTION

Instructors are the most important cornerstones of universities, which are the pioneers of science. Job satisfaction levels of instructors are closely related to both the academic and scientific achievements expected from them, and the quality of the students to be raised by the universities they work at. Job satisfaction with the universities of the instructors who have an important role in the development of sport affect the achievement of the students they teach. While high-level job satisfaction of instructors contributes to the achievement of their universities, job dissatisfaction affects the achievement of the university negatively. Instructors who are satisfied with their jobs provide positive contributions to themselves, to society, and to the national economy.

Job satisfaction has always been a research subject, in terms of organizations that has gained place in the changing and developing world order; and the individuals who work within these organizations. As of the early 1900s, behavioural scientists have conducted many researches in order to determine the extent of job satisfaction and the factors that affect job satisfaction. The first researches for the provision of job satisfaction are "Hawthorne" studies that were conducted in Chicago Western Electric Company in America in 1920s by Elton Mayo et al. The results of these studies became significant in the 1930s. Hawthorne studies revealed that failure in behaviours of workers as human beings resulted generally from problems such as low morale and performance; and they claimed that industrial businesses could get more efficient results if they showed consideration for the workers (O'Connor 1999; Simsek et al. 2001).

Vroom (1964) defines job satisfaction as "pleasing and positive emotional state resulting from the positive evaluation of the job and job experience of the individual. Job satisfaction represents a feature varying from person to person (Örücü and Friends 2005). Basically, the importance of employee attitude towards their jobs and workplaces is available through human resources and they are most effective for the development of positive attitudes (Ramazanoglu 2002). In this context, the ability to provide services in elite sports, Iil to implement a quality management style that will be Ibas and a pleasure to be in the top level of the facility is required to ensure a harmonious coexistence (Ramazanoglu and Friends 2002).

Importance of Job Satisfaction

People want to reveal their personal skills and want to realize them. Job dissatisfaction disappoints them. Work is the base of human life.

Address for correspondence:
Dr. Mehmet Dalkiliç
Kilis 7 Aralik University,
School of Physical Education and Sports,
Kilis, Turkey 79000
Telephone: +905325821375
E-mail: m.dalkilic@hotmail.com

Unemployed individuals sink into despair. Job dissatisfaction results in alienation from work, dispiritedness; and results in low efficiency, and concordantly an unhealthy society. Providing job satisfaction is not practically easy. The reason for this is that, finding a job that can realize the requirements and desires is very difficult. There are various opinions which claim that job satisfaction is important, or unimportant (Kaynak 1990).

Because job dissatisfaction is the most important indicator of unhappiness for workers and working conditions are getting defective, it is one of the most important subjects to be studied. Job dissatisfaction underlies organizational problems such as sudden strikes, slowing down of the work, low efficiency, and discipline problems. In terms of the organizational consequences, job dissatisfaction may result in reluctance to go to work, quitting the organization, sense of inadequacy, non-cooperation, failure at work, desire to get away from work, wrong decisions, and qualitative and quantitative downfall for the employees (Bas and Ardic 2001).

Studies on job satisfaction are of great importance for the detection of employees' job related problems, developing their attitudes toward work, determining intra-organizational educational needs, planning and managing the organizational change, and arranging the intra-organizational communication (Newstrom and Davis 1993).

Factors that Affect Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is not a static or stable phenomenon. Therefore, individuals or some other kind of problems may result in job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. These factors are classified as individuals and job or job-environment related factors (Kumas 2008).

Individual Factors

"What workers expect from their jobs are closely related to their personality features. Basic personality features are primary indicators of individuals' qualitative and quantitative expectations of their jobs and job environment" (Alkis 2008).

Environmental Factors

General view of the job, social and economic interests provided for the employees, and job environment conditions are among the factors that affect job satisfaction. Above all, these factors are variables that managers can process in order to increase job satisfaction of the employees. The combination of the employees' attitudes towards job and job environment with a range of factors produces job satisfaction (Erdogan 1999).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The purpose of the present research is determining job satisfaction levels of instructors who work in physical education and sports departments at universities, and the researchers adopted descriptive research model which is frequently used in the field of social sciences (Buyukozturk et al. 2014). The universe of the present research is formed by the instructors who work at state universities in Turkey. Sample is formed by 46 females, and 183 males; a total of 229 instructors with different academic titles who work at 7 universities in 7 regions of Turkey.

While selecting the universities in the sample, purposeful sampling method was used in order to obtain a high participation. With this purpose, the oldest universities, with the highest number of instructors in the region were selected. These universities are; Gaziantep University in South-eastern Anatolia Region; 19 Mayis University in Black-sea Region; Ataturk University in Eastern Anatolia Region, Marmara University in Marmara Region, Gazi University in Central Anatolia Region, Cukurova University in Mediterranean Region, and Celal Bayar University in Aegean Region.

Data Collection Tool

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by Weiss et al. (1967) in order to determine job satisfaction levels of employees was used as the data collection tool of the present research. Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was adapted to Turkish by Baycan (1985).

In the reliability studies of this questionnaire; Cronbach Alpha coefficients were calculated as 99 for internal sub-dimension; 78 for external subdimension; and 89 for the whole scale.

Data Analysis

Data collected in accordance with the subproblems with the purpose of the present re-

search were recorded with coding and data input procedures. For the statistical analysis of the data collected via "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire" and "Demographic Information Form", frequency (f), percentage (%) distributions, t-test for independent groups, and one-way variance analysis for independent groups (ANOVA) tests were used. In t-test and one-way variance analyses; the researchers based on the equivalence of the variances principle among the premises of parametric tests; and in the case that variances were not equal, they didn't seek for significant differences between groups even the 'p' value was lower than significance level. In addition, Turkey HSD test was conducted to test which groups had statistically significant differences in one-way analyses of variance. Significance level was taken as $\alpha = .05$ in analyses.

Mann Whitney U test was used to compare two independent groups when "normality" hypothesis were not met for parametric tests, and k-sample Kruskal-Wallis H-test was used to test the statistical significance of the observed difference between independent groups of more than two.

FINDINGS

This section presents information related to the data on the demographic information of the participants. The table below shows the demographic information on the instructors who participated in the present research (Table 1).

As can be seen in Table 1, 183 (79.9%) of the instructors who participated in the present research are males, and 46 (20.1%) of them are females; 168 (73.4%) of them are married; 80 (60.7%) of them are between the ages 31-40; 47 (20.5%) of them work in Marmara Region; 139 (60.7%) are in the others (res. Assist., lecturer, specialist, and so on)125 (54.6%) of them have been working for 11-20 years; 187 (81.7%) of them has never served as administrators; and 63 of them teach for d"15 hours weekly. The distribution of the instructors by academic title is; 7 (3.1%) of them are professors, 20 (8.7%) of them are associate professors, 63 (27.5%) of them are assistant professors, 48 (21%) of them are instructors, 44 (19.2%) of them are lecturers, and 47 (20.5%) of them are research assistants.

The statistical analyses showed that, there are no statistically significant differences between genders in both sub-dimensions and the whole scale ($p > 0.05$). According to obtained results, mean scores for whole scale (mean=3.426); and two sub-dimensions (internal mean=3.739, external mean=2.957) of male participants are higher than female participants (Table 2).

Table 3 presents that according to t-test analysis for independent groups; "Internal Satisfaction" (single mean=3.766; married mean=3.722), and "General Satisfaction (single mean=3.411; married mean=3.402) scores of single participants are higher than married participants. However, the differences between the scores of the groups were not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

Table 1: Distribution of the demographic information of the instructors

Variable		*Frequency (n)*	*Percentage (%)*
Gender	Male	183	79.9
	Female	46	20.1
	Total	229	100
Marital Status	Married	168	73.4
	Single	61	26.6
	Total	229	100
Age	20-30 years	22	9.6
	31-40 years	80	34.9
	41-50 years	84	36.7
	51 ≥ years	43	18.8
	Total	229	100
Region	South-eastern Anatolia	17	7.4
	Black-sea	52	13.5
	Eastern Anatolia	33	14.4
	Marmara	47	20.5
	Central Anatolia	43	18.8
	Mediterranean	26	11.4
	Aegean	32	14.0
	Total	229	100
Title	Faculty Member	90	39.3
	Other	145	60.7
	Total	229	100
Period of Service	10 ≤ years	51	22.3
	11-20 years	125	54.6
	21 ≥ years	53	23.1
	Total	229	100
Period of Administration	None	187	81.7
	1-5 years	26	11.3
	6 ≥ years	16	7.0
	Total	229	100
Weekly Course Hours	15 ≤ hours	63	27.9
	16-20 hours	59	26.1
	21-25 hours	53	23.5
	26 ≥ hours	51	22.6
	Total	229	100
Title	Professor	7	3.1
	Associate Professor	20	8.7
	Assistant Professor	63	27.5
	Instructor	48	21.0
	Lecturer	44	19.2
	Research Assistant	47	20.5
	Total	229	100.0

Table 2: t-test results for the correlation between job satisfaction and gender

	Gender	*N*	*Mean*	*Ss*	*t*	*p*
Internal Satisfaction	Male	183	3.739	0.689	0.202	0.840
	Female	46	3.715	0.760		
External Satisfaction	Male	183	2.957	0.772	1.827	0.069
	Female	46	2.725	0.750		
General Satisfaction	Male	183	3.426	0.649	0.982	0.327
	Female	46	3.317	0.693		

Table 3: t-test results for the correlation between job satisfaction and marital status

	Marital status	*N*	*Mean*	*Ss*	*t*	*p*
Internal Satisfaction	Married	168	3.722	0.701	0.415	0.679
	Single	61	3.766	0.710		
External Satisfaction	Married	168	2.921	0.758	0.370	0.712
	Single	61	2.878	0.814		
General Satisfaction	Married	168	3.402	0.653	0.092	0.927
	Single	61	3.411	0.677		

As for "External Satisfaction", married participants (mean=2.921) have higher scores than the single participants (mean= 2.879). However, this difference between these groups was also not significant according to the results of t-test analysis ($p > 0.05$).

Table 4 reveals that, instructors who work in Marmara Region have the highest job satisfaction scores (internal, external, general); while instructors who work in the Mediterranean Region have the lowest scores. According to Kruskal Wallis test results, job satisfaction levels of participants for both "General Satisfaction" [χ^2 (6) = 50.082, $p < 0,01$] score; and sub-dimensions scores (Internal Satisfaction [χ^2 (6) = 61.940, $p < 0.01$]; External Satisfaction [χ^2 (6) = 58.169, $p < 0.01$]) varied at a significant level by the regions they work in.

Table 4: Kruskal Wallis test results for the job satisfaction levels of instructors by the regions they work in

	Region	*N*	*Rank Ort.*	*Sd*	χ^2	*p*	*Difference*
Internal Satisfaction	South-eastern Anatolia	17	127.21	6	50.082	0.000	2-1,3,4,5, 74-3,56-
	Black-sea	31	75.27				1,2,3,4,5,7
	Eastern Anatolia	33	118.76				
	Marmara	47	151.24				
	Central Anatolia	43	123.36				
	Mediterranean	26	53.94				
	Aegean	32	128.27				
External Satisfaction	South-eastern Anatolia	17	147.53	6	61.945	0.000	2-1,3,45-
	Black-sea	31	91.44				46-1,3,4,57-
	Eastern Anatolia	33	144.47				1,2,3,4,5
	Marmara	47	154.29				
	Central Anatolia	43	117.91				
	Mediterranean	26	74.54				
	Aegean	32	61.42				
General Satisfaction	South-eastern Anatolia	17	142.35	6	58.168	0.000	2-1,3,4,54-
	Black-sea	31	80.63				56-1,2,3,
	Eastern Anatolia	33	134.33				4,5,77-1,
	Marmara	47	157.05				3,4,5
	Central Anatolia	43	121.66				
	Mediterranean	26	56.27				
	Aegean	32	90.83				

Mann Whitney U tests were conducted on groups in combinations of two in order to determine from which groups the significant difference resulted. According to the results; for the "Internal Satisfaction" sub-dimension of Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire", there are significant differences between the instructors who work in the Black-sea Region (mean rank=75.27), and the instructors who work in South-eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=127.21), Eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=118.76), Marmara Region (Mean Rank=151.24), Central Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=123.36), and Aegean Region (Mean Rank=128.27) in favour of the instructors who work in Black-sea Region; and between the instructors who work in Marmara Region (Mean Rank=151.24), and the instructors who work in Central Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=123.36), and Eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=118.76), in favour of the instructors who work in Marmara Region.

Analyses also revealed that for "Internal Satisfaction" sub-dimension, there are differences between the instructors who work in Mediterranean Region (Mean Rank=53.95), and the instructors who work in South-eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=127.21), Black-sea Region (Mean Rank= 75.27), Eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=118.76), Marmara Region (Mean Rank= 151.24), Central Anatolia Region (Mean Rank= 123.36), and Aegean Region (Mean Rank=128.27), in favour of the instructors who work in Mediterranean Region.

For the "External Satisfaction" sub-dimension, there are significant differences between the instructors who work in Black-sea Region (Mean Rank=91.44), and the instructors who work in South-eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=147.53), Eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=144.47), and Marmara Region (Mean Rank=154.29) in favour of the instructors who work in Black-sea Region; between the instructors who work in Marmara Region (Mean Rank=154.29), and the instructors who work in Central Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=117.91) in favour of the instructors who work in Marmara Region. There are also significant differences between the instructors who work in Mediterranean Region (Mean Rank=74.54), and the instructors who work in South-eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=147.53), Eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=144.47), Marmara Region (Mean Rank=154.29), and Central Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=117.91) in favour of the instructors who work in Mediterranean Region. Additionally, there are significant differences between the instructors who work in Aegean Region (Mean Rank=61.42), and the instructors who work in South-eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank= 147.53), Black-sea Region (Mean Rank=91.44), Eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=144.47), Marmara Region (Mean Rank=154.29), and Central Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=117.91) in favour of the instructors who work in Aegean Region.

The Mann Whitney U test was conducted to examine the reason for the difference between the mean scores from the "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire." It revealed that there are significant differences between the instructors who work in Black-sea Region (Mean Rank=80.63), and the instructors who work in South-eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=142.35), Eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=134.33), Marmara Region (Mean Rank=157.05), and Central Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=121.66) in favour of instructors who work in Marmara Region.

As for the whole scale, there are significant differences between the instructors who work in the Mediterranean Region (Mean Rank=56.27), and the instructors who work in South-eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=142.35), Black-sea Region (Mean Rank=80.63), Eastern Anatolia Region (134.33), Marmara Region (Mean Rank=157.05), Central Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=121.66), and Aegean Region (Mean Rank=90.83) in favour of the instructors who work in the Mediterranean Region. Additionally, for the whole scale, there are also significant differences between the instructors who work in Aegean Region (Mean Rank=90.83), and the instructors who work in South-eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=142.35), Eastern Anatolia Region (Mean Rank=134.33), and Marmara Region (Mean Rank=157.05), and this difference is in favour of the instructors who work in Aegean Region.

Table 5 "Internal Satisfaction" scores of the participants don't differ at a significant level by period of service [$F_{(2, 226)} = 3.413$; $p < 0.05$]. Tukey HSD multiple comparison test was conducted in order to find the difference between groups, and it was found that mean scores of the participants who had been working for $\geq$21 years (mean=3.945) were more positive than the participants who had been working for $\leq$10 years (mean=3.612).

Table 5: Anova results for the job satisfaction levels of instructors by period of service

	Period of service	*N*	*Mean.*	*Ss*	*F*	*p*	*Differencece*
Internal	10≤ Years	51	3.612	0.778	3.413	0.035	1-3
Satisfaction	11-20 Years	125	3.694	0.676			
	21 ≥ Years	53	3.945	0.654			
External	10 ≤ Years	51	2.799	0.876	3.853	0.023	1-2
Satisfaction	11-20 Years	125	2.849	0.748			
	21 ≤ Years	53	3.162	0.672			
General	10 ≥ Years	51	3.290	0.721	4.439	0.013	1-3
Satisfaction	11-20 Years	125	3.356	0.630			
	21 ≥ Years	53	3.632	0.616			

According to analyses, there are significant differences between participants' scores from "External Satisfaction" sub-dimension of "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire" by period of service [$F_{(2, 226)}$= 3.853; p< 0.05]. Turkey HSD multiple comparison test was conducted in order to find the significant differences between groups, and it was found that there were significant differences between the instructors who had been working for ≤10 years (mean=2.799), and the instructors who had been working for 11-20 years (mean=2.849), and ≥21 years (mean= 3.162). "External Satisfaction" sub-dimension scores of instructors who have been working for ≤10 years are lower than the other two groups.

According to ANOVA results, there are statistically significant differences between "General Satisfaction" scores [$F_{(2, 226)}$= 4.439; p< 0.05] of instructors by period of service. Analyses conducted to reveal the source of these differences revealed that there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the instructors who had been working for ≤10 years (mean=3.287), 11-20 years (mean=3.356), and 21 ≥ years (mean=3.632). Instructors who have been working for ≤21 years got more positive general satisfaction scores than the other two groups.

DISCUSSION

The present research determined the job satisfaction related expectations of the instructors who teach at Physical Education and Sports departments at Universities, and examined the correlations between their personality features and job satisfaction levels.

As can be observed from the demographic features of instructors presented in Table 1, most of the participants were male and married, had been working for 11-20 years, and 81.7 percent of these hadn't served as an administrator. The majority of the participants may be interpreted as the male-dominant society in work life.

According to the findings, male participants have higher job satisfaction scores than female participants (Table 2). This indicates that, male instructors love their jobs and feel more pleased with their jobs. Loscocco and Bose (1998), who studied the correlation between gender and job satisfaction found that female individuals had lower job satisfaction levels than male individuals.

Table 3 presents that, single instructors have higher, even slightly, job satisfaction levels than married instructors. This finding is in agreement with the finding of the research conducted by Ergin (1993). The studies on the correlation between marital status and job satisfaction in the literature didn't find any correlations between job satisfaction scores and burnout, stolidity, and loss of sense of achievement scores. Even marital status is considered to be strongly correlated with job satisfaction (Clark 1996). Literature also provides other studies that are not in agreement with this.

For the whole scale (Table 4), academic personnel who work in Marmara Region have the highest job satisfaction levels, this is followed by the personnel working in South-eastern Anatolia Region; and academic personnel working in the Mediterranean Region have the lowest job satisfaction scores.

According to the analyses (Table 5), scores for "External Satisfaction" sub-dimension of "Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire" varied at a significant level by period of service. Instructors who have been working for 21 years and more have higher general job satisfaction levels than the other two groups. Instructors with less seniority have lower job satisfaction levels

than the instructors with more seniority. This may have been caused because the expectation before work; life cannot be realized immediately after starting work; or that expectations (autonomy, respectability, self-realization and so on) are realized as seniority increases. Cetinkanat (2000: 101-117) who conducted a research on academicians found that job dissatisfaction decreased as seniority increased. It was stated that employees who worked for long in the same field or in the same organization have higher job satisfaction levels. With these in mind, we can claim that there is a correlation between seniority and job satisfaction. Therefore, seniority is a factor that affects job satisfaction. Experience in work life increased success, and success increases job satisfaction.

CONCLUSION

The present research examined the factors that affect job satisfaction among instructors who teach at schools of physical education and sports; and found that male instructors of physical education and sports have higher levels of job satisfaction than female instructors of physical education and sports. It was observed that single instructors have higher job satisfaction levels. Job satisfaction levels of instructors varied by period of service, and the instructors who have been working for longer years have higher levels of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction levels also vary by age, and instructors who are older than 51 years have higher job satisfaction. Additionally, academic personnel who work in Marmara Region have the highest job satisfaction levels, this is followed by the personnel working in South-eastern Anatolia Region; and academic personnel working in the Mediterranean Region have the lowest job satisfaction scores.

REFERENCES

Alkis H 2008. *Frederick Herzberg'in Çift Etmen (Hijyen-Motivasyon) Kuraminin Is Görenin Is Doyumuna Etkisive Otel Isletmelerinde Bir Uygulama.* Doktora Tezi. Egitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi,

Bas T, Ardiç K 2001. Kamuve Vakif Üniversitelerindeki Akademik Personelin Is Tatmin Düzeyinin Arastirilmasi. *9th Ulusal Yönetimve Organizasyon Kongresi,* 24-26 Mayis 2001, Silivri, Istanbul.

Baycan FA 1985. *Farkli Gruplarda Çalisan Gruplarda Is Doyumunun Bazi Yönlerinin Analizi.* Istanbul: Bogaziçi Üniversitesi Bilim Uzmanligi Tezi.

Büyüköztürk S, Kiliç Çakmak E, Akgün ÖE, Karadeniz S, Demirel F 2014. *Bilimsel Arastirma Yöntemleri.* 16th Edition. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Clark AE 1996. Job satisfaction in Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations,* 34(2): 189-217.

Çetinkanat C 2000. *Örgütlerde Güdülenmeve Is Doyumu.* Ankara: Ani Yayincilik

Erdogan I 1999. *Örgütsel Davranis.* Istanbul: Dönence Basimve Yayin Hizmetleri.

Ergin C 1993. Doktorve Hemsirelerde Tükenmislik ve Maslach Tükenmis- lik Ölçeginin Uyarlanmasi. *VII Ulusal Psikoloji Kongresi Bilimsel Çalismalari,* Türkpsikologlar Yayini, 22-25 Eylül, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Kaynak T 1990. *Organizasyonel Davranis.* Istanbul: I.Ü.I.F. Yayini.

Kumas V 2008. *Ögretmenlerin Is Doyum Düzeyleriile Stres Düzeyleri Arasindaki Iliski.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Istanbul: Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Loscocco K, Bose CE 1998. Gender and job satisfaction in urban China: The early post-Mao period. *Social Science Quarterly,* 79(1): 91–109

Newstrom JW, Davis K 1993. *Organizational Behaviour: Human Behaviour at Work.* 9th Edition. New York: McGraw Hill, pp.196-201.

O'Connor E 1999. Minding the workers: The meaning of "human" and human relations. *Elton Mayo Organization,* 6(2): 223-246.

Örücü E, Yumusak S, Bozkir Y 2005. Kalite Yönetimi Çerçevesinde Bankalarda Çalisan Personelin Is Tatminive Is Tatminini Etkileyen Faktörlerin Incelenmesine Yönelik Bir Arastirma. *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi I.I.B.F. Yönetim ve Ekonomi,* 13: 1.

Ramazanoglu F 2002. *Taekwondo Öðretilen Özel Spor Isletmelerinde Çalisanlarin Kurumlarindaki Personel Yönetimini Deggerlendirmesi ve Taekwondonun Yayginlastirilmasi için Yeni Bir Yönetim Modeli Önerisi.* Sag Bil Ens, Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi.

Ramazanoglu F, ark 2002. Egitim ve çalisma sürelerine göre antrenör ve spor isletmecilerin doyum düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Spor Araþtirmalari Dergisi,* 16.

Simþek M, Akgemci T, Çelik A 2001. *Davranis Bilimlerine Girisve Örgütlerde Davranis.* Ankara: Nobel Yayin Dagitim, pp.128-134.