

Conceptualizing a Four-Factor Construct for Journalists' Job Satisfaction: A Structural Equation Modeling Method

Pandey, Uma Shankar

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Pandey, U. S. (2019). Conceptualizing a Four-Factor Construct for Journalists' Job Satisfaction: A Structural Equation Modeling Method. *Media Watch*, 10(2), 262-276. <https://doi.org/10.15655/mw/2019/v10i2/49641>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-NC-ND Lizenz (Namensnennung-Nicht-kommerziell-Keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-NC-ND Licence (Attribution-Non Commercial-NoDerivatives). For more information see:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>

Conceptualizing a Four-Factor Construct for Journalists' Job Satisfaction: A Structural Equation Modeling Method

UMA SHANKAR PANDEY

Surendranath College for Women, Kolkata, India

Job Satisfaction studies, especially in the field of Organization research, have traditionally been looked at as a measure of motivation and environmental factors. Factors of burnout related to emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment and its different variants have also been related to diverse conceptualizations of job satisfaction. Recent studies in the fields of human services have also looked at intrinsic, organizational and salary as factors of job satisfaction. The present study theorizes a four-factor construct of job satisfaction for journalists—*intrinsic satisfaction, organizational satisfaction, tangible benefits and efficacy perceptions*. Based on an online survey of 216 journalists in three Indian cities, this study provides a structural equation modeling approach to prove the construct validity of the hypothesized model proposed as a second order hierarchical construct. Standard goodness of fit indices and factor loadings are used to prove the construct validity.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, Koeske, organizational, exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis

Over the last two decades, job satisfaction studies have seen some different empirical methodologies especially in the field of organizational research (Gruneberg, 1979) (Latham, 2007). The job satisfaction construct has been conceptualized in various forms, most of them multidimensional (Pincus, 1986).

In the first known study on job satisfaction, Hoppock (1935) reported that job satisfaction was affected by some factors other than money. These factors included the relative status of the person within the societal and economic community with which he identified himself, relationships with superiors and companions on the job, the nature of the work, prospects for progression, diversity, and freedom from close regulation, visible outcomes, appreciation, and security.

In their seminal work on job satisfaction, Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman advanced the two-factor motivation-hygiene theory. The Herzberg theory suggested that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were not opposites but distinct elements influenced by essential and extrinsic effects. They posited that intrinsic or motivational elements, such as appreciation or accomplishment, are instrumental in inspiring workers, and are directly connected to job satisfaction. Extrinsic or hygiene factors, such as salary or 'company policy,' are responsible for job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959).

Correspondence to: Uma Shankar Pandey, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, Surendranath College for Women, University of Calcutta, Kolkata- 700 009, India

Providing desirable hygiene factors by the organizations is primarily to avoid workers' discontent. These factors do not lead to greater levels of incentives but, in their absence, there is dissatisfaction. These include company policy and administration, supervision, relationship with supervisors, work conditions, salary, relationship with colleagues, personal life, relationship with subordinates, status and security (Herzberg F., 1968, p. 57). Unlike hygiene factors, motivation factors inspire employees to increase productivity and enjoy their work. These include factors like achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, development, and growth (Herzberg F., 1968, p. 57). In other words, motivators caused satisfaction on the job and hygiene factors were the cause of unhappiness at work. The remarkable point is that salary can be both a hygiene aspect and a motivator according to its interpretation if salary is considered as an indicator of purchasing power, it can be considered a hygiene factor.

On the other hand, salary could be a motivator if considered as an indicator of achievement at work. There have recently been a large number of empirical applications of Herzberg's Two-Factor theory. Some studies have pointed out that the theory does not apply to all kinds of establishments. According to one such study for the hospitality industry, when the administration did not allow employees access to the motivating factors, hygiene factors became more dominant sources of motivation, even leading to more productivity (Chitiris, 1988). This led to even more rigorous scrutiny of Herzberg's Two-Factor theory's claims of universalizability.

In another conceptual approach, job satisfaction is considered to be an individual's affective reaction to important aspects of work (Vroom, 1964). Popularly known as the Expectancy Approach, it means that the effort that a person puts in his work is a function of his anticipation of the outcomes after the performance and also the 'valence' of these outcomes. The more the attractiveness (positive valence) of any outcome, the more likely the decision to exert more effort in work (Vroom, 1964, pp. 17-19). The valence of an outcome is dependent on the instrumentality for obtaining alternative outcomes and the expected valence of those outcomes. This theory is also known as Valence Instrumentality Expectancy theory (Latham, 2007, p. 45).

In other words, the VIT theory defines job motivation in terms of four factors. The first is an effort. The second factor is the desirability for effective performance which is related to the valence in the outcome following effort. The third factor is an instrumentality, the linkages the person perceives between his performance and the possible rewards that follow this performance. The fourth factor is the valence that the person perceives of the rewards (Latham, 2007, p. 46).

Maslach Burnout Inventory

The Maslach Burnout Inventory developed in 1981 is a comprehensive measure for conceptualizing burnout, widely used by researchers across disciplines. It was initially conceptualized as a three-factor construct. The first is emotional exhaustion, especially among those who are involved in work involving interface with people. It describes a state of mental fatigue among workers leading to other undesirable emotional states and finally a burnout. This condition is also described as an energy factor (Maslach & Leiter, 1997, p. 156). The second factor is that of depersonalization, which is a measure of the level of involvement with the job. It leads to the development of negativism and cynicism and is visible in adverse and distrustful attitudes towards one's clients. The third is the self-perception of insufficient personal accomplishments. Workers are unhappy with what they have achieved in their job (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, p. 99). This study states burnout

has a positive correlation with different 'self-reported indices' of personal despair, including physical fatigue, sleeplessness, increased use of alcohol and drugs, and family problems (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, p. 100).

The Maslach Burnout Inventory measures exhaustion-energy; depersonalization-involvement and inefficacy-accomplishment. These items are measured on two dimensions: an 8-point intensity scale and a 7-point frequency scale. The frequency scale ranges from 0 meaning never, and 1 stands for a few times a year to 6 which stands for daily. The intensity scale ranges from 1 for very mild to 7, very strong (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, p. 100).

An initial form of the MBI contained 47 items in this two-dimension plan, was administered to 605 people respondents spread across different occupations: police, counselors, educators, social workers, lawyers, doctors, and supervisors. The data was then put to a factor analysis and an orthogonal rotation. Ten factors showed up for both the frequency and the intensity measurements, of which four was responsible for over 75 percent of the variance. Using a specified criterion the number of items was reduced to 25 from 47 (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, p. 101).

These 25 items were further administered to another sample of 420. The results were similar to the first sample. Nine items loaded on to the Emotion Exhaustion subscale, five of them to the Depersonalization subscale and eight items to the Personal accomplishment subscale (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, p. 101). Groups that provide high scores for Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization and low scores for Personal Accomplishment are said to be in a state of Burnout. On the other hand, those scoring low on Depersonalization and Emotional Exhaustion while scoring high on Personal Accomplishment are said to be in a state of engagement with their work (Maslach & Leiter, 1997, p. 156).

The Maslach Burnout Inventory primarily focuses on affective aspects of work. The predominant factor is that of feeling, for example being emotionally fatigued, uncaring and inspired at work. The correlation between burnout and work distinguishes it from general emotive states, such as depression. The Burnout Inventory in this respect is not a general psychiatric syndrome but related to the specificities of work. Human resource administrators and researchers use MBI to trace linkages between burnout and organizational policies and productivity. The following elements are regarded as important contributors to engagement at work and avoiding burnout: Sustainable workload, Feelings of choice and control, Recognition and reward, A sense of community, Fairness, respect, and justice, and Meaningful and valued work (Maslach & Leiter, 1997, p. 149).

Early Conceptualization of Journalists' Job Satisfaction

One of the earliest job satisfaction surveys for journalists was conducted about five decades ago (Samuelson, 1962). This study observed 13 attitudinal areas related to job contentment: Equity of salary distribution; Equity of status distribution; job status rank; Management's attitude toward editorial workers; attitude toward superiors; opportunity for self-expression; Service to society; Constraints; Future in the job; Future in the profession; Attitude toward the newspaper; Congruence of values and job security (Samuelson, 1962, pp. 287-288).

These items were administered to 223 journalism graduates who worked in newspapers at some point in time. Factor analysis provided six subscales. The first consisted of job status rank and the prospective future in the profession; this could be described as optimism in the future of the profession. The second was that of service to society and opportunity for self-expression and could be categorized as satisfaction with the profession.

The third factor related to equity of salary distribution, equity of status distribution, management's attitude toward editorial workers and job security and could be characterized as Relationship with the Management. The fourth factor included attitude toward the newspaper, congruence of values and future in the job and was characterized as congeniality in the profession. The fifth factor consisted of attitude toward supervisors and constraint and was named as the quality of supervision in the profession (Samuelson, 1962, pp. 288-289).

Samuelson reported that those working in bigger newspapers were less satisfied than the ones at small newspapers. Journalists who had spent at least four years in the profession reported greater levels of job satisfaction. Journalists who were older than 35 years and had at least two dependents too reported greater levels of satisfaction and intended to stay on in their current jobs. The ones who reported being supervised by poor leadership were the ones more likely to leave their current jobs. Significantly salary was not related to job satisfaction (Samuelson, 1962, p. 289).

In their extensive study, Johnstone et al. (1971) observed job satisfaction of journalists in terms of professional values, editorial restraints, tangible rewards such as salary and demographic variables including gender, and education. The study demonstrated that qualitative performance was linked to satisfaction at work. Those who had spent a number of years at work were more likely to accept editorial constraints like deadlines and selection/rejection of stories. Salary was an important element of dissatisfaction among younger persons. Remarkably women were more satisfied than men at their work. More importantly, dissatisfaction among young journalists was not limited to salary but had to do with editorial practice. Many of the younger journalists reported dissatisfaction with the practice of journalism which was far removed from the idealistic orientations of professional journalism. The everyday 'compromises' in journalistic practice was what led to greater job dissatisfaction (Johnstone, Slawski, & Bowman, 1976, p. 154).

Johnstone et al. surveyed over 1300 journalists. They reported that more than 4 out of 5 journalists said they would remain in the profession in the next five years. Almost half the journalists (48.8 percent) said they were 'very satisfied' at work. About 38.6 percent of the journalists said they had moderate satisfaction (Johnstone, Slawski, & Bowman, 1976).

Another prominent study applied Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory to a sample of journalism graduates identifying 24 elements that lead to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, based on the 16 factors proposed by Herzberg (Shaver, 1978, p. 56).

The first factor was that for recognition specified by appreciation and compliments for one's work, the second achievement — successful completion of tasks, salary, and increments, the third good working relations with superiors, peers, and subordinates, the fourth helpful infrastructure and resources for working conditions.

The other factors included perceived status on the job, and also the conditions of one's personal life. Two items were provided for Herzberg's conceptualization of the possibility of growth — which included opportunities for promotion in the firm and also the prospect for acquiring new skills for growth. The supervision factor was also conceptualized as whether the supervisor had necessary expertise about the work and whether he was fair in guiding and leading others. The responsibility factor was also identified as a responsibility not just for one's work but also for the work of colleagues. The characteristics for work included whether it was creative and challenging and whether it was suited to one's skills and knowledge. Company policy and administration were divided into four items: whether they were beneficial, whether there were well-defined lines of communication, whether the lines of the hierarchy were clearly defined and whether the top management was competent. Job dissatisfaction factors were negative versions of the above (Shaver, 1978, p. 56).

The areas where this study differed from Herzberg's work were that company policy, and administration was seen more as a hygiene factor leading to job dissatisfaction as also salary which was a factor of job dissatisfaction.

The possibility for growth was overwhelmingly in support of job satisfaction as was 'work itself' largely seen as a motivating factor (Shaver, 1978, p. 57). Almost 20 percent of respondents in this study reported satisfaction to the levels that they would remain in the same job till retirement. The six factors that support Herzberg's hypothesis as being motivating factors include: having the opportunity for professional growth, a sense of responsibility, challenging work, being complimented for one's work. The one exception is the factor involving good personal relations with colleagues which contributed to job dissatisfaction according to Herzberg and which is a motivating factor according to this study (Shaver, 1978, p. 58).

In a more recent study (Willnat & Weaver, 2003) discuss the factors that determine job satisfaction among US and foreign journalists. These include 'amount of autonomy, editorial policies of the organization, pay, chance to influence public affairs, chance to help people, job security, chance to develop a specialty, chance to get ahead in the organization and fringe benefits'(Willnat & Weaver, 2003, p. 413). The study concluded that foreign correspondents were of a higher age, had more education and also greater work experience than the US journalists. The foreign correspondents had spent more than ten years working in the US were more satisfied than the US journalists at work. Among the important factors that contributed to this satisfaction were greater autonomy and higher pay.

On the other hand, the factors that contributed to lesser job satisfaction among the US journalists were the organization's editorial policy, chance to help people and job security. The foreign journalists also said the autonomy in their work was reflected in the greater levels of professional freedom they enjoyed in selection and pitch of their stories. However, they displayed less concern with the editorial policy of their employers (Willnat & Weaver, 2003, pp. 417-418).

A study of US newspaper editors supports the hypothesis that editors of bigger newspapers report greater satisfaction than the ones of smaller newspapers. The common perception is that the editors of bigger newspapers enjoy more power, are more famous and get bigger salaries than those at the smaller newspapers. However this association is not linear; job satisfaction increases with the size of news organizations, but at a reducing rate. Also, editors at bigger newspapers enjoy more autonomy than the ones of smaller news organizations. This is the major factor of job satisfaction for editors of larger newspapers. Salary and age, however, do not show a greater correlation to satisfaction (Demers, 1994, pp. 922-923).

An innovative study also looked at the effect of computer pagination software on the job satisfaction of journalists. Lower job satisfaction was related to greater importance to background work, more emphasis on production tasks, lesser creativity, and autonomy. The perceived ease of computerized pagination did not lead to greater job satisfaction (Stamm, Underwood, & Giffard, 1995, p. 858).

Another study provided 21 items for a five-factor scale of job satisfaction. It included income consisting of four items, power with four items, prestige measured by four items, autonomy consisting of three items and creativity of three items. An additional factor defined as 'general field' of three items was also included (DeFleur, 1992, p. 10). The study reported that photojournalists reported the greatest satisfaction and the television journalists the least satisfaction among the journalists interviewed. The factor that led to the greatest satisfaction was that of prestige associated with working in the media, followed by the creativity factor (DeFleur, 1992, p. 12). Satisfaction levels were also higher for those in the media profession than those outside it.

A survey of 110 full-time journalists in 1993 reported different predictors of job satisfaction for reporters and copy editors (Cook & Banks, 1993). Those journalists who were younger and worked for smaller newspapers reported greater emotional exhaustion. Male journalists reported higher levels of personal accomplishment compared to their female counterparts (Cook & Banks, 1993, p. 114). Subeditors too reported greater emotional exhaustion, as did journalists who had spent less time in the profession. Those who had a higher income reported lesser exhaustion (Cook & Banks, 1993, p. 115).

Another study hypothesized internal and external job satisfaction. It showed that internal job satisfaction was lower in organizations with chain ownership and external job satisfaction was higher for a small family owned newspapers (Stamm & Underwood, 1993, p. 533). Internal job satisfaction was also reported to be higher among journalists who perceived a change in the policy of news coverage.

A more recent study studies sensitivities of journalists towards their employers' business and editorial objectives as important factors of job satisfaction (Beam, 2006). Journalists reported greater satisfaction when the news organization they worked for put a premium on quality journalism. The satisfaction was greater when journalists thought that their employers valued quality journalistic principles as paramount. Journalists would prefer working for such employers. This variable was missing in earlier research on job satisfaction (Beam, 2006, p. 180). This, however, does not lead to a natural corollary that if a news organization prioritizes business interests over journalistic interests, it will lead to greater job dissatisfaction. An organization that prefers maximizing its audience, hence its profits does not form a negative correlation with the satisfaction of its employees.

This research also looked at satisfaction across two occupational groups — the rank and file and the supervisors. It reports factors of job satisfaction for news supervisors are different from that for rank-and-file journalists. Rank-and-file employees take it as a given that the news organization give greater priority to business interests than quality journalism and put profits before principles of good journalism (Beam, 2006, p. 180). Also the news supervisors take it as a given that the news organizations are more profit-driven.

Interestingly, the rank-and-file employees perceive lesser resources and travel opportunities to track complex stories in an organization with a stronger profit orientation. They also perceive a greater workload in such organizations. This according to them leads to weaker journalism (Beam, 2006, p. 181).

The rank and file journalists reported greater satisfaction with working for those news organizations where the supervisors valued quality journalism more. The work conditions also account for the maximum variance in job satisfaction among the two groups (Beam, 2006, p. 181). Journalists who report greatest satisfactions are the ones who think they have greater autonomy in their work and they are working for a news organization which is doing an adequate job of providing information to the public (Beam, 2006, p. 182).

In another recent study, employing at news organizations reported greater levels of cynicism, while reporting moderate levels of exhaustion. The sense of accomplishment or being efficient too shows a decline. Journalists who reported intentions to leave the profession stated the generally poor quality of present-day journalism and lack of appreciation for quality work as their primary reasons for quitting journalism (Reinardy, 2011, p. 47).

Another study of student editors reported 38.4 percent of the student editors experienced high levels of emotional exhaustion and 43 percent students reporting depersonalization. Scores of personal accomplishment too were reported as moderate compared to other studies where this factor scored high (Filak & Reinardy, 2011, p. 252).

Koeske's Reconceptualization of MBI

Koeske et al. have proposed a more direct measure of job satisfaction among people working in human services. They suggest the Maslach Burnout Inventory proves emotional exhaustion as the predominant factor of burnout. The factors of depersonalization and personal accomplishment have a relation to burnout but are not constituents of it (Koeske & Koeske, 1989, p. 132). The new conceptualization sees emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment as related factors that work in different ways in a complex theoretical framework of burnout and emphasizes on the mediating variables of stress and strain (Koeske & Koeske, 1989, p. 141). This study suggests that since these three factors are related, hence researchers should refrain from calculating a composite burnout index from the three. They suggest the emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment factors are reported and preserved separately to relate them to other measures including stress and strain.

Additionally in the MBI, depersonalization subscale consists of only five items and given its complexity, more items should be added to it, an alternative conceptualization of burnout suggests a demand-stress-strain-outcome model, where emotional exhaustion represents strain and accomplishment and depersonalization represent other related variables (Koeske & Koeske, 1989, p. 142). They hence introduce three subscales for the Job Satisfaction Survey measured on a 7 point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7 on the satisfaction scale categorized into three subscales. Intrinsic satisfaction includes the factors related to the type of the work which is measured by 7 factors; working with one's clients, the challenge the job provides, opportunities for acquiring new skills, amount of contact with people, opportunities for helping people, feeling of success as a human service worker, field of specialization, the type of clients served, and coworker interaction. This accounted for four times as much as factor variance as organizational job satisfaction. This consists of five factors: the amount of authority given to one's job, the quality of supervision received, clarity of guidelines for doing one's job, opportunity for involvement in decision making and the recognition given one's work by their superiors, the quality of supervision, clarity of job demands, adequacy of funding, and opportunity.

The salary and promotion subscale are measured by salary and benefits and opportunities for promotion (Koeske, Kirk, Koeske, & Rauktis, 1994, p. 30). The new Job Satisfaction Scale proposed is thus a 16-item job satisfaction scale divided into three subscales: a seven-item intrinsic satisfaction factor, a five-item organizational job satisfaction, and a two-item salary factor (Koeske, Kirk, Koeske, & Rauktis, 1994, p. 31).

More importantly, items related to job stress or emotional exhaustion were excluded from this scale. Koeske et al. argue that job pressure is a distinct construct that indirectly affects job satisfaction and should not be regarded as a characteristic of the job itself. Hence, job satisfaction scale should not be identified with the related ideas of work commitment, burnout, or the intent to leave the job (Koeske, Kirk, Koeske, & Rauktis, 1994, p. 32).

Journalists' Job Satisfaction

The job satisfaction scales designed for social service and health workers have been tested over the years, and by and large, results have been consistent. In many of the studies discussed above organizational factors do not appear as prominent for other occupations as they are for journalists. Earlier studies have shown greater job dissatisfaction among employees who perceive bad policy of the news organization they work for (Shaver, 1978).

Journalists have reported different levels of emotional exhaustion according to age and rank and also according to the department they work for (Reinardy, 2006, p. 407). Other studies too have proved that emotional exhaustion is an inadequate measure of job satisfaction for journalists. The same holds for depersonalization as well. Journalists have reported only moderate levels of depersonalization in some studies, without any particular trend (Reinardy, 2006, p. 408). As we have already discussed personal accomplishment measures too were seen to vary across different subfields in journalism and also the experience of journalists (Cook & Banks, 1993). Later studies have suggested the lower levels of personal accomplishment could be related to lesser resources that are now available in newsrooms these days (Filak & Reinardy, 2011).

The six-factor construct proposed by (DeFleur, 1992): income defined by four items, power measured by four indicators, prestige made up of four items and autonomy, creativity and the general field of three items each has also not made any progress. Respondents reported these factors in most studies. A study which looked at the most important elements for an ideal job suggested three intrinsic aspects which included the opportunities for advancement, autonomy, and personal interest. It also listed two extrinsic factors good salary and capable administration (Barrett, 1984, pp. 598-599).

Based on the inadequacy of the Maslach Burnout Inventory and its different variants discussed above, the Herzberg's hygiene-motivation theory and also Hackman Expectancy theory, this study surmises a more inclusive approach to measure journalists' job satisfaction. Building upon Koeske's 16 items, three-factor construct, this study administers the following 16 items — satisfied with people; authority; salary; promotion; job challenge; quality of supervision; opportunities for acquiring new skills; work pressure; opportunities for helping people; clarity of guidelines; involvement in decision making; recognition by superiors; self-perception; field of specialization; interpersonal relations; restriction to social media.

Methodology

We hypothesize a four-factor structure for the job satisfaction of journalists based on the theoretical construct discussed above. Based on those arguments, this paper hypothesizes efficacy perception as one of the subscales of job satisfaction especially for an occupation like journalism where the practice is also related to various codified and accepted conventions of ethicality and proper conduct. Hence apart from the three constructs of the Koeske scale, the fourth construct is introduced in this study.

Intrinsic Satisfaction measured through job challenge, quality of supervision, opportunities for acquiring new skills, clarity of guidelines, opportunities for helping people, work pressure and involvement in decision making.

Tangible Benefits is measured through two factors salary and opportunities for promotion.

Organizational Satisfaction is measured by authority, recognition by superiors, Field of specialization and interpersonal relations.

Efficacy Perception is measured by satisfaction with people, opportunities for helping people and self-perception.

An online survey was administered to working journalists working in newspapers, electronic media, and the online media in the three Indian cities of Delhi, Kolkata, and Bhubaneswar. Emails acquired through press clubs and contacts in media organizations were used and as were contacts available on the Facebook Messenger. Emails and the link

for the survey were sent out to 434 journalists, 227 responded with a response rate of over 52 percent. Eleven responses were rejected as they were highly incomplete. Some missing values were replaced with the mean of the item; it was less than 3 percent of the total.

The responses were transferred from the online spreadsheet to SPSS for Exploratory Factor Analysis, followed by a reliability test for the extracted items loading on to distinct factors.

The data were then analyzed for confirmatory factor analysis using SEM, which allows us to perform path-analytic structural modeling with latent and observed variables. The software package used was AMOS 17.

Results

The total number of respondents was $N = 216$ (95 females, 44 percent and 121 males, 56 percent), Measures of central tendency for age variable reported ($N = 216$, $M=29.5$, $SD=7.5$).

Adequacy tests for Factor analysis showed that the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was 0.932, regarded as excellent. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity Approx. Chi-Square was significant at p values below .01 and reported as 2097.078 with 120 degrees of freedom. The initial factor analysis provided the following communalities extracted through Principal Component Analysis:

Communalities of the Indicators in the Exploratory Factor Analysis process is reported here.

Indicators	Initial	Extraction
Satisfied with people	1.000	.664
Authority	1.000	.762
Salary	1.000	.837
Promotion	1.000	.807
Job challenge	1.000	.752
Quality of supervision	1.000	.809
Chances for acquiring new skills	1.000	.787
work pressure	1.000	.921
Opportunities for helping people	1.000	.728
Carity of guidelines	1.000	.775
Involvement in decision making	1.000	.746
Recognition by superiors	1.000	.760
Self-perception	1.000	.831
Field of specialization	1.000	.735
Interpersonal relations	1.000	.773
Restriction to social media	1.000	.935

Results following Varimax rotation of the factors to facilitate maximized loadings are:

Indicators	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Satisfied with people	.364	.235	.335	.592	.107	.047
Authority	.195	.575	.594	.140	.013	.149
Salary	.168	.848	.171	.096	.208	.089
Promotion	.367	.785	.105	.154	.060	.134
Job challenge	.604	.382	.189	.424	-.097	.125
Quality of supervision	.749	.275	.323	.126	.101	.205
Chances for acquiring new skills	.695	.206	.442	.127	.215	-.061
Work pressure	.182	.173	.186	.248	.873	-.009
Opportunities for helping people	.483	.149	.110	.667	.124	-.009
Clarity of guidelines	.699	.266	.179	.312	.193	.221
Involvement in decision making	.247	.490	.448	.483	-.003	-.102
Recognition by superiors	.412	.297	.555	.439	.001	.036
Self-perception	.013	.037	.253	.769	.358	.213
Field of specialization	.256	.166	.685	.271	.252	.189
Interpersonal relations	.328	.108	.701	.235	.187	.267
Restriction to social media	.157	.151	.201	.090	-.001	.916

Of the six factors extracted after Varimax rotation, we can identify our four initially hypothesized factors (shown in bold in the table above).

Component 1 shows high factor loadings for job challenge, acquiring new skills, clarity of guidelines and quality of supervision. As discussed earlier, this corresponds with the subscale Intrinsic Satisfaction.

The component 2 shows high loadings to salary, promotion, and involvement in decision making and hence corresponds to the subscale Tangible Benefits. Involvement in decision making was initially thought of corresponding to the Intrinsic Satisfaction; hence we have to slightly revise our construct.

Component 3 corresponds to our hypothesized construct of Organizational Satisfaction and Component 4 corresponds to Efficacy perception.

Since the item work pressure loads on to only Component 5 and restriction to social media to Component 6 and no other indicator loading on to these components, we can discard these factors since they do not satisfy the condition that every factor should have at least two indicators (Kline, 2011, p. 249).

We hence propose a hierarchical model for Journalists' Job Satisfaction composed of four first-order factors defined as Intrinsic Satisfaction, Tangible benefits, Organizational satisfaction, and Efficacy perception.

Reliability statistics for the subscales identified in the above factor analysis provides the following result. For the indicators job challenge, quality of supervision, opportunities for acquiring new skills, clarity of guidelines and opportunities for helping people the Cronbach's Alpha is calculated as 0.883, the measure based on the standardized items is 0.884. This proves excellent internal consistency of the five items that make up the Intrinsic Job Satisfaction scale. This hence proves the high reliability of the subscale(Field, 2009, p. 679).

The total item statistics for the five questions in the following table shows that deleting none of the items increases the Alpha score. At this juncture, we continue with the five-item Intrinsic Job Satisfaction until we undertake the Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

Indicators	Scale mean if item deleted	Scale variance if item deleted	Corrected item- total correlation	Squared multiple correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted
Job challenge	16.30	35.039	.720	.528	.858
Quality of supervision	16.66	34.422	.765	.634	.847
Chances for acquiring new skills	16.61	36.314	.713	.538	.860
Clarity of guidelines	16.72	35.766	.769	.599	.847
Opportunities for helping people	16.79	37.533	.634	.433	.877

For the indicators salary, promotion and involvement in decision making which we have hypothesized loads on to Tangible Benefits the Cronbach's alpha is calculated as .807 proving excellent reliability (Field, 2009, p. 679). Removing none of the items leads to a significantly greater value of Cronbach's alpha. This subscale is conclusively regarded as composed of the three items.

Indicators	Scale mean if item deleted	Scale variance if item deleted	Corrected item- total correlation	Squared multiple correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted
Salary	7.33	9.310	.689	.496	.699
Promotion	7.17	9.200	.697	.504	.691
Involvement in decision making	6.52	10.474	.582	.339	.808

The indicators authority, recognition by superiors, Field of specialization and interpersonal relations too were put to the reliability test and the Cronbach's alpha is reported as .855, based on standardized items the Cronbach's alpha is reported as .858, which again meets the conditions for excellent reliability (Field, 2009, p. 679). This measure does not improve if any of the items are deleted as seen in following Item-total statistics. This confirms the internal consistency of the subscale Organizational Satisfaction as being composed of four indicators.

Indicators	Scale mean if item deleted	Scale variance if item deleted	Corrected item- total correlation	Squared multiple correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted
Authority	13.85	21.420	.657	.434	.835
Recognition by superiors	14.03	20.846	.710	.505	.811
Field of specialization	13.45	21.719	.706	.516	.813
Interpersonal relations	13.18	22.595	.729	.541	.806

The test for the reliability statistics of the 3-indicator Efficacy Perception subscale reports the Cronbach's alpha as .774 regarded as a good measure of internal consistency.

Indicators	Scale mean if item deleted	Scale variance if item deleted	Corrected item- total correlation	Squared multiple correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted
Satisfied with people	8.16	8.877	.627	.394	.677
Opportunities for helping people	8.79	8.187	.619	.387	.685
Self-perception	8.58	9.007	.583	.340	.723




Figure 1: Path diagram for the four-factor second order confirmatory factor analysis for journalists' job satisfaction (using Amos 17).

The above diagram is the final confirmatory model using the information provided by the modification indices and the residual coefficients. As can be seen in the diagram the indicators quality of supervision and opportunities for helping people are dropped from the latent factor Intrinsic Job Satisfaction. The indicator quality of supervision was identified closely with the clarity of guidelines; hence for reasons of parsimony this indicator is dropped. The indicator opportunities for helping people show a very high loading of .75 to the latent factor Efficacy Perception. Hence we reconceive Intrinsic Job satisfaction to be measured by the remaining three indicators.

With a large sample size of 216, the results of SEM analysis revealed an acceptable fit for the hypothesized model indicated by standard goodness-of-fit indices. More specifically, CFI, IFI, NNFI, RMSEA, RMSR, Hoelter values AIC and a ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom all reported excellent goodness-of-fit.

The chi-square statistic was not significant, $\chi^2(46) = 64.6$, $p = .036$ for the proposed model, indicating that the fit of the data to the postulated model was good.

The Comparative Fit Index compared to a saturated model is found to be 0.988, proving an excellent fit for the proposed model with the data (Kline, 2011, p. 225). The Tucker Lewis Index measure is .982, and the Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index is 0.922 while the TMR value is 0.095 all proving the excellent fit of the proposed model to the sample data.

The Model Parsimony Ratio of 0.688 also is in the range of expected values. The Non-Centrality Parameter of the Hypothesized model is 18.602 compared to the Independent Model's 1500.478. This too proves excellent goodness of fit. The value of Minimum Discrepancy Function — 0.3 to proves that the hypothesized model fits well with the sample data.

The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) is found to be 0.043 with 90 percent of the values between .011 and .067, indicating an excellent fit between the proposed model and the sample data.

The Akaike's Information Criterion measure is 128.602 and is found to be significantly close to the saturated model measure of 156, hence proving that the hypothesized model fits excellently with the data. The Hoelter value of 210 indicates that our sample size of 216 is adequate for the proposed model. All the above goodness of fit indices proves that the hypothesized model (Figure 1) fits well with our sample data.

Notably all items in the Journalists' Job Satisfaction unobserved factor exhibited factor loadings ranging from .91 to .995 reconfirming the construct validity of the measurement model. The loadings of the 12 observed variables to the 4 unobserved exogenous first order factors also range from .629 to .829 confirming the construct validity of the hypothesized model.

Factor loadings			Estimate
Tangible Benefits	<—	Journalists'_Job Satisfaction	.910
Efficacy perception	<—	Journalists'_Job Satisfaction	.932
Organizational	<—	Journalists'_Job Satisfaction	.953
Intrinsic	<—	Journalists'_Job Satisfaction	.995
Guidelines clarity	<—	Intrinsic	.796
News kills	<—	Intrinsic	.755
Job challenge	<—	Intrinsic	.771
Promotion	<—	Tangible Benefits	.672
Salary sat	<—	Tangible Benefits	.643
Interpersonal	<—	Organizational	.746
Specialization	<—	Organizational	.732
Recognition superv	<—	Organizational	.839
Self perception	<—	Efficacy perception	.629
Helppeople	<—	Efficacy perception	.748
Satisfpeople	<—	Efficacy perception	.800
Decisionmaking	<—	Tangible Benefits	.803

Model Fit Summary

CMIN

Model	NPAR	CMIN	DF	P	CMIN/DF
Default model	32	64.602	46	.036	1.404
Saturated model	78	.000	0		
Independence model	12	1566.478	66	.000	23.735

RMR, GFI

Model	RMR	GFI	AGFI	PGFI
Default model	.095	.954	.922	.563
Saturated model	.000	1.000		
Independence model	1.468	.249	.113	.211

Baseline comparisons

Model	NFI Delta1	RFI rho1	IFI Delta2	TLI rho2	CFI
Default model	.959	.941	.988	.982	.988
Saturated model	1.000		1.000		1.000
Independence model	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

Parsimony-Adjusted Measures

Model	PRATIO	PNFI	PCFI
Default model	.697	.668	.688
Saturated model	.000	.000	.000
Independence model	1.000	.000	.000

NCP

Model	NCP	LO 90	HI 90
Default model	18.602	1.303	43.920
Saturated model	.000	.000	.000
Independence model	1500.478	1375.300	1633.036

FMIN

Model	FMIN	F0	LO 90	HI 90
Default model	.300	.087	.006	.204
Saturated model	.000	.000	.000	.000
Independence model	7.286	6.979	6.397	7.596

RMSEA

Model	RMSEA	LO 90	HI 90	PCLOSE
Default model	.043	.011	.067	.653
Independence model	.325	.311	.339	.000

AIC

Model	AIC	BCC	BIC	CAIC
Default model	128.602	132.721	236.611	268.611
Saturated model	156.000	166.040	419.272	497.272
Independence model	1590.478	1592.022	1630.981	1642.981

ECVI

Model	ECVI	LO 90	HI 90	MECVI
Default model	.598	.518	.716	.617
Saturated model	.726	.726	.726	.772
Independence model	7.398	6.815	8.014	7.405

HOELTER

Model	HOELTER .05	HOELTER .01
Default model	210	237
Independence model	12	14

Discussion

The construct validity of the proposed hierarchical model suggests that the hypothesized four-factor construct for Journalists' Job Satisfaction works excellently with the sample data. The extremely high regression weights (or factor loadings as they are popularly known) in the range 0.91 to 0.995 proves that these factors are equal-weighted constructs of JSS. A composite Job Satisfaction survey measure for journalists thus would include all the four first-order factors: Intrinsic satisfaction, Tangible benefits, Organizational satisfaction, and Efficacy perception as equal contributors. The element of autonomy provided to journalists is more important an element of tangible benefits to journalists compared to other occupations. Journalists who perceived they were part of the decision making in their respective fields reported higher levels of satisfaction. The quality of supervision received too is not an important indicator of intrinsic job satisfaction, partly to do with the fact that freedom is regarded as an unimpeachable virtue in journalism and also the clarity of guidelines showed greater correlation with quality of supervision. This led us to discard the supervision item as an indicator of job satisfaction.

Of greater importance is the fact that efficacy perception is construed as important as the other three factors. Professionals in the field of journalism regard the effectiveness of their job as an important factor of satisfaction in terms of their perception as professionals and their dealings with other stakeholders including their colleagues. The forms of the guidelines or policy decisions are more important for the intrinsic satisfaction of journalists compared to the tenor — opportunity for acquiring new skills and the challenge that the job offers remain important intrinsic factors. Recognition of superiors is an important element of organizational job satisfaction.

Limitations and Scope

This study does not factor the differences across the sub-fields of print, electronic and online media nor does it provide a comparative gender-based study. Earlier studies have shown differences across the sub-fields and also in different specializations in a particular media. A comparative study would provide further validity to the proposed construct. This study also does not provide a view of the diverse language journalists in India. The work conditions of language journalists are reputedly more challenging than the city-based English language journalists that this study surveys. Limitations of online surveys including a representative sample too are at play here. The construct validity of the present study, however, provides a fresh approach to the highly complex conception of job satisfaction. Studies across various groups and languages and even across time scales will provide an interesting perspective.

References

- Beam, R. A. (2006). Organizational Goals and Priorities and the Job Satisfaction of US. Journalists. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 83, 169-185.
- Chitiris, L. (1988). Herzberg's proposals and their applicability to the hotel industry. *Hospitality Education and Research Journal*, 12(1), 67-79.
- Cook, B. B., & Banks, S. R. (1993). Predictors of Job Burnout in Reporters and Copy Editors. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 70(1), 108-117.
- DeFleur, M. H. (1992). Foundations of Job Satisfaction in the Media Industries. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 47(1), 3-15.

- Demers, D. P. (1994). Effect of Organizational Size on Job Satisfaction of Top Editors at U.S. Dailies. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 71(4), 914-925.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS (3rd ed.)*. London: Sage
- Filak, V. F., & Reinardy, S. (2011). Editor Toast: A Study of Burnout and Job Satisfaction among College Newspaper Editors. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 66(3), 243-256.
- Gruneberg, M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction*. New York: John Wiley.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 40(1), 53-62.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Johnstone, J., Slawski, E., & Bowman, W. (1976). *The news people: A sociological portrait of American journalists and their work*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Kline, R.B. (2011). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling (3rd ed.)*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Koeske, G. F., & Koeske, R. D. (1989). Construct Validity of the Maslach Burnout Inventory: A Critical Review and Reconceptualization. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 25(2), 131-144.
- Koeske, G., Kirk, S., Koeske, R., & Rauktis, M. (1994). Measuring the Monday blues: Validation of a job satisfaction scale for human services. *Social Work Research*, 18(1), 27-35.
- Latham, G. P. (2007). *Work Motivation: History, Theory, Research, and Practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 2, 99-113.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The Truth About Burnout: How Organisations Cause Personal Stress and What to Do About It*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pincus, J. D. (1986). Communication Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction, And Job Performance. *Human Communication Research*, 12(3), 395-419.
- Reinardy, S. (2011). Newspaper journalism in crisis: Burnout on the rise, eroding young journalists' career commitment. *Journalism*, 12(1), 33-50.
- Samuelson, M. (1962). A standardized test to measure job satisfaction in the newsroom. *Journalism Quarterly*, 39(3), 285-291.
- Shaver, H. (1978). Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among journalism graduates. *Journalism Quarterly*, 55(1), 54-66.
- Stamm, K., & Underwood, D. (1993). The Relationship of Job Satisfaction to Newsroom Policy Changes. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 70(3), 528-541.
- Stamm, K., Underwood, D., & Giffard, A. (1995). How Pagination Affects Job Satisfaction of Editors. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 72(4), 851-862.
- Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley.
- Willnat, L., & Weaver, D. (2003). Through their Eyes: The Work of Foreign Correspondents in the United States. *Journalism*, 4(4), 403-422.

Uma Shankar Pandey (Ph.D., University of Calcutta, 2015) is an Associate Professor and Head in the Department of Journalism and Mass Communication at Surendranath College for Women, Kolkata, India. Dr. Pandey is the first India Ambassador of the International Association for Media and Communication Research (IAMCR), the pre-eminent global association for media and communication research. He is a Member Board of Studies at some Indian Universities. Before joining academics, Dr. Pandey was a senior journalist with English national daily *The Asian Age*, Kolkata. His research interests include framing of election news, media credibility, and journalistic role perceptions. He is also a visiting Faculty at some national and foreign universities and institutes.