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Abstract: Changes that came into being globally in administration manner, also shows its effects in Turkey in both the private sector and public bodies and institutions. Many regulations and modifications are being made in public bodies and institutions in order to submit a more effective and efficient public service. But these modifications and regulations are being made by not taking into consideration well enough the thoughts and the feelings of the public sector employees against their job. In this study, during this process of modifications and regulations, in respect of job satisfaction, it has been tried to state at what level the Karaman Governorship employees are. Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire has been distributed to the employees and the returned questionnaire has been analysed using SPSS 16.0 packet program. According to the results of the analyses, it has been determined that the employees working in Karaman Governorship are not satisfied with only 6 items (wages, preferment, appreciation, participation to decisions, execution of the decisions and unrestraint in the execution of decisions) of the job satisfaction items scales, and that they have the satisfaction feeling against their job in general.
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1. Introduction

In recent years, quality seeking efforts have become remarkable in public institutions that should produce service. According to public institutions which accept service function, one of the indicators of evaluating quality element is “customer satisfaction” in other words “citizen satisfaction.” It is needed to identify how much service takers are satisfied from public services in order to mention a public institution’s qualified public service.

It is wished to increase satisfaction level of service taking citizens by making improvements on parties of public managements subject to various complaints. With this scope, regulations like; diminishing stationary work, connecting briefer and short-cut methods of work, providing reach of service easily and faster by implementing applications like e-government and so forth.

However it is known that efforts to have service-takers’ satisfaction is closely related to provide satisfaction in employees who are creators of those services, it is seen that job satisfaction level of public employees has not been dwelt on. Most of the studies about job satisfaction are center on private sector employees. There are fewer studies about public employees (Schneider and Vaught, 1993: 71; Nayak, 2002:3). However, basic indicator of service quality is the employee (Tengilimoğlu, 2005:24).

Most of the awoken time of people is occupied by their job. For some, job is the most important thing in his/her life. Thus, employees’ feeling about their job which is a significant part of their lives is an issue that should be examined and researched. Because of the fact that there are very limited numbers of studies about measuring public employees’ job satisfaction, this study has been done with considering contribution to the literature.

In this study, it is aimed to measure job satisfaction level of Karaman Governorship’s employees. Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire was used to determine job satisfaction of public employees from sub-departments of Governorships which are Directorate of Editorial Department, Directorate of Local Administrations, Directorate of Administrative Board, Directorate of Press and Public Relations, Directorate of Associations, Directorate of Planning and Coordination, Directorate of National Education, Public Works and Settlement Directorate, Directorate of Cadastre, Directorate of Land Registry and Inhabitants and Nationality Directorate.
1.1. Definitions of Job Satisfaction

First systematic information about job satisfaction is based on 1930s. Many theoretical researches refer Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs and Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory just like they do at Classical and Neo-Classicall approaches to explain job satisfaction (Gül et al, 2008:72).

While defining job satisfaction, authors have agreed on one point which is factors cause job satisfaction. It is possible to discuss these factors under three headings; factors relating to individual, job and environment related factors (Sığrı and Basım, 2006: 134-138);

Individual related factors are sum of individual’s demographic features and his/her job’s demographic features. Such variables have indirect effects on variations rather than causing job satisfaction directly. Individual factors related to job satisfaction might be counted as age, gender, personality traits, term of office, education, and social status. According to studies, there three different approaches to represent the relationship between age variable and job satisfaction. According to first one, there is “U” shape relationship between age variable and job satisfaction which says employees have high job satisfaction when they are young, low job satisfaction when they are middle-age and high job satisfaction again when they get older. With regard to second approach, job satisfaction increases when employees get older. Besides, third approach says that job satisfaction and age show linear increase together but after a while there is a decrease.

There are also three different approaches according to studies that are dealing with relationships between job satisfaction and gender variable. These approaches say respectively; women have more job satisfaction than men, men have more job satisfaction than women and there are no significant differences between genders about job satisfaction.

According to studies that aims to represent relationship between personality traits and job satisfaction, it is found that employees who has outer control focus, is narcissist and competitor have higher job satisfaction. Nonetheless, there is a negative relationship among precipitance, and anger and job satisfaction and there is a positive relationship between “having high motive of success” and job satisfaction. Findings of researches also tell us that employees who have A-type personality and intense negative feelings have less job satisfaction than those who does not have intense negative feelings.

It could be stated that there are two different approaches in studies where the relationship between term of office and job satisfaction is being examined. Accordingly, employee would have higher job satisfaction in the beginning since he/she joined the organization with his/her own will. However, when time passes, he/she will have low job satisfaction when he/she realize the difference between his/her expectation and reality. With regards to other approach, since evaluations will be done with more rationalist and reasonable way with considering realities of organization, there can be a rise on job satisfaction.

There are research results declare that there is positive and also negative oriented relationship between education variable and job satisfaction. Parallel to rise on education level of employee, job satisfaction level of them will increase too as long as their expectation have been met. Contrarily, an employee who thinks he/she do not get in return for his/her education level and skills, he/she will have lower job satisfaction.

Job related factors are organizational justice, organizational support, wage and working conditions. These factors have an important role on employees’ job satisfaction. Organizational justice indicates justice perceptions of employees in organization environment. Organizational justice has been examined under three headings in the literature. “Distributive justice” investigates allocation of employees’ outcomes. “Procedural Justice” which is about how to get those said outcomes, briefly which procedures are being used is perceived justice of procedures and policies to make decisions. “Transactional Justice” is defined as attitude and behavior qualification that people encounter during performing transactions between employees who will be affected from allocation decision and managers who are the source of allocation.

Organizational support describes respect, support and help to employees from organization where they endeavor their labor and time. This process may cause ascending job satisfaction and positive state of mind for employee and increasing emotional commitment, performance and low employee turnover rate for organization.

Wage, in the widest sense, is price of labor and an important element. Yet another factor determines job satisfaction is working conditions and it affects job satisfaction essentially in two ways. First, insufficient and inappropriate working conditions cause physical ailment. Secondary, inappropriate working conditions may cause psychological problems.

Primary factor of “environmental factors” that create job satisfaction is “alternative job opportunities.” According to studies, at the time when alternative job opportunities are higher, employees’ job satisfaction level is being lower. Another satisfaction factor related to environment is “social support.” The meaning of social support in business life is individual’s satisfaction of essential social needs like; love, self-esteem, belonging, self-actualization and security in consequence of interaction with other individuals. Yet another satisfactory job dimension that counts in environmental factors is “relationship with colleagues.” In today, employees spend most of their time at working place and at that time they are in continuous communication with their colleagues. In working environment where colleagues have good relations with each other, there will be higher level of job satisfaction of employees.

1.2. Job Satisfaction Definitions and Theories

It would be useful to discuss essential theories.
1.2.1. Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory
According to Maslow, on the basis of individual’s motivation is need and individual takes action to meet these needs. Consequently, needs is an important element that determines the behavior. In essence of Maslow’s theory, there is an approach states that needs follow a sequence gathered into five groups and saturated need lose its motivating effect. These needs are listed as follows according to their importance; physiological needs, safety needs, social needs, need of respect and status and self-actualization need. While, Maslow handle physiological and safety needs as internal needs; social needs, need of respect and status and self-actualization need are accepted as external needs. The difference between these groups is whereas internal needs are evaluated as highly significant and external needs have lower importance (Toker, 2007: 94-95).

1.2.2. Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory
Herzberg et al. theorize “Motivation and Hygiene Model” which is about employee satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Original study to test the theory consists of interviews about job factors that have important effects on 200 engineer and accountant’s attitudes. Participants were asked to think the times when they feel unusually good and bad at their current job. After asking specific questions to reveal these critical cases, interviewers tried to enlighten the structure of cases and individual responses to those cases (Bingöl, 1997: 271-272).

Herzberg’s said model is influenced from Maslow’s model and Herzberg et al. state motivation factors as job itself, responsibility, achievement, personal growth and recognition. Besides, hygiene factors are inter-personal relationships, supervision, company policy and administration, job security, working conditions and salaries. Herzberg describes motivation factors are more internal motivators and hygiene factor are external and dissatisfactory job factors (Bingöl, 1997:272).

Accordingly, motivation factors reflect direct satisfaction which is rewarding and formed during the work performance. Others are apart from work and create no satisfaction during the work performance. In short, factors in the first group increase motivation of job satisfaction towards superior effort and achievement. Other factors do not increase job satisfaction on their own, however their absence create job dissatisfaction (Bingöl, 1997:272). Hygiene factors prevent dissatisfaction even if they do not provide job satisfaction (Toker, 2007:95).

1.2.3. Equity Theory
Equity theory which is theorized from Adams is primarily a motivation theory, though it remarks important points about job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. According to this theory, individual’s achievement and satisfaction level is related to his/her perception of equities and inequities about working environment. To Adams’, job satisfaction is determined in accordance with individual perception of input-output balance and individual compares the efforts he/she exerts and output he gets (Toker, 2007: 95).

1.2.4. Job Characteristics Model
Hackman and Oldman propound “Job Characteristics Approach” that discusses the reasons of job satisfaction. This approach is grounded on five basic characteristics which are; skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback. Accordingly, those characteristics cause three different psychological state and they create important results on individuals’ job satisfaction and motivation. Skill variety of job is about required tasks of job includes coherence. Employees consider job as meaningful, as long as it is significant. When job allows employee autonomy, it also gives him/her responsibility. Ultimately, feedback provides individual to have information about the result of the work done. Hackman and Oldman develop Job Diagnostic Survey to measure all these variables (Toker, 2007: 95-96).

1.2.5. Cornell Model
Cornell Model develop by Smith, Kendall and Hulin states that job satisfaction is individual’s emotion associated with his/her job or affective responses developed toward different dimensions of state of job. According to researchers, these emotions stem from individual’s perception on difference between experience and expectation of reasonable and fair response, in relation to current situation’s alternatives. Smith et al. are the first researchers who discuss the definition of “frame of references” which is the basis of their study. This standard is about individual’s experiences, expectations and edge of change toward current stimuli. With starting out from concept of frame of references, Smith et al. developed Job Descriptive Index which has dimension like; job itself, wage, promotion opportunities, supervision and colleagues (Tümgan, 2007:29).

1.3. Job Satisfaction Scales
With starting out from said job satisfaction theories, some scales were developed to use at measurement of job satisfaction. Some of the most used ones are listed below.

1.3.1. Porter’s Need and Satisfaction Questionnaire
Scale developed by Porter is questionnaire that measures employee’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction by using several job satisfaction dimensions. The scale is based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Thus, Porter relate between employee’s perceived current conditions and conditions that he accepts as ideal. However, scale can be used particularly for administrative officers. Questions are more about administrative problems and aimed at specific points (Tümgan, 2007:30; Toker, 2007:96).

1.3.2. Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
According to Kantarcı, the most widely used job satisfaction scale is Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Scale was developed by Weiss, Davis, England and Lofquis
at 1967 and it relates work conditions and job satisfaction. It intends to measure job satisfaction in 20 different dimensions. These dimensions are: relationship with colleagues, promotion, wage, managerial relations, achievement, recognition, responsibility, organization policies, security, status, utilization of skills, activities carried out, authority, creativeness, autonomy, moral values, social services, change, working conditions and technical support (Toker, 2007:96).

1.3.3. Job Descriptive Index

Scale developed by Smith, Kendall and Hulin at 1987. Turkish translation reliability analysis of the scale was done by Ergin at 1997.

1.4. Literature Review

As is stated in the beginning of the study, academic studies about job satisfaction widely have been done with private sector organizations. Even if they are in limited numbers, there are still some academic studies that are conducted with public employees and they are given as follows.

Brunetto and Wharton (2002) conducted a study that they investigate the effect of social status on job satisfaction at Australian police organization. Indsales Job Satisfaction Scale was used in the study. Participants of the research are officers, senior officers and sergeants. According to the findings of the study on 178 police, rank of employee is not an significant factor to affect job satisfaction, the most powerful contribution to job satisfaction comes from colleagues dimension and customer (citizen) dimension seem to be major dimension of dissatisfaction. In addition to this, it is reached that wage and administration policies are other dimensions that cause dissatisfaction.

Alarcon’s (2005) study conducted on San Antonio police organization’s employees researches the relation between transformational leadership and job satisfaction. Employees of police organization divided two groups as arrestment unit and security police. Abbreviated Job Descriptive Index was used for both groups with using different job satisfaction indications. According to the results of study, employees from San Antonio police organization arrestment unit have lower satisfaction levels on wage, colleagues and job itself dimension than officers from security police department. It is also found that there are no differences between two groups about supervision and promotion opportunities dimensions. Bajpai and Srivastava (2004) used Job Satisfaction Scale developed by Sinha (1990) at their study where job satisfaction levels of employees of public and private sector banks in India. According to findings of the study, threat of firing, sudden releases, lower promotion opportunities and insufficient assistance programs increase job dissatisfaction. Additionally, it is reached that secure working environment; assistance policies and job stability have positive impact on job satisfaction. With this respect, it is stated that public sector employees of banking sector have higher job satisfaction than private sector employees.

Chen (2005) conducted a study at Taiwan’s public sector where he researched the factor affect employees’ job satisfaction. Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire was used in the study. According to results of the study; organization should provide good salary/wage conditions of organizations, appropriate working conditions, job autonomy, secure working place, equal reward allocation, procedural justice, two-way communication, a system where performance is appreciated, effective and diverse rewarding system, transparent promotion system.

Everet’s (2002) study was conducted on beginner employees at a federal institution at United States. Job satisfaction levels of employees and relationship between quality of mentorship and job satisfaction were researched on the study. Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman job satisfaction scale was used it is found that there is a significant relation between mentorship and job satisfaction.

In Jones et al.’s (2009) study on Afro-American certified public accountants who are members of American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire was used to determine the level of job satisfactions. As findings of the study, it is seen that participants have job satisfaction on job itself with 87% level. Further, it is reached that they are satisfied with 19 out 20 dimensions of job satisfaction factors and they only have dissatisfaction on promotion opportunity.

A study practiced by Mayo (2004) that researches effects of working environment on job satisfaction in nursing care and three different types of working conditions (working order, status of employment and intensity of nurses working in hospital) were tested. It was reached that nurses are pleasant to work in a single job with full-time employment than part-time employment with doing several different works.

Nayak (2002) did a research on employees from purchasing department of American Revenue Association. The relation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment was analyzed as factors affecting employees’ resign intention. It is found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment level are not significantly related to employees’ resign intention. It is also reached as findings of the study that job satisfaction and organizational commitment level do not differ by race and gender.

Schneider and Vaught’s (1993) study about employees who work in private or public institutions in Missouri, USA compares job satisfaction situations of employees and Job Descriptive Index was used in the study. It is reached as findings of the study that both male and female employees in private institutions have higher satisfaction on wage and supervision dimensions rather than public employees. However, the most important difference between private and public employees was found in wage dimension, no significant variation was found for dimension of job itself.

Shirley (2003) found that there is a statistically significant relationship between low-level employees’
satisfaction and commitment and quality of leader-member exchange in the study researched the effect of leader-member exchange on low level employees working at newly-established federal institutions.

Alyahya (2005) practiced a research in Saudi Arabia with public employees. Scope of the study is to measure job satisfaction level of employees and test if job satisfaction level is changing with hierarchical degree or the power and affection level. In consequence of the study, it is seen that job satisfaction level of officials at the highest level in the hierarchy is the highest (7 out of 10), middle level officials’ is 6.5, auditors’ is 6.2 and low-level employees’ is 5.3. In this study, it is also reached that there are no significant differences on job satisfaction with regards to age, gender, education and seniority. It is determined that only group size affects job satisfaction level significantly, when group size grows, level of job satisfaction also increases.

A study from Markovits et al. (2007) measure the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction level of public and private employees in Greece. It is stated in the study that most of the studies about employees’ attitudes and behaviors for previous jobs are from North America. There are important differences between Anglo-American group (countries from North America and West Europe) and Near East group (where Greece and Turkey are in) with regards to socio-cultural features that affect job attitude and behavior. In the study, job satisfaction was measured by using Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire and there were 1119 private employees and 479 public employees in research sample as participants. Hereunder, it is reached that emotional commitment of public and private employees in Greece is the factor that affects at most their job satisfaction.

A study on academicians in Turkey revealed from Bakan and Büyükbeşe (2004) states that academicians are satisfied from quality of job, institutions, administrators, managerial approach and colleagues, however they are not satisfied with in wages and salaries dimension.

Another research was performed by Alçıkaya et al. (2005) at GATA Haydarpaşa Training and Research Hospital, İstanbul. The subject of the research is measurement of nurses’ job satisfaction levels within the framework of total quality management. It is found that nurses have high satisfaction level on quality of job and colleagues, but low job satisfaction level on social facilities. The fact that head nurses and nurses graduated from Nursing Vocational Schools have higher job satisfaction levels presents career and education dimensions have a positive impact on job satisfaction levels of nurses.

Sevimli and İşcan’s (2005) study had 454 medicine doctors who live in Erzurum, Turkey on its sample. In the study, general job satisfaction level was designated as 100 points and decided that 25 and lower points are low, points between 26 and 74 are middle and 75 and upper points are high job satisfaction level. With regard to this evaluation, it is reached that 7.5% of doctors have low, 57% have middle and 35.5% have high level of job satisfaction.

In Sığrı and Basım’s (2006) study about comparison of public and private employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment, it is propounded that employees who work in private sector have higher levels of job satisfaction than employees from public sector.

Soyer and Can’s (2007) study about physical education teachers states that occupational expectation and perception of occupational support are positively and significant related to job satisfaction.

2. The Purpose, Methodology and Constraint of Research

2.1. The Purpose of Research

Since job satisfaction has positive impact on employees’ work performance, it is important to present job satisfaction level of Karaman Governorship employees. It is believed that the findings will be useful to administrators on practice.

2.2. Methodology of Research

2.2.1 Data Collection

Primarily a literature review made about job satisfaction subject to propound how the subject was discussed. Findings of field studies were also scanned and it was tried to compare those findings and this research study. In the second part of the study, survey method was used as field study. Used survey technique was Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire which is referenced quite a lot of academic studies (Kantarcı, 1997: 21). Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Weiss, Davis, England and LoFquist at 1967 and translated to Turkish by Baycan (1985). Reliability analysis of Turkish translation version was done by Baycan (1985) also (Sevimli ve İşcan, 2005: 60).

In the first part of survey, there are questions for demographics. In the second part, 20 statements of Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire were replaced. These statements are about; relationship with colleagues, promotion, wage, managerial relations, achievement, recognition, responsibility, organization policies, security, status, utilization of skills, activities carried out, authority, creativeness, autonomy, moral values, social services, change, working conditions and technical support. Participants were asked to choose (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly disagree) one of the 5-point Likert scale as an answer.

2.2.2. Population and Sample

The population of the research is all employees of provincial and centre directories of Karaman Governorship. The data gathered and generalization contains only Karaman Governorship. The directories are as follows; Directorate of Editorial Department, Directorate of Local Administrations, Directorate of Administrative Board, Directorate of Press and Public Relations, Directorate of Associations, Directorate of Planning and Coordination,
Directorate of National Education, Public Works and Settlement Directorate, Directorate of Cadastre, Directorate of Land Registry and Inhabitants and Nationality Directorate.

Before the collection of data, researcher met with every single director of each directory and has verbal approval of data collection process. Surveys were delivered at 25.11.2010 and at that time there were 150 employees working at said departments. 127 survey forms were delivered when Governor, Vice-Governors and absent employees excluded from the population. 102 of delivered survey forms were collected. Survey response rate is 80%, which is fairly high proportion.

2.3. The Constraint of Study

It is aimed to identify job satisfaction levels of public employees who work at several directories of Karaman Governorship in this study. Other public employees who work at other public institutions in Karaman were not included to the study with several reasons.

3. Findings and Discussion

Demographics of Karaman Governorship’s employees who are the subject to the research is given at Table 1, as follows.

| Demographics | Frequency | %  |
|---------------|-----------|----|
| Gender        |           |    |
| Female        | 15        | 16,3|
| Male          | 77        | 83,7|
| Age           |           |    |
| 0-19          | 2         | 2,2 |
| 20-29         | 13        | 14,1|
| 30-39         | 42        | 45,7|
| 40-49         | 30        | 32,6|
| 50+           | 5         | 5,4 |

When Table1 is checked, it is seen that 62% of participants are at 19-39 age group, 89,1% of them are married, 34,8% of them have high school graduation and 34,8 of them have university graduation. Besides, 35,5% of the employees have 2 kids and 79,6% of them working there more than 10 years.

| Demographics        | Frequency | %  |
|---------------------|-----------|----|
| Number of Kids      |           |    |
| 0                   | 16        | 17,2|
| 1                   | 14        | 15,1|
| 2                   | 33        | 35,5|
| 3                   | 26        | 28,0|
| 4                   | 2         | 2,2 |
| 5+                  | 2         | 2,2 |

| Demographics      | Frequency | %  |
|-------------------|-----------|----|
| Term of Office    |           |    |
| Less than 1 year  | 2         | 2,2 |
| 1-3               | 5         | 5,4 |
| 4-5               | 6         | 6,5 |
| 6-7               | 4         | 4,3 |
| 8-9               | 2         | 2,2 |
| 10+               | 74        | 79,6|

| Demographics | Frequency | %  |
|---------------|-----------|----|
| Marital Status|           |    |
| Married       | 82        | 89,1|
| Single        | 7         | 7,6 |
| Divorced      | 2         | 2,2 |

Table 2: Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

| Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire | f  | %  |
|-----------------------------------------|----|----|
| The chance to be “somebody” in the community. |    |    |
| Strongly Disagree                       | 9  | 9,8 |
| Disagree                                | 19 | 20,7|
| Neutral                                 | 7  | 7,6 |
| Agree                                   | 40 | 43,5|
| Strongly Agree                          | 17 | 18,5|
| Total                                   | 92 | 100|

| The way my boss handles his/her workers. |    |    |
| Strongly Disagree                       | 8  | 9,0 |
| Disagree                                | 22 | 24,7|
| Neutral                                 | 13 | 14,6|
| Agree                                   | 30 | 33,7|
| Strongly Agree                          | 16 | 18,0|
| Total                                   | 89 | 100|

| The competence of my supervisor in making decisions. |    |    |
| Strongly Disagree                       | 7  | 7,9 |
| Disagree                                | 20 | 22,5|
| Neutral                                 | 11 | 12,4|
| Agree                                   | 35 | 39,3|
| Strongly Agree                          | 16 | 18,0|
| Total                                   | 89 | 100|
| Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire                                      | f   | %   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|
| The way my job provides for steady employment                                |     |     |
| Strongly Disagree                                                           | 11  | 12,1|
| Disagree                                                                    | 9   | 9,9 |
| Neutral                                                                     | 9   | 9,9 |
| Agree                                                                       | 42  | 46,2|
| Strongly Agree                                                              | 20  | 22,0|
| Total                                                                       | 91  | 100 |
| Strongly Disagree                                                           | 5   | 5,4 |
| Disagree                                                                    | 27  | 29,0|
| Neutral                                                                     | 10  | 10,8|
| Agree                                                                       | 35  | 37,6|
| Strongly Agree                                                              | 16  | 17,2|
| My pay and the amount of work I do.                                         |     |     |
| Strongly Disagree                                                           | 20  | 21,5|
| Disagree                                                                    | 38  | 40,9|
| Neutral                                                                     | 7   | 7,5 |
| Agree                                                                       | 24  | 25,8|
| Strongly Agree                                                              | 4   | 4,3 |
| Total                                                                       | 93  | 100 |
| Strongly Disagree                                                           | 16  | 17,4|
| Disagree                                                                    | 23  | 25,0|
| Neutral                                                                     | 13  | 14,1|
| Agree                                                                       | 32  | 34,8|
| Strongly Agree                                                              | 8   | 8,7 |
| The chances for advancement on this job.                                    |     |     |
| Strongly Disagree                                                           | 12  | 13,3|
| Disagree                                                                    | 28  | 31,1|
| Neutral                                                                     | 12  | 13,3|
| Agree                                                                       | 31  | 34,4|
| Strongly Agree                                                              | 7   | 7,8 |
| Total                                                                       | 90  | 100 |
| Strongly Disagree                                                           | 10  | 10,9|
| Disagree                                                                    | 18  | 19,6|
| Neutral                                                                     | 7   | 7,6 |
| The working conditions.                                                      |     |     |
| Agree                                                                       | 45  | 48,9|
| Strongly Agree                                                              | 12  | 13,0|
| Total                                                                       | 92  | 100 |
| Strongly Disagree                                                           | 2   | 2,2 |
| Disagree                                                                    | 13  | 14,1|
| Neutral                                                                     | 16  | 17,4|
| Agree                                                                       | 47  | 51,1|
| Strongly Agree                                                              | 14  | 15,2|
| Total                                                                       | 92  | 100 |
| Strongly Disagree                                                           | 15  | 16,7|
| Disagree                                                                    | 21  | 23,3|
| Neutral                                                                     | 12  | 13,3|
| Agree                                                                       | 28  | 31,1|
| Strongly Agree                                                              | 14  | 15,6|
| Total                                                                       | 90  | 100 |

*Cronbach’s Alpha* coefficient was used to detect reliability of the scale. Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was found 0,877. Calculated result of reliability coefficient is higher than acceptable level (0,70) in social sciences.

As a result of the survey that use Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire; 62% of Karaman Governorship employees state that they are satisfied from their job since their job gives them the chance to be “somebody” in the community. 51,7% of participants state that they are satisfied the way his/her boss handles his/her workers. 57,3% of them are satisfied the competence of his/her supervisor in making decisions, 60,9% of them are satisfied the way his/her job provides for steady employment, 54,8% of them are satisfied the chance to do something that makes use of his/her abilities, 62% of them are satisfied from working conditions and 66,3% of them are satisfied from his/her colleagues.

This study supports the findings of Brunetto and
Wharton’s (2002) study. In that study, researchers found that the highest satisfactory dimension is “colleagues.” Findings of this research also state that employees are satisfied in that respect. However, in Sığrı and Basım’s (2006) study, it is propounded that employees have dissatisfaction at colleagues dimension in significant levels.

With the statement “the way his/her job provides for steady employment”, it was tried to measure satisfaction condition about job security. Not only this research but also many academic researches in literature show that there is a high satisfaction level on job security dimension in public sector institutions and offices. On the other hand, high dissatisfaction levels seen in private sector employees in the researches of the said literature.

Participants’ satisfaction level for the chance to use of his/her abilities has positive but borderline value. Providing an environment where employees can use their own abilities is an important satisfaction dimension. Particularly, strict rules are very common in public institutions as a result of bureaucratic approach to do operations. Therefore, in realization of the business and operations, it is not really possible to provide an appropriate environment to employees where they can reflect their personal skills. However, findings of Chen (2005) and Alyahya (2005) present that public employees have satisfaction to use their abilities in their job.

The result we found at “working conditions” dimension in our study is parallel to other studies in literature. The difference in this dimension is seen only at Sığrı and Basım’s (2006) study. According to their study, public employees have dissatisfaction about working conditions.

Participants state that they are not satisfied with payments at 69.9%. Other dimensions that participants are not satisfied are as follows; the chances for advancement on this job (56.5%), the chance to try my own methods of doing the job (57.8%), the praise I get for doing a good job (53.3%) and the way company policies are put into practice (57%).

Participants in total have dissatisfaction on advancement and promotion opportunity dimension at 53.3%, but participants graduated from vocational school and university have satisfaction at 51%. It is seen that there is a significant variation between education and satisfaction levels of participants in terms of having advancement chance.

The result about participants’ dissatisfaction on payments is parallel to other studies in the literature except from Markovits (2007), Bajpai and Srivastava (2004) and Sığrı and Basım (2004). Respectively, these studies have done in Greece, India and Turkey. It is seen that employees have dissatisfaction about wages, salaries and payments in studies in literature except from studies said above.

There are similar findings about advancement chance among our study and Chen (2005), Jones (2009), and Brunetto and Wharton (2002). According to other studies’ results, employees seem satisfied in terms of advancement opportunity. Karaman Governorship employees have dissatisfaction about the praise they get for doing a good job, just like physical education teachers in Soyer and Can’s (2007) study. In other studies, employees seem like they are satisfied with this dimension.

4. Conclusion

As a result of this study, it is seen that employees from Karaman Governorship are satisfied with 12 dimensions, dissatisfied with 6 dimension and neutral to 2 dimensions of 20-dimension job satisfaction scale.

It could be considered the traditional respect and worthiness that Turkish society have toward people who use “the government power” during the evaluation of participants’ satisfaction on dimension about “being somebody in the community.” As an inherent result of this point of view, it might be stated that Karaman Governorship employees are respected and appreciated from the community and they feel that way.

As an outcome public employees’ job security, which is slightly absolute, Karaman Governorship employees are highly satisfied with that dimension. While global economic crisis caused so many people lost their jobs, legal regulation in Turkey reassure public employees about job security. This is the essential reason of employees satisfaction for job security in public sector.

It is observed that participants are satisfied with working conditions and colleagues. In this respect, the fact that Karaman Governorship building is new (launched at 2005) and it provides a convenient environment to work cause to have positive satisfaction in working conditions dimension.

Another finding of the study is Karaman Governorship employees are satisfied with their bosses, namely administrators. It could be stated that democratic governance approached that arisen with the effect of general shift on management understanding is dominant point of view at directories where the research was conducted. This situation is effective on having high satisfaction level of administrators.

The dimension gets the highest rate of dissatisfaction from employees participated to the survey is payment dimension. 69.6 of the participant, which is an significant percentage, stated that they are not satisfied with the payment they have for the work they do. The reason of this satisfaction is not only the wage is low, but also difference and disparity of salaries among directories. For example; employees from education department of National Education Directory have additional course payment, but employees from general administrative services (employees with lower degrees than supervisor) do not have this payment.

It is observed that participator employees have dissatisfaction on advancement and promotion dimension. This result might be derived from lack of acceptable, transparent an objective promotion system in public sector as a whole.

Yet another dimension that Karaman Governorship
employees have dissatisfaction at is getting praise after doing a good job. It could said that directors of each directories participated to the research avoid or disregard to praise his/her subordinates. It should be state expressed that the notice of praise dimension from directors is needed and important, because it is a significant detail on employees’ motivation. As a consequence, it is understood that even though Karaman Governorship employees have dissatisfaction on some dimensions, they are satisfied with their job in general. Satisfaction levels of employees toward dimensions that employees have dissatisfaction could be raised with the precautions of administrators and directors. Employees in satisfaction would ease the main objective of public institutions which is producing effective and efficient service.

For future studies, it might be suggested to make researches to reveal the relationship between job satisfaction and other variables, because this research tried only to propound job satisfaction profiles of Karaman Governorship employees.
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