
EURASIAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT

<http://www.eurasianpublications.com>

DETERMINATION OF PERCEPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AT UNIVERSITIES ABOUT JOB SATISFACTION - A RESEARCH ON MEHMET AKIF ERSOY UNIVERSITY

Huseyin Cicek

Corresponding Author: Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Turkey.

E-Mail: hcicek@mehmetakif.edu.tr

Huseyin Korkmazer

Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Turkey. E-Mail: hkorkmazer@mehmetakif.edu.tr

Abstract

Job satisfaction is one of most studied/researched subjects at the branch of management psychology. On the other hand, studies about job satisfaction level of administrative staff are very rare in Turkey. The aim of this study is to determine perceptions of administrative staff working at universities about job satisfaction. For this purpose, a survey study was performed with 200 administrative staff working at Mehmet Akif Ersoy University and surveys were evaluated with statistical analysis methods. As the result of analysis, job satisfaction level was found to be affected from management policy, nature of business and workmates.

Keywords: University, Staff, Job Satisfaction

1. Introduction

People spend majority of their daily lives at workplace. For this reason, satisfaction level of people from job highly affect their lives, feelings of job and positive effects of job gradually leaves positive effects on spiritual and physical conditions. Also positive impacts of job satisfaction lead to happiness in family life and productivity in organizations.

At the present time, all companies can be spoken to discharge many responsibilities against itself, workers and social environment. Companies have two main responsibilities to their workers. First responsibility is compensating psychological, living and social needs according to psychological, social and legal agreements. Enabling workers to educate themselves is the second responsibility. These two responsibilities are very important in terms of workers' job satisfaction. Accordingly, companies, where workers live dissatisfaction, are observed to neglect their responsibilities.

Job satisfaction vary from person to person. This condition can get importance according to values of people. For example, promotion opportunities may be valuable for one and salary for another. People performing favorite job, receive salary proper to needs, having compensated opportunities and conditions, reaching many of needs, are considered to be

happy in both daily and work life because of reaching material and moral satisfaction. But, people performing unfavorable jobs, working in a workplace where needs uncompensated are affected negatively because of getting ahead bad conditions at both work and daily life (Orucu *et al.* 2006).

One of most significant evidences showing conditions working improperly is job satisfaction to be low. For this reason, superiors are frequently interested in studies measuring job satisfaction. People, may be more productive at work life by having favorite life and related party of the job with their capacity and have their material and moral needs to be compensated. However, workers, whose expectations and needs aren't being compensated, live dissatisfaction and uncertainty.

This study approaches perceptions of university staff about job satisfaction. Job satisfaction perception was researched with survey and responses were presented as findings of study.

2. Job Satisfaction

Concept of satisfaction means peace of mind perceived by people and observed by other people (Orucu *et al.* 2006). There are many definitions about job satisfaction. Some of these are below:

- Perception of person that values about job, are compensated and those values to be compatible with personal values (Akcemete *et al.* 2001).
- Emotion of pleasure and a positive manner appearing as the result of harmonization between employee and work place (Iskan and Sayin, 2010).
- Positive spiritual condition appearing as the result of work experience of person (Demir, 2007; Erogluer, 2011). Job satisfaction is an emotion defining perceptions of people about job and workmates (Cekmecelioglu, 2005).
- Job satisfaction is a multi-faceted construct. The most accepted and common facets of satisfaction are satisfaction with pay, promotion, opportunities, coworkers, supervision and the work itself (Rogelberg, *et al.* 2010).

3. Theories About Job Satisfaction

Some researchers presented theories explaining job satisfaction context. Most-famous ones can be counted as Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory, Herzberg's Motivator Hygiene Theory, Discrepancy Theory. Below those theories are explained.

3.1. Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory

Maslow's needs hierarchy is an important approach informing about human needs, causes of needs, realization of needs and factors affecting satisfaction levels. Human needs have hierarchical importance related to this layout. In this manner, human, whose needs aren't compensated at lower levels, can't be motivated at upper levels (Erturk and Kiyak, 2011).

3.2. Herzberg's Motivator Hygiene Theory

Herzberg's theory is one of most important factors about business life. This theory has started at 1969 and two phases of job satisfaction were reviewed. This two different factors are motivation factor providing job satisfaction and dissatisfying protective factor. According to this theory, protective factors don't realize job satisfaction and also prevent job dissatisfaction. Protective factors are management, managed working conditions, wage and relationships with job mates. Increases in wages do not directly cause job satisfaction and prevent job dissatisfaction. Motivating factors are success, recognition, job itself, responsibility and advancement (Savas, 2012).

3.3. Theory of Discrepancy

According to literature job satisfaction is determined according to the differences between compensation levels of individual expectations and actual experiences. These differences are defined as "gaps" existing actual and expected livings. This theory is named as discrepancy theory explaining gaps occurring in mind of people because of expectations (Cooper and Artz, 1995).

4. Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is affected by two important factors. First group is personal factors containing emotions, expectations, characteristics etc.. Second group is organizational factors appearing during working time (Baykoca, 2012).

4.1. Personal Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction

Gender: Gender is the most used factor to be related with job satisfaction. In most researches, significant results were obtained between gender-job satisfaction relationship (Gundogan, 2010).

Age: In most researches similar results were obtained between age-job satisfaction. So, there is a positive relationship between age and job satisfaction. People get satisfied from their jobs while they get elder (Konukoglu *et al.* 2009).

Education: Education level-job satisfaction relationship is not obvious in many researches. Satisfactions or dissatisfactions may release in several researches (Kaymakci, 2013).

Title: Title is related with image of people in aspect of others. People challenge to gain such a value. Because such a feeling provides a valuable satisfaction to be a qualified workmate (Baykoca, 2012).

4.2. Organizational Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction

Job: Job, being interesting and providing person to learn different things may increase job satisfaction. Job satisfaction increases in such conditions (Konukoglu *et al.* 2009).

Wage: People need wage factors to come workplaces and sustain their works. Therefore, wage is a very important management tool for companies (Atay, 2007).

Promotion Opportunities: Employees get promotions to increase their job satisfaction. Equal and fair promotion opportunities is the point to be cared (Iskan and Sayin, 2010).

Communication: Efficient communication is very important in organization announce opportunities for promotions, arrangements and rules (Sahal, 2005).

Rewarding: Effective and equal rewarding system is required for high job satisfaction for employees. Job satisfaction of employees increase while attaining their objectives (Karakus, 2011).

Working Conditions: Employees prefer companies where conditions are positive. For example; warm, silent, cleans work places are more desirable (Atay, 2007).

Work mates: Employees should be compatible with work mates because of spending much time with each other. Because more harmonization means more job satisfaction (Karakus, 2011).

5. Research

5.1. Purpose of Research

Basic purpose of this research is to determine perception of faculty administrative staff about their job satisfaction.

5.2. Model of Research

Model of the research is cross-sectional scanning model. Scanning researches which are the ones targeting to describing past or present conditions (Baykoca, 2012).

5.3. Universe and Sample

Universe of research is whole administrative staff of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University. Size of research universe has been determined as 290 people. Sample size is 200 administrative staff. Sample size consists of 100 male and 100 female candidates.

This research was performed on 200 administrative staff working at Mehmet Akif Ersoy University. Demographic properties of administrative staff joining research has been shown at Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic properties

Properties	Categories	f	%
Gender	Female	100	50.0
	Male	100	50.0
Age	Between 18-25	32	16.0
	Between 26-34	106	53.0
	Between 35-43	40	20.0
	44 and Older	22	11
Education	High School	42	21.0
	Vocational School	52	26.0
	Undergraduate	91	45.5
	Graduate	15	7.5
Title	Department Manager	8	4.0
	Faculty Secretary	4	2.0
	School Secretary	8	4.0
	Chief	7	3.5
	Expert	8	4.0
	Technical Staff	8	4.0
	Officer	89	44.5
	Other	68	34.0
Duration	0-5 Years	78	39.0
	6-10 Years	63	31.5
	11-15 Years	36	18.0
	16 and more	23	11.5
Total		200	100.0

As shown in Table 1, 50% of participants consists of male and other 50% consists of female. Age percentages of administrative staff are observed as 16% between 18-25 ages, 53% between 26-34 ages, 20% between 35-43 ages and 20% older than 44. Percentage for education are 21% for high school, 26% for vocational school, 45.5% for undergraduate and 7.5% for graduate levels. Percentages for positions are 4% is department manager, 6% is

faculty and school secretary, 3.5% chief, 8% expert and technical staff, 44.5% officer and 34% is other titles. Duration of administrative staff are 39% between 0-5 years, 31.5% between 6-10 years, 18% between 11-15 years, 11.5% are 16 years or more.

5.4. Data Collection Tools

Datas were collected via Minnesota job satisfaction survey. Job satisfaction survey consists of two parts. First part contains questions determining demographic properties. Second part contains 25 expressions about job satisfaction and were graded with Likert scale. Reliability values were shown at Table 2.

Table 2. Validity and reliability values about job satisfaction survey dimensions

Dimensions	Number of Items	Reliability (Cronbach Alfa)
Management Policy	1-5	0.760
Workmates	6-10	0.814
Manager	11-15	0.896
Property of Job	16-20	0.846
Wage	21-25	0.500
Total Reliability	26-30	0.763

As shown in Table 2, there are 5 items at management sub-dimension and reliability coefficient is 0.760. Reliability coefficient of work mates sub-dimension is 0.814; thus reliability coefficient of managers sub-dimension is 0.896. Reliability coefficient of property of job sub-dimension is 0.846 and reliability coefficient of wage sub-dimension is 0.500. Total reliability coefficient of job satisfaction survey is 0.763. As reliability coefficients were asseses reliability coefficients of management policy, work mates, manager and property of job approaches to "1" and those are accepted reliable. But reliablty coefficient of wage becomes distant from "1" and nears to "0" and accepted as unreliable.

5.5. Analysis of Data

Data analysis was performed with descriptive statistics as minimum, maximum, arithmetic mean and standard deviation firstly. Afterwards, t test, one-way anova and tukey tests were performed. Significance is accepted as 0.05.

6. Findings

6.1. Minimum, Maximum, Aritmethic Mean and Standard Deviation Values

25 question survey was applied to Mehmet Akif Ersoy University administrative staff. Minimum, maximum, aritmethic mean and standard deviation values obtained from survey was shown at Table 2.

Tablo 3. Perception levels of administrative staff about job satisfaction

Size of Dimension	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Management Policy	200	5.00	25.00	12.9300	3.93606
Workmates	200	5.00	25.00	18.5400	4.05098
Manager	200	5.00	25.00	17.0550	5.07155
Property of Job	200	5.00	25.00	181600	4.32527
Wage	200	5.00	20.00	12.2200	3.69321

As shown in Table 3, there are 5 items under management policy dimension of job satisfaction survey. Minimum and maximum points for dimension are 5 and 25 respectively. Average of points for this questions is (12.39) and this shows that satisfaction level of administrative staff for this dimension is at middle-level. Standard deviation (3.93) shows that administrative staff have similar properties. Also in Table 3, there are 5 items under workmates dimension of job satisfaction survey. Minimum and maximum points for dimension are 5 and 25 respectively. Average of points for this questions is (18.54) and this shows that satisfaction level of administrative staff for this dimension is near to high-level. According to Table 3, there are 5 items under manager dimension of job satisfaction survey. Minimum and maximum points for dimension are 5 and 25 respectively. Average of points for this questions is (17.05) and this shows that satisfaction level of administrative staff for this dimension is near to high-level.

Table 3 also shows that there are 5 items under property of job dimension of job satisfaction survey. Minimum and maximum points for dimension are 5 and 25 respectively. Average of points for this questions is (18.16) and this shows that satisfaction level of administrative staff for this dimension is near to high-level. As presented in Table 3, there are 5 items under wage dimension of job satisfaction survey. Minimum and maximum points for dimension are 5 and 25 respectively. Average of points for this questions is (12.12) and this shows that satisfaction level of administrative staff for this dimension is at middle-level.

6.2. Analysis of Job Satisfaction of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Administrative Staff According to Gender

Table 4. (Independent) T test results for job satisfaction according to gender

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t
Total point for Manager Dimension	Female	100	16.9500	5.06997	.50700
	Male	100	17.1600	5.09648	.50965
Total point for Property of Job Dimension	Female	100	17.7300	4.33183	.43318
	Male	100	18.5900	4.29727	.42973
Total point for Wage Dimension	Female	100	11.6800	3.67597	.36760
	Male	100	12.7600	3.64905	.36490
Total point for Management Policy Dimension	Female	100	13.1400	3.87955	.38796
	Male	100	12.7200	4.00020	.40002
Total point for Workmates Dimension	Female	100	18.4300	4.07816	.40782
	Male	100	18.6500	4.04114	.40411

Table 5. Significance values for job satisfaction survey according to gender

	F	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
Manager Dimension Significance	.182	.670	.770
Property of Job Dimension Significance	.083	.774	.160
Wage Dimension Significance	.003	.955	.038
Management Policy Significance	.027	.871	.452
Workmates Significance	.098	.755	.702

As shown in Table 4 and Table 5, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under management policy dimension ($p > 0.05$). Male participants (mean=12.72) have lower job satisfaction perception than female participants (mean=13.14). According to the findings, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under workmates dimension ($p > 0.05$) too, thus male participants (mean=18.65) have higher job satisfaction perception than female participants (mean=18.43). Table 4 and Table 5 also show that job

satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under manager dimension ($p>0.05$). In that sense, male participants (mean=17.16) have higher job satisfaction perception than female participants (mean=16.95). Moreover, the findings present that job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under property of job dimension ($p>0.05$), so male participants (mean= 18.59) have higher job satisfaction perception than female participants (mean=17.73).

On the other hand, job satisfaction of administrative staff differ significantly under wage dimension ($p<0.05$). Male participants are happier than female participants ($p=0.038$) according to the results. However, Table 4 and Table 5 demonstrates that, job satisfaction of administrative staff generally doesn't differ significantly ($p>0.05$). Therefore, male participants have higher job satisfaction perception than female participants.

6.3. Analysis of Job Satisfaction of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Administrative Staff According to Age

As shown in Table 6 and 7, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under manager dimension ($p>0.05$). Participants between ages 35-43 have highest satisfaction level (Mean: 17.4250) and lowest at the ages 44 and older (Mean=16.5000). According to findings, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under property of job dimension ($p>0.05$). Oldest participants (44 and older) are most satisfied ones (Mean=18.5000)with the property of job and the group between ages 26-34 are the most dissatisfied ones (Mean=17.6321). Also job satisfaction of administrative staff under the dimensions of wage doesn't differ significantly ($p>0.05$). Oldest participants are again most satisfied ones with wages (Mean: 13.0000) and the group between ages 26-34 are the most dissatisfied ones (Mean=11.8019). Additionally, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under management policy dimension ($p>0.05$). The group between ages 26-34 is the most satisfied one (Mean=13.4375) and the group between ages 26-34, include most dissatisfied ones. Moreover, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under management workmates dimension ($p>0.05$). Oldest participants (44 and older) are most satisfied ones (Mean=18.9091) with the workmates and the group between ages 26-34 are the most dissatisfied ones (Mean=18.3585).

Table 6. ANOVA results according to age

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Total point for Manager Dimension	18-25	32	17.0625	5.20507	5.00	25.00
	26-34	106	17.0283	5.25440	5.00	25.00
	35-43	40	17.4250	5.28611	6.00	25.00
	44 and older	22	16.5000	3.63515	10.00	25.00
	Total	200	17.0550	5.07155	5.00	25.00
Total point for Property of Job Dimension	18-25	32	18.6563	3.94813	8.00	25.00
	26-34	106	17.6321	4.35633	5.00	25.00
	35-43	40	18.5000	4.90421	5.00	25.00
	44 and older	22	19.3636	3.34586	13.00	24.00
	Total	200	18.1600	4.32527	5.00	25.00
Total point for Wage Dimension	18-25	32	12.7813	3.72207	6.00	19.00
	26-34	106	11.8019	3.75796	5.00	20.00
	35-43	40	12.4500	3.40399	5.00	20.00
	44 and older	22	13.0000	3.81725	6.00	19.00
	Total	200	12.2200	3.69321	5.00	20.00

Total point for Management Policy Dimension	18-25	32	13.4375	3.89323	5.00	22.00
	26-34	106	12.6887	4.18925	5.00	25.00
	35-43	40	13.1250	3.77704	5.00	21.00
	44 and older	22	13.0000	3.07060	8.00	18.00
	Total	200	12.9300	3.93606	5.00	25.00
Total point for Workmates Dimension	18-25	32	18.8438	3.18372	13.00	25.00
	26-34	106	18.3585	4.44905	5.00	25.00
	35-43	40	18.5750	3.92812	7.00	25.00
	44 and older	22	18.9091	3.53094	10.00	25.00
	Total	200	18.5400	4.05098	5.00	25.00

Tablo 7. Significance values for job satisfaction survey according to age

	Sig.
Manager Dimension Significance	.925
Property of Job Dimension Significance	.268
Wage Dimension Significance	.359
Management Policy Significance	.795
Workmates Significance	.903

6.4. Analysis of job satisfaction of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Administrative Staff According To Education

Table 8. ANOVA results for education

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Total point for Manager Dimension	High School	42	17.6905	4.90141	5.00	25.00
	Vocational School	52	16.1538	5.06578	6.00	25.00
	Undergraduate	91	17.1978	5.02266	5.00	25.00
	Graduate	15	17.5333	5.91447	5.00	25.00
	Total	200	17.0550	5.07155	5.00	25.00
Total point for Property of Job Dimension	High School	42	17.9524	4.60091	5.00	25.00
	Vocational School	52	18.3846	4.50774	5.00	25.00
	Undergraduate	91	18.1648	4.01459	5.00	25.00
	Graduate	15	17.9333	5.09154	5.00	24.00
	Total	200	18.1600	4.32527	5.00	25.00
Total point for Wage Dimension	High School	42	11.9048	3.34817	5.00	18.00
	Vocational School	52	12.2500	3.81881	5.00	20.00
	Undergraduate	91	12.3297	3.86740	5.00	20.00
	Graduate	15	12.3333	3.37357	5.00	17.00
	Total	200	12.2200	3.69321	5.00	20.00
Total point for Management Policy Dimension	High School	42	13.7619	4.68422	5.00	25.00
	Vocational School	52	13.0000	3.34898	7.00	21.00
	Undergraduate	91	12.5824	3.70005	5.00	23.00
	Graduate	15	12.4667	4.89704	5.00	22.00

	Total	200	12.9300	3.93606	5.00	25.00
Total point for Workmates Dimension	High School	42	18.1905	4.28405	7.00	25.00
	Vocational School	52	18.4038	4.08373	5.00	25.00
	Undergraduate	91	18.8242	3.83433	5.00	25.00
	Graduate	15	18.2667	4.81763	5.00	24.00
	Total	200	18.5400	4.05098	5.00	25.00

As shown in Table 8 and 9, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under management dimension ($p>0.05$). Participants with high school degree are the most satisfied ones (Mean: 17.6905) and the ones having vocational school degree are the most dissatisfied ones (Mean: 16.1538). Also, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under workmates dimension ($p>0.05$). Satisfaction levels are in very similar values. Highest satisfaction level is vocational school (18.4038) and lowest is (18.1905). Additionally, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under wage dimension ($p>0.05$). Job satisfaction under wage dimension increase proportionally to education. Graduates are most satisfied ones (Mean: 12.3333) and the ones having high school degree are the most dissatisfied (Mean: 11.9048). Table 8 and 9, also shows that, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under management policy dimension ($p>0.05$).

Table 9. Significance values for job satisfaction survey according to education

	Sig.
Manager Dimension Significance	.477
Property of Job Dimension Significance	.965
Wage Dimension Significance	.940
Management Policy Significance	.424
Workmates Significance	.831

6.5. Analysis of Job Satisfaction of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Administrative Staff According to Title

Anova tests performed according to titles were divided into three groups as following:

- 1st Group: Department manager, faculty secretary and school secretary
- 2nd Group: Chief, expert, technical staff and official
- 3rd Group: Others

Table 10. ANOVA results for titles

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Total point for Manager Dimension	1 st Group	20	15.6000	4.96726
	2 nd Group	112	16.4732	5.27267
	3 rd Group	68	18.4412	4.49339
	Total	200	17.0550	5.07155
Total point for Property of Job Dimension	1 st Group	20	17.6000	5.77107
	2 nd Group	112	17.9107	4.10790
	3 rd Group	68	18.7353	4.19885

	Total	200	18.1600	4.32527
Total point for Wage Dimension	1 st Group	20	14.9500	2.99956
	2 nd Group	112	11.8036	3.58133
	3 rd Group	68	12.1029	3.76607
	Total	200	12.2200	3.69321
Total point for Management Policy Dimension	1 st Group	20	13.4000	2.79850
	2 nd Group	112	12.1786	3.71802
	3 rd Group	68	14.0294	4.31924
	Total	200	12.9300	3.93606
Total point for Workmates Dimension	1 st Group	20	16.9500	3.99309
	2 nd Group	112	18.3036	4.16947
	3 rd Group	68	19.3971	3.71821
	Total	200	8.5400	4.05098

Table 11. Significance values for job satisfaction survey according to titles

	Sig.
Manager Dimension Significance	.016
Property of Job Dimension Significance	.387
Wage Dimension Significance	.002
Management Policy Significance	.007
Workmates Significance	.038

As shown in Table 10 and 11, job satisfaction of administrative staff differ significantly under manager dimension ($p < 0.05$). Most dissatisfied ones (Mean: 15.6000) are in Group 1 (*Department manager, faculty secretary and school secretary*) and the most satisfied ones are in Group 3 (Other) (Mean: 18.4412). Also, job satisfaction of administrative staff differ significantly under wage dimension ($p < 0.05$). Executives of academic units (Group 3) are most satisfied (Mean: 14.9500) with wages and Group 2 are most dissatisfied (Mean: 11.8036) ones with wages. Table 10 and 11, also show that job satisfaction of administrative staff differ significantly under management policy dimension ($p < 0.05$). Moreover, job satisfaction of administrative staff differ significantly under workmates dimension ($p < 0.05$). Group 1 is the most dissatisfied ones (Mean: 16.9500) and Group 3 is the most satisfied ones (Mean: 19.3971).

As shown in Table 10 and 11, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under property of job dimension ($p > 0.05$). Group 1 is the most dissatisfied ones (Mean: 17.6000) and Group 3 is the most satisfied ones (18.7353).

Table 12. Tukey test

			Mean Difference	Sig.
Total for Manager Dimension	1 st group	2 nd group	-.87321	.752
		3 rd group	-2.84118	.067
	2 nd group	1 st group	.87321	.752
		3 rd group	-1.96796	.030
	3 rd group	1 st group	2.84118	.067
		2 nd group	1.96796	.030
Total point for	1 st group	2 nd group	-.31071	.953

Property of Job Dimension	2 nd group	3 rd group	-1.13529	.558
		1 st group	.31071	.953
		3 rd group	-.82458	.431
	3 rd group	1 st group	1.13529	.558
		2 nd group	.82458	.431
	Total point for Wage Dimension	1 st group	2 nd group	3.14643*
3 rd group			2.84706*	.006
2 nd group		1 st group	-3.14643*	.001
		3 rd group	-.29937	.851
3 rd group		1 st group	-2.84706*	.006
		2 nd group	.29937	.851
Total point for Management Policy Dimension	1 st group	2 nd group	1.22143	.395
		3 rd group	-.62941	.798
	2 nd group	1 st group	-1.22143	.395
		3 rd group	-1.85084*	.006
	3 rd group	1 st group	.62941	.798
		2 nd group	1.85084*	.006
Total point for Workmates Dimension	1 st group	2 nd group	-1.35357	.347
		3 rd group	-2.44706*	.045
	2 nd group	1 st group	1.35357	.347
		3 rd group	-1.09349	.180
	3 rd group	1 st group	2.44706*	.045
		2 nd group	1.09349	.180

In Table 12 p values under 0.05 under Tukey test were shown. Marked rows show values under 0.05. There are significant difference among gorups.

6.6. Analysis of Job Satisfaction of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Administrative Staff According to Duration

Table 13. ANOVA results for duration

		N	Mean	StandardDeviation	Std. Error
Total for Manager Dimension	0-5	78	17.8718	5.37033	.60807
	6-10	63	16.6667	5.21784	.65739
	11-15	36	16.6111	4.63081	.77180
	16 and more	23	16.0435	4.08410	.85159
	Total	200	17.0550	5.07155	.35861
Total point for Property of Job Dimension	0-5	78	18.1538	4.67121	.52891
	6-10	63	18.0635	4.21928	.53158
	11-15	36	17.7778	4.49832	.74972
	16 and more	23	19.0435	3.06710	.63953
	Total	200	18.1600	4.32527	.30584
Total point for Wage Dimension	0-5	78	12.4359	3.88667	.44008
	6-10	63	11.7143	3.81182	.48024
	11-15	36	12.2500	3.04607	.50768
	16 and more	23	12.8261	3.67612	.76652

	Total	200	12.2200	3.69321	.26115
Total point for Management Policy Dimension	0-5	78	13.4872	4.13645	.46836
	6-10	63	12.4444	4.27965	.53919
	11-15	36	12.8333	2.95200	.49200
	16 and more	23	12.5217	3.57859	.74619
	Total	200	12.9300	3.93606	.27832
Total point for Workmates Dimension	0-5	78	19.0385	4.12292	.46683
	6-10	63	18.5238	4.35467	.54864
	11-15	36	.5278	3.90959	.65160
	16 and more	23	18.4783	2.93675	.61235
	Total	200	18.5400	4.08	.28645

As shown in Table 13 and 14, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under workmates dimension ($p > 0.05$). New staff (0-5 years) are the most satisfied ones (Mean: 19.0385) and oldest ones (16 and more) are the most dissatisfied (Mean: 18.4783) ones. Also, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under manager dimension ($p > 0.05$). New staff (0-5 years) are the most satisfied ones (Mean: 17.8718) and the oldest ones (16 and more) are the most dissatisfied (Mean: 16.0435) ones. Additionally, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under property of job dimension ($p > 0.05$). The oldest (16 and more) are the most satisfied ones (Mean: 19.0435) and third group (11-15 years) are the most dissatisfied (17.7778) ones. Table 13 and 14, also shows that job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under wage dimension ($p > 0.05$). Oldest staff (16 and more) are the most satisfied ones (Mean: 12.8261) and second group is (6-10 years) are most dissatisfied ones (Mean: 11.7143). Moreover, job satisfaction of administrative staff doesn't differ significantly under management policy dimension ($p > 0.05$). As mean of averages were assessed the highest values about management policy are 0-5 years duration (13.4872) and the lowest values are 6-10 years duration (12.4444).

Table 14. Significance values for job satisfaction survey according to duration

	Sig.
Manager Dimension Significance	.312
Property of Job Dimension Significance	.739
Wage Dimension Significance	.561
Management Policy Significance	.428
Workmates Significance	.331

7. Results

Job satisfaction is the sign of good governance for companies. Actually it appears as a result of effective management. Therefore most important evidence for negative governance in companies are low points for job satisfaction. From another perspective a person may direct to another job or other interest areas to compensate job dissatisfaction. As the result of dissatisfaction people may live unhappiness, depression and indiscipline.

As the result, low points for job satisfaction causes companies and people to fail. Because organizations may achieve their goals with their workers. Our results and suggestions for the study can be explained in the following paragraphs.

As demographic factors were analyzed job satisfaction of female participants are lower than male ones. Also, there have been found no difference for job description dimension in aspect of title variable. Whole the participants think similar because of indifference. This result shows that all the participants do their jobs conveniently to task and responsibilities. This is a positive condition for company.

As duration factors were analyzed job satisfaction were found highest between 0-5 years and lowest between 16 and more years. In aspect of managers job satisfaction is highest between 0-5 years and lowest between 16 and more years. In aspect of property of jobs, job satisfaction is highest between 0-5 years and lowest between 11-15 years and 16 and more years. In aspect of wages, job satisfaction is highest between 0-5 years and lowest between 6-10 years and 16 and more years. In aspect of management policy, job satisfaction is highest between 0-5 years and lowest between 6-10 years. In general job satisfaction is higher at beginning years of job and lower at later years. So managers should produce policies to increase job satisfaction.

According to analysis most dissatisfied groups are wage group. Wage has the lowest mean among other variables (females=11.68; males=12.76). Because of this executives should produce opportunities to increase wages. Other answers for other questions have average means. Job satisfaction is aspect of titles significantly differs. Most satisfied ones from wages are department managers, faculty and school secretaries and most dissatisfied ones are chiefs, experts, technical staffs and officers.

Finally, efforts to improve job satisfaction for all companies and enterprises via periodical evaluations can be said to be crucial additional to universities. Because companies and enterprises should benefit from workers that have high job satisfaction.

References

- Akcamete, G., Kaner, S., and Sucuoglu, B., 2001. *Öğretmenlerde tükenmişlik iş doyumu ve kişilik [Exhaustion, job satisfaction and personality at Teachers]* Ankara: Nobel Publishing.
- Atay, O., 2007. *İşletmelerde doğal grupların iş tatmini üzerindeki etkileri ve bir uygulama [Effects of natural groups on job satisfaction and an application]* Ph.D. İnönü University Social Sciences Institute.
- Baykoca, Z., 2012. *Üniversitelerde idari personelin iş doyumlarına ilişkin algıları [Perception of administrative staff about job satisfaction at universities]* Master Thesis. Gazi University Social Sciences Institute.
- Cooper, A.C. and Artz, K.W., 1995. Determination of satisfaction for entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10(6), pp.430-457. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026\(95\)00083](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(95)00083)
- Cekmecelioglu H., 2005. Örgüt ikliminin iş tatmini ve işten ayrılma niyeti üzerindeki etkisi: Bir araştırma [Effect of organizational climate on job satisfaction and intention of release: A Research]. *C.U. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi [Cumhuriyet University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences]*, 6(2), pp.23-39.
- Demir N., 2007. *Örgütsel iletişim ile iş tatmini unsurları arasındaki ilişkiler: Kuramsal bir inceleme [Organizational Culture and Job Satisfaction]*. Istanbul: Turkmen Publishing.
- Erogluer K. 2011. Relationships between organizational communication and job satisfaction: A conceptual review. *Ege Academic Review*, 11(1), pp.121-136.
- Erturk, K. and Kiyak, M., 2011. Looking forward in aspect of Maslow's Needs Hyerarchy to Increase Customer Satisfaction. *Journal of Communication, Concept and Research*, 32, pp.127-150.
- Gundogan, T., 2010. *İş tatmini ve örgütsel bağlılık. bir insan kaynakları bölümünde uygulama [Job satisfaction and organizational dependance. a research on a human resources department]* Master Thesis. Ankara University Social Sciences Institute.
- Iscan, O. and Sayin, U., 2010. Örgütsel adalet. İş tatmini ve örgütsel güven arasındaki ilişki [Organizational justice. Relationship between job satisfaction and organizational trust]. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi [Atatürk University, Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences]*, 24(4), pp.195-216.
- Karakus, H., 2011. *Mobbing'in hemşireler ve iş tatmini üzerine etkileri: Sivas ili örneği [Effects of mobbing on nurses and job satisfaction: a survey on Sivas province]*. Ph.D. Cumhuriyet University Social Sciences Institute.

- Kaymakci, K., 2013. *Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ve iş tatmini arasındaki ilişki: Sağlık sektöründe bir araştırma [Relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction: a research on Health industry]*. Master Thesis. Pamukkale University Social Sciences Institute.
- Konukogu, F., Timuroglu, Ç., and Cinar, O., 2009. *Örgütsel İletişim ve İş Tatmini İlişkisi [Organizational communication and job satisfaction relationship]*. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Yönetim Dergisi [Atatürk University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Management Journal]*, 20(63), pp.59-76.
- Orucu, E., Yumusak, S., and Bozkir, Y., 2006. *Kalite yönetimi çerçevesinde bankalarda çalışan personelin iş tatmini ve iş tatminini etkileyen faktörlerin incelenmesine yönelik bir araştırma [A research to determine job satisfaction and factors affecting job satisfaction of bank staff in aspect of quality management]*. *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Yönetim ve Ekonomi Dergisi [Celal Bayar University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Journal of Management And Economics]*, 13(1), pp.39-51.
- Rogelberg, S., Allen, J., Shanock, L., Scott, C., and Shuffler, M., 2010. *Employee satisfaction with meetings: a contemporary facet of job satisfaction*. *Human Resources Management*, 49(2), pp.149-172. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20339>
- Sahal, E., 2005. *Akademik örgütlerde örgüt kültür ve iş tatmini arasındaki ilişki: Akdeniz Üniversitesi'nde doktora yapan araştırma görevlilerinin örgüt kültürüne ve iş tatminine yönelik algı ve kanaatleri [Relationship between organizational culture and job satisfaction in academic organizations: Perceptions and opinions of PhD candidate research assistants about organization culture and job satisfaction]*. Master Thesis. Akdeniz University Social Sciences Institute.
- Savas, A. 2012. *Effects of Emotional Quality (EQ) and Emotional Sufficiencies of Managers of Primary Schools*. Ph.D. Gaziantep University Social Sciences Institute.