THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VALUES OF EMPLOYEES WORKING FOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS WITH THE LEVEL OF JOB SATISFACTION: A RESEARCH IN BARTIN PROVINCE

Fazilet GÜLATAR[1]
Bartın Üniversitesi, *(fgulatar@bartin.edu.tr)*

Doç. Dr. Şaban ESEN
Bartın Üniversitesi, İİBF, *(sesen@bartin.edu.tr)*

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between the values attributed to quality, innovation, cooperation and participation in the decisions terms by the public institutions' employees with job satisfaction. The values attributed by the employees to aforementioned terms are defined as "job-related values". In this context, the opinions of the 761 people working at the university, municipality, governorship and state hospital in Bartın were collected using a questionnaire. The data obtained were analyzed via both descriptive and generalizing statistical methods. The findings of analyses show that there is a relationship between workplace values of public institution employees and their level of job satisfaction.

Keywords: *Business values, Quality, Innovation, Cooperation, Participation to Decisions, Job Satisfaction.*

KAMU KURUMU ÇALIŞANLARININ İŞE İLİŞKİN DEĞERLERİ İLE İŞ TATMİN DÜZEYİ İLİŞKİSİ: BARTIN İLİNDE BİR İNCELEME

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada kamu kurumu çalışanlarının kalite, yenilikçilik, işbirliği ve kararlara katılım kavramlarına atfettikleri değerlerin, çalışanların iş tatmini ile ilişkisi incelenmiştir. Çalışanların sözü edilen kavramlara ilişkin atfettikleri değerler "işe ilişkin değer" olarak tanımlanmıştır. Bu bağlamda Bartın ilinde faaliyet gösteren üniversite, belediye, valilik ve devlet hastanesinden 761 çalışanın görüşleri anket ile toplanmıştır. Elde edilen veriler hem tanımlayıcı hem de genelleyici istatistiksel yöntemlerle analiz edilmiştir. Analiz sonuçları göstermektedir ki kamu kurumu çalışanlarının iş değerleri ile işlerinden elde ettikleri tatmin düzeyi ilişkilidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *İş Değerleri, Kalite, Yenilikçilik, İşbirliği, Kararlara Katılım, İş Tatmini.*

---

[1] This paper was produced from the master's thesis in Business Administration Department carried out jointly by Bartın University and Bülent Ecevit University.
This paper was presented at "1st Black Sea and Balkans Economic and Political Studies Symposium." on 3-5 September 2014.

www.ijmeb.org ISSN:2147-9208 E-ISSN:2147-9194
http://dx.doi.org/10.17130/ijmeb.2015.11.25.910

1. Introduction

Values have always been a focused issue throughout the history of human. Since the existence of social life, philosophers, man of God and today, researchers and authors working in different disciplines thought about values, emphasized the significance of values in the life of the individuals and the society; and worked to define the virtues that they believed to be right and to make these virtues adopted by the society (Atay, 2003:87-88).

The values that people adopt changes in time. And this change shows up with the impact of various factors. While the developments in the values that effect everyday life impact attitudes and behaviors of the individual, it also shows that there is a social change. If values did not change, both the society and the individuals would be static. And if the values changed very fast and continuously, in this case, there would be imbalance and instability in both the character of the individuals and the social structure. At this point, it is possible to say that the values people choose change according to different factors (Yapıcı & Zengin, 2003:173).

Values are embedded in the structure and business style of an organization. An organization's consistent behavior with the values it adopts creates a feeling of company and increases energy. In the long-term successful organizations are the ones that are grounded on values. Productivity can be increased by activating the decision-making process via a shared values platform and encouraging team work and cooperation (Kılıç, 2010:86).

Job satisfaction that people feel when they are doing their job is highly important both for themselves and the organizations they work for. In order to ensure job satisfaction, the first thing is that the job should be in parallel to such factors as the personal characteristics, interests, skills and values. Individual values which stands out as an important one among these factors, is highly important in terms of ensuring job satisfaction (Koca, 2009).

Today's organizations reach their objectives with their values, attitudes, behaviors and different types of people working for the institutions. There is a positive relationship between the contributions of the employees to the objectives of the organization and the job satisfaction they have from the tasks and responsibilities they undertake. Therefore, it is possible to say that ensuring that the employees in an organization are satisfied with their job is one of the main objectives and works of the management of an organization.

As in all other countries, the process of globalization initiated the discussions of the performances of public institutions in Turkey. Public institutions do not make profit because of their activities but they are responsible for using their existing resources effectively and efficiently. In this context, it is necessary to examine the values, attitudes and behaviors of the employees working at public institutions in order to develop the potential of public institutions.

2. Workplace Values

What are the reasons that push people to work? The most widely known reason is, for sure, money. However, although some people have the money they still keep working. Why those people who do not have any economic problems still insist on working? We might think that some people work because they are used to working or because they love their job

while others work due to the deep satisfaction that they have from managing other people and because what they do brings them a prestige or with the satisfaction of living as a respected person in the society (Tınaz, 1996:43).

According to Kubat (2007) work, as a planned activity, is human-specific and has a significant place in many adults' life. The meaning attributed to work changes from one people to another. This meaning is important at individual, organizational and social levels. It is indicated that there are many work-related factors that have an impact of the productivity of employees. Here, workplace values is the most important factor effecting the motivation and performance of employees (Kubat, 2007:1).

Transformation of values into business life started with Hawthorne towards the end of 1920. Later, theorists started to examine the impact of working conditions and human characteristics on behaviors at work. Studies of Allport et. al during the 1930s on values studies had a potential to be used at work. In 1960s, the studies on business ethics became widespread. In 1970s, studies on workplace valuesaccelerated and were supported with development of scales on workplace values (Kubat, 2007:12).

As for Avcı (2011) workplace values reflect what people value at work and what they expect as a result of their activities at work. Such answers to such questions as "why I work?, what I expect from life and work?" that people ask themselves build their workplace values (Avcı, 2011:8).

Workplace values are values that direct individual on what is wrong and what is right and on how to behave at work. And the important workplace values for individuals are success, showing interest in others, honesty and justice (Can vd., 2006:93).

There is not commonly accepted definition of business values. In this study, the definition of Dyne et. al., 1994:772 whose scale was used was taken into account and workplace values are defined as: "the satisfaction of an employee from the workplace, colleagues and their superiors as well as satisfaction from the work they do and satisfaction from the existing and long-term gains."

Working life is one of the most important areas of human life. Therefore, as in all other areas, people have some values in working life. Called as business values, these values help employees in reaching the objectives of the organization by guiding them on what is correct and convenient; what is wrong and inconvenient (Özkan, 2010:31).

Workplace values are effected from Daily events, interactions, senses, expectations and objectives. In addition, there could be certain workplace values that people protect completely such as pay, working hours etc. That the organizations are aware of the workplace values of its employees and protect them, is important in terms of the productivity of the employees (Özkan, 2010:35).

Today, people spend most of their time at business environments. The time an individual spends in business environment is more than the time s/he spends in social environment. And that makes the time spent at work important. Therefore, the concept of spending quality time at

work arises as an important problem. That the individuals who spend most of their time doing their occupational activities feel happy and peaceful will reflect on their life in general. It is only when such needs as spending good time at work, being productive and satisfied with what you do, responding to the needs of the institution worked at are met, it is possible to talk about job satisfaction (Koca, 2009).

3. Job Satisfaction

3.1. Definition of Job Satisfaction

After 1930s, "employees in the workplace" has become an interesting area for researchers and within this scope, various research have been made on job satisfaction and the impact of job satisfaction on performance (Özcan, 2011:107).

Today's management understanding projects the determination of a content and policy that will ensure supplying employees, employing them to jobs that fit their skills, their training and development. Modern management understanding includes motivating employees so that they will put all their efforts and get the highest material and psychological satisfaction and benefit from what they do, improving their success and contribution to the organization. Therefore, using employees in the most effective way and motivating and protecting them are important issues (Aksu, 1998:1).

The total of what people feel towards their job is called job satisfaction or moral. Although we see in the newspapers and various media organs that employees go on a strike because they are not satisfied with their jobs or show hostile behaviors to their superiors, questionnaires conducted show that most of the employees are satisfied and glad with their jobs (Can et. al., 2006:88).

People want to be satisfied with the job they do, and in this case, if the existing conditions require doing a job that is far from satisfying, employees change their expectations according to existing conditions and try to get satisfied; this is in a way, a kind of rationalization and protection mechanism. We see that satisfaction is in a close relationship with our expectations arising from defining external world according to our internal values (Ayral,1992:30).

People develop certain values related to their work. As the organization responds to the workplace values that employees attach importance to, or in other words, as the employees are motivated by the organization in line with these values, their job satisfaction will be high accordingly. Thus, satisfied, productive and committed employees will be provided (Tınaz, 1996:53).

One certain thing about job satisfaction is that it is dynamic. Managers cannot provide job satisfaction for once and cannot keep it away for a few years later. Job satisfaction can disappear fast (usually very fast); therefore, job satisfaction should be monitored carefully annually or even monthly and be protected (Aksu, 1998:4).

Job satisfaction is one of the most important factors of modern management understanding and is one of the measures to be considered in evaluating the success of an organization. Working is a need and because a big part of our lives passes in the workplace it is

a necessity that the workplace is rewarding, at least unproblematic and should have humanistic conditions (Balci, 2004:12).

3.2. The Importance of Job Satisfaction

It is suggested that for an organization to be successful under today's conditions and to ensure its sustainability, depends on the productivity of the people working in the organization as much as on the management of the organization, the rewarding system, colleagues and the job satisfaction (Yüksel, 1998:5-6).

The importance of job satisfaction for employee is known. It is believed that high job satisfaction will lead to happiness of the employee while low job satisfaction will cause to alienation of one to himself/herself and thus, indifference and incompatibility. It is obvious that as the level of education of the employees increase, so does their expectations from job and in case the business can not respond to these developments, job dissatisfaction will be source of important problems. The satisfaction employees get from their job depends, to a large extent, on the level of meeting their requirements, expectations and demands (Akgündüz, 2006:77).

Job satisfaction has three important dimensions: The first one is the emotional attitude of an individual towards his/her job. Therefore, it cannot be observed but can be understood from the behaviors in the workplace. And the second one is determined by results related to work. In other words, what determines job satisfaction is to what extent the things individuals attach importance are met, either negatively or positively. If a group in an organization believe that they work harder than another group of people yet awarded less than the other group, the people in this group will have negative attitudes towards their job, bosses and colleagues. Because these people are unsatisfied. If the situation is vice versa, then they will show positive attitudes towards their job and bosses with a feeling of satisfaction. Finally, job satisfaction is made up of relevant attitudes (Özkalp & Kırel, 2008:76).

4. Purpose of the Study, Hypotheses and Method

4.1. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to relate the job satisfaction level of the people working at public institutions in Bartın province with their values and priorities related to work. Workplace values are discussed under four topics as: "quality", "cooperation", "innovation" and "participation to decisions". In the study, the relationship of these components with job satisfaction is separately presented. In this context, to what extent workplace values related to quality, cooperation, innovation and participation in decisions are related to job satisfaction level are examined.

4.2. Hypotheses of the Study

H_1 There is a significant relationship between job satisfaction of the employees and their business values.

H_2 There is a significant difference between the type of institution people work at and job satisfaction.

H_3 There is a significant difference between the type of institution people work at and their business values

H_4 There is a significant difference between quality, cooperation, innovation and participation in decisions, the components of business values, and the type of institution they work at.

4.3. Method of the Study

Survey method was used in the study; and the existing cases were described. Survey method defines a case that existed in the past or still exists as they are (Karasar, 2009:77). In survey method, certain number of people representing a large number of people (sample) are chosen and this sample group is worked on in the data collection process. Data collection process is based on the answers given to questions that could be asked with different data collection tools. (Büyüköztürk et al., 2011:248).

4.3.1. Population and Sample

Four public institutions which are Bartın State Hospital, Bartın University, Bartın Governorship and Bartın Municipality form the population of the study.

The sample of the study is 761 employees working in these four institutions.

4.3.2. Administration of Data Collection Tools and Collecting the Data

After necessary permissions were taken from Bartın State Hospital, Bartın University, Bartın Governorship and Bartın Municipality, "Organizational Commitment Questionnaire" and "Job Satisfaction Scale" (including demographics variables), the data collection tools of the study, were administered in the aforementioned institutions. Of the total 1530 scales given, 761 replied back and they were used in the study.

4.3.3. Research Scale

The research scale includes three main parts. The first part includes 12 statements aiming to measure business values; whilst the second part includes 12 statements to measure job satisfaction. And in the third part there are statements including demographic variables.

4.3.3.1. Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

In order to measure the perceptions of public employees on quality, innovation, cooperation and participation in decisions, "Organizational Commitment Questionnaire" developed by Dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994) was used. The scale was administered on 950 employees and 169 auditors. The scale included 12 items and these items can be grouped under quality, innovation, cooperation and participation to decisions components. The reliability analyses of the scale were made and Cronbach's alpha was found as 0,89. In the scale questions 1, 2 and 3 are related to quality component; whilst questions 4, 5, 6 are related to innovation component; 7, 8 and 9 are related to participation to decisions component and questions 10, 11 and 12 are related to cooperation component. In accordance with the original scale, 5-point

Likert scale was used in this study in which: (5) represents "I strongly agree", (4) represents "I agree", (3) represents "I am neutral", (2) represents "I disagree" and (1) represents "I strongly disagree". In this study, the study was conducted on a total number 761 people and using the research data, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found as 0,892 (variance 99,616 standard deviation 9,981). The scales Cronbach's alpha value is similar to the same value found by Van Dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994) which is interesting.

4.3.3.2. Global Job Satisfaction Scale

Global Job Satisfaction scale was developed by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979). The scale uses 15 items and has two subscales. Assessing satisfaction with extrinsic and intrinsic aspects of a job, including such issues as as co-workers, pay, promotion, work environment were evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale. In accordance with the original scale, 5 represents "I am completely satisfied", 4 represents "I am satisfied", 3 represents "I am neutral", 2 represents " I am dissatisfied" and 1 represents "I am completely dissatisfied". Among 15 items, 7 of them (2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14) are questions assessing intrinsic satisfaction and the remaining questions ones assessing extrinsic satisfaction. There is a 0.72 correlation between intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction questions. This study was implemented on 761 people and Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was found as 0,903 (variance 153,883 standard deviation 12,405)

4.3.3.3. Demographics Variables

There are 8 questions in this section. With these questions information on gender, age, marital status, educational background, the institution worked at, position in the institution, monthly pay, period people have been working in the institution were collected.

4.3.4. Data Analysis

SPSS (Statistical Package For Social Sciences) for Windows, Evaluation (ver 15.0)" was used in the statistical analysis of the data collected. In order to test the results of the study, correlation coefficient and one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) method was used.

5. Findings

5.1. Descriptive Information of the Sample Group

Demographic information on the number and rates of the people in the sample group are shown in Table 1. When Table 1 is analyzed, the following results are obtained:

It is seen that 288 of the people who participated in the study were women (39,3%) whilst 445 (60,7%) were men. Among the participants 28 people did not provide information on the gender section. Among the participants, 192 of them were below the age of 29 (26,2%) whilst 216 of them were between 30-35 years old (29,4%), 138 of them were 36-40 years old (18,8%), 114 of them were between 41-45 years old (15,5%), 48 of them were between 46-50 years old (6,5%) and 26 of them were above 50 years old (3,5%). And 27 of the participants did not write their age in the form. Of all the participants, 218 were single (29,1%), 532 were married (70,9%). And 11 of the participants of the study did not write their marital status in the form. When the educational background information of the participants is looked into, it

Table 1: Breakdown of the Demographic Information of the Employees

Demographic Information	Variables	N	N %
Gender	Female	288	39,3
	Male	445	60,7
Age	29 and below	192	26,2
	30-35 years old	216	29,4
	36-40 years old	138	18,8
	41-45 years old	114	15,5
	46-50 years old	48	6,5
	Over 50	26	3,5
Marital Status	Single	218	29,1
	Married	532	70,9
Educational Background	Primary School	96	12,8
	High School	190	25,4
	Associate Degree	131	17,5
	Undergraduate Degree	200	26,7
	Graduate Degree	61	8,1
	PhD	71	9,5
Institution	Bartın State Hospital	201	26,4
	Bartın University	347	45,6
	Bartın Governorship	50	6,6
	Bartın Municipality	163	21,4
Position in the Institution	Manager	51	6,9
	Lecturer	105	14,2
	Worker	581	78,8
Income	500-999 TL	141	19,1
	1000-1499 TL	27	3,7
	1500-1999 TL	182	24,7
	2000-2499 TL	211	28,6
	2500-2999 TL	91	12,3
	Over 3000 TL	85	11,5
Duration of employment in the workplace	5 years and below	432	57,8
	6-10 years	113	15,1
	11-15 years	75	10,0
	16-20 years	65	8,7
	21-25 years	40	5,4
	Over 25	22	2,9

is seen that 96 of them were primary school graduate (12,8%), 190 of them were high school graduate (25,4%), 131 had associate degree (17,5%), 200 of them had an undergraduate degree (26,7%), 61 of them had a graduate degree (8,1%) and 71 of them had a PhD degree (9,5%). 12 of the participants did not write the information on their educational background. Of all the participants in the study 201 of them worked in the Bartın State Hospital (26,4%) whilst 347 of them worked at Bartın University (45,6%), 50 worked at Bartın Governorship (6,6%), and 163 of them worked at Bartın Municipality (21,4%). Of all the participants 51 were managers (6,9%), 105 were lecturer (14,2%) and 581 were workers (78,8%). 24 participants did not write the information on their position in the institution. Of all the participants of the study, 141 of them were paid between 500-999 TL monthly (19,1%), 27 of them were paid 1000-1499 TL monthly (3,7%), 182 were paid 1500-1999 TL monthly (24,7%), 211 of them were paid between 2000-2499 TL monthly (28,6%), 91 were paid between 2500-2999 TL monthly (12,3%), and 85 were paid over 3000 TL monthly (11,5%). Of all the participants 24 of them did not write the information on their monthly pay. When the period of time the participants have been working in their current institution is considered, it is seen that 432 of them were working less than 5 years (57,8%), 113 were working for 6-10 years (15,1%), 75 of them were working for 11-15 years (10,0%), 65 were working for 16-20 years (8,7%), 40 of them were working for 21-25 years (5,4%) and 22 of them were working for more than 25 years (2,9%). 14 participants did not provide information under this question.

5.2. The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction, Workplace Values and The Components of Workplace Values

Table 2 shows the correlation coefficients of the variables used in the study. As it is seen in the table there is a statistically significant difference between workplace values and "quality", "cooperation", "innovation", "participation in decisions" and "job satisfaction" variables. There is a statistically high, positive and significant relationship between workplace values and quality ($r = 0,844$; $p<0,01$), innovation ($r = 0,875$; $p<0,01$), participation to decision ($r = 0,856$; $p<0,01$) and cooperation ($r = 0,865$; $p<0,01$). Between workplace values and job satisfaction ($r = 0,714$; $p<0,01$) there is a significant and over average relationship.

Workplace values are in high and positive relationship with its components: "quality", "innovation", "participation to decision" and "cooperation".

There is a positive and above average relationship between the "quality" component of workplace values and "innovation" component and since ($r = 0,709$; $p<0,01$) it is statistically significant. There is an average and positive relationship between quality and participation to decisions ($r =0,589$; $p<0,01$); above average and positive relationship between quality and cooperation ($r = 0,619$; $p<0,01$. And there is an above average and positive relationship between quality and job satisfaction variables ($r = 0,631$; $p<0,01$).

Table 2: Correlation Coefficients Between the Variables of the Study

	Business Values	Quality	Innovation	Participation to Decisions	Cooperation	Job Satisfaction
Workplace values	1					
Quality	,844(**)	1				
	,000					
Innovation	,875(**)	,709(**)	1			
	,000	,000				
Participation to Decisio	,856(**)	,589(**)	,675(**)	1		
	,000	,000	,000			
Cooperation	,865(**)	,619(**)	,642(**)	,690(**)	1	
	,000	,000	,000	,000		
Job Satisfaction	,717(**)	,631(**)	,637(**)	,595(**)	,608(**)	1
	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	

There is an above average and positive relationship between the "innovation" component of workplace values and participation to decisions (r =0,675; p<0,01) and cooperation (r = 0,642; p<0,01). Between innovation component and job satisfaction, there is an above average and positive relationship and as it is (r = 0,637; p<0,01) it is statistically significant.

There is an above average and positive relationship between the "participation to decisions" component of workplace values and cooperation (r =0,690; p<0,01). There is an average and positive relationship between participation to decisions component and job satisfaction (r =0,595; p<0,01).

There is an average relationship between "cooperation" component of workplace values and job satisfaction (r = 0,608; p<0,01).

5.3. The Differentiation of Corporate Culture Based on Job Satisfaction and Workplace Values

In order to find out whether corporate culture differs based on job satisfaction and business values, averages and standard deviations were calculated. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Frequency, Average and Standard Deviations of Job Satisfaction and Workplace Values Based on the Type of Institution

	Groups	N	Average	Standard Deviation
Job Satisfaction	Bartın State Hospital	201	2,9885	0,76070
	Bartın University	347	3,3519	0,81299
	Bartın Governorship	50	3,5027	0,63592
	Bartın Municipality	163	**3,6888**	0,81337
	Total	761	3,3380	0,82513
Business Values	Bartın State Hospital	201	2,9232	0,72788
	Bartın University	347	3,0878	0,84228
	Bartın Governorship	50	3,4024	0,60244
	Bartın Municipality	163	**3,6472**	0,78034
	Total	761	3,1848	0,82884
Quality	Bartın State Hospital	201	3,0580	0,88425
	Bartın University	347	3,3180	0,96023
	Bartın Governorship	50	3,7000	0,67428
	Bartın Municipality	163	**3,8221**	0,83418
	Total	761	3,3824	0,93861
Innovation	Bartın State Hospital	201	2,8723	0,87035
	Bartın University	347	2,9577	0,92474
	Bartın Governorship	50	3,2400	0,82490
	Bartın Municipality	163	**3,5419**	0,89893
	Total	761	3,0788	0,93298
Participation to Decisions	Bartın State Hospital	201	2,8259	0,87135
	Bartın University	347	2,9280	0,95580
	Bartın Governorship	50	3,1867	0,78292
	Bartın Municipality	163	**3,5971**	0,81098
	Total	761	3,0613	0,93852
Cooperation	Bartın State Hospital	201	2,9337	0,86073
	Bartın University	347	3,1479	1,12400
	Bartın Governorship	50	3,4800	,82797
	Bartın Municipality	163	**3,6278**	,98437
	Total	761	3,2159	1,04165

Table 3 shows the frequency, average and standard deviation values of job satisfaction and workplace values based on the type of institution. Job satisfaction average ranges were evaluated as given:

Arithmetic mean	Range
1,00 - 1,80	I am completely dissatisfied
1,81 - 2,60	I am dissatisfied
2,61 - 3,40	I am neutral
3,41 - 4,20	I am satisfied
4,21 - 5,00	I am completely satisfied

"1 – 1,80 range represents "I am completely dissatisfied"; 1,81 – 2.60 represents "I am dissatisfied"; 2,61 – 3,20 represents "I am neutral"; 3,21 – 4, 20 represents "I am satisfied"; "4,21 – 5,00 represents "I am completely satisfied". Job satisfaction averages were evaluated according to these ranges given above.

According to these ranges Bartın State Hospital and Bartın University are "Neutral" with 2,99 and 3,35 averages respectively; Bartın Governorship is at "I am satisfied" level with 3,50 and 3,69 averages respectively. Whilst the job satisfaction level in two of the institutions is at satisfaction level it is neutral in the remaining two. However, while Bartın University is close to "I am satisfied level"; Bartın State Hospital is more neutral.

Averages of business values, quality, innovation, participation to decisions and cooperation are as follows:

Arithmetic mean	Range
1,00 - 1,80	I completely disagree
1,81 - 2,60	I disagree
2,61 - 3,40	I am neutral
3,41 - 4,20	I agree
4,21 - 5,00	I completely disagree

The averages of business values, quality, innovation, participation to decisions and cooperation are evaluated according to these averages.

According to these averages of business values, Bartın State Hospital with 2,92 average, Bartın University with 3,09 average and Bartın Governorship with 3,40 average are all at "I am neutral" level whilst Bartın Municipality is at "I agree" level with 3,65 average. However, Bartın Governorship is moving from "I am neutral" level towards "I agree" level.

According to quality averages, Bartın State Hospital and Bartın University are at "I am neutral" levels with 3,05 and 3,32 averages respectively; whilst Bartın Governorship is at "I agree" level with 3,82 average. While Bartın State Hospital and Bartın University are at "I am neutral" level in quality level, Bartın Governorship and Bartın Municipality are at "I agree" level.

According to innovation averages; Bartın State Hospital, Bartın University and Bartın Governorship are at "I am neutral" level with 2,87, 2, 96 and 3,24 averages respectively; whilst Bartın Municipality is at "I agree" level with 3,54 average. While Bartın State Hospital,

Bartın University and Bartın Governorship are at "I am netural" level in innovation, Bartın Municipality is at "I agree" level.

According to averages of participation to decisions, Bartın State Hospital, Bartın University and Bartın Governorship are at "I am neutral" level with 2,83, 2,93 and 3,19 averages, respectively whilst Bartın Municipality is at "I agree" level with 3,60 average. While Bartın State Hospital, Bartın University and Bartın Governorship are at "I am netural" level in participation to decisions, Bartın Municipality is at "I agree" level.

According to cooperation averages Bartın State Hospital and Bartın University are at "I am neutral" level with 2,93 and 3,15 averages; whilst Bartın Governorship and Bartın Municipality are at "I agree" level with 3,48 and 3,63 averages. While Bartın State Hospital and Bartın University are at "I am netural" level in cooperation, Bartın Governorship and Bartın Municipality are at "I agree" level.

When Table 3 is analyzed, it is seen that the staff in Bartın Municipality have higher averages in job satisfaction, business values, quality, innovation, participation to decisions and cooperation. Besides, it is seen that the job satisfaction level of those working at Bartın Municipality are at "I am satisfied" level and their business values, quality, innovation, participation to decisions and cooperation levels are at "I agree" level.

In order to look into the effect of corporate culture on job satisfaction and business values, one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) was carried out and the results are shown in Table 4.

As it is seen in Table 4, there are differences among the job satisfaction and workplace values of staff working in different institutions. These differences are between Bartın State Hospital and Bartın University; between Bartın State Hospital and Bartın Governorship; between Bartın State Hospital and Bartın Municipality and finally between Bartın University and Bartın Municipality in "Job satisfaction".

In "Business values" component, the difference is between Bartın State Hospital and Bartın Governorship; between Bartın State Hospital and Bartın Municipality and finally between Bartın University and Bartın Municipality.

In "Quality" component the difference is between Bartın State Hospital and Bartın University; between Bartın State Hospital and Bartın Governorship, between Bartın State Hospital and Bartın Municipality; between Bartın University and Bartın Governorship and finally between Bartın University and Bartın Municipality.

In "Innovation" component, the difference is between Bartın State Hospital and Bartın Municipality, and between Bartın University and Bartın Municipality.

In "participation to decisions" component, the difference is between Bartın State Hospital and Bartın University; and between Bartın Governorship and Bartın Municipality.

In "cooperation" component, the difference is between Bartın State Hospital and Bartın Governorship; between Bartın State Hospital and Bartın University and Bartın Municipality.

Table 4: ANOVA Results of Job Satisfaction and Workplace Values Based on Corporate Culture

		Sum of squares	sd	Square means	F	p	Significance
Job Satisfaction	Between Groups	46,031	3	15,344	24,639	0,000	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 2-4,
	Within groups	471,411	757	,623			
	Total	517,442	760				
Business values	Between Groups	54,246	3	18,082	29,257	0,000	1-3, 1-4, 2-4
	Within groups	467,855	757	,618			
	Total	522,101	760				
Quality	Between Groups	59,143	3	19,714	24,448	0,000	1-2,1-3, 1-4, 2-3, 2-4
	Within groups	610,415	757	,806			
	Total	669,557	760				
Innovation	Between Groups	49,917	3	16,639	20,594	0,000	1-4, 2-4
	Within groups	611,631	757	,808			
	Total	661,547	760				
Participation to decision	Between Groups	64,898	3	21,633	27,089	0,000	1-4,2-4, 3-4
	Within groups	604,519	757	,799			
	Total	669,416	760				
Cooperation	Between Groups	48,758	3	16,253	15,857	0,000	1-3,1-4, 2-4
	Within groups	775,867	757	1,025			
	Total	824,624	760				

Significant difference codes 1: Bartın State Hospital, 2: Bartın University, 3: Bartın Governorship, 4: Bartın Municipality sd: Degree of Freedom.

It is seen that there is a statistically significant difference at $p < 0,005$ level between corporate culture and job satisfaction, workplace values and the components of workplace values which are quality, innovation, participation to decisions and cooperation.

6. Result and Suggestions

The aim of this study is to identify the relationship between the values that public employees attach to the components of workplace values which are quality, innovation, cooperation and participation to decisions, and job satisfaction. To this end, the findings collected from the state hospital, university, governorship and municipality employees in Bartın and the suggestions made are given below.

When the profile of the participants of the study are evaluated in general, male participants (60,7 %), participants aged between 30-35 years old (29,4%), married participants (70,9%), those with an undergraduate degree (26,7%), Bartın University staff (45,6%), employees (78,8%), those with an annual pay between 2000-2499 TL (28,6%), those working in their current institution for 5 years and less (57,8%) form the majority in their own categories.

Results of the correlation analysis between workplace values level and job satisfaction of the public institution employees who participated in the study:

The workplace values level of the public institution employees who participated in the study were analyzed based on quality, innovation, cooperation and participation to decision factors. The first hypothesis of the study was towards determining the relationship between job satisfaction of the employees and their business values. With the statistical analyses carried out, the relationship between workplace values and its components quality, innovation, cooperation, participation to decisions and job satisfaction was revealed. And the results revealed a statistically significant and positive relationship between workplace values, quality, innovation, cooperation, participation to decision and workplace values. Accordingly, as the level of value public institution employees assign to their job increases, so does their level of job satisfaction.

Results on the examination of ANOVA analysis of the difference between business value levels and job satisfaction of the public institution employees who participated in the study;

The second, third and fourth hypotheses of the study were towards revealing the difference between type of institution and job satisfaction and business values. According to the analyses carried out, the averages of job satisfaction and workplace values and quality, innovation, participation to decisions and cooperation level averages differ by the type of institution. The institution with the highest average in job satisfaction, business values, quality, innovation, participation to decisions and cooperation was the municipality; followed by governorship and university. According to job satisfaction average, the municipality is at "I am satisfied" level and at "I agree" level in business values, quality, innovation and participation to decisions variables.

The following suggestions are made based on the results of the study:

Possible relationships between workplace values of the employees and other organizational outputs should be studied. In addition, similar studies should be carried out in different organizational environments and within the context of different employee groups. The findings of the study will contribute to further studies in the field and also will help administrators in the institutions during the employment processes.

It is concluded that the institution worked at has an impact on workplace values and job satisfaction. That the employees are satisfied from the job satisfaction level effects other business variables positively. Being satisfied with the management, payment and colleagues shows the result of these.

References

Akgündüz, S. (2006). Örgütsel stres kaynaklarının çalışanların iş tatmini üzerindeki etkisi ve *banka çalışanları için yapılan bir araştırma*. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi/ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.

Aksu, S. (1998). *Hizmet işletmelerinde iş tatmini*. (Yayınlanmamış y*üksek lisans tezi)*. Marmara Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Atay, S. (2003). Türk yönetici adaylarının, siyasal ve dinî tercihleri ile yaşam değerleri arasındaki ilişki. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(3), 87-120.

Avcı, N. (2011). Turizm eğitimi alan lisans öğrencilerinin iş değerleri: çeşme turizm ve otelcilik yüksekokulu örneği. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 22(1), 7-18.

Ayral, A. E. (1992). *Akademisyenlerin* çalışmayla ilgili değerleri. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Balci, B. (2004). *Milli Eğitime bağlı meslek okullarinda görev yapan öğretmenlerin iş tatmini*. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi/ Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K.., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2011). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri***,** 10. Baskı, Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Can, H., Aşan, Ö., & Aydın, E. M. (2006). Örgütsel d*avranış*. İstanbul: Yaylacılık Matbaası.

Dyne, L. V., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal,* 37(4), 765-802.

Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. 19. Baskı, Ankara: Nobel Yayın.

Kılıç, M. (2010). Stratejik yönetim sürecinde değerler, vizyon ve misyon kavramları arasındaki ilişki. *Sosyo Ekonomi*, 2, 81-97.

Koca, A. İ. (2009*)*. Üniversite öğrencilerinin değerleri ve bireysel özellikleri ile kariyer tercihleri arasındakı ilişki: Çukurova Üniversitesi'nde bir araştırma. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Çukurova Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

Kubat, U. (2007). İ*malat sektöründe* iş değerleri ile kişilik özellikleri *arasındakı ilişkinin incelenmesi*. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Akdeniz Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya.

Özcan, E. D. (2011). *Kişilik bakış açısından örgüt yapısı ve iş tatmini*. 1. Baskı, İstanbul: Beta.

Özkalp, E., & Kırel, Ç. (2008). Örgütsel d*avranış*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Web-Ofset Tesisleri.

Özkan, Ç. (2010). Ege bölgesi'ndeki 4-5 yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde örgüt kültürünün iş değerlerinin dönüşümüne etkileri. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Çanakkale.

Tınaz, P. (1996). Çalışanların iş değerleri konusunda bir durum değerlendirmesi. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 29(4), 43-53.

Yapıcı, A., & Zengin, Z. S. (2003). İlahiyat fakültesi öğrencilerinin değer tercih sıralamaları üzerine psikolojik bir araştırma: Çukurova Üniversitesi ilahiyat fakültesi örneği. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1 (4), 173-206.

Yüksel, Ö. (1998). İnsan kaynakları yönetimi. Ankara: Gazi Yayınevi.

Warr, P., Cook, J., & Wall T. (1979). Scales For The Measurement of Some Work Attitudes and Aspects of Psychological Well-Being, *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. Printed in Great Britain, 52, 129-148.