

A PRACTICAL TURKIYE SAMPLE OF ADVOCATE - CLIENT RELATIONSHIP
WITH REGARD TO SERVICE MARKETING

Sefer Gümüş, Hande Gülnihal Gümüş, Tuğbay Burçin Gümüş*

ABSTRACT

Nowadays the activities offered towards meeting the demands and the needs of the humans take part within the frequently used service concept. While service is showing diversity and variety in terms of offering, Service Sector includes many sectors. Service Marketing exists, having the topics to be realized while considering the specific characteristics of service, in every field of service. One of those fields is Law. One of the professions representing service in field of law is the advocacy. There is a sort of exchanging service between the advocates and their clients. Within this context, assessing the advocate client relationship from the service marketing point of view, determining the advisee-client relationship between advocates and the lawsuit holders and finding out main factors in advisee's selecting advocates constitutes the purpose of this study.

The research area is Turkey focusing on the cities of İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Bursa, Diyarbakır, Mersin and Trabzon. The study has a descriptive character, and the questionnaire technique is used in the practice part. Questions have been asked for determining the demographic and descriptive characteristic of the participants in the first part of the questionnaire; and the consumer-client relationship between the advocate-advisee in the second part. Cronbach's alpha analysis has been applied for the reliability of the questions and 0.918 has been found as the reliability parameter. For the analysis of the data acquired, descriptive statistics, T test and one sided ANOVA test was practiced on. At the end of the data acquired, despite majority of the client's knowing their advocates enough are not satisfied from the service they received and stated that they will not advice their advocates to the people in their vicinity.

At the end of the research, it was concluded that majority of the participants specified with the simple random method get their advocates insufficient, selecting a different advocate will change the lawsuit process and the confidence to the advocacy was shaken. It was also determined that participants stating toward the gender factor was not a factor that could affect the lawsuit process.

INTRODUCTION

Service concept which is analyzed processing technically and systematically, as a natural cause of

Yrd.Doç.Dr.Sefer Gümüş-Beykent Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.Fakültesive Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Öğretim Üyesi-
gumus.sefer@gmail.com-0533-7765202

Hande Gülnihal Gümüş-Şişli Meslek Yüksek Okulu Öğr.Görevlisi,B.Ü.S.B.E.İşletme Yönetimi Doktora Öğrencisi
Tuğbay Burçin Gümüş,Beykent Ünivresitesi S.B.E.İşletme Yönetimi Doktora Öğrencisi

humans living together appears to us with different shapes through 1700s. For this reason, service concept must be identified (Sayım and Aydın, 2011:246).

Human beings live in groups by nature, need each other and communicate with each other because of the social nature. That's why it is possible that services exist in all periods from the time human beings exist up to now (Biçer, 2007:46).

Service Concept, with a very simple statement, is described as an intangible benefit or activity offered to a person or institution by a person or institution (Tarcan, 2001:4)

Marketing is discussed in all fields that service exists. Marketing can be described as the process of practice and planning done for developing ideas, goods and services, pricing, distributing and promotion for realizing the changes that enables personal and corporate aims. This definition includes non-profit institutions as well (İslamoğlu, 2000: 325-327).

On the principle of Marketing subject lays the evolution against providing the needs and the demands of the humans (Akdoğan, 2011:1). Within this context, Service sector has become an area of marketing concept started to be used widely (Akdoğan, 2011:1). Nowadays Service Sector has been accepted as a developing and enriching sub-discipline of science of marketing (Akdoğan, 2011:19).

It has been observed that the concept of Service Marketing is being used in many different sectorial fields and being assessed within this frame. In our study a practical advocate-advisee relationship is aimed to get assessment within the frame of this concept.

The advocates, solving conflicts impartially as well as having expertise playing important roles in realizing the rules of law, are independent businessmen (Akil, 2012). There is a sort of service exchange between the advocate and the client. There is a matter of a process functioning within the Service Marketing mixture (distribution, price, promotion, human, etc.).

Advocates while performing their profession have some rights while having some responsibilities not only for their clients having a representation relationship but also for the judicial institution and members and for the community and their colleagues. Advocate according to the Advocate Law item 37 can refuse the job that is offered to him without any reason. It is compulsory to notify the job owner of the rejection. According to the Advocates Law, Advocates should perform worthily their duties as paying care, truth and honor and act in accordance with the respect and trust proper for the advocacy title and ethical rules of the Union of Turkish Bar Associations. Advocates should protect and value their clients' rights (<http://mygtakca.blogcu.com>) (Access Date: 12.12.2014). There is an open and acceptable, true and honest procedure in Service Marketing. Otherwise it is inevitable that service receivers may get suspicious perceptions.

Advocates have a task to enlighten their clients. Advocates should be in dialogue with their clients in all phases of the case and enlighten their clients about the issues like course of trial, risks and advantages of the trial, judgment, ways of law to be applied against the judgment, offered compromises, acceptances, way in executing the provision, period, and get opinions and decisions accordingly. Finally advocates should also enlighten and explain the judicial assistance opportunities for his client's being in poverty (<http://mygtakca.blogcu.com>) (Access Date: 11.11.2014). There is a continuous communication and interaction between the people receiving and offering the service in marketing factors. Marketing processes pose a dynamic structure.

Some of the issues related to service basis of the advocate-client relationship in the ethical rules of advocacy designated by the Union of Turkish Bar Associations are as follows :

Advocate can never get an advantage for himself on his client's loss by jobbery or lying down on the job, in the case undertaken. Advocate can request advance payment for the expenses related to the case. Attention must be paid for the advance payment not to exceed over the requirement, notifying the client in the end. The Money and other values received made on behalf of the client should be informed without any delay and given to the client. If there is an account related to the client, the situation should be notified to the client as written in appropriate periods. Advocate should pay attention to use his right to withdraw from and leave the case (<http://www.karamanbarosu.org.tr>) (Access Date: 11.12.2014).

It is obvious that there may be some problems that the human relations are in question where service exists. There are automatically disputes in the profession of advocacy of its nature. For this reason, advocate should represent his own professional experience to the judicial world first, should give Professional service to his clients waiting/requesting legal assistance from him in compliance with the legal regulations and customs of the service. With the financial dimension of the work done, the advocate-client relationship should be designed within the frame of contractility, transparency and the advocacy honor without neglecting the lofty part like law (<http://bavder.com.tr>) (Access Date: 07.10.2014).

Another important issue between the advocate and the client through service process, the basis of the contract relationship is mutual trust. When the client does not trust his advocate and present a look about all important incidents, it will be too difficult for the advocate to provide consultancy and to represent the client in an effective way. For this reason, it is assured to keep the secret with many acts, agreement and the ethical rules (Akt: Günergök, 2003). One of the main issues for offering the Advocacy Service is the relation of mutual trust. Honestly, reliability and clarity are also important factors in the marketing concept.

This issue has an important role in the relation between receiving and offering service.

The relation of the client receiving the service and the advocate undertaking the realization of the service mean ensuring certain conditions within the service marketing. The qualification criterion of the advocates is important with regard to be present in service marketing.

While realizing the service for the client and the criteria of qualification of the advocate related to this, is advocate's fulfilling the job with the client subjective feeling and thinking; for other legal persons and institutions (judge, prosecutor, and law enforcement, etc.) it is advocate's fulfilling precisely transactions without any fault and qualification of the advocate in the legal system (<http://web.e-baro.web.tr>) (Access Date: 22.09.2014).

For this reason, the qualification of the advocate should be done through objective criteria and in the communication of advocate with his client as a priority we need to suppose that the advocate informs for all possibilities in terms of legal issues. Because, in case this assessment won't be done by the advocate, the client will see his advocate responsible for the issues or the results that he's unaware and will set the casual connection as the advocate is incapable. The objectiveness of the relationship between the advocate and the client in service marketing is also important in terms of sustainability (<http://web.e-baro.web.tr>).

If we assess with objective criteria, for an advocate to be capable in his profession, principally we should say that his education be huge and legal knowledge about he contracted for service. Accordingly an advocate should know legal issues best as well as satisfy his client (<http://web.e-baro.web.tr>) (22.11.2014). In connection with the promotion concept inside the marketing mixture, advocate's success in the service field and having enough knowledge and education in service field offered to more easily set up client relations and satisfying clients about service efficiency can be assessed as one of the preconditions.

Grönross (1982) in his study stated how service institutions having direct relations with clients adapted marketing mixture to service marketing and most of the service institutions act according to the theory of service marketing (Özgüven, 2008). Advocates are doing business of having the character of public service for the feature of persons devoting his legislative knowledge and experience to the good of the society in organizing the legal relationships, solving conflicts convenient to law and justice (Akil, 2012). Bar Associations and advocate offices can be regarded as service institutions offering public service, advocates as service presenter.

Asher (1989) in his study measured the client satisfaction and proposed suggestions for using the results as to increase the quality of services offered to the clients by the firms. He accepted client satisfaction as the last step of the product (Özgüven, 2008). During the service marketing client satisfaction is one of the factors gaining importance. In the advocate-client relationship process, client's satisfaction from the service is also major outcomes of the process.

Advocacy is a profession that everyone living in the society needs it from time to time. Although an advocate's bureau is not "business firm", producing service is an organization and good managing requires a notion of "management" at the same time. It concerns a lot of fields for being character of social profession (Yenipinar, 2013).

Aim, Scope and Method

The aim of this research is to determine the advocate-advisee relationship between the advocates and the case owners and to find out main factors on advisee's advocate selection. The research area is Turkey focusing on the cities of İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Bursa, Diyarbakır, Mersin and Trabzon. The questionnaire was made by the inspiration of the study (Korkmaz, M, 2012); "Analysis of Meeting the Client Expectation and Satisfaction by Advocate with a Practice", Türkiye Barolar Birliği Dergisi, Vol: 102; p.242-268) that its reliability was proved before. The questionnaire used in the related study adapted to the study, a pre-test has been applied on 150 persons before going into the main search. In the result of the pre-test Cronbach's alpha criteria (0.871) was acquired as the reliability level. This criterion shows us that the questionnaire used in this study is quite reliable.

Questions have been asked to determine the participants' demographic and descriptive characteristics in the first part of the questionnaire, consumer-seller relationship between the advocate-advisee in the second part of the questionnaire. Non-parametric and parametric statistical tests have been applied on the gathered data.

Analysis of the Data:

Descriptive Analysis, Reliability Analysis, Independent sampled T-test, Anova Analysis, Kruskal Wallis Analysis were used within the scope of the analysis. In analyzing the data acquired through the research, PASW 18.0 software package was used. 0.05 importance level has been considered in the relation and difference between the variances.

BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

A Practical Türkiye Sample of Advocate - Client Relationship with Regard to Service Marketing,
Sefer Gümüş, Hande Gülnihal Gümüş, Tuğbay Burçin Gümüş,
Volume 7 (2) 2014, 35-53

PRACTICE AND ANALYSIS:

Table 1: Reliability analysis related to scale

Cronbach's Alpha	Item Number
,918	55

At the end of the reliability analysis, for Alpha=0.918, we can say that 55 items are at very high reliability level.

DEMOGRAPHIC STATISTICS:

7% of the participants of the research are at 18-20 age group, 29% of them at 21-30 age group, 29% of them at 31-40 age group, 24% of them 41-50 age group and 11% of them are over 51 age group.

Table 2. Dispersion related to age variance

Variances	Frequency	Colomn N	
YOUR AGE	18-20	250	7%
	21-30	1043	29%
	31-40	1037	29%
	41-50	841	24%
	51 above	391	11%

Participants' education levels are, 1% literate, 13% elementary school, 25% lycea, 31% high school, 24% university, 6% post graduate. Participants income rate is; 24% at 500-1000 TL, 24% at 1001-1500 TL, 28% at 1501-2000 TL, 11% at 2001-2500 TL, 3% at 2501-3000 TL, 9% over 3001 TL.

Variances	Frequency	Colomn %	
YOUR EDUCATION	Literate	50	1%
	Elementary School	465	13%
	Lycea	892	25%
	High School	1091	31%
	University	868	24%
	Post Graduate	196	6%
YOUR INCOME	500-1000	870	24%
	1001-1500	868	24%
	1501-2000	990	28%
	2001-2500	397	11%
	2501-3000	122	3%
	3001+	315	9%

BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

A Practical Türkiye Sample of Advocate - Client Relationship with Regard to Service Marketing,
Sefer Gümüş, Hande Gülnihal Gümüş, Tuğbay Burçin Gümüş,
Volume 7 (2) 2014, 35-53

76% of the participants are married, 24% single. 87% live in metropolitan cities, 10% in cities, 1% in counties, 1% in towns.

Table 4. Demographic statistics (marital status, gender, and residential area) related to participants

Variances		Frequency	Column N %
YOUR MARITAL STATUS	Married	2702	76%
	Single	860	24%
YOUR GENDER	Male	2124	60%
	Female	1438	40%
YOUR RESIDENTIAL AREA	Metropolis	3091	87%
	City	372	10%
	County	49	1%
	Town	50	1%

93% of the participants can use computer and internet. The ratio of the ones that searches to find the advocates that they selected is 33%, trusting the advices of his vicinity is 36%, coincidentally ratio 22%, assigned by the Bars Association is 9%. The ones investigating the advocate before the court and related to the case is 66%, not investigating is 34%.

BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

A Practical Türkiye Sample of Advocate - Client Relationship with Regard to Service Marketing,
Sefer Gümüş, Hande Gülnihal Gümüş, Tuğbay Burçin Gümüş,
 Volume 7 (2) 2014, 35-53

Table 5. Dispersion of participants related to the questions

Items		Frequency	Column N %
DO YOU HAVE COMPUTER LITERACY TO USE İNTERNET	Yes	3320	93%
	No	242	7%
HOW DID YOU REACH YOUR ADVOCATE?	Searching	1187	33%
	Advice of vicinity	1284	36%
	Coincidentally	775	22%
	Assigned by Bar	316	9%
HAVE YOU INVESTIGATED YOUR ADVOCATE BEFORE YOU GIVE HIM THE CASE?	Yes	2358	66%
	No	1204	34%

When we look at the participants' reason to select their advocates, the rates are price 17%, expertise & skill 26%, familiarization & recognizing 10%, approach 18%, advice 29%. The rate of the ones to consult to the same advocate in other problems is 17%. The rate of the ones content with the service they received is 19%.

Table 6. Dispersion of participants related to some questions

Items		Frequency	Column N %
WHAT WAS YOUR REASON TO SELECT AND PREFER YOUR ADVOCATE	Price	620	17%
	Expertise & skill	939	26%
	Familiarization & recognizing	344	10%
	Approach	635	18%
	Advice	1024	29%
WOULD YOU WORK WITH THE SAME ADVOCATE İN ANOTHER PROBLEM OF YOURS?	Yes	608	17%
	No	2954	83%
ARE YOU SATİSFIED WITH THE ADVOCACY SERVICE YOU RECEİVED	Yes	683	19%
	No	2879	81%

66% of the participants have paid the all of the advocacy fee with the power of attorney. 19% too much, 59% enough, 19% too little, 3% have no information about their advocate. 84% will not give a positive reference about their advocate. 83% had no information Exchange with the advocate about the case. 86% were not informed through a frequent communication with the advocate. 86% stated that they had no frequent communication with the advocate in the subjects they are curious about related to the case.

BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

A Practical Türkiye Sample of Advocate - Client Relationship with Regard to Service Marketing,
Sefer Gümüş, Hande Gülnihal Gümüş, Tuğbay Burçin Gümüş,
Volume 7 (2) 2014, 35-53

84% stated that his advocate did not meet his personal expectations. 35% of the advocates are female, 65% are male. 65% stated that his advocate's gender had no effect to the result of the case. 83% of their advocate is a freelance advocate. A second advocate as defendant entered to the 79% of their cases. The courts that the lawsuit of the participants determined as 16% Heavy penalty, 17% Criminal court, 26% Court of peace, 12% Commercial court, 15% Civil Law, 1% Peace Law, 6% Trade Court, 1% Consumer Court, 7% Family Court. 77% consider his advocate inefficient. 55% believe if another advocate takes over the lawsuit, the result will be different. 68% lost his confidence in the profession of advocacy. 62% had a lawsuit at another court before.

BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

A Practical Türkiye Sample of Advocate - Client Relationship with Regard to Service Marketing,
Sefer Gümüş, Hande Gülnihal Gümüş, Tuğbay Burçin Gümüş,
 Volume 7 (2) 2014, 35-53

Table 7. Dispersion of participants related to some questions

Items	Frequency	Column N%
HAVE YOU PAID THE PRICE YOUR ADVOCATE REQUESTED WITH THE ATTORNEY AGREEMENT ?	Yes	2335 66%
	No	1227 34%
HOW MUCH INFORMATION DO YOU HAVE ABOUT YOUR ADVOCATE?	None	100 3%
	Too little	667 19%
	Enough	2110 59%
	Too much	685 19%
WILL YOU GIVE A POSITIVE REFERANS ABOUT YOUR ADVOCATE ?	Yes	561 16%
	No	3001 84%
HAVE YOU MEET WITH YOUR ADVOCATE FREQUENTLY ABOUT YOUR CASE AND AXCHANGED OPINIONS?	Yes	607 17%
	No	2955 83%
WERE YOU INFORMED BY YOUR ADVOCATE FREQUENTLY THE SUBJECTS YOU ARE CURIOUS ABOUT?	Yes	510 14%
	No	3052 86%
HAS YOUR ADVOCATES PERSONAL ATTITUDE MET WITH YOUR PERSONAL EXPECTATIONS?	Yes	560 16%
	No	3002 84%
WHAT IS THE GENDER OF YOUR ADVOCATE?	Female	1233 35%
	Male	2329 65%
DO YOU THINK THAT YOUR ADVOCATE'S GENDER HAD A NEGATIVE OR POSITIVE EFFECT ON THE RESULT OF YOUR CASE?	Yes	1231 35%
	No	2331 65%
IS THE ADVOCATE YOU WORK WITH A FREELANCE ADVOCATE?	Yes	2964 83%
	No	598 17%
HAS ANOTHER ADVOCATE ENTERED TO DEFEND YOUR ONGOING LAWSUIT APART FROM YOUR CURRENT ADVOCATE?	Yes	765 21%
	No	2797 79%
AT WHICH COURT IS YOUR LAWSUIT? WHIS IS YOUR LAWSUIT	Heavy penalty	564 16%
	Criminal court	564 17%
	Court of peace	922 26%
	Commercial court	445 12%
	Civil law	523 15%
	Peace low	50 1%
	Trade Court	199 6%
	Consumer Court	24 1%
DO YOU HAVE AN IDEA THAT YOUR ADVOCATE IS INCARAPLE ?	Yes	2735 77%
	No	827 23%
IF ANOTHER ADVOCATE HAD TAKEN OVER THE SAME LAWSUIT, WOULD HE BE MORE SUCCESSFUL?	Yes	465 55%
	No	386 45%
HAVE YOU LOST YOUR CONFIDENCE IN ADVOCATES AND ADVOCACY?	Yes	562 68%
	No	265 32%
HAVE YOU HAD A PREVIOUS COURT EXPERIENCE BEFORE IN SIMILAR OR DIFFERENT SUBJECT OF LAWSUITS?	Yes	513 62%
	No	314 38%

BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

A Practical Türkiye Sample of Advocate - Client Relationship with Regard to Service Marketing,
 Sefer Gümüş, Hande Gülnihal Gümüş, Tuğbay Burçin Gümüş,
 Volume 7 (2) 2014, 35-53

FACTOR ANALYSIS:

55 scaled questions have been asked to the respondents' participating the questionnaire in order to evaluate the experience they had during the process between the court and the advocates, and it was asked them to give points. The results acquired evaluated with the factor analysis and 5 different dimensions were discovered. These dimensions will be used in further analysis.

Table 8. Factor analysis

Items	1	2	3	4	5
3- My advocate informed me frequently about the outcome of the case.	0,849				
2- I would work together with the same advocate.	0,846				
17- I informed my advocate for all relevant information about the lawsuit truly and completely.	0,843				
4- I received any kind of support and assistance from my advocate with regard to lawsuit fee and the attorney fee.	0,840				
15- I got any kind of information from my advocate in accordance with my request.	0,838				
29- I respect the advocates and the profession of advocacy.	0,803				
20- I did my best in this lawsuit.	0,800				
10- I could not create a social sharing with my advocate.	-0,769				
30- I am thinking that the profession of advocacy is blessed.	0,763				
16- My advocate did any kind of sacrifice and work with regard to information about the lawsuit and obtaining the documents.	0,726				
9- The reason of not confronting any negative result is my advocate.	-0,717				
8- I never satisfied with my advocate.	-0,681				
5- The lawsuit fee of my advocate was reasonable comparing with the advocates I negotiated.	0,680				
25- There is no unsuccessful advocate. There is a condition of giving less documents and information.	0,632				
31- My advocate did not share the information and secrets belonging to me with a third party.	0,628				
7- My advocate did not ever inform me about the file and the lawsuit.	-0,568				
19- My advocate acted realistically and sincerely to me during the course of lawsuit.	0,489				
1- I'm extremely satisfied with my advocate.	-0,455				
11- I provided any kind of document and information to my advocate related to the lawsuit.	-0,385				
27- My advocate participated in every court session during the course of lawsuit.	-0,338				
42- I don't believe the decision made about me is right.	0,852				
38- The decision made about me was the decision I was expecting. I do not think going to the higher court.	0,832				
41- The decision given about me is right. That's why I believe that the justice appeared whole and complete.	0,825				
40- I have full confidence in the Turkish Courts.	0,805				
39- The decision of the court was the one I was expecting.	0,771				
45- I had a negative result like this because of my advocate did not defend the lawsuit going on about me completely and as expected.	0,758				
22- I'm thinking that the advocates should work in the subjects and the lawsuits that they are expert.	0,696				
14- My advocate performed the relations with the court whole and complete.	0,692				
37- The related court explained the most right decision considering the proposals and opinions of my advocate.	0,683				
44- My advocate thinks that the decision will be changed at the higher court. Because he expresses his idea that the decision was not taken through a whole and complete research.	0,633				
26- I hid the truth that my advocate should know.	0,505				
55- The decision has been given at the end of a whole and complete research.	0,427				
34- I am thinking that the advocate advisee relation rests on mutual trust.	0,416				
35- I will never tell my advocate the secrets I hid about the subject of the lawsuit. Because I don't trust him.	0,348				
51- The main aim of the advocates is to gain Money and benefit.	0,755				
50- My advocate defended me without having enough knowledge through research about the lawsuit and for this reason the court reached a negative decision.	0,730				
54- I faced a negation I did not know the reason. Because in the beginning of the lawsuit my advocate had informed me that I would get a more positive result.	0,697				
48- Advocates gaining expertise in a field and subject would satisfy the court enough and the court would have a more true decision.	0,670				
52- The profession of advocacy is a kind of exploitation in materialized sense.	0,653				

BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

A Practical Türkiye Sample of Advocate - Client Relationship with Regard to Service Marketing,
Sefer Gümüş, Hande Gülnihal Gümüş, Tuğbay Burçin Gümüş,
Volume 7 (2) 2014, 35-53

Table 8. Factor analysis

46- My advocate could not persuade the court enough and defend me with the knowledge, document and evidences at him.	0,651
47- The main reason why my advocate could not defend me is he is incapable about my lawsuit and inexperienced.	0,638
53- Had I paid more attorney fee to my advocate, the result would be for my favor.	0,558
12- I did completely every task and responsibility that my advocate demanded from me.	0,780
21- I had all my expectation through the lawsuit and the course of the case.	0,778
18- I am thinking that my advocate has enough knowledge and expertise about the lawsuit.	0,766
33- I share any kind of my secrets and the truth I hide.	0,738
23- Expertise fields should be set up in Advocacy about different lawsuits.	0,734
24- I think that the advocates paid enough time and interest for the lawsuit he has undertaken.	0,696
13- My advocate acted like a businessman.	0,676
32- I believe the importance of secrecy in the profession of advocacy.	0,398
36- The lawsuit ongoing about me ended in a faster and untroubled process.	-0,301
6- My advocate demanded too much lawsuit fee from me.	0,564
43- My advocate claims that the decision taken by the court is not right.	-0,521
49- My advocate could not reply well and completely to the questions he was asked by the court.	0,416
28- My advocate dealt with the lawsuit enough and did best for me.	-0,382

Table 9. Factors and query groups

Query groups (variances)	Factor Name
Maintaining an effective communication and sharing with the advocate	Factor 1
The decision taken was just	Factor 2
Trust to Advocacy	Factor 3
Maintaining the support needed during the course of the case	Factor 4
Effectiveness of an Advocate	Factor 5

H1: No difference is seen in the factors related to the age groups.

When the factors related to the age groups reviewed, it is seen that all Asymp. Sig values related with questions are smaller than 0.005. Because of this reason the basic hypothesizes related with these questions will be rejected. Difference is seen at factors according to age group. Sharing information with advocates, thinking that the court decision is fair, reliance on advocacy, providing required support during the lawsuit and reliance on advocate’s effectiveness show difference at specific ages when it is compared with other ages.

TABLE 10. Analysis of relation between the factors related to the age variance

	FACTOR1	FACTOR2	FACTOR3	FACTOR4	FACTOR5
ChiSquare	108,027	156,071	195,248	104,448	198,051
df	4	4	4	4	4
Asymp. Sig.	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000

H2: No difference is seen in the factors related to the education.

When the factors related to education reviewed, it is seen that all Asymp. Sig values related with questions are smaller than 0.005. Because of this reason the basic hypothesizes related with these questions will be rejected. Difference is seen at factors according to education. Sharing information with advocates, thinking that the court decision is fair, reliance on advocacy, providing required support during the lawsuit and reliance on advocate’s effectiveness show difference at specific education levels when it is compared with other education ages.

TABLE 11. Analysis of relation between the factors related to the Education variance (Anova)

	FACTOR1	FACTOR2	FACTOR3	FACTOR4	FACTOR5
ChiSquare	323,203	95,247	69,799	332,795	122,237
df	5	5	5	5	5
Asymp. Sig.	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000

H3: No difference is seen in the factors related to the income.

When the factors related to education reviewed, it is seen that all Asymp. Sig values related with questions are smaller than 0.005. Because of this reason the basic hypothesizes related with these questions will be rejected Difference is seen at factors according to education. Sharing information with advocates, thinking that the court decision is fair, reliance on advocacy, providing required support during the lawsuit and reliance on advocate's effectiveness show difference at specific education levels when it is compared with other education ages.

TABLE 12. Analysis of relation between the factors related to the state of income variance (Anova)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
FACTOR1	BetweenGroups	173,635	5	34,727	36,456	,000
	Within Groups	3387,365	3556	,953		
	Total	3561,000	3561			
FACTOR2	BetweenGroups	101,744	5	20,349	20,918	,000
	Within Groups	3459,256	3556	,973		
	Total	3561,000	3561			
FACTOR3	BetweenGroups	204,286	5	40,857	43,283	,000
	Within Groups	3356,714	3556	,944		
	Total	3561,000	3561			
FACTOR4	BetweenGroups	364,380	5	72,876	81,069	,000
	Within Groups	3196,620	3556	,899		
	Total	3561,000	3561			
FACTOR5	BetweenGroups	195,709	5	39,142	41,360	,000
	Within Groups	3365,291	3556	,946		
	Total	3561,000	3561			

H4: No difference is seen in the factors related to the gender.

When the factors related to gender reviewed, it is seen that all Asymp. Sig values related with 1, 2 and 4th factors are smaller than 0.005. Because of this reason the basic hypothesizes related with these questions will be rejected. Difference is seen at 1, 2 and 4th factors according to gender. Sharing information with advocates, thinking that the court decision is fair, reliance on advocacy, providing required support during the lawsuit show difference at males when it is compared with females.

TABLE 13. Analysis of relation between the factors related to the Gender variance (Anova)

BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

A Practical Türkiye Sample of Advocate - Client Relationship with Regard to Service Marketing, Sefer Gümüş, Hande Gülnihal Gümüş, Tuğbay Burçin Gümüş, Volume 7 (2) 2014, 35-53

TABLE 13. Analysis of relation between the factors related to the Gender variance (Anova).

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
FACTOR1	BetweenGroups	180,675	1	180,675	190,278	,000
	Within Groups	3380,325	3560	,950		
	Total	3561,000	3561			
FACTOR2	BetweenGroups	33,106	1	33,106	33,407	,000
	Within Groups	3527,894	3560	,991		
	Total	3561,000	3561			
FACTOR3	BetweenGroups	11,271	1	11,271	11,304	,100
	Within Groups	3549,729	3560	,997		
	Total	3561,000	3561			
FACTOR4	BetweenGroups	52,954	1	52,954	53,738	,000
	Within Groups	3508,046	3560	,985		
	Total	3561,000	3561			
FACTOR5	BetweenGroups	7,923	1	7,923	7,938	,060
	Within Groups	3553,077	3560	,998		
	Total	3561,000	3561			

H5: No difference is seen related to the service satisfaction from the advocacy received.

When the analysis reviewed, there is a meaningful difference related to the analysis of 1, 2, 3 and 5th factors. The received advocacy service is a factor, which is effective over providing effective communication with advocate, reliance on the court decision that it is fair, reliance on advocacy in general and advocate's effectiveness.

TABLE 14. Analysis of relation between the factors related to the Service Satisfaction variance (Anova)

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	T-Test for Equality of Means										
		F		t		Sig. (2-tailed)		Mean Difference		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	
FACTOR 1	Equal variances assumed	888,275	,000	57,341	3560	,000	1,75988600	,03069171	1,82006110	1,69971091		
	Equal variances not assumed			36,806	745,814	,000	1,75988600	,04781522	1,85375444	1,66601757		
FACTOR 2	Equal variances assumed	,454	,501	25,070	3560	,000	,98385343	,03924385	1,06079612	,90691075		
	Equal variances not assumed			25,834	1068,028	,000	,98385343	,03808321	1,05857983	,90912704		
FACTOR3	Equal variances assumed	12,608	,000	5,172	3560	,000	,21935594	,04240831	,13620892	,30250297		
	Equal variances not assumed			4,747	941,431	,000	,21935594	,04621041	,12866862	,31004327		
FACTOR 4	Equal variances assumed	743,327	,000	1,801	3560	,072	,07663067	,04254798	,16005155	,00679021		
	Equal variances not assumed			1,187	754,452	,236	,07663067	,06457632	,20340131	,05013997		
FACTOR 5	Equal variances assumed	42,700	,000	5,583	3560	,000	,23660868	,04238225	,31970461	,15351275		
	Equal variances not assumed			4,829	893,229	,000	,23660868	,04900065	,33277850	,14043886		

BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

A Practical Türkiye Sample of Advocate - Client Relationship with Regard to Service Marketing, Sefer Gümüş, Hande Gülnihal Gümüş, Tuğbay Burçin Gümüş, Volume 7 (2) 2014, 35-53

H6: No meaningful difference happens to cause in the factors related to the communication with the advocate.

When the analysis reviewed, analysis results for the factors 1, 2, 3 and 5, Sig value been seen lower than 0.05. When communication with advocate is increased, thinking that more effective communication with advocate is provided, reliance on the court decision that it is fair, reliance on advocacy profession and advocate’s effectiveness on the lawsuit differs.

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	
FACTOR1 Equal variances assumed	444,770	,000	33,806	3560	,000	1,31089762	,03877760	1,38692617	1,23486907	
			24,732	700,974	,000	1,31089762	,05300427	1,41496377	1,20683147	
FACTOR2 Equal variances assumed	,050	,822	19,356	3560	,000	,82058251	,04239421	,90370189	,73746313	
			20,906	948,405	,000	,82058251	,03925161	,89761255	,74355247	
FACTOR3 Equal variances assumed	133,276	,000	3,649	3560	,000	,16230976	,04448611	,24953058	,07508894	
			3,041	754,377	,002	,16230976	,05336761	,26707644	,05754307	
FACTOR4 Equal variances assumed	268,261	,000	8,805	3560	,421	,03586205	,04456515	,12323785	,05151374	
			5,547	678,233	,585	,03586205	,06555939	,16458581	,09286171	
FACTOR5 Equal variances assumed	176,210	,000	18,972	3560	,000	,80581232	,04247372	,88908759	,72253705	
			14,872	726,807	,000	,80581232	,05418457	,91218926	,69943537	

H7: No meaningful difference happens to cause in the factors related to the Gender of the Advocate.

When the analysis reviewed, it is seen that all Asymp. Sig values related with 1, 2, 3 and 4th factors are smaller than 0.005. Advocate’s being male or female is an effective factor over thinking that more effective communication with advocate is provided, reliance on the court decision that it is fair, reliance on advocacy profession and providing required support during the lawsuit.

TABLE 15. Analysis of relation between the factors related to the Gender of the Advocate variance. variance (T-test)

TABLE 15. Analysis of relation between the factors related to the Gender of the Advocate variance (T-test)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
FACTOR1	Between Groups	23,963	1	23,963	24,118	,000
	Within Groups	3537,037	3560	,994		
	Total	3561,000	3561			
FACTOR2	Between Groups	54,270	1	54,270	55,094	,000
	Within Groups	3506,730	3560	,985		
	Total	3561,000	3561			
FACTOR3	Between Groups	16,591	1	16,591	16,664	,000
	Within Groups	3544,409	3560	,996		
	Total	3561,000	3561			
FACTOR4	Between Groups	27,188	1	27,188	27,389	,000
	Within Groups	3533,812	3560	,993		
	Total	3561,000	3561			
FACTOR5	Between Groups	1,299	1	1,299	1,299	,255
	Within Groups	3559,701	3560	1,000		
	Total	3561,000	3561			

H8: No meaningful difference happens to cause in the factors related to the Case Type.

When the relation between the lawsuit type and the factors reviewed, it was found that the type of lawsuit, thereby the advocacy specialization area is a factor, which is effective over all other factors. The factors of thinking that more effective communication with advocate is provided, reliance on the court decision that it is fair, reliance on advocacy profession, providing required support during lawsuit and advocate's effectiveness on the lawsuit differs according to the type of lawsuit.

TABLE 15. Analysis of relation between the factors related to the Case Type variance. (Anova)

	FACTOR1	FACTOR2	FACTOR3	FACTOR4	FACTOR5
ChiSquare	473,560	742,870	522,596	227,594	202,777
Df	8	8	8	8	8
Asymp. Sig.	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000

CONCLUSION AND ASSESSMENT

The effectiveness of advocates and satisfaction of clients during lawsuit were analyzed in this study. According to the results obtained from the study, however a great majority of the clients state that they have familiarized sufficiently with their advocates, they didn't satisfy with the service they have received and they will not recommend their advocate to their environment. The clients stated that they have not been informed through being got in contact continuously; thereby their advocates became very poor regarding the satisfaction of their personal expectations. They expressed that most of the trial lawyers are male, but the gender of the advocate is not a factor that may affect the course of lawsuit.

BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

A Practical Türkiye Sample of Advocate - Client Relationship with Regard to Service Marketing,
Sefer Gümüş, Hande Gülnihal Gümüş, Tuğbay Burçin Gümüş,
Volume 7 (2) 2014, 35-53

The lawsuits of most of the participants are being pended at peace court of criminal jurisdiction and a second advocate has not accepted their lawsuit as defendant. Most of them assume their advocate as inadequate and they think if any other advocate would deal with their the lawsuit, the case result may be different and they stated that they lost confidence in advocacy profession.

The factor of maintaining communication and sharing with the advocate differentiates to the age, education, income, gender, satisfaction from the advocacy service received, communication with the advocate, gender of the advocate and the case type.

The trust that the decision made is just differentiates to the age, education, income, satisfaction from the advocacy service received, communication with the advocate, gender of the advocate and the case type.

Trust to the Advocacy differentiates to the age, education, income, satisfaction from the advocacy service received, communication with the advocate, gender of the advocate and the case type.

Maintaining the required support in the course of the case differentiates to the age, education, income, gender, gender of the advocate and the case type.

Efficiency of the Advocate differentiates to the age, education, income, satisfaction from the advocacy service received, communication with the advocate, gender of the advocate and the case type.

Majority of the participants are the people between the ages of 21-40, with high school education, married, male and living in the metropolitan cities.

REFERENCES

1. Akdoğan, C. (2011). Hizmet pazarlamasında kalite anlayışı: Servqual ve servperf kalite modellerinin karşılaştırılmasına yönelik bir uygulama, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, s. 1.
2. Akil, C. (2012). Türkiye Barolar Birliği Disiplin Kurulu Kararları Işığında Avukatın Görevini Özenle Yerine Getirme Yükümlülüğü, Hacettepe Hukuk Fak. Derg., 2(1): 11-26
3. Asher, M. (1989). Measuring customer satisfaction, The TQM magazine, Vol.1, Issue. 2.
4. Biçer, D. (2007). Toplam Kalite Yönetimi Çerçevesinde Hizmet Pazarlaması ve Bir Araştırma, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sivas, s.46.
5. Gronross, C. (1982). An applied service marketing theory, European Journal of Marketing
6. İslamoğlu A. H. (2000). Pazarlama Yönetimi, Beta Basım Yayınevi, İstanbul, s. 325-327.

BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

A Practical Türkiye Sample of Advocate - Client Relationship with Regard to Service Marketing, Sefer Gümüş, Hande Gülnihal Gümüş, Tuğbay Burçin Gümüş,

Volume 7 (2) 2014, 35-53

7. Özgüven, N. (2008). Hizmet pazarlamasında müşteri memnuniyeti ve ulaştırma sektörü üzerinde bir uygulama, ege akademik bakış, 8(2): 651-682.
8. Sayım, F., ve Aydın, V. (2011). Hizmet sektörü özellikleri ve sistematik olmayan risklerin sektör menkul Kıymetleri ile etkileşimine dair teorik bir çalışma, Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, sayı,29, s. 246.
9. Tarcan, E. (2001). Hizmet yönetiminde kalite ve müşteri tatmini ölçümü, İstanbul Üniversitesi yayımları, İstanbul.
10. Yenişınar, F. (2013). Hukuki Ve Sosyal Perspektifte Avukatlık Kariyeri Gaziantep Örneği, Yüksek lisans tezi, Gaziantep üniversitesi, sosyal bilimler enstitüsü, s. 13.
11. <http://mygtakca.blogcu.com/avukatin-haklari-ve-yukumlulukleri/13285377/> (Erişim Tarihi : 12.02.2014)
12. <http://www.karamanbarosu.org.tr/Print.aspx?ID=15177&Tip=Duyuru> (Erişim Tarihi:11.12.2014)
13. http://www.selulozis.org.tr/isci_recep_html/2005/04_piyasa_ve_avk.html
14. <http://bavder.com.tr/?p=makaleOku&id=104> (Erişim Tarihi:7.11.214)
15. Günergök, Ö. (2003). Avukatın sır saklama yükümlülüğü, AÜEHFD, Cilt. 7, Sayı.1-2, s. 655.
16. <http://web.ebaro.web.tr/uploads/55/AVUKATLIKTA%20GELECE%C4%9E%C4%B0N%20UZMANI%20PROJES%C4%B0/agup2donemtez.pdf> (Erişim Tarihi: 22.08.2014)
17. <http://mygtakca.blogcu.com/> (Erişim Tarihi:15.12.2014)
18. <http://www.karamanbarosu.org.tr/> (Erişim Tarihi:11.12.2014)
19. <http://bavder.com.tr/> (Erişim Tarihi: 7.11.2014)