

A COMPARATIVE STUDY FOR EMPLOYEE JOB SATISFACTION IN AYDIN MUNICIPALITY AND NAZILLI MUNICIPALITY

Assist. Prof. Dr. Hulusi DOGAN, Adnan Menderes University, Nazilli Vocational School, hulusidogan@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study was composed of a conceptual analysis of job satisfaction and an empirical research for the relationships between job satisfaction and a set of variables; pay, promotion, positive affectivity/encouragement, job involvement, potential of rest-day/off-day, relations with co-workers, health facilities, relations with supervisor, training and education facilities, autonomy, physical facilities, reconciliation role of supervisor, procedural justice, tangible aids, office tools, level of role clearness, participation in decisions, management style of supervisor. The results, based on a sample of 220 employees from Aydın Municipality and Nazilli Municipality, indicated that 59% of the variance in job satisfaction was explained by the variables included in the regression test. The variable of management/democratic style of supervisor had the greatest effect on job satisfaction, followed by the variables of "level of role clearness", "health facilities", "autonomy", "participation in decision", "job involvement", and "training and educational facilities". The study found that satisfaction level for "tangible aids" and "potential of rest-day" was significantly higher for employees working in Aydın Municipality than those working in Nazilli Municipality. But, satisfaction level for "health facilities", "physical facilities" and "relations with supervisor" was significantly higher for employees working in Nazilli Municipality than those working in Aydın Municipality. So, it is suggested that managers should apply additional/further researches in their organizations to investigate the underpinning variables of job satisfaction and commitment of employees.

Key Words: Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement, Autonomy.

1. INTRODUCTION

For a few decades, many researches have been carried out about job satisfaction and its components. Many researchers and administrators have noticed the importance of job satisfaction on a variety of organizational variables (Chu et al., 2003). In particular, we know that dissatisfied employees are likely

to leave their jobs. Thus, the understanding of employee job satisfaction and its contributing variables are important for any organization to exist and prosper (Mrayyan, 2005). Accordingly, the main aim of this study was to identify components of job satisfaction and compare the job satisfaction level of employees working in Aydın Municipality with that of employees working in Nazilli Municipality.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Job satisfaction is simply defined as the affective orientation that an employee has towards his or her work (Price, 2001). In other words, it is an affective reaction to a job that results from the comparison of perceived outcomes with those that are desired (Kam, 1998). Shortly, job satisfaction describes the feelings, attitudes or preferences of individuals regarding work (Chen, 2008). Furthermore, it is the degree to which employees enjoy their jobs (McCloskey and McCain, 1987). And also, it is possible to see a number of theories developed to understand its nature in literature. Vroom (1964), need/value fulfilment theory, states that job satisfaction is negatively related to the discrepancy between individual needs and the extent to which the job supplies these needs. On the other hand, Porter and Lawler (1968) collect the influences on job satisfaction in two groups of internal and external satisfactory factors. According to them, internal satisfactory factors are related the work itself (such as feeling of independence, feeling of achievement, feeling of victory, self-esteem, feeling of control and other similar feeling obtained from work), whereas external satisfactory factors are not directly related to work itself (such as good relationships with colleagues, high salary, good welfare and utilities). So, the influences on job satisfaction can be also divided into work-related and employee-related factors (Glisson and Durick, 1988).

On the other hand, Arvey and Dewhirst (1976), took 271 scientists as a study sample, and found that the degree of job-satisfaction of the workers with high achievement motivation exceeded that of workers with low achievement motivation. Also autonomy is an important concern for employees' job satisfaction. For example, Abdel-Halim (1983) investigated 229 supervisory and non-supervisory employees in a large retail-drug company and concluded that individuals who have high need-for-independence performed better and were more satisfied with high participation for non-repetitive tasks (Kam, 1998). Additionally, administrative styles, professional status and pay are known as important factors influencing job satisfaction. For example, Carr and Kazanowsky (1994) successfully showed that inadequate salary was very related to employees' dissatisfaction. And recent studies showed that a participative (democratic) management style was mostly preferred by today's managers to increase their employees' job satisfaction (Dogan and Ibicioglu, 2004; Knoop, 1991).

Consequently, numerous researches have been going on job satisfaction for many years. And it is common thought that job satisfaction influences

organizational behavior, namely it positively affects employee working performance and organizational commitment, and negatively influences employee turnover (Agarwal and Ferrat, 2001; Poulin, 1994; Chen, 2008). Moreover, the relationships between job satisfaction and many variables such as motivation, stress, salary, promotion, role conflict, distributive and procedural justice, role ambiguity, autonomy, workload, leadership style, educational level, emotional intelligence are still being analyzed in different fields as an attractive and important subject of management literature (Ross and Reskin, 1992; Agho et al., 1993; Stordeur et al., 2001; Chu et al., 2003; Kafetsios and Zampetakis, 2008). For example, Sengin (2003), and Hinshaw and Atwood (1984) identify variables that influence employee job satisfaction as: (1) demographic variables: education, experience, and position in the hierarchy; (2) Job characteristics: autonomy, tasks repetitiveness, and salaries; and (3) organizational environment factors: degree of professionalization, type of unit. And Mrayyan (2005) says that the variables of encouragement, feedback, a widening pay scale and clear job description, career development opportunity, supportive leadership style, easy communication with colleagues and social interaction positively affect job satisfaction, whereas role stress has a negative influence on it. Similarly, the research made by Chu and his friends (2003) demonstrates that satisfaction is positively related to involvement, positive affectivity, autonomy, distributive justice, procedural justice, promotional chances, supervisor support, co-worker support, but it is negatively related to negative affectivity, role ambiguity, work-load, resource inadequacy and routinization.

3. THE STUDY

3.1. Aim

The aim of this study is to define the relationships between job satisfaction and the potential variables of pay, promotion, positive affectivity/encouragement, job involvement, potential of rest-day/off-day, relations with co-workers, health facilities, relations with supervisor, training and education facilities, autonomy, physical facilities, reconciliation role of supervisor, procedural justice, tangible aids, office tools, level of role clearness, participation in decisions, management style of supervisor. In addition, whether a difference exists between employee job satisfaction levels of Aydin and Nazilli Municipalities is to be the second important part of the study.

3.2. Sample

The target organizations selected for this research are Nazilli Municipality and Aydin Municipality. These municipalities have been chosen for similarities in employee number, city population, and service area. Nazilli city centre, population of 121.762, is 45 km far away from Aydin, in which 165.712 people are living according to the official declaration of national government in the year of 2000 (www.die.gov.tr). Further, official records taken from these

organizations indicate that Nazilli Municipality has 360 employees and 494 people are employed in Aydin Municipality in 2008, January.

A completed employee questionnaire of 220 was obtained from 127 (35.3%) of Nazilli Municipality's 360 employees, and 93 (18.8%) of Aydin Municipality's 494 employees. The responses given by the employees were anonymous and confidential. All analyses described below are based on the data from these 220 subjects.

3.3. Procedure/Instruments

The employees were handed a demographic and a job satisfaction survey questionnaire designed (by the author; Eren, 2001; Chu et al., 2003) for this study. Demographic survey part of the questionnaire is composed of 10 variables. And 42 variables exist on the second part of the questionnaire to measure the degree of job satisfaction and the factors, namely pay, promotion, positive affectivity/encouragement, job involvement, potential of rest-day/off-day, relationship with co-workers, health facilities, relations with supervisor, training and education facilities, autonomy, physical facilities, reconciliation role of supervisor, procedural justice, tangible aids, office tools, level of role clearness, participation in decisions, management style of supervisor, having influence on it. The instrument consisted of these 42 items answered on a seven-point Likert scale anchored by the terms "strongly disagree/very low/the worst" (1) and "strongly agree/very high/the best" (7).

3.4. Statistical Analysis

SPSS pc + version 15.0 was used for statistical analysis. Differences in the responses between the groups were tested by the Independent Samples T-Test, the internal consistency was tested by Cronbach's alpha; job satisfaction (cronbach alpha=0,63), pay (alpha=0,53), promotion (alpha=0,56), positive affectivity/encouragement (alpha=0,53), job involvement (alpha=0,50), potential of rest-day/off-day (alpha=0,47), relations with co-workers (alpha=0,54), health facilities (alpha=0,64), relations with supervisor (alpha=0,61), training and education facilities (alpha=0,54), autonomy (alpha=0,62), physical facilities (alpha=0,76), reconciliation role of supervisor (alpha=0,45), procedural justice (alpha=0,62), tangible aids (alpha=0,61), office tools (alpha=0,44), level of role clearness (alpha=0,66), participation in decisions (alpha=0,58), management style of supervisor (alpha=0,61). And the Pearson rank correlation coefficient was used to calculate the correlation between the factors. And also, multiple regression analysis was used because it provided estimates of net effects and explanatory power. The adjusted explained variance (the adjusted R^2) was used in this research to measure explanatory power.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Demographic Statistics

As can be seen from Table 1, the majority of our respondents were male employees (63,1 %), and 35,6 % of them were female. And 70,7 % of respondents were married, whereas 24,8 % were single and only 3,6 % were divorced. 137 (61,7 %) of 220 employees were in the range, can be called as middle-age group, of 31-50 years. On the other hand, the majority of respondents were not so experienced (30,6%), as ranked in the range of 1-5 years. Also as presented in Table 1, the probability of a respondent having an elementary or a high school degree was 71,7 %. In other words, 27,5 % of respondents graduated from a university. Finally, 132 (59,5) of respondents were blue-collar, and 88 (39,6%) employees were white-collar.

Table 1. Demographic Statistics of The Respondents

Item	Frequency	Percent (%)	Item	Frequency	Percent (%)
<i>Sex</i>			<i>Marital Status</i>		
<i>Male</i>	140	63,1	<i>Married</i>	157	70,7
<i>Female</i>	79	35,6	<i>Single</i>	55	24,8
<i>Missing</i>	3	1,3	<i>Divorced</i>	8	3,6
<i>Total</i>	220	100	<i>Missing</i>	2	0,9
			<i>Total.</i>	220	100
<i>Work Experience</i>			<i>Age</i>		
<i>1-5 years</i>	68	30,6	<i>18-30</i>	78	35,1
<i>6-10 years</i>	53	23,9	<i>31-40</i>	70	31,5
<i>11-15 years</i>	30	13,5	<i>41-50</i>	67	30,2
<i>16-20 years</i>	39	17,6	<i>51 and over</i>	5	2,3
<i>21 years and over</i>	30	13,5	<i>Missing</i>	2	0,9
<i>Missing</i>	2	0,8	<i>Total</i>	220	100
<i>Total</i>	220	100			
<i>Education Level</i>			<i>Vocational Status</i>		
<i>Primary School</i>	41	18,5	<i>Blue-collar</i>	132	59,5
<i>High School</i>	118	53,2	<i>White-collar</i>	88	39,6
<i>University</i>	61	27,5	<i>Missing</i>	2	0,9
<i>Missing</i>	2	0,8	<i>Total</i>	220	100
<i>Total</i>	43	100			

4.2. Correlation and Regression Analysis

As overall reliabilities of the scales used in this study are within acceptable limits (average Cronbach Alpha = 0,825), no major violation of the multiple regression assumptions was found in this study. Pearson correlation coefficients, indicating

the relationships among the variables and satisfaction, and Beta values of variables tested in multiple regression are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Pearson Correlations And Multiple Regression Results For Job Satisfaction

Determinants and controls	Pearson correlations (r)	Beta Coefficients (β)
Determinants		
pay	0,327**	0,041
promotion	0,111	0,050
job involvement	0,501**	0,123
positive affectivity/encouragement	0,448**	-0,015
potential of rest-day/off-day	0,153*	0,026
relationship with co-workers	0,405**	0,101
health facilities	0,436**	0,164
relationship with supervisor	0,491**	-0,026
training and education facilities	0,525**	0,106
autonomy	0,373**	-0,155
physical facilities	0,287**	0,057
reconciliation role of supervisor	0,463**	0,071
procedural justice	0,492**	0,015
tangible aids	0,442**	0,099
office tools	0,384**	0,034
level of role clearness	0,595**	0,167
participation in decisions,	0,546**	0,141
management style of supervisor	0,620**	0,206
Controls		
Age	-0,145*	0,076
Sex	0,017	0,034
Educational level	-0,138*	-0,076
Work experience	-0,171*	-0,092
Vocational Status	-0,340**	-0,090
R ²		0,634
Adjusted R ²		0,591

*Correlation is significant at the 0,05 level (two-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0,01 level (two-tailed).

We see that almost all of the independent variables tested to affect job satisfaction have significant Pearson correlations. But only promotion variable does not have a correlation with job satisfaction. Excluding promotion, variables of pay, job involvement, positive affectivity/encouragement, potential of rest-day/off-day, relationship with co-workers, health facilities, relationship with supervisor, training and education facilities, autonomy, physical facilities, reconciliation role of supervisor, procedural justice, tangible aids, office tools, level of role clearness, participation in decisions, management/democratic style of supervisor are positively related to job satisfaction. According to the

A COMPARATIVE STUDY FOR EMPLOYEE JOB SATISFACTION IN AYDIN MUNICIPALITY
AND NAZILLI MUNICIPALITY

correlation analysis seen in Table 2, satisfaction is negatively related to 4 control variables; age, educational level, work experience, and vocational status. And no relation exists between job satisfaction and sex variable. Control variables are used in regression analysis to present the net effects of determinant variables on the effects of other variables (Chu et al., 2003).

Table 3. Mean, Standart Deviation and Independent Samples T-Test Results for Municipalities

Factors/variables	Municipality	N	Mean	Std. deviation	t	Sig.
Pay	Nazilli	128	1,79	0,15	-0,833	0,406
	Aydin	92	1,42	0,14		
Job involvement	Nazilli	128	5,35	1,62	0,668	0,505
	Aydin	92	5,20	1,73		
Promotion	Nazilli	128	2,57	1,81	-0,219	0,827
	Aydin	92	2,63	1,64		
Positive affectivity/encouragement	Nazilli	128	4,09	1,99	0,228	0,820
	Aydin	92	4,03	1,91		
Potential of rest-day/off-day	Nazilli	128	3,46	1,89	-2,077	0,039*
	Aydin	92	4,91	7,59		
Relationship with co-workers	Nazilli	128	5,88	1,43	0,994	0,321
	Aydin	92	5,68	1,48		
Health facilities	Nazilli	128	4,56	1,83	2,755	0,006*
	Aydin	92	3,89	1,69		
Relationship with supervisor	Nazilli	128	5,57	1,64	2,077	0,039*
	Aydin	92	5,10	1,59		
Training and education facilities	Nazilli	128	4,26	1,97	-0,482	0,630
	Aydin	92	4,39	1,81		
Autonomy	Nazilli	128	1,92	0,17	-0,859	0,391
	Aydin	92	1,65	0,17		
Physical facilities	Nazilli	128	5,46	1,55	7,901	0,000*
	Aydin	92	3,68	1,75		
Reconciliation role of supervisor	Nazilli	128	4,89	1,59	1,526	0,128
	Aydin	92	4,56	1,59		
Procedural justice	Nazilli	128	3,41	1,90	-1,627	0,105
	Aydin	92	3,82	1,77		
Tangible aids	Nazilli	128	3,03	2,18	-4,864	0,000*
	Aydin	92	4,32	1,52		
Office tools	Nazilli	128	4,36	1,91	0,081	0,936
	Aydin	92	4,34	1,50		
Level of role clearness	Nazilli	128	4,03	1,85	-0,795	0,428
	Aydin	92	4,22	1,57		
Participation in decisions	Nazilli	128	3,64	1,88	-1,373	0,171
	Aydin	92	3,97	1,67		
Management style of supervisor	Nazilli	128	3,96	1,81	-1,795	0,074
	Aydin	92	4,40	1,77		
Job satisfaction	Nazilli	128	4,53	1,74	-0,020	0,984
	Aydin	92	4,54	1,48		

Significance, $p < 0,05$ ((two-tailed). *Variables which significance values lower than 0,05.

On the other hand, regression results indicate that 8 variables, sequentially management/democratic style of supervisor ($r=0,620$, $\beta=0,206$), level of role clearness ($r=0,595$; $\beta=0,167$), health facilities ($r=0,436$; $\beta=0,164$), autonomy ($r=0,373$; $\beta=-0,155$), participation in decision ($r=0,546$; $\beta=0,141$), job involvement ($r=0,501$; $\beta=0,123$), training and educational facilities ($r=0,525$; $\beta=0,106$), relationship with co-workers ($r=0,405$; $\beta=0,101$) have the greatest effect on job satisfaction because of their big Beta coefficients. Moreover, adjusted R^2 value of regression analysis, as seen in Table 2, is 0,591. It means that the variables in this model explain 59 % of the association of variance in job satisfaction for this sample of employees in our target municipalities.

4.3. Comparative Analysis: Independent Samples T-Test

Mean, standart deviation and Independen Samples T-Test results are seen in Table 3. According to these results, there is a statistical difference for only 5 factors/variables between Nazilli Municipality and Aydin Municipality as the significance values of t-test are smaller than 0,05. Explicitly, the employees of Aydin Municipality find a higher potential of rest-day/day-off than those of Nazilli Municipality ($p, 0,039 < 0,05$).

Also Table 3 indicates that there is a significant difference between employee perceptions for health facilities of their own municipalities ($p, 0,006 < 0,05$). In other words, health facilities of Nazilli Municipality seem to be better than those of Aydin Municipality. A similar difference ($p, 0,000 < 0,05$) exists on the variable of physical facilities in Nazilli Municipality's favour.

On the other hand, Aydin Municipality seems to be more generous than Nazilli in giving tangible (out of money) aids to employees ($p, 0,000 < 0,05$). But employee relationships with supervisors in Nazilli Muncipality are a little beter than those of Aydin Muncipality ($p, 0,006 < 0,05$). But as an important consequence, job satisfaction exhibits no difference for both municipalities. Interestingly, satisfaction mean values of each municipality are very near, even same as 4,53 for Nazilli and 4,54 for Aydin.

5. CONCLUSION

We believe that this study makes a contribution to the understanding of job satisfaction and its key determinants. The results of the study indicates that "management/democratic style of supervisor", "level of role clearness", "health facilities", "autonomy", "participation in decision-making", "job involvement", "training and educational facilities", and "relationship with co-workers" are the main determinants of job satisfaction. In particular, "management style of supervisor" has the greatest effect on job satisfaction. But one of the outstanding results of the reserach is organizational/structural variables such as "training and educational facilities", "health facilities", "physical facilities" (heating, cooling, lighting, noisy etc), "office tools" (work equipment, material,

instrument etc.) are also as important as personal traits such as “job involvement” and “positive affectivity” to increase job satisfaction level of employees in organizations. On the other hand, one of the interesting result of our study is that no relation exists between job satisfaction and “promotion”. This finding is not consistent with some previous researches (for example, Chu et al., 2003; Lu et al., 2005). It is possible that employees may not see a promotion chance due to bureaucratic/political structure of these organizations. Another possible explanation of this finding may be low reliabilities of items related to promotion variable.

One of the major findings of this study is that determinants/variables may have a different effect rate on job satisfaction, even the organizations have similar characteristics. Or conversely, if similar organizations have the same level of employee job satisfaction, the effect rate of determinants on job satisfaction can change. Thus, satisfaction values for Nazilli and Aydin Municipality are equal, but the determinants of “rest-day/day-off potential”, “health facilities”, “physical facilities”, “tangible aids”, and “relationship with supervisors” are perceived/evaluated in a different effect rate by employees of these two organizations.

On the other hand, research results show that there is a significant difference between the satisfaction levels of employees, working in Aydin Municipality and Nazilli Municipality, for only five research variables. According to the research results, satisfaction level for “tangible aids” and “potential of rest-day” is significantly higher for employees working in Aydin Municipality than those working in Nazilli Municipality. But, satisfaction level for “health facilities”, “physical facilities” and “relations with supervisor” is significantly higher for employees working in Nazilli Municipality than those working in Aydin Municipality. Moreover, research results show that employees of both Municipalities are dissatisfied with “pay”, “promotion” and “autonomy”. So, we suggest that both Municipalities should emphasize the value of job satisfaction for employees and organization, and try to investigate and terminate the underpinning elements of dissatisfaction, particularly with “promotion”, “pay” and “autonomy”.

Consequently, for managers it is very important to use determinants above as a strategic tool to increase job satisfaction and commitment of employees in their organizations. Especially, managers may have to investigate key determinants of job satisfaction for their own organization. Because research results show that key determinants and their effect rates on job satisfaction may change from organization to organization. Thus, this type of researches may give a chance for managers to investigate their own weaknesses in not only personal related, but also job related determinants of job satisfaction, such as “health facilities”, “physical facilities”, “tangible aids” etc. So, these researches may supply important clues for decision-makers to develop organizational strategies or policies to increase their employees’ job satisfaction and commitment.

Additionally, there is a need to apply these types of researches in all organizations frequently to investigate general atmosphere and take precautions for possible problems that can occur about human resources. And a final recommendation is that further researches are compulsory for academicians to analyze the relationship between job satisfaction and other variables in order to obtain higher/satisfactory results.

REFERENCES

- ABDEL-HALIM, A.A. (1983), "Effects of tas and personality characteristics on subordinate responses to participative decision making", *Academy of Management Journal*, 26 (3): 477-484.
- AGARWAL, R. and FERRATT, T.W. (2001), "Crafting and HR strategy to meet the need for IT workers", *Communications of the ACM*, 44 (7): 58-64.
- AGHO, A.O., MUELLER, C.W. and PRICE, J.L. (1993), "Determinants of Employee Job Satisfaction: An Emprical Test of a Causal Model", *Human Relations*, 46: 1007-1027.
- ARVEY, R. and DEWHIRST, H.D. (1976), "Relationships between goal clarity, participation in goal-setting, and personality characteristics on job-satisfaction in a scientific organization", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61 (1): 103-105.
- CARR, K.K. and KAZANOWSKI, M.K. (1994), "Factors affecting job satisfaction of nurses who work in long-term care", *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 19: 878-883.
- CHEN, L.H. (2008), "Job satisfaction among information system (IS) personel", *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24: 105-118.
- CHU, C.I, HSU, H.M., PRICE, J.L. and LEE, J.Y. (2003), "Job satisfaction of hospital nurses: an emprical test of a causal model in Taiwan", *International Nursing Review*, 50: 176-182.
- DOĞAN, H. ve İBİCİOĞLU, H. (2004), "Göller Bölgesindeki İşletme Yöneticilerinde Eğitim Düzeyleriyle İlişkilendirilmiş Liderlik Algılamaları", *CBÜ, SBE Dergisi*, 2: 55-66.
- EREN, E. (2001), *Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi*, 7. Basım, Beta Yayıncılık, İstanbul: 524-527.
- GLISSON, C.V. and DURICK, M. (1988), "Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations", *Administrative Quarterly*, 33 (1): 61-68.

HINSHAW, A. and ATWOOD, J. (1984), "Nursing staff turnover, stress and satisfaction: models, measures, and management", *Annual Review of Nursing Research*, 1: 133-155.

KAFETSIOS, K. and ZAMPETAKIS, L.A. (2008), "Emotional intelligence and job satisfaction: Testing the mediatory role of positive and negative affect at work", *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44: 712-722.

KAM, L.F. (1998), "Job satisfaction and autonomy of Hong Kong registered nurses", *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 27: 355-363.

KNOOP, R. (1991), "Achievement of work values and participative decision-making", *Psychological Reports*, 68: 775-781.

LU, H., WHILE, A. and BARRIBALL L. (2005), "Job satisfaction among nurses: a literature review", *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 42: 211-227.

MCCLOSKEY, J.C. and MCCAIN, B. (1987), "Satisfaction, commitment, and professionalism of newly employed nurses", *Journal of Nursing Scholarship* 19 (10): 20-24.

MRAYYAN, M.T. (2005), "Nurse job satisfaction and retention: comparing public to private hospitals in Jordan", *Journal of Nursing Management*, 13: 40-50.

POULIN, J.E. (1994), "Job task and organizational predictors of social worker job satisfaction change: A panel study", *Administration in Social Work*, 18 (1), 21-39.

PORTER, L.W. and LAWLER, E.E. (1968), *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*, Homewood, IL: Irwin.

PRICE, J.L. (2001), "Reflections on the Determinants of Voluntary Turnover", *International Journal of Manpower*, 22 (7): 600-624.

ROSS, C.E. and RESKIN, B.F. (1992), "Education, control at work and job satisfaction", *Social Science Research*, 21 (2): 134-148.

SENGIN, K.K. (2003), "Work-related attributes of RN job satisfaction in acute care hospitals", *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 33 (6): 317-320.

STORDEUR, S., D'HOORE, W. and VANDENBERGHE, C. (2001), "Leadership, organizational stress, and emotional exhaustion among hospital nursing staff", *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 35 (4): 533-542.

VROOM, V.H. (1964), *Work and Motivation*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.

www.die.gov.tr.16/01/2008.