



INVESTIGATION OF JOB SATISFACTION LEVELS OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS

Gönül Şener¹ⁱ,

Mukadder Boydak Özhan²

¹Assist Prof. Dr., Munzur University, Çemişgezek Vocational School,
Tunceli, Turkey

²Prof. Dr., Firat University, Faculty of Education,
Elazığ, Turkey

Abstract:

The main purpose of the research is to determine the job satisfaction levels of school administrators and teachers. The descriptive method based on screening model for revealing the existing situation was used in the study. An attempt to determine the job satisfaction levels of administrators and teachers in educational organizations was made in this research. It was concluded in the research that the job satisfactions of administrators and teachers regarding the management, additional payment, reward, working conditions, workmates, the job itself and communication were mainly at medium-level, and their satisfactions regarding wage and promotion were at low level. The satisfaction or dissatisfaction experienced by school administrators and teachers while working affect the structure and functioning of the school in which they work. Accordingly, it is necessary to establish a school environment in which the job satisfactions of school administrators and teachers are ensured for educational organizations to achieve their objectives. Work saturation has been done in many studies in the related field. However, it is thought-provoking if satisfaction is provided to the schools. Taking all of these into consideration is thought that it would be beneficial to carry out this study.

Keywords: job satisfaction, school administer, teacher

1. Introduction

The most important source of the organization is the workers. Workers' performance and efficiency are the most important factors that affect the success of the organizations. The fact that they can show high performance and work efficiently depends on having enough satisfaction from their job (Akşit Aşık, 2010). As long as workers are satisfied with their jobs and working environment, job satisfaction is ensured and they work efficiently to the same degree. If the job performed is resulted as desired by the individual, the individual becomes motivated and satisfaction is achieved. If the result is not at the expected level, job dissatisfaction can be experienced in the individual (Köroğlu, 2012).

Simply, job satisfaction is an indication of how much a worker is satisfied with the job (Vieira, 2005). Robbins defines job satisfaction as the worker's identification with the organization and its objectives and desire to maintain membership in the organization (Robbins, 1994). Job satisfaction is also expressed as employees' internal evaluations as an output of their feelings, thoughts and behaviors towards job, job environment and workmates, and an overall attitude towards their job (Solmuş, 2004). Çetinkanat defines job satisfaction as an emotional response given by an employee to the work state (Çetinkanat, 2000). Tengilimoğlu defines job satisfaction as the difference between employees' expectations and perceptions from the job and working environment (Tengilimoğlu, 2005). Locke, who is accepted to have made the broadest definition regarding the job satisfaction, stated job satisfaction as "*the pleasant and positive feelings aroused in the person by the person' evaluation of his job and job experience*" (Izgar, 2008).

Based on the definitions given above, it is possible to group factors that form the basis of job satisfaction under two groups as personal and organizational factors (Ünsar et al, 2006). The main personal factors are age, gender, education level, marital status, status in the workplace, term of office, socio-cultural environment and personality structure, the organizational factors are the job and its nature, management and control, wage, development and promotion opportunities, physical conditions of the workplace, social environment of the workplace, administrator behaviors, job success, organizational climate and the working group (Özaydın and Özdemir, 2014; Tözün et al, 2008). Although problems encountered in these factors lead to the decrease in employees' job satisfactions, behaviors and consequences such as lack of continuity, boredom, ignoring rules, complaining about the job, damaging the organization, leaving the job, extravagance, false diseases and accidents may also occur in employees (Başaran, 2000). The positive effects of these factors can lead employees to have high level of job satisfaction and therefore can make great contributions such as performance

increase, productivity, productivity growth, low-level personnel turnover rate and attracting qualified workers to the business (Köroğlu, 2012; Robbins, 1994; Balcı, 1985; Lunenberg and Ornstein, 2000; Rollinson and Broadfield, 2002).

Making employees become active and ensuring that they achieve satisfaction by setting motivational factors in the job environment are the primary tasks of the leader. Therefore, school administrators should pay attention to improve the working conditions of the school and also to meet the individual and professional expectations of teachers in order to ensure quality and efficiency in education (Karaköse, 2006). Likewise, top authorities are expected to meet the expectations of managers.

There is a close relationship between job satisfaction and motivation. Individuals with high motivation have also high job satisfaction. There may be an opposite condition. Individuals who get what they expect from their job achieve satisfaction. In this case, the motivation and performance of individuals can increase (Şimşek et al, 2001).

Job satisfaction, one of the psychological aspects of education and training, leads teachers to develop positive attitudes towards their profession and increase in the realization levels of school's objectives and their own objectives (Argon et al, 2014). The job satisfaction sources of school administrators and teachers consist of factors such as relations with students, relations with teachers, relations with top managers, opportunity to apply their own ideas, holidays, economic assurance, wage payments, working conditions, realization of personal interests, working hours, nature of the job, promotion opportunity, supervision, organization and management, job security, personality and being appreciated (Vural, 2004). The satisfaction or dissatisfaction experienced by school administrators and teachers while working affect the structure and functioning of the school in which they work. Accordingly, it is necessary to establish a school environment in which the job satisfactions of school administrators and teachers are ensured for educational organizations to achieve their objectives.

The main purpose of this research is to determine the job satisfaction levels of school administrators and teachers. Based on this main purpose, an answer was sought to the question of "*Do the job satisfaction levels of school administrators and teachers significantly differ by their task types, types of schools and seniority in general and in the sub-dimensions of the scale?*".

2. Method

2.1 Research model

The descriptive method based on screening model for revealing the existing situation was used in the study. Screening models are the research approaches that aim to

describe a situation which is in the past or existing as is. According to this approach, an attempt to describe an event, person or object which is the subject of the research as it is and within its own conditions is made (Karasar, 2014). An attempt to determine the job satisfaction levels of administrators and teachers in educational organizations was made in this research.

2.2 Population and sample

The school administrators and teachers working in Elazığ city center in the 2014-2015 academic year constitute the population of the research. The random and disproportionate cluster sampling method was used while determining the sample of the research. Accordingly, the schools located in Elazığ city center were randomly selected from the list, and 20 school administrators and 264 teachers working in these schools selected were determined as sample. Cluster sampling study is used in case of the presence of different groups showing similarities in themselves in terms of certain properties that occurred naturally in the considered universe or that are artificially created for different purposes (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011). The distributions of the participants included in the research according to their demographic characteristics are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics

Variable	f	Variable	f		
Education Level	Undergraduate	245	1-5 years	60	
	Postgraduate	39	6-10 years	38	
Type of School	Elementary School	161	Seniority	11-15 years	50
	Secondary School	80		16-20 years	70
	High School	43		21+...years	66

When personal variables are taken into account, 86.3% of participants had undergraduate education level and 13.7% of them had postgraduate education level, 56.7% of them were working in the elementary school, 28.8% of them in the secondary school and 15.1% of them in the high school. In addition, 21.1% of participants had a seniority of 1-5 years, 13.4% of them had a seniority of 6-10 years, 17.6% of them had a seniority of 11-15 years, 24.6% of them had a seniority of 16-20 years, and 23.2% of them had a seniority of 21+ years.

2.3 Data Collection Tool

Job Satisfaction Scale developed by Spector (1985) to determine the job satisfaction levels of school administrators and teachers was used in the research. The Job Satisfaction Scale consisting of 36 items and nine dimensions is a Likert-type scale

scored between 1-6 (*Strongly Disagree=1, Moderately Disagree=2, Partially Disagree=3, Partially Agree=4, Moderately Agree=5 and Agree=6*). The factor distributions and alpha values of the scale were found as *wage* (4 items, $\alpha=.92$), *promotion* (4 items, $\alpha=.86$), *management* (4 items, $\alpha=.86$), *additional payment*(4 items, $\alpha=.78$), *reward* (4 items, $\alpha=.76$), *working conditions* (4 items, $\alpha=.78$), *workmates* (4 items, $\alpha=.72$), *the job itself* (4 items, $\alpha=.73$) and *communication* (4 items, $\alpha=.57$). The alpha value for the entire scale was determined as .95 (Yılmaz, 2012).

17 positive and 19 negative items are included in the scale. Negative items (2nd, 4th, 6th, 8th, 10th, 12th, 14th, 16th, 18th, 19th, 21st, 23rd, 24th, 26th, 29th, 31st, 32nd, 34th and 36th) were scored inversely and made ready for the analyses.

2.4 Data Analysis

The t-test for the determination of the significant difference between pair groups and the one-way analysis of variance for the determination of the significant difference between multiple groups were used in the research. In cases where significant difference was observed, the Scheffe test from the post-hoc tests was applied to find the source of the difference. The significance level was accepted as $p<.05$.

3. Findings and Comments

This section includes the analyses of job satisfaction levels of school administrators and teachers who participated in the research according to the variables of task type, school type and seniority, and the comments related to analyses.

As a result of the t-test performed regarding the scores received by school administrators and teachers from the job satisfaction scale, it was seen that the scores regarding the overall scores and working conditions along with the workmates sub-dimensions did not show normal distribution. Therefore, it was decided to perform Mann Whitney U test for these dimensions. The values related to the analyses performed are given in Table 2.

Table 2: t-test Results by The Variable of Task Type

Dimensions	Task Type	N	X	ss	t	MWU	
						Sig.	Mean Rank
General	Administrator	20	3.85	.29	.174	.638	150.83
	Teacher	264	3.83	.54			141.87
Work Conditions	Administrator	20	3.03	.52	2.982*	.002*	87.78
	Teacher	264	3.55	.75			146.65
Work Mate	Administrator	20	4.60	.54	-.328	.537	131.60
	Teacher	264	4.66	.89			143.33

$p<.05$

When the scores received by school administrators and teachers from the job satisfaction scale were examined in general, it was seen that the average of school administrators was $X=3.85$, and the average of teachers was $X=3.83$. No significant difference was observed between the job satisfaction scores of the two groups ($p<.05$).

When they were analyzed in terms of sub-dimensions, a statistically significant difference was observed between the total scores in the sub-dimension of Working Conditions ($X_{\text{administrator}}=3.03$; $X_{\text{teacher}}=3.55$). The significant difference in this sub-dimension was observed to be in favor of teacher. Accordingly, it can be said that teachers' working conditions are in better condition compared to administrators. No significant differentiation was observed in other sub-dimensions.

When they were analyzed in terms of averages, administrators' opinions were observed to be higher in the sub-dimensions of wage, promotion, management, additional payment, reward, the job itself and communication, and teachers' opinions were observed to be higher in the sub-dimensions of working conditions and workmates. The values regarding the analysis of variance performed to determine the job satisfaction levels of school administrators and teachers by the variable of school type are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Analysis of Variance Results by The Variable of School Type

Dimensions	School Type	N	X	ss
Management	Primary School	161	4.68	.79
	Secondary School	80	4.95	.63
	High School	43	4.30	.84
Workmates	Primary School	161	4.69	.87
	Secondary School	80	4.82	.83
	High School	43	4.23	.80

Dimensions	Source of Varyans	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	p	scheffe
Management	Between Groups	11.88	5.94	10.16	.000*	1-2
	Within Groups	164.39	.58			1-3
	Total	176.28				2-3
Workmates	Between Groups	10.30	5.15	7.03	.001*	1-3
	Within Groups	205.74	.73			2-3
	Total	216.04				

$p<.05$

When scores received by school administrators and teachers according to the variable of school type were analyzed in general, it was seen that the average of administrators and teachers working in primary schools was $X=3.85$, it was $X=3.88$ in secondary schools and $X=3.71$ in high schools. No significant difference was observed between the job satisfaction scores of the groups.

When they were analyzed in terms of sub-dimensions, a statistically significant difference was observed between the total scores in the sub-dimension of Management ($X_{\text{primary school}}=4.68$; $X_{\text{secondary school}}=4.95$; $X_{\text{high school}}=4.30$) and Workmates ($X_{\text{primary school}}=4.69$; $X_{\text{secondary school}}=4.82$; $X_{\text{high school}}=4.23$). In both sub-dimensions, it was seen that the averages regarding the opinions of administrators and teachers working in secondary schools were higher but lower in high schools. No significant differentiation was observed in other sub-dimensions.

When they were evaluated in terms of averages, it can be said that job satisfactions were higher in high schools in terms of wage and additional payment, in secondary schools in terms of promotion, management, workmates and communication, and in primary schools in terms of reward, working hours, the job itself and communication.

It was seen that the scores regarding the sub-dimension of Management by the variable of school type did not show normal distribution. Therefore, the Kruskal-Wallis-h-Test was performed for these sub-dimensions. The values regarding the analyses performed are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: KWH Test Results by The Variable of School Type (Management)

School Type	N	Mean Rank	sd	KWH	p	Sig.
Primary School	161	141.61	2	15.905	.000*	1-2
Secondary School	80	165.16				1-3
High School	43	103.70				2-3

p<.05

According to the KWH test result, no significant difference was encountered between the groups in the sub-dimension of Management (KWH=15.905, p<.05). When mean ranks were taken into account, it was seen that while the management perceptions of administrators and teachers working in secondary schools were at the highest value, the perceptions of administrators and teachers working in high schools were at the lowest value. The values regarding the analysis of variance performed to determine the job satisfaction levels of school administrators and teachers by the variable of seniority are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Analysis of Variance Results by The Variable of Seniority

Dimensions	Seniority	N	X	ss
Workmates	1-5 years	60	4.32	.94
	6-10 years	38	4.91	.81
	11-15 years	50	4.73	.73
	16-20 years	70	4.75	.91
	21 + years	66	4.68	.82
The Job Itself	1-5 years	60	4.75	.88
	6-10 years	38	4.86	.92
	11-15 years	50	4.64	1.04
	16-20 years	70	5.04	.86
	21 + years	66	5.18	.72

Dimensions	Source of Varyans	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	p	scheffe
Workmates	Between Groups	10.20	2.55	3.45	.009*	1-2
	Within Groups	205.84	.73			
	Total	216.04				
The Job Itself	Between Groups	11.38	2.84	3.64	.007*	3-5
	Within Groups	217.83	.78			
	Total	229.21				

p<.05

When scores received by school administrators and teachers from the job satisfaction scale according to the variable of seniority were analyzed in general, it was seen that the average of administrators and teachers with 1-5 years seniority was $X=3.76$, the average of those with 6-10 years was $X=3.89$, the average of those with 11-15 years was $X=3.75$, the average of those with 16-50 years was $X=3.86$, and the average of those with 21 and more years was $X=3.91$. Accordingly, it can be said that the job satisfaction levels of administrators and teachers with 21 and more years seniority were higher compared to other groups, and the job satisfaction levels of administrators and teachers with 11-15 years seniority were lower. In addition, no significant difference was observed between the job satisfaction scores of the groups.

On the other hand, when sub-dimensions were analyzed, a statistically significant difference was observed between the total scores in the sub-dimensions of Workmates ($X_{1-5\text{years}}=4.32$; $X_{6-10\text{ years}}=4.91$; $X_{11-15\text{ years}}=4.73$; $X_{16-20\text{ years}}=4.75$; $X_{21+\text{years}}=4.68$) and the Job Itself ($X_{1-5\text{years}}=4.75$; $X_{6-10\text{ years}}=4.86$; $X_{11-15\text{ years}}=4.64$; $X_{16-20\text{ years}}=5.04$; $X_{21+\text{years}}=5.18$). While administrators and teachers with 6-10 years seniority expressed more frequent opinions to the sub-dimension of Workmates, administrators and teachers with 21 and more years seniority expressed more frequent opinions to the sub-dimension of the Job Itself. Accordingly, it is possible to say that administrators and teachers with 6-10 years seniority positively affected the job satisfaction levels of their workmates by their

opinions, and administrators and teachers with 21 and more years seniority increased the job satisfaction levels of the work performed.

When they were evaluated in terms of averages, it can be said that the job satisfactions were higher in administrators and teachers with 1-5 years seniority in terms of Wage and Additional Payment, in administrators and teachers with 6-10 years seniority in terms of Management, Working Conditions and Workmates, in administrators and teachers with 11-15 years seniority in terms of Communication, in administrators and teachers with 21 and more years seniority in terms of Promotion, Reward and the Job Itself.

As a result of the analysis of variance performed regarding the scores received by school administrators and teachers from the job satisfaction scale by the variable of seniority, it was seen that the scores regarding the sub-dimension of the Job Itself did not show normal distribution. Therefore, Kruskal-Wallis-h-Test was performed for this dimension. The values related to the analyses performed are given in Table 6.

Table 6: KWH Test Results by The Variable of Seniority (The Job Itself)

Seniority	N	Mean Rank	sd	KWH	p	Sig.
1-5 years	60	124.88	4	13.106	.011*	1-4
6-10 years	38	137.64				1-5
11-15 years	50	120.76				3-4
16-20 years	70	154.14				3-5
21 + years	66	165.44				

p<.05

A significant difference was encountered between the groups in the sub-dimension of the Job Itself (KWH=13.106, p<.05). When mean ranks were analyzed, it was seen that administrators and teachers with 21 and more years seniority were satisfied due to the job itself, and the satisfaction levels of administrators and teachers with 11-15 years seniority were at lower levels.

4. Conclusion and Discussion

The efforts made by school administrators and teachers for better education and higher student success are the most important factors affecting the success of the school. The fact that the efforts made by administrators and teachers gain continuity and are responded will definitely affect their job satisfaction. In this research, when the scores received by school administrators and teachers from the job satisfaction scale were evaluated in general, it was observed that the job satisfaction levels of school

administrators and teachers were close to each other and at medium-level. Yılmaz and Altinkurt (2012) and Sun (2002) concluded in his study that the job satisfaction levels of primary school teachers were at medium-level. In addition, many researches carried out emphasize that the job satisfaction levels of primary school teachers are not very high (Akın and Koçak, 2007; Ayan et al, 2009). On the other hand, it can be said that teachers' working conditions are in better condition compared to administrators in the sub-dimension of Working Conditions. In addition to this, it can be concluded that school administrators have higher job satisfaction levels regarding the wage, promotion, management, additional payment, reward, the job itself and communication, and teachers also have higher job satisfaction levels regarding the working conditions and workmates.

When the scores received by school administrators and teachers by the variable of school type were evaluated in general, it was concluded that job satisfactions of the groups were at medium-level and close to each other, however the job satisfaction levels of administrators and teachers working in secondary schools were higher compared to administrators and teachers working in primary schools and high schools. Regarding this variable, in the sub-dimension of Management and Workmates, it was observed that the job satisfactions of administrators and teachers working in secondary schools were higher, and the job satisfactions of administrators and teachers working in high schools and primary schools were lower. Similarly, Kumaş and Deniz (2010), concluded that the job satisfactions of teachers working in different types of high schools were lower compared to teachers working in primary schools. Furthermore, it can be said according to this variable that the job satisfactions of teachers and administrators are higher in high schools in terms of wage and additional payment, in secondary schools in terms of promotion, management, workmates and communication, and in primary schools in terms of reward, working conditions, the job itself and communication. Regarding the sub-dimension of Management, it was seen that although the management-originated job satisfactions of administrators and teachers working in secondary schools were at the maximum value, the job satisfactions of administrators and teachers working in high schools were at the lowest value.

No significant difference was observed between the job satisfaction scores of the groups by the variable of seniority. When the relevant literature was reviewed, it was found in the researches carried out by (Oshagbemi, 1997; Tezcan, 2011) that there was not a significant difference in teachers' job satisfaction levels by their seniority. These findings support the research results. However, in researches carried out by (Ayık, 2000; Karataş and Güleş, 2010), it was determined that teachers' seniority was a factor that created a significant difference in their perceptions on job satisfaction levels. Besides, it is possible to say that the job satisfaction levels of administrators and

teachers with 21 and more years seniority are higher compared to other groups, and the job satisfaction levels of administrators and teachers with 11-15 years seniority are lower. The seniority of teachers and administrators in the profession is one of the most important factors affecting the job satisfaction. As the seniority of teachers and administrators increases, teachers get used to problems related to their job and do not regard them as a problem. For this reason, factors that may cause administrators and teachers to have job dissatisfaction decrease, and therefore the job satisfaction level of administrators and teachers increases as their seniority increases. On the other hand, administrators and teachers with 6-10 years seniority in the sub-dimension of Workmates and the administrators and teachers with 21 and more years seniority in the sub-dimension of the Job Itself reported that their job satisfaction levels were higher. Accordingly, it can be concluded that administrators and teachers with 6-10 years seniority positively affected the job satisfaction levels of their workmates. Similar results are also encountered in the study of Sönmezer (2007). It is possible to say that administrators and teachers with 21 and more years seniority increased the job satisfaction levels of the work performed. The result obtained concerning this sub-dimension matches up with the result about the fact that the job satisfactions of teachers with 25 years and more seniority are higher, which was achieved by (Şahin, 1999). Furthermore, it can be said that the job satisfactions were higher in administrators and teachers with 1-5 years seniority in terms of Wage and Additional Payment, in administrators and teachers with 6-10 years seniority in terms of Management, Working Conditions and Workmates, in administrators and teachers with 11-15 years seniority in terms of Communication, in administrators and teachers with 21 and more years seniority in terms of Promotion, Reward and the Job Itself. In the sub-dimension of the Job Itself in which a significant difference was observed, it was seen that administrators and teachers with 21 years and more seniority had more satisfaction due to the job itself between the groups. The results show similarity with the study in which Balcı (1985) found a significant relationship between the seniority of school administrators and their job satisfaction levels. The job satisfactions levels of administrators and teachers with 11-15 years seniority were found to be low.

When a general evaluation was made, it was concluded that the job satisfactions of administrators and teachers were mostly at medium-level regarding management, additional payment, reward, working conditions, workmates, the job itself and communication, and their job satisfactions were at low level regarding wage and promotion. In this regard, the ministry should carry out studies that could satisfy administrators and teachers, especially with regard to wages, and the sluggish promotion system in the education environment should be reconsidered.



Mukadder Boydak Özkan is the vice dean Educational Sciences at Firat University in Turkey. She is also a professor in the Department of Educational Management. Mukadder obtained his master and PhD in Educational Management from Firat University. Her current research interests include, school management, classroom management, leadership, organizational behavior, supervision, human resource management, education economics and planning, research methods.



Gönül Şener is the corresponding author of this paper. She completed his Ph.D. degree in Educational Management from Firat University and Turkey, She is a assist professor in the Department of Child Development. Her research interests are in the area of leadership, school management, classroom management, organizational communication.

References

1. Akın, U. and Koçak, R. (2007), "Öğretmenlerin sınıf yönetimi becerileri ile iş doyumları arasındaki ilişki," *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, Vol. 13, No. 51, pp. 353-370.
2. Akşit Aşık, D. (2010), "Çalışanların iş doyumunu etkileyen bireysel ve örgütsel faktörler ile sonuçlarına ilişkin kavramsal bir değerlendirme," *Türk İdare Dergisi*, Vol. 467, pp. 31-51.
3. Argon, T., İsmetoğlu, M. and İşeri, B. (2014), "İlkokullarda sanatsal denetim ve öğretmen motivasyonu üzerine öğretmen görüşleri," *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 286-296.
4. Ayan, S., Kocacık, F. and Karakuş, H. (2009), "Lise öğretmenlerinin iş doyumunu düzeyi ile bunu etkileyen bireysel ve kurumsal etkenler," *Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi*, Vol.10, pp. 18-25.
5. Ayık, A. (2000), "İlköğretim okullarındaki yöneticilerin yönetsel davranışlarının öğretmenlerin iş doyumlarına etkisi," M.S. thesis, Dept. Education, Atatürk Univ., Erzurum, Turkey.
6. Balcı, A. (1985), "Eğitim Yöneticisinin İş Doyumu," Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. Education, Ankara Univ., Ankara, Turkey.
7. Başaran, İ. E. (2000), *Eğitim Yönetimi. Nitelikli Okul*. Ankara: Feryal Matbaası.
8. Çetinkanat, C. (2000), *Örgütlerde Güdülenme ve İş Doyumu*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
9. Izgar, H. (2008), "Okul yöneticilerinde iş doyumunu ve örgütsel bağlılık," *Selçuk Üniversitesi Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25, pp. 317-334.

10. Karaköse, T. and Kocabaş, İ. (2006), "Özel ve devlet okullarında öğretmenlerin beklentilerinin iş doyumu ve motivasyon üzerine etkileri," *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama Dergisi*, 2(1), pp. 3-14.
11. Karasar, N. (2014), *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
12. Karataş, S. and Güleş, H. (2010), "İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin iş tatmini ile örgütsel bağlılığı arasındaki ilişki," *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(2), pp. 74-89.
13. Köroğlu, Ö. (2012), "İçsel ve dışsal iş doyum düzeyleri ile genel iş doyum düzeyi arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi: turist rehberleri üzerinde bir araştırma," *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 13(2), pp. 275- 289.
14. Kumaş, V. and Deniz, L. (2010), "Öğretmenlerin iş doyum düzeylerinin incelenmesi," *M.Ü. Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 32, pp. 123-139.
15. Lunenberg, F. C. and Ornstein, A. C. (2000), *Educational Administration: Concepts and Practices*, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
16. Oshagbemi, T. (1997), "Job satisfaction profiles of university teachers," *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 12(1), pp. 27-39.
17. Özaydın, M. and Özdemir, O. (2014), "Çalışanların bireysel özelliklerinin iş tatmini üzerindeki etkileri: bir kamu bankası örneği," *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(1), pp. 251-281.
18. Robbins, S. P. (1994), *Örgütsel Davranışın Temelleri*, (Translate: S. A. Öztürk). Eskişehir: Etam A.Ş.
19. Rollinson, D. and Broadfield, A. (2002), *Organisational Behavior and Analysis: An Integrated Approach*. New York: Prentice Hall.
20. Solmuş, T. (2004), *İş Yaşamında Duygular ve Kişilerarası İlişkiler*. İstanbul: Beta Basım.
21. Sönmezer, M.G. (2007), "Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı'nda çalışan öğretmenler ile Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'ndan emeklilik veya istifa nedeniyle özel eğitim kurumlarında çalışanların iş tatmin düzeylerinin karşılaştırmalı analizi," M.S. thesis, Dept. Education İstanbul Univ., İstanbul, Turkey.
22. Sun, H. Ö. (2002), "İş doyumu üzerine bir araştırma: Türkiye Cumhuriyet Merkez Bankası banknot matbaası genel müdürlüğü," Professional Qualification thesis, Türkiye Cumhuriyet Merkez Bankası Banknot Matbaası Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara, Turkey.
23. Şahin, İ. (1999), "İlköğretim okullarında görevli öğretmenlerin iş doyum düzeyleri," M.S. thesis, Dept. Education Dokuz Eylül Univ., İzmir, Turkey.
24. Şimşek, M. Ş., Akgemci, T. and Çelik, A. (2001), *Davranış Bilimlerine Giriş ve Örgütlerde Davranış*, 2nd ed. Ankara: Nobel Yayın-Dağıtım.

25. Tengilimoğlu, D. (2005), "Hizmet işletmelerinde liderlik davranışları ile iş doyumunu arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma," *Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1, pp. 23-45.
26. Tezcan, T. (2011), "Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin yaşam kalitesi ve iş doyumlarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi (Bolu ili örneği)," M.S. thesis, Dept. Education, Abant İzzet Baysal Univ., Bolu, Turkey.
27. Tözün, M., Çulhacı, A. and Ünsal, A. (2008), "Aile hekimliği sisteminde birinci basamak sağlık kurumlarında çalışan hekimlerin iş doyumunu (Eskişehir)", *TAF Preventive Medicine Bulletin*, 7(5), pp. 377-384.
28. Ünsar, S., Taştan, İ., Ünsar, S. and Dindar, İ. (2006), "İş tatmin düzeyleri ve etkileyen etmenler: sağlık sektöründe bir alan araştırması," *Verimlilik Dergisi*, 2, pp. 131-134.
29. Vieira, J. A. C. (2005), "Skill Mismatches and Job Satisfaction," *Economic Letters*, 89, pp. 39-47.
30. Vural, B. (2004), *Yetkin-İdeal-Vizyoner Öğretmen*. İstanbul: Hayat Yayınları.
31. Yıldırım, A. and Şimşek, H. (2011), *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*, 8th ed. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
32. Yılmaz, K. (2012), "İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin iş doyumunu düzeyleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki," *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 2(2).
33. Yılmaz, K. and Altınkurt, Y. (2012), "Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin iş doyumunu arasındaki ilişki," *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 20(2), pp. 385- 402.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).