

The Evaluation of Education Faculty's Staff's Job Expectations Based on Generations in Turkey¹

Müyesser CEYLAN

Anadolu University, Turkey

mceylan@anadolu.edu.tr

Abstract

The present study aiming at determining the level of job expectation of instructors according to generations was carried out in descriptive survey based on quantitative method. The population of the study is the instructors in education faculties in all public universities in Turkey. The sampling of the study consists of 674 instructors at education faculties in 68 public universities. The data was conducted in spring semester 2014-2015. As the data collection instrument 'Job expectation Scale' by Balcı and Bozkurt (2013) was used. It was found that level of job expectation of instructors is quite high. According to the results of level of job expectations of instructors regarding seniority, level of job expectations of instructors having 6-10 years of seniority is higher than the instructors having 16-20, 26-30 and 31 and more seniority. The results of the level of job expectations of instructors in terms of generation support the results related to seniority. The study showed that Y-generation instructors' level of job expectations is higher than the instructors from baby boomers.

Keywords: Education faculty, Instructors, Job expectations, Generation, Gen X, Gen Y, Baby boomers

¹ Araştırma makalesi, ilk gönderim tarihi: 11.01.2016 Kabul tarihi: 22.01.2016

Introduction

When organizations are evaluated as a ‘micro-society’, it can be seen that they own all characteristics of the society they belong, have individuals from all ages and cultures who work together and make their organization reach its aim and as a consequence they can reach their individual aims, too. The most significant elements of organizations are the increase of the productivity of workers and the improvement of their effectiveness, and by means of these, providing the durability of employees in organizations has become a target for organizations in 21st century. The concepts of productivity and effectiveness in organizations gains meaning just with the organizational devotion of employees, job satisfaction, motivation, level of dependence, and on the whole, according to state of meeting the expectations of the organizations. However, the generation difference among the employees may display difference in job and organizational expectations. The present study aims at based on generations, to determine the education faculty instructors’ job expectation levels, who bring up teachers who have an efficient role in building the future generations of the society. For this aim, the concept of professional expectation is explained, and then the concept ‘generation’ and the characteristics of different generations are presented.

Individuals may have some expectations in the environment they take place. This includes expectations such as inter-individual relationships, organizations they get served, organizations they produce service for and expectations from nature. Basically, the concept ‘expectation’ means an individual inferencing new experiences as a result of experiences. Expectation is defined as “the shape an individual gets in specific conditions and situations or as the prediction on what is expected from the individual” in Turkish Language Society. According to Can (1999), expectation is the possibility of making an attitude or an attempt reach a specific result

(as cited in İleli, 2007). An expectation on a specific field an individual has is shaped rather by the perception of self of the individual than by a wish or desire for the future (Akman, 1992).

In work life, in case the job expectations of employees are not met, their level of job satisfaction decreases and as a result of this, job burnout for employees may be caused in time (Can and Soyer, 2008). Because individuals can obtain the happiness which is the result of meeting personnel expectations when they get responsible for the work they believe they will like doing and satisfy themselves (İleli, 2007).

According to the results of the research on job and business life expectations, the success or failure of the individual affects job expectations (Akman, 1992). According to the results of Bourjail (1984)'s study, there is a significant relationship between job perception and expectations of an individual (as cited in Akman, 1992). According to Dalal and Singh (1986)'s and Erden (1989)' research, higher education influences the students' expectations about their jobs.

According to Akman (1992) and Kutlu, Schreglmann and Ari (2013)'s research, first year teacher candidates' job expectations are higher than fourth year teacher candidates. In Erden (1990)'s study, it is was found that the level of job expectations of last year students decreased (as cited in Akman, 1992). On the other hand, there are also studies showing that an individual's job expectation level is high in the first period of their work lives, but low for experienced employees (Dalal and Singh, 1986).

According to Günçer (1982), expectation is an individual's predicting the future performance considering the facts or making judgement on their future performance. Although there is a close relationship between the wishes and expectations of an individual, rather than the wishes, emotions such as desire play an important role (as cited in Erden, 1989). According to Erden (1989), wishes are at a higher level than expectations in general. There are a lot of obstacles hindering wishes to become true. These obstacles may lower the level of expectation of an

individual. An individual basing his/her expectations on facts is vital as much as how the facts are perceived by the individual, and this changes depending on the life experiences the individual has. However, the experiences of an individual may show differences according to time period and era they were raised in. As a consequence, considering the idea that the attitude and experiences of an individual show differences according to the era they were in, the assumption that the job expectations of generations show difference may be proposed. Considering this, there is a need to examine the concept 'generation' and focus on what the differences between the generations might be.

The concept 'generation' is defined as "all the people living in the same era and almost at the same age" by Turkish Language Society. Dilthey (1957) stated that generation is created by individuals who experience the same emotions, thoughts and values. Therefore, generation is a concept that describes people living in the same time period, and makes people gain experiences on a homogenous common understanding which ties one another as a whole despite individual differences (as cited in Schlindwein, 2014: 2). Since early 2000, it is observed that there has been an increase in the studies on generations. It is seen that individuals living almost in the last century are named according to some phenomenon which influenced the period they lived in and resolve them according to the period they live in (Howe and Strauss, 2000; Twenge and Campbell, 2008; Tulgan, 2000; Zemke, Raines, Filipczak, 2000). In Table 1, generations and the characteristics in the period they lived are grouped. Table 1 displays the general and basic characteristic differences between generations. Although it can be thought that the years have sharp differences in Table 1, having a clear cut grouping of these years can be misleading. However, it is the periods, events and characteristics which trigger the behaviors and attitudes and shape the generations.

Table 1

Characteristics of Generations (adapted from Zemke, Raines, Filipczak, 2000; Scholz, 2014; Tavolato 2012)

Generation (Year of birth)	Characteristics of The Period	Characteristics of the periods in Turkey	Value	Source Motivation	of Understanding of job	Sense of Self
Traditionists (1922-1945)	They were born before World War II.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independence period First years of the republic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> War Honor Commitment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect 	Sense of mission/devotion to mission	Part of the society
Baby Boomers (1946-1964)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They were born during and after the World War II. They were grown up in an era of optimism, opportunism, and improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10th year of the republic Years of transition of multi-party period 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Idealism Optimism Rivalry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> been in need of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Everyone makes their own dream come true
X – Generation (1965-1980)	They were born after baby boom and were grown up in the shade of baby boomers.	The period having two military coups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cynicism Independence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Autonomy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficulty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selfish Introverted
Y – Generation (1981-2000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They were born as the children of last baby boomers and first X generation. They grew up in high technology, take place in neo-optimist period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Born after military coup of 80 Years with fast transition to computer and the Internet era from balk and White televisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sense of self Trust 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Novelty and entertaining environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tool for reaching the aim 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the place where the web comes together
Z – Generation (2001-.....)	Smart phones, Wi-Fi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family structures becoming smaller Technology becoming widespread in Turkey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pragmatism Freedom 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individualism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pragmatism Optimism Low-dependence to employer Running away from the job 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High self-confidence Successful Enterprising

Taking the years as basic in Table 1, Turkey's population was examined according to generations. According to the data obtained from Turkish Statistical Institute (TSI), Turkey's 5,6% of population is formed by traditionists, 18,50% by baby boomers generation, 22,60% X generation, 26,80% Y generation, 26,50% Z generation. Such a balanced distribution can be positively evaluated as number. When it is considered that except the traditionists, the rest of the generations work in the same environment, the variety of the differences of motivation sources related to work, work understandings and value judgments may affect the work environment both positively and negatively.

In Turkey, the choice of a job does not depend on the individual. The expectations related to work of an individual who cannot complete their under graduation in the major they would like to might be influenced. As in many jobs, the possibility to work (being appointed or not) on their field related to teaching may negatively influence the job expectation of most of the teacher candidates. Teacher candidates being educated in 2010s is defined as 'Z-generation'. The instructors taking part in bringing up the Z-generation teacher candidates are from the baby boomers, X and Y generation. The low or high level of job expectation of instructors in institutes bringing up teachers, may affect the education period directly because instructors have the mission of being a role-model for teacher candidates. The basis on job acceptance and professional application and 'teaching spirit' is founded in student years and may affect all work life (Beydağ, Gündüz, Gök-Özer, 2008; Uras and Kunt, 2006). The sub-aims of the study aiming at determining the level of job expectation of instructors according to generations at education faculties in public universities in Turkey are as following:

1. What are the level of job expectations of instructors in education faculty?
2. Do the levels of job expectation of instructors in education faculty display variety according to
 - a. Gender

- b. Seniority
- c. Baby boomers, X and Y generations
- d. Title?

The method, findings, and result and suggestions sections of the present study aiming at determining the level of job expectation of instructors at education faculties who have a direct contribution in bringing up the new generation are presented in the following sections.

Method

The present study aiming at determining the level of job expectation of instructors according to generations was carried out in descriptive survey based on quantitative method. The population of the study is the instructors in education faculties in all public universities in Turkey. The sampling of the study consists of 674 instructors at education faculties in 68 public universities. The data was conducted in spring semester 2014-2015. Demographic information of the instructors taking place in the study are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Demographic Information of the Instructors in the Study

Variables	N	%	
Gender	Female	323	% 47,90
	Male	351	% 52,10
Generation	Y Generation	334	%49,55
	X Generation	258	%38,28
	Baby boomers	82	%12,17
Seniority	1-5 years	237	35,16
	6-10 years	122	18,10
	11-15 years	91	13,50
	16-20 years	77	11,42
	21-25 years	64	9,50
	26-30 years	34	5,05
	31 years +	49	7,27
Title	Prof.dr	49	7,27
	Assoc. Prof.	94	13,95
	Assist. Prof.	201	29,82
	Research Dr.	31	4,60
	Instr.dr	23	3,41
	Lecturer.dr	4	0,60
	Teaching assist.	36	5,34
	Lecturer	5	0,74
Research assist.	231	34,27	
Total	674	100	

As the data collection instrument 'Job expectation Scale' by Balcı and Bozkurt (2013) was used. The Job Expectation Scale having one dimension consists of 25 items. The scale prepared as a 5-point likert scale changes from '1- never to 5- always'. The Job Expectation Scale by Balcı and Bozkurt (2013)'s internal consistency was calculated with Cronbach Alpha coefficient and was found as .92. In this study the internal consistency was calculated with Cronbach Alpha coefficient and was found .81.

To determine the job expectations of instructors in the study, descriptive statistics was carried out. For comparisons, first the average and standard deviation of each variable of the answers the instructors gave in the scale was calculated and normality and the homogeneity of variances were checked. According to these analyses:

- T-test was applied for comparing the total point the instructors obtained from the job expectation scale regarding 'Gender' variable.
- ANOVA was used to compare the total point from the job expectation scale regarding 'Generation and Seniority' variables. LSD test was conducted to determine the source for the differences of the F values which were found as significant in ANOVA because the variances were homogenously distributed.
- Kruskall Wallis H test was conducted to compare the total points from the job expectation scale regarding the 'Title' variable.

Results

The findings of the present study aiming at determining the level of job expectation according to generations of instructors were analyzed in terms of sub-aims. As it can be seen in Table 3, the job expectations of instructors are quite high ($\bar{x}=108.41$, $s=8.7$).

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics Related to Job Expectations of Instructors

Variable	N	K	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}/K
Job expectation	674	25	108.41	8.7	4.33

When the t-test results in Table 4 were examined, it can be seen that there is no significant difference in terms of gender at the total points of instructors from the job expectation scale [t(674)= 0.29; p>.05].

Table 4

Comparing Job Expectations of Instructors in terms of Gender

Variable	Gender	n	X	S	sd	t	P
Job Expectation	Male	351	108.32	.67	672	0.29	0,77
	Female	323	108.51				

P<.05

As it can be observed from Table 5, when the job expectation of the instructors were compared in terms of seniority, it is seen that the level of job expectation is significantly different regarding the variable seniority. It was found that the level of job expectations of the instructors having seniority of 6-10 years is higher than the instructors with 16-20, 26-30 and 31 and more years of seniority at the total point obtained from the job satisfaction scale [F(6)= 2.208; p<.05].

Table 5

Comparing Instructors in terms of Seniority Variable

Variable	Seniority	N	Mean Rank	sd	F	p	Significant Difference
Job expectations	1-5 years	237	108.79	6	2.208	.04	6-10 > 16-20 6-10 > 26-30 6-10 > 31 +
	6-10 years	122	109.93	6			
	11-15 years	91	108.57	6			
	16-20 years	77	106.65	6			
	21-25 years	64	108.86	6			
	26-30 years	34	105.88	6			
	31 years +	49	106.41	6			

p<0.05

As seen in Table 6, when the job expectations of instructors are compared in terms of generations, it is found that the level of job expectation display significant difference in terms of generations. It was found that at the total point obtained from the job expectation scale [F(2)= 3.97; p<.05], the level of job expectations of Y generations is higher than the instructors from baby boomers generation.

Table 6

Comparing The Level of Job Expectations of Instructors in terms of Generations

Variable	Generation	N	Mean Rank	Sd	F	p	Significant Difference
Job Expectation	Y Generation (22-35 years)	334	109,14	2	3,97	.02	22-35>51-67
	X Generation (36-50 years)	258	108,18	2			
	Baby Boomers (51-67 years)	82	106,20	2			

p<0.05

Analyzing the Kruskal Wallis-H test results in Table 7, it is seen that there was no significant difference between the level of expectations of instructors in terms of title at the total point of the job expectation scale ($\chi^2=8.51$, p>.05).

Table 7

Comparing The Level of Job Expectations of Instructors in terms of Title

Variable	Title	n	Mean Rank	sd	X ²	p
Job Expectations	Prof.dr	49	291,16	8	8,51	.39
	Assoc. Prof.	94	312,21			
	Assist. Prof.	201	348,61			
	Research Dr.	31	374,68			
	Instr.dr	23	357,87			
	Lecturer.dr	4	453,00			
	Teaching assist.	36	316,72			
	Lecturer	5	376,00			
	Research assist.	231	341,34			

The result and suggestions for the present study aiming at determining the level of job expectation of instructors at education faculties in Turkey who have a direct contribution in bringing up the new generation are presented in the following sections.

Results and Suggestions

In the study, first, it was found that level of job expectation of instructors is quite high. This can imply that the job expectations of instructors are met by organizations because administration is responsible for meeting the expectations of employees regarding the organization. The job expectation of employees is directly related to organizational commitment, organizational satisfaction and organizational efficiency (Balci and Bozkurt, 2013).

The findings of the study showed that the level of job expectation of instructors does not differ according to gender. This may imply that there is no sex discrimination in the universities the instructors work and that they have a positive organizational culture in their institution because if the organizational culture is qualified, no difference can be found between the male and female workers' level of job expectation in the organization. Discrimination is the most important problem which individuals face at work among the problems they face. When a situation takes place which is on the contrary to the employees' expectations who cannot get the promotion or position they deserve, it can cause both decrease in productivity in work life and despair and demotivation (Demir, 2011). According to Erkmen (2001), in organizations being supportive for the expectations, assisting employees' plans by preparing every kind of possibility and environment, having organizational culture and without discrimination, employees are more productive.

According to the results of level of job expectations of instructors regarding seniority, level of job expectations of instructors having 6-10 years of seniority is higher than the instructors having 16-20, 26-30 and 31 and more seniority. The reason of this finding may be that the instructors with 6-10 years of seniority are at the beginning of their career. It can be seen that the instructors with 6-10 year of seniority are from Y generation, and when the characteristics of this generation is considered, it can be stated that the level of job expectations of Y-generation instructors is higher compared to other generations because they have high level of

sense of self, prefer to work at places based on trust and in entertaining environment, and are open to novelties. The results of the level of job expectations of instructors in terms of generation support the results related to seniority. The study showed that Y-generation instructors' level of job expectations is higher than the instructors from baby boomers. According to Balcı and Bozkurt (2013)'s study on job expectation of teachers, Y-generation teachers' job expectations and organizational dependence is lower. The reason why the job expectation of Y-generation instructors is higher can be explained them working at higher education, showing their inner-potential and energy more and university administration supporting them in sense of job.

This study was conducted based on quantitative study methods. It is suggested to design a similar study on job expectations of instructors at education faculty based on qualitative study methods. This may provide determine the job expectation level of instructors at education faculties in terms of generation in a more detailed way.

Reference

- Akman, Y. (1992). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Meslek, Evlilik ve Geleceğe Yönelik Beklentileri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. Sayı: 7. Pp. 125-149.
- Beydağ, K. D.; Gündüz A.; Özer F. G. (2008). Sağlık Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Eğitimlerine ve Mesleklerine Bakış Açılıarı, Meslekten Beklentileri. *Denizli: Pamukkale Tıp Dergisi*, 1 (3), pp. 137-142.
- Can, Y. & Soyer F. (2008). Mesleki ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Beklenti İle Yaşam Tatmini Arasındaki İlişki: Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenleri Üzerinde Bir Araştırma. *Atatürk Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences (atabesbd)*.

Dalal, A.K & Singh, R.A. (1986). An Integration Theoretical Analysis of Expected Job Attractiveness and Saticfaction. *International Journal of Phychology. Vol. 21 (4-5). Pps. 555-564.*

Erden, M. (1989). H.Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü Öğrencilerinin Meslekleri İle İlgili Beklentileri. *Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. Sayı: 4, ss. 93-107.*

İleli, A. (2007). Orta Öğretim Öğrencilerinin Beden Eğitimi Dersinden Beklentileri ve Doyum Düzeyleri (Sakarya İl Örneği). Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sakarya: Sakarya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Kutlu, M. O.; Schreglmann, S.; Arı, N. (2013). Bilişim Teknolojileri Öğretmeni Adaylarının Mesleki Beklentilerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi: Ç.Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi, Bilg. Ve Öğret. Tekn. Eğitimi Bölümü Örneği. *Kastamonu: Kastamonu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt: 21, No: 3.*

Lancaster, L. C. & Stillman, D. (2003), When Generations Collide: Who they are. Why they clash. How to solve the generational puzzle at work. , New York: HarperBusiness. NY.

Schindwein, B. (2014). **Generationsbeschreibungen in der Moderne.** Vom wissenschaftlichen Konzept zum Kassenschlager. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. E-book: <http://www.grin.com/de/e-book/279182/generationsbeschreibungen-in-der-moderne>

Scholz, C. (2014). Generation Z: Wie sie tickt, was sie verändert und warum sie uns alle ansteckt. Weinheim: Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH&Co. KGaA.

Tavolato, P. (2012) (<http://www.verwaltung.steiermark.at/cms/dokumente/11685132>

_74837309/eec831de/Generationen%20F%C3%BChren.pdf) Erişim tarihi 01 Kasım 2015.

Tulgan, B. (2000) *Managing Generation X: How to bring out the best in young Talent*. New York: W. W. Norton&Company.

Twenge, M. J. & Campell, S. M.. (2008). Generational differences in psychological traits and their impact on the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. Vol.23. No. 8, pp.862-877)

Uras, Meral; Muammer Kunt (2006). Öğretmen Adaylarının Öğretmenlik Mesleğinden Beklentileri. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(19), 71-83.

Zemke, R.; Raines, C.; Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at work: managing the clash of veterans, boomers, X'ers, and nexters in your workplace*. New York: Performance Research Associate, Inc.