The Academic Expectations of Academic Staff from Their Universities

Feyyaz Karaca[1] and Ali Riza Erdem[2]

Faculty of Education, Pamukkale University, 20070 Denizli, Turkey
E-mail: [1]<fkaraca@pau.edu.tr>, [2]<arerdem@pau.edu.tr>

ABSTRACT The objectives of this research are first to determine the level of academic expectations of academic staffs working in seven universities in the Aegean Region in Turkey. Second is to determine the level of realization of these expectations. Third is to asses the effect of the realization level of these expectations on their performances and to propose some suggestions. This research is based on a descriptive study using a general survey model. The research sample comprised of 620 academic staffs and was selected based on stratified random sampling. The data were collected through a developed Likert scale survey questionnaire and analyzed based on the descriptive techniques and parametric statistical techniques. The researchers concluded that most of the academic staffs did not have any academic expectations from their universities.

INTRODUCTION

As academic institutions the universities have three missions which are (1) teaching, (2) scientific research, and (3) community services. The first mission of the universities is to provide pre-service training based on vocational and undergraduate programs to educate professions that are needed by the society, these kinds of universities are called mass education universities. The second mission of the universities is to conduct basic and applied scientific research to contribute to the development of scientific fields, and to publish the results of the scientific research as reports, research articles or books to share with related fields. Research universities especially realize their scientific research mission through their graduate education programs. The third mission of the universities is to enlighten community, to contribute to the development of democracy and the republic's achievements towards further strengthening the intellectual knowledge to provide the community services (Guruz et al. 1994; Dogramaci 2000; Erdem 2005; Erdem 2006; Arimoto 2007; Aslan 2007).

While the universities fulfill these three missions primarily through their academic staffs, the administrative staffs of the universities provide academic staffs with technical and administrative service supports. Academic staffs working at the universities are also called "faculty". The faculty consists of faculty members with Ph.D. degrees and teaching staffs. Faculty members with Ph.D. consist of professors, associate professors and assistant professors. Teaching staffs consist of Instructors, lecturers and support staffs that are hired for a specified period by higher education institutions in accordance with the Turkish Higher Education Law (No. 2547).

There have been several researches about the determinations of the job performance of the personnel working in an institution. Such as, the need theory of motivation focuses on the needs that drive individual behavior and assumes that the lack of needs or the desire of the fulfillment of needs leads the direction of behavior in certain ways. However, some researchers assert that, the existence of human needs is insufficient to initiate the individual behavior. Moreover, the individual should have an expectation that as a result of his/her behavior, he/she should reach the purpose of relieving the needs. Based on this view, some researchers have developed theories of motivation. Such as "Theory of Expectations" was developed by Victor H. Vroom and widely accepted in this field. Later Porter and Lawler developed Vroom' model and transformed into a detailed model (Davis 1982; Simsek, Akgemci and Celik 2001; Anik 2007).

Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory claims that the expectations of employees from their own institution have a significant impact in increasing their job motivation. This theory also assumes that behavior results from conscious choices among alternatives whose purpose is to maximize pleasure and to minimize pain. Vroom

realized that an employee's performance is based on individual factors such as personality, skills, knowledge, experience and abilities. He stated that effort, performance and motivation are linked in a person's motivation.

Over the last decades, the academic career systems have been described as a critical factor for the future of research and higher education. The recruitment and the retention of academic staffs and the attractiveness of the academic profession are considered as an important issue. In recent years, the subject matters of research on academic work have changed and some studies have focused on the challenging and restructuring of the traditional academic roles in the higher education sector (Nixon et al. 2001; Chung et al. 2010; Egginton 2010; Barry and Gaughan 2011; Majzub 2012; Leisyte and Dee 2012; Kyvik 2013; Osakwe 2014).

Majzub (2012) researched how newcomers perceive the academic environment of the university including expectations stipulated by the university and how they manage themselves as newcomers to the academia. She found that during the recruitment of newcomers into the academia they experienced a gap between original expectation and reality that makes them feel some form of cognitive dissonance. Although the newcomers expected the university environment to be more facilitating to their necessary expectations, it did not realize fully those expectations. Newcomers expected senior colleagues to provide a more effective mentoring process but the findings indicate that the response of several professors was more like warm than collegial (Majzub 2012).

Kyvik (2013) examined the changes in six academic research roles over the last three decades in Norwegian research universities as networking, collaboration, managing research, doing research, publishing research and evaluation of research. He concluded that academic staffs practice research has changed in line with governmental and societal expectations. Due to the many tasks in the researcher role and the mixed and ambiguous expectations, universities and their staffs have some tensions with public authorities, industry, and society, the institution, colleagues, students and the academic community in terms of the time and attention related to those sub-roles. He suggested that the proper balance must be constantly sought between contrasting tasks: applying for research funds

and doing research; conducting scientific research and commercialization of the results; publishing scientific articles and the popularization of research; working in the laboratory and being available for networking activities and for evaluating other researchers; or managing research projects and finding time for one's own research (Kyvik 2013).

Osakwe (2014) investigated the factors affecting motivation and job satisfactions of academic staffs in several state universities in Nigeria. She found that there is no significant difference between male and female non-management academic staffs' motivation and job satisfaction; but highly motivated non-management academic staffs perform their job better than poorly motivated academic staffs. Thus she recommended that university authorities and the government should pay increasing attention to the motivation of non-management academic staff to increase their work performance and satisfaction for their high productivity.

In their study Murat and Cevik (2008) "The analysis of the factors as stakeholder which determine job satisfaction of the academicians in Zonguldak Karaelmas University" concluded that structure of management and organization have the most important effect on job satisfaction of the academicians in Zonguldak Karaelmas University. Later this was followed by education, academic activities, physical and technical conditions, followed by the socio-cultural and health factors and communication factors. On the other hand Onç OO Turk Egitim Sen (2009) research report about "The university problem and university employees in Turkey," indicated that research assistants were the least satisfied (78%) whereas associate professors were the most satisfied (90%) among the academic group working at the university. On the other hand, if academic staffs were to begin work again, more than half of them (60%) would prefer to start work at the university again. On the other hand, the satisfaction survey report of Gazi University Academic Evaluation and Quality Improvement Board (GUADEK) (2012) shown that without any status differences most of the academic staffs are satisfied with their university based on its research facilities, academic environments and the relationship with their friends and administrative staffs. These research results are very important to show us the attractiveness of the university when the university

fulfills the expectations of the university academic staffs. All these research show that the academic expectations of academic staffs from their universities have important influences on their job performances.

This research considers that the academic expectations of academic staffs are usually related to teaching and scientific research services. Thus, it is very important to determine the academic expectations of academic staffs and how to effectively fulfill the realization of the objectives of the university. Thus, the researchers believed that it is necessary to determine the level of academic expectations, the realization level of these expectations and the impact of the realization level of these expectations on their job performances of academic staffs working in seven universities, located in the Aegean Region in Turkey.

Problem Statement and Sub-problems

What are the opinions of academic staffs about their academic expectations from their universities, the realization level of these expectations and the impact of the realization level of these expectations on their job performance in Aegean region? Research sub-problems are:

1 (a) What are the opinions about academic expectations of academic staffs working in the university?

(b) What are the opinions about the realization level of the academic expectations?

(c) What are the opinions about the impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance?

2 (a) Are there any significant differences among the opinions of academic staffs about their academic expectations based on their gender, age, educational level, status and university?

(b) Are there any significant differences among the opinions of academic staffs about the realization levels of their academic expectations based on their gender, age, educational level, status and university?

(c) Are there any significant differences among the opinions of academic staffs about the impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance based on their gender, age, educational level, status and university?

METHODOLOGY

The researchers conducted a descriptive study using a general survey model in this research. "Survey model is a research approach that aims to describe a situation as it was in the past or as it is in the present time" (Karasar 2007). The population of this research approximately consisted of 8647 academic staffs working at the seven different universities, Adnan Menderes University, Afyon Kocatepe University, Celal Bayar University, Dokuz Eylul University, Mugla University, Pamukkale University and Usak University which are located in the Aegean Region (Adnan Menderes University 2009; Afyon Kocatepe University 2009; Celal Bayar University 2009; Dokuz Eylul University 2009; Mugla University 2009; Usak University 2009). The universities were selected based on three different groups as the well-established university (Dokuz Eylul University), the young university (Adnan Menderes University, Afyon Kocatepe University, Celal Bayar University, Mugla University, Pamukkale University), and the new university (Usak University).

Since it was not possible to survey all the research population, we used stratified sampling to select a total of 620 academic staffs that was arranged by universities. Stratified sampling model is the process that the study population is divided into sub-population from which the study sample was drawn through simple random sampling (Arikan 2004; Balci 2007).

The data were collected through a Likert scale survey questionnaire developed by the researchers as a data collection tool based on primarily literature review. The survey questionnaire as the measurement tool consists of three parts. The first part consists of demographic information; the second part consists of a four-point Likert-type scale (where 1 is never, 2 is sometimes, 3 is mostly and 4 is always) using a list of 10 scale items with objectives to identify the academic expectations of academic staffs and the realization level of expectations of academic staffs working at the university. The third part consists of a three-point Likert-type scale (where 1 is negatively affecting, 2 is no effect and 3 is positively affecting) using a list of 10 scale items with objectives to identify the impact of the realization level of expectations on job performanc-

es. The level interval for the terms in the scale was found through n-1 in Table 1.

Table 1: Level intervals for the terms in the scale

Dimensions	Level interval	Level of agreement
Academic expectations	1.00-1.75	Never
	1.76-2.50	Sometimes
	2.51-3.25	Mostly
	3.26-4.00	Always
The realization level of expectations	1.00-1.75	Never
	1.76-2.50	Sometimes
	2.51-3.25	Mostly
	3.26-4.00	Always
The impact of the realization level of expectations on job performances	1.00-1.66	Negatively affecting
	1.67-2.33	No effect
	2.34-3.00	Positively affecting

For the content validity of the scale developed by the researchers, nine field specialists and a language specialist were consulted. The reliability results of the measurement scale on the basis of sub-dimensions are shown in Table 2.

The collected data were analyzed through the SPSS statistical program. In order to answer the sub-problems of the research, the descriptive techniques such as frequency, percentage distribution, arithmetic mean, standard deviation were used. Since the measurement tool was based on the interval scale and the distributions of measurements of academic expectation as the dependent variable were normally distributed, parametric statistical techniques were used, such as the t test and one-way ANOVA.

RESULTS

Results for the First Sub-Problem

Results of the first sub-problem were discussed under three headings as follows. 1. The opinions of university academic staffs about their academic expectations. 2. The opinions of university academic staffs about the realization level of their academic expectations. 3. The opinions of university academic staffs about the impact of the realization level of their academic expectations on their job performance.

1. The Opinions of University Academic Staffs about Their Academic Expectations

The opinions of the large majority of academic staffs about their academic expectations from their university were "never" with 81.7 percent compared to 1.1 percent "always", 3.9 percent "usually" and to 12.9 percent "sometimes". This result is very important in showing that more than 3/4 of academic staffs working at the university did not have any academic expectations from their universities based on the list of our scale items. Table 3 shows the opinions of academic staffs about their academic expectations from their university. Based on arithmetic averages, the first three academic expectations of the academic staffs are orderly as follows: "To be sent abroad by the university for my academic development", "To be awarded for my articles that published in an indexed international journal" and "To be awarded for my new inventions and patents".

2. The Opinions of University Academic Staffs about the Realization Level of Their Academic Expectations

The opinions of academic staffs about the realization level of their academic expectations from their university were mainly "sometimes" with 40.6% compared to 31% "mostly", 17.2 % "never" and 7.8% "always. This result is meaningful in showing that since most of academic staffs have never academic expectations; they think that their academic expectations included in the survey scale were realized sometimes by their universities. This indicates that the univer-

Table 2: The reliability results of measurement tool

Dimensions	Number of questions	The level of expectations	The realization level of expectations	The impact of the realization level of expectations on job performances	Total
Academic expectations	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	.92	.86	.88	.88

Table 3: The opinions of academic staff about their academic expectations from their universities

Order no.	Question no.	Survey questions	Mean	Standard deviation	Meaning
1	8	To be sent abroad by the university for my academic development	1.52	.92	
2	9	To be awarded for my articles that published in an indexed international journal	1.50	.91	
3	10	To be awarded for my new inventions and patents	1.44	.88	
4	5	To be given financial support to attend in international scientific meetings, such as organized conferences, congresses and symposiums	1.37	.78	
5	4	To be given financial support to attend in national scientific meetings, such as organized conferences, congresses and symposiums	1.33	.71	Never
6	7	Increasing the number of resources in the library for scientific research	1.29	.65	
7	6	A sufficient online library services for scientific research	1.28	.64	
8	1	Having my own computer for academic studies	1.27	.71	
9	2	Having an internet connection for my personal computer for academic studies	1.21	.55	
10	3	Having a fast Internet connection for my PC	1.19	.56	

sities are insufficiently realizing academic expectations of their academic staffs. Table 4 shows the opinions of the academic staffs about the realization level of their academic expectations from their universities in detail.

The views of academic staffs about the realization level of their academic expectations from their university based on arithmetic averages, the first three are as follows: "To be sent abroad by the university for my academic development", "To be given financial support to attend in international scientific meetings, such as organized conferences, congresses and symposiums", and "To be awarded for my articles that have been published in an indexed international journal".

3. The Opinions of University Academic Staffs about the Impact of the Realization Level of Their Academic Expectations on Their Job Performance

The university academic staffs opinions on the impacts of the realization level of their academic expectations on their job performances were mostly "negative". More than half of the participant (53.7%) view that the realization level of their academic expectation had a negative impact on their job performance; 30.2% mention that it did not have any impact on their job performance and 12.2% state that it had positive impact on their job performance.

This result is important to show that since the university academic staffs had newer academic expectations from their universities and

their academic expectations were sometimes realized, the academic staffs developed negative opinion about the impact of these facts on their job performance. Moreover, they viewed all these things as nonfunctional. Table 5 represents the opinions of university academic staffs about the impact of the realization level of their academic expectations on their job performance in detail.

The university academic staffs opinions about the impacts of the realization level of their academic expectations on their job performances based on arithmetic averages, the first three are as follows: "To be sent abroad by the university for my academic development", "To be given financial support to attend international scientific meetings, such as organized conferences, congresses and symposiums" and "To be awarded for my new inventions and patents"

Results for the Second Sub-problem

Results of the second sub-problem were discussed under five headings as follows.

1. Are There any Significant Differences among the Opinions of Academic Staffs about Their Academic Expectations, the Realization Levels of Their Academic Expectations and the Impact of the Realization Level of Academic Expectations on Their Academic Performance Based on Their Gender?

Concerning the gender, the research findings show that while there is a significant difference

Table 4: The opinions of academic staff about the realization level of their academic expectations from their universities

Order no.	Question no.	Survey questions	Mean	Standard deviation	Meaning
1	8	To be sent abroad by the university for my academic development	3.16	1.01	Mostly
2	5	To be given financial support to attend in international scientific meetings, such as organized conferences, congresses and symposiums	2.93	1.05	
3	9	To be awarded for my articles that published in an indexed international journal	2.91	1.14	
4	10	To be awarded for my new inventions and patents	2.90	1.11	
5	4	To be given financial support to attend in national scientific meetings, such as organized conferences, congresses and symposiums	2.65	1.04	
6	7	Increasing the number of resources in the library for scientific research	2.41	.94	Sometimes
7	6	A sufficient online library services for scientific research	2.19	.94	
8	2	Having an internet connection for my personal computer for academic studies	1.95	.94	
9	1	Having my own computer for academic studies	1.94	1.10	
10	3	Having a fast Internet connection for my PC	1.55	.87	Newer

Table 5: The opinions of university academic staff about the impact of the realization level of their academic expectations on their job performances

Order no.	Question no.	Survey questions	Mean	Standard deviation	Meaning
1	8	To be sent abroad by the university for my academic development	1.99	.94	No effect
2	5	To be given financial support to attend in international scientific meetings, such as organized conferences, congresses and symposiums	1.95	.95	
3	10	To be awarded for my new inventions and patents	1.79	.87	
4	9	To be awarded for my articles that published in an indexed international journal	1.77	.88	
5	4	To be given financial support to attend in national scientific meetings, such as organized conferences, congresses and symposiums	1.70	.93	
6	7	Increasing the number of resources in the library for scientific research	1.60	.88	Negatively affecting
7	6	A sufficient online library services for scientific research	1.51	.83	
8	3	Having a fast Internet connection for my PC	1.41	.77	
9	1	Having my own PC for academic studies	1.39	.75	
10	2	Having an internet connection for my PC for academic studies	1.19	.53	

among the opinions of academic staffs about their academic expectations, there are no significant differences among the realization levels of their academic expectations and the impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance. According to Table 6, the academic expectations of male academic staffs working at the universities are higher than those of female staffs.

2. Are There any Significant Differences among the Opinions of Academic Staffs about Their Academic Expectations, the Realization Levels of Their Academic Expectations and the Impact of the Realization Level of Academic Expectations on Their Academic Performance Based on Their Age?

Based on age, the research findings indicate that while there are significant differences among

Table 6: The differences among the opinions of academic staff about their academic expectations, the realization levels of their academic expectations and the impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance by gender

Dimensions	Gender	N	X	Ss	t	P
Academic expectations	Female	201	1.18	.46	-2.636	.009*
	Male	346	1.30	.55		
The realization level of academic expectations	Female	192	2.36	.74	-.183	.855
	Male	337	2.38	.69		
The impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance	Female	191	1.58	.61	-.733	.464
	Male	336	1.62	.57		

*p <.05

the opinions of academic staffs about their academic expectations and the impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance, there are no significant differences among the realization levels of their academic expectations as shown in Table 7.

According to Table 8, there is a meaningful difference between the opinions of academic staffs about the academic expectations from their universities based on their age groups because the value "p" is below 0.05. The means of age group changed between 1.13 and 1.94. Among the academic staffs based on their age groups, while the 60 and over age group has the highest expectations from their universities, 20-29 age group has the lowest expectations from their universities. The higher the age groups of the academic staffs, the higher the level of academic expectations academic staffs have.

As shown in Table 9, there exist meaningful differences in the means of the academic staffs opinions about the impact of the realization level of their academic expectations on their job performance based on their age groups because the value "p" is below 0.05. The means of age groups also changed between 1.30 and 1.75. Among the academic staffs, while the highest impact of the realization level of academic staffs' expectations on their job performance is for the 60 and over age group, the lowest is for the 50-59 age group.

3. Are There any Significant Differences among the Opinions of Academic Staffs about Their Academic Expectations, the Realization Levels of Their Academic Expectations and the Impact of the Realization Level of Academic Expectations on Their Academic Performance Based on Their Educational Level?

Based on the educational level, the research findings show that there are significant differ-

Table 7: The differences among the opinions of academic staff about their academic expectations, the realization levels of their academic expectations and the impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance by age

Dimensions	Source of the variance	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F	p
Academic expectations	Between groups	4	9.351	2.338	8.964	.000*
	Within groups	542	141.353	.261		
	Total	546	150.704			
The realization level of academic expectations	Between groups	4	2.249	.562	1.116	.348
	Within groups	524	264.015	.504		
	Total	528	266.264			
The impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance	Between groups	4	3.742	.936	2.708	.030*
	Within groups	522	180.326	.345		
	Total	526	184.069			

*p <.05

Table 8: The opinions of academic staff about their academic expectations by age groups

Age	N	Mean	Standard deviation
20–29	157	1.13	.40
30–39	221	1.24	.51
40–49	142	1.34	.54
50–59	22	1.67	.71
60 and over	5	1.94	1.13

Table 9: The opinions of academic staff about the realization level of their academic expectations by age groups

Age	N	Mean	Standard deviation
20–29	153	1.60	0.64
30–39	214	1.68	0.57
40–49	135	1.54	0.56
50–59	21	1.30	0.37
60 and over	5	1.75	0.90

ences among the opinions of academic staffs about the realization levels of their academic expectations because the value "p" is below 0.05. However, as shown in Table10, there are no significant differences among their academic expectations and the impacts of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance.

Table 11 indicates that the means of academic staffs' opinions about the realization level of their academic expectations by education level changed between 2.31 and 2.52. Among the aca-

demic staffs, Bachelor degree group has the highest realization level of their academic expectation whereas Master degree group has the lowest realization level of their academic expectation.

4. Are There any Significant Differences among the Opinions of Academic Staffs about Their Academic Expectations, the Realization Levels of Their Academic Expectations and the Impact of the Realization Level of Academic Expectations on Their Academic Performance Based on Their Status?

The research findings indicate that there are significant differences among the opinions of academic staffs about their academic expectations, the realization levels of their academic expectations and the impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance based on their status in Table 12.

When compared the opinions of academic staffs about their academic expectations based on their status, there exists significant differences since the value "p" is below 0.05. The opinion means of academic staffs are changed between 1.16 and 1.66 as shown in Table 13. While lecturers have the highest academic expectations, research assistants have the lowest academic expectations from their universities.

When compared the opinions of academic staffs about the realization levels of their aca-

Table 10: The differences among the opinions of academic staff about their academic expectations, the realization levels of their academic expectations and the impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance by educational level

Dimensions	Source of the variance	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F	p
Academic expectations	Between groups	2	2.290	.598	2.190	.054
	Within groups	544	147.714	.273		
	Total	546	150.704			
The realization level of academic expectations	Between groups	2	6.848	1.370	2.761	.028*
	Within groups	526	259.416	.496		
	Total	528	266.264			
The impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance	Between groups	2	.832	.166	.473	.796
	Within groups	524	183.237	.352		
	Total	526	184.069			

*p <.05

Table 11: The opinions of academic staff about the realization level of their academic expectations by educational level

Age	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Bachelor degree	51	2.52	.91
Master's degree	150	2.31	.72
PhD degree	328	2.37	.65

demic expectations based on their status, there exists significant differences since the value "p" is below 0.05. As shown in Table 14, the means of academic staffs' opinions about the realization levels of their academic expectations changed between 1.99 and 2.69. Among the academic staffs, lecturers have the highest realization levels of their academic expectations whereas specialists have the lowest realization levels of their academic expectations from their universities.

On the other hand, comparing the opinions of academic staffs about the impacts of the realization levels of academic expectations on their academic performance based on their status, there also exists significant differences since the value "p" is below 0.05. Table 15 indicates that the means of academic staffs' opinions about those impacts on their work performance changed between 1.43 and 1.69. Among the academic staffs, while research assistants have the highest impacts of realization levels of their academic expectations on their work performance, Assoc. Prof. have the lowest impacts of realiza-

tion levels of their academic expectations on their work performance.

5. Are There any Significant Differences among the Opinions of Academic Staffs about Their Academic Expectations, the Realization Levels of Their Academic Expectations and the Impact of the Realization Level of Academic Expectations on Their Academic Performance Based on Their University?

There exist significant differences among the opinions of academic staffs about their academic expectations, the realization levels of their academic expectations and the impacts of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance in terms of their university in Table 16, because the value "p" is below 0.05.

As shown in Table 17, the opinion means of academic staffs about their academic expecta-

Table 13: The opinions of academic staff about their academic expectations by their status

Status	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Professor	39	1.56	.70
Assoc. Prof.	45	1.34	.48
Assist. Prof.	172	1.21	.43
Instructor	81	1.19	.44
Lecturer	31	1.66	.94
Research Assistant	160	1.16	.41
Specialist	19	1.29	.83

Table 12: The differences among the opinions of academic staff about their academic expectations, the realization levels of their academic expectations and the impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance by their status

Dimensions	Source of the variance	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F	p
Academic expectations	Between groups	6	11.691	1.299	5.018	.000*
	Within groups	540	138.013	.259		
	Total	546	150.704			
The realization level of academic expectations	Between groups	6	12.147	2.180	2.757	.004*
	Within groups	522	254.117	.490		
	Total	528	266.264			
The impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance	Between groups	6	6.187	.687	1.998	.038*
	Within groups	520	177.882	.344		
	Total	526	184.069			

*p <.05

Table 14: The realization levels of their academic expectations of academic staff by their status

Status	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Professor	37	2.17	.55
Assoc. Prof.	44	2.20	.52
Assist. Prof.	169	2.35	.68
Instructor	77	2.38	.66
Lecturer	25	2.69	1.05
Research Assistant	159	2.46	.72
Specialist	20	1.99	.88

Table 15: The impacts of the realization levels of their academic expectations of academic staff on their work performance by their status

Status	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Professor	36	1.48	.61
Assoc. Prof.	44	1.43	.64
Assist. Prof.	169	1.60	.63
Instructor	76	1.63	.71
Lecturer	25	1.54	.75
Research Assistant	159	1.69	.66
Specialist	18	1.45	.53

tions from their universities based on the universities were distributed between 1.22 and 1.50. While the academic personal of Celal Bayar University have the highest academic expectations from their university, the academic staffs of Adnan Menderes University, Afyon Kocatepe University, Dokuz Eylul University and Pamukkale University together have the lowest expectations from their institutions.

Table 17: The opinions of academic staff about their academic expectations by the universities they are employed

University	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Adnan Menderes University	67	1.22	.62
Afyon Kocatepe University	115	1.22	.44
Celal Bayar University	45	1.50	.68
Dokuz Eylul University	99	1.22	.45
Mugla University	63	1.35	.63
Pamukkale University	118	1.22	.44
Usak University	40	1.23	.46

Table 18: The opinions of academic staff about the realization level of their academic expectations by the universities

University	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Adnan Menderes University	63	2.25	.77
Afyon Kocatepe University	109	2.10	.67
Celal Bayar University	40	2.72	.83
Dokuz Eylul University	97	2.36	.49
Mugla University	63	2.12	.67
Pamukkale University	117	2.58	.65
Usak University	40	2.78	.75

The research findings in Table 18 show that the opinion means of academic staffs about the realization level of their academic expectations from their university changed between 2.10 and 2.78 based on the universities. The differences among the opinion means of academic staffs

Table 16: The differences among the opinions of academic staff about their academic expectations, the realization levels of their academic expectations and the impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance by their university

Dimensions	Source of the variance	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F	p
Academic expectations	Between groups	6	3.807	.635	2.333	.031[*]
	Within groups	540	146.897	.272		
	Total	546	150.704			
The realization level of academic expectations	Between groups	6	29.513	4.919	10.845	.000[*]
	Within groups	522	236.751	.454		
	Total	528	266.264			
The impact of the realization level of academic expectations on their academic performance	Between groups	6	6.398	1.066	3.121	.005[*]
	Within groups	520	177.670	.342		
	Total	526	184.069			

[*]p <.05

Table 19: The opinions of about the impacts of the realization level of academic expectations of academic staff on their academic performance by their university

University	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Adnan Menderes University	63	1.49	.61
Afyon Kocatepe University	110	1.55	.57
Celal Bayar University	40	1.68	.69
Dokuz Eylul University	97	1.58	.52
Mugla University	*62*	*1.45*	*.51*
Pamukkale University	*115*	*1.77*	*.61*
Usak University	40	1.70	.59

about that are statistically significant because the value "p" is below 0.05. Among the seven participating universities, Usak University's academic staffs have the highest the realization level of their academic expectations whereas Afyon Kocatepe University's academic staffs have the lowest the realization level of their academic expectations from their university.

As shown in Table 19, the opinion means of academic staffs about the impacts of the realization level of their academic expectations on their work performance based on their universities changed between 1.45 and 1.77. The differences among these opinion means are also statistically significant, since the value "p" is also below 0.05. The impacts of the realization level of academic expectations of academic staffs on their work performance are the highest for the academic staffs of Pamukkale University but the lowest for the academic staffs of Mugla University among the participating seven universities.

DISCUSSION

It is highly expected that having higher academic expectation and the higher the realization level of academic expectation has more positive impacts on the work performance of academic staffs. However, the research results weakly supported this expectation because academic staffs working in universities have "never" academic expectations from their universities. Academic staffs think that their academic expectations are "sometimes" realized and believe that the low realization levels of their academic expectations have negative impact on their work performance. The reason for this is that since academic staffs

either do not have any academic expectations or their academic expectations are weakly realized, academic staffs consider these two reasons as useless and have negative impact on their academic performance.

The analyses of the academic expectations, the realization levels of academic expectation and the impact of the realization levels of academic expectations on work performance of academic staffs based on various sub-categories indicate some important results and discussion points. Based on the gender, male academic staffs have more academic expectations than female academic staffs. This is why male academic staffs are more willing to realize and sustain their academic achievement than female academic staffs. This result, in some ways. contradicts with the former research results of Osakwe (2014) because she concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female non-management academic staffs' motivation and job satisfaction in their universities. When comparing age, it is clear that the older age group appear to have more academic expectations than the young age group. Based on the impact of the realization levels of academic expectations on work performance of academic staffs, the biggest difference existed between 60 and over age group and 50-59 age group on behalf of the former party. One possible reason for this, as academic staffs get older, they increase the importance of academic achievement and the fulfillment of responsibilities.

Based on educational status, academic staffs with Bachelor's degrees have a higher realization level of academic expectation than academic staffs with Masters and PhD degrees. In this sense, it can be concluded that the academic staffs with a low level educational status have a higher chance than the academic personal with a high level educational status to realize their academic expectations. Based on status, among academic staffs working at the university, lecturers have the highest level of academic expectations compared to research assistants. On the other hand, while Instructors have the highest realization level of academic expectations, the specialists have the lowest realization level of their academic expectations. These results are similar to the research findings of Majzub (2012) in that although the newcomers expected the university environment to be more facilitating to their necessary expectations, it did not realize fully those expectations. Newcomers also expect-

ed senior colleagues to provide a more effective mentoring process but the findings indicate that the response of several professors were more like warm than collegial. This result also parallels to the research findings of Kyvik (2013) in that due to the many tasks in the researcher role and the mixed and ambiguous expectations, universities and their staffs have some tensions with the institution, colleagues, students and the academic community in terms of the time and attention related to academic roles.

The positive impacts of the realization level of academic expectations on their work performance are the highest for the research assistants but the lowest for Assoc. Professors. This result is similar to the findings of Osakwe (2014) because she concluded that the highly motivated non-management academic staffs perform their job better than poorly motivated academic staffs. Therefore, university authorities and the government should focus more on the motivation of non-management academic staff to increase their work performance and satisfaction for their high productivity (Osakwe 2014). On the other hand, the research results, in some ways, contradict with the former research results of Paksoy (2007) about job satisfaction of academic staffs in that professors are the most satisfied while lecturers are the least satisfied. These results also contradict with the research report of Turk Egitim Sen (2009) in that research assistants are the least satisfied whereas associate professors are the most satisfied among academic groups working at the university. The research results are opposite to the report findings of GUADEK (2012) in that without any status differences, most of the academic staffs are satisfied with their university based on its research facilities and academic environment. The reason for our research results is that there is no positive relationship between academic expectations and the levels of academics status. In addition, having various statuses creates different academic expectations among the academic staffs.

According to the universities, while Celal Bayar University academic personal have the highest level of academic expectations, Adnan Menderes, Dokuz Eylul and Pamukkale Universities have the lowest level of academic expectations. On the other hand, Usak University academic staffs appear to have the highest realization level of their academic expectations but Afy-

on Kocatepe University academic staffs seem to have the lowest level of academic expectations. One possible reason for these results is that each university submits their own academic staffs to different academic facilities. Another reason for this is that in order to attract new academic personal currently founded Usak University can propose better opportunities and facilities to the their academic personal compared to other universities. In addition, the different points of view of each university administration about its academic staffs can have important impact on this result.

CONCLUSION

The objectives of this research are to determine the levels of academic expectations, the realization levels of academic expectation and the impacts of the realization levels of academic expectations on their work performance of academic staffs working in seven different universities, located in the Aegean Region. The research findings indicated that the opinions of the academic staffs about the level of their academic expectations from their universities are mostly (81.7%) "never". On the other hand, the opinions of the academic staffs about the realization levels of their academic expectations are mainly (40.6%), "sometimes". More than half of the academic staffs (53.7%) have negative opinions about the impact of the realization levels of their academic expectations on their work performance.

It is important that academic staffs working in universities have "never" academic expectations from their universities based on our survey questionnaire. On the other hand, academic staffs working in universities think that their academic expectations are "sometimes" realized. This indicates that since academic staffs don't have any academic expectations, it is much more probably expected that their academic expectations are insufficiently taken place. Academic staffs believe that the low realization levels of their academic expectations have negative impact on their work performance. This reveals that since academic staffs don't have any academic expectations and their academic expectations are poorly realized, academic staffs view these two reasons as nonfunctional and have negative impact on their academic performance.

When the academic expectations, the realization levels of academic expectation and the

impact of the realization levels of academic expectations on work performance of academic staffs are analyzed based on various sub-categories, some important results and discussion points are observed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

According to the findings of the study these can be suggested. Academic staffs should be sent abroad by the university to develop professionally. Academic staffs should be supported to participate in scientific meetings abroad, such as the congress symposia by providing adequate financial support. Academic staffs should be given incentive awards for their new inventions or patents. For scientific research the number of sources and online service of their libraries should be developed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Adnan Menderes University 2009. Official Home Page of Adnan Menderes University. From <http://www.idari.adu.edu.tr/db/personel/topics.asp? path=313833> (Retrieved on 7 July 2009).

Afyon Kocatepe University 2009. Official Home Page of Afyon Kocatepe University. From <http://www.aku.edu.tr/per/sayi.htm> (Retrieved on 7 July 2009).

Anik C 2007. Egiticinin performansini niteleyen faktorler, *Bilig,* 43: 133-168.

Arikan R 2004. *Araþtirma Teknikleri ve Rapor Hazirlama.* Ankara: Asil Yayin Dagýitim.

Arimoto A 2001. Case Study: Trends in Higher Education and Academic Reforms from 1994 onwards in Japan. From <http://www.chet.org.za/papers/Japan.doc> (Retrieved on 15 July 2007).

Aslan H 2007. Universitelerin kalkinmadaki rolu, Yeni Asir Gazetesi, December 01, 2007.

Balci A 2007. *Sosyal Bilimlerde Arastirma (Yontem, Teknik ve Ilkeler),* Ankara: 6. Baski, PEGEMA Yayincilik.

Barry B, Gaughan M 2011. Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 82(2): 154-186.

Celal Bayar University 2009. Official Home Page of Celal Bayar University. From <http://www. bayar.

edu.tr/ogrenci/07-08faaliyet/sorunlar-oneriler.pdf> (Retrieved on 7 July 2009).

Chung Kevin, Song Jae W JW, Kim H, Myra HM, Woolliscroft James JO et al. 2010. Predictors of job satisfaction among academic faculty members: Do instructional and clinical staffs differ? *Medical Education,* 44(10): 985-995.

Davis K 1982. *Isletmede insan davranisi* (Cevirenler: Kemal Tosun baskanliginda Tomris Somay, Fulya Aykar, Can Baysal, Omer Sadullah, Semra Yalcin), Istanbul: Istanbul Universitesi Yayin No: 3028.

DEU 2009. *Dokuz Eylul Universitesi 2009 yili nihai performans programi,* Izmir.

Dogramaci I 2000. Gunumuzde Rektor Secimi ve Atama Krizi (Turkiye'de ve Dunyada Yuksekogretim Yonetimine Bakis), Ankara: Meteksan. From <www.dogramaci.org/r-bol5.html> (Retrieved on 21 April 2002).

Egginton Bill E 2010. Introduction of formal performance appraisal of academic staff: The management challenges associated with effective implementation. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 38: 119-133.

Erdem AR 2005. Universitenin var olus nedeni. *Pamukkale Universitesi Egitimi Fakultesi Dergisi,* 17: 104–116.

Erdem AR 2006. Dunyadaki Yuksekogretimin Degisimi, *Selcuk Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi,* 15: 299–314.

Gazi Universitesi Akademik Degerlendirme ve Kalite Gelistirme Kurulu (GUADEK) 2012. G U A D E K Memnuniyet Araþtirma Raporu 2011-2012. *GUADEK Raporu*, Gazi Universitesi, Ankara.

Guruz K, Suhubi EAM, Sengor C, Turker K, Yurtsever E 1994. *Turkiye'de ve Dunyada Yuksekogretim, Bilim ve Teknoloji,* Istanbul: Turk Sanayicileri ve Isadamlari Dernegi (TUSIAD).

Karasar N 2007. *Bilimsel arastirma yontemi (kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler),* Ankara: Nobel Yayin Dagitim.

Kyvik, S 2013. Academic workload and working time: Retrospective perceptions versus time-series data. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 67(1): 2–14.

Leisyte L, Dee JR 2012. Understanding academic work in a changing institutional environment. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research,* 27: 123-206.

Majzub, Rohaty Mohd 2012. Perspectives of UKM Newcomers to the Academic Environment of the University. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 59: 357 – 363. From <http://ac.els-cdn.com/S1877042812037342/1-s2.0-S18770428 12037342-main.pdf?_tid=4fe1b82c-24ad-11e4-9fce00000aacb35dandacdnat=1408128931_ 3f7c49353babeae 54c76948ebfd9753d> (Retrieved on 10 August 2014).

Mugla University 2009. Official Home Page of Mugla University. From <http://akbis.mu.edu.tr> (Retrieved on 7 July 2009).

Murat G, Cevik EI 2008. Ic paydas olarak akademik personel memnuniyetini etkileyen faktorlerin analizi: Zonguldak Karaelmas Universitesi ornegi, *ZKU Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi,* 4(8): 1-18.

Nixon J, Marks A, Roland S, Walker M 2001. Towards, a new academic professionalism: A manifesto of hope. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 22(2): 227-244.

Osakwe R 2014. Factors affecting motivation and job satisfaction of academic staff of universities in South-South Geopolitical Zone of Nigeria, *International Education Studies,* 7(7): 43-51.

Paksoy HM 2007. Universitelerde akademik personelin is memnuniyeti: Harran Universitesi ornegi, *Selcuk Universitesi Karaman I.I.B.F. Dergisi,* 12(9): 138-151.

Pamukkale University 2009. Official Home Page of Pamukkale University. From <http://www. pau.edu.tr/Pau30/tanitim.aspx?tID=2> (Retrieved on 1 July 2009).

Simsek S, Akgemci T, Celik A 2001. *Davranis bilimlerine giris ve orgutlerde davranis,* Ankara: Nobel Yayinlari, Yayin No: 56.

Turk Egitim-Sen 2009. *Turkiye'de universite sorunu ve universite calisanlari uzerine bir arastirma*, (Vedat bilgin (araþtirma yoneticisi) ve digerleri), Ankara.

Usak University 2009. Official Home Page of Usak University. From <http://www.usak.edu.tr> (Retrieved on 1 July 2009).

Vroom VH 1964. *Work and Motivation.* New York: Wiley.