

Full Length Research Paper

Opinions of the academic and management staff concerning administrative expectations: Sampling of Aegean Region of Turkey

Ali Riza Erdem

Education Faculty, Pamukkale University, Kınıklı Campus, Denizli /Turkey. E-mail: arerdem@gmail.com.
Tel: (0258) 2961137.Fax: (0258) 2961200.

Accepted 13 December, 2010

The academic and management staff while dealing with activities to perform the functions of the university also wishes their administrative expectations to be filled out by the university itself since such awareness of the university to consider the academic staff's expectations are assumed to surely maximize the staff's performance and contribution of institutional targets and duties of the university. The purpose of this study is to clarify the opinions of the academic and management staff concerning effects of the realization level of their administrative expectations on their performance (The sampling of the Aegean Region). The data of the study was collected through specifically developed poll, including 1121 people of sampling in Adnan Menderes University, Dokuz Eylül University, Muğla University, Pamukkale University and Uşak University. Among the participants of the poll, there was 620 academic and 501 management staff. According to the findings of the study, the opinions of the academic and management staff in the sampling of the poll are "never" for administrative expectations while for the level of realization of these expectations "mostly" and for the effect of the realization of these expectations on their performance "negatively affecting".

Key words: The university, academic and management staff, administrative expectations, performance.

INTRODUCTION

As an academic institution, duties of the university are (1) education and training (2) scientific studies and (3) social services and while another vital responsibility of it is training the professionally required individuals by the society itself. In that way, the universities which are primarily in such a service via vocational training are named as "Mass education universities" via training services in bachelor's and two-year degrees. Meanwhile, universities are also supposed to contribute scientific branches to development through "fundamental" and "practical" projects, announcing the obtained results in form of reports, articles or book to who are primarily concerned with.

As for the searching universities, they often perform the duty of "scientific search" through post-graduate education service. Another responsibility of the university is to enlighten the society, making contribution to the development of democracy and sharing its intellectual accumulation with the society itself concerning its

acquisitions of the republic (Doğramacı, 2000; Gürüz et al., 1994; Erdem, 2005; 2006; Arimoto, 2007; Aslan, 2007; Gasset, 2009). As a result, it is an undeniable fact that these missions undertaken by the university are heavily executed by the academic staff while the administration staffs provide its technical and administrative support to the academic staff.

In order to perform its social-service and level possible, education and training responsibility at the maximum university management is supposed to be aware of expectations of the academic and administration staff from the management itself and to try its best to make these expectations real. In addition, it should be noted that the expectations may be ranging from social and administrative to individualistic or academic ones, and it is vital that the more these expectations are met by the university management, the more dedication the academic and administration staff will exhibit to perform the duties of the university.

The expectation and importance of the academic and administrative staff's expectations

Vroom describes the term "expectation" as a temporary belief in a specific action which will end with a specific aim. In this term, the "expectation" can also be seen as the opinion of someone whether a specific end will come true or not. The roots of the expectation theories date back to the studies of Kurt Lewin and Edward Tolman in the 1930s and 1940s. Based on the model, individuals are ones who could judge and reason and they tend to make intentional choices consistent with their current future treatments. The requirement/content theories related to motivation, on the other hand, heavily focus on the necessities that are assumed to drive human characteristics and these theories mostly argue the notion that the lack of these necessities or the desire to meet them will surely drive the behavior in certain ways. Some researchers, on the other hand, have argued that the existence of human requirements will not be proficient in starting out the intended behavior and, as the result of such a behavior, the individual will also have to get an expectation that this behavior will also reach the target in meeting the requirement, by which they felt obliged to develop motivation theories based on this argument. Among them, "The Expectation Theory" put forward by Victor H. Vroom has established a large credibility and over time Vroom's model was developed further and converted into a detailed model by Porter and Lawler (Davis, 1982; Gifford and Hine, 1997; Şimşek, Akgemci and Çelik, 2001; Goss and Hyness, 2005; Anık, 2007).

While performing a number of activities to fulfill the university's functions, the academic and administrative staff would also wish their managerial expectations to be realized by the university he works for. In other words, there are mutual expectations between the academic and administrative staff as the labor side and the university itself, as an institution. In that way, the expectations of the university from the academic and administrative staff are officially enlisted by the constitution, as well as laws, official codes, instructions and some circulars. Thus, the academic and administrative staffs which are employed by the university are supposed to be aware and accept all these official statutes. However, too much surprise, there exist no headline for the managerial expectations of these two staffs from the university. Nevertheless, it has become an undeniable fact that satisfaction of managerial expectations of the academic and administrative staff from the university management will mean maximum contribution possible to institutional responsibilities of the university itself.

The problem sentence and sub-problems

The problem sentence and sub-problems are underlining the views of the academic and administrative staff in the

university concerning effects of the realization level of their administrative expectations on their performance (The sampling of the Aegean Region). Here are the sub-problems involved:

- (1) What are the opinions of the academic and administrative staff concerning the their (a) managerial expectations (b) the realization level of their managerial expectations (c) and effects of these managerial expectations on their performance
- (2) Among the academic and administrative office, is there any meaningful discrepancy between (a) their managerial expectations (b) their realization level of their managerial expectations (c) their opinions concerning the effects of these managerial expectations on their performance based on their (i) genders (ii) age (iii) marital status (iv) educational status (v) years in service (vi) their occupations (vii) status (viii) the university.

METHODS

In maintenance of this study, the general scanning method was used which usually aims to describe a current or past situation without touching its originality (Karasar, 2007). The study, in this respect, should be considered a descriptive research whose universe is comprised of 8647 academic staff and 6655 administrative staff total 15302 staff employed in the Aegean Region: Adnan Menderes University, Afyon Kocatepe University, Celal Bayar University, Dokuz Eylül University, Muğla University, Pamukkale University and Uşak University (ADÜ, 01.07.2009; AKÜ, 01.07.2009; CBÜ, 01.07.2009; DEÜ, 2009; MÜ, 01.07.2009; PAÜ, 01.07.2009; UÜ, 01.07.2009). It should also be noted that, while pinpointing the universities under study, universities were subject to three criteria: the established ones (Dokuz Eylül University) and the promising ones (Adnan Menderes University, Celal Bayar University, Muğla University and Pamukkale University) and the newly founded ones (Uşak University). As it was improbable to reach the whole of the study universities, the samples representing it were chosen. Meanwhile, the academic and administrative staff consisting of the major sampling of the study was pinpointed by the plying sampling method which refers to divide the universe into several sub-sections from which the samples were chosen thanks to simple sampling way (Arıkan, 2004; Balcı, 2007). Meanwhile, the sampling of the study is made up of 1121 staff, 620 of whom are academic staffs and 501 of whom are administrative staffs.

The data was piled up through a pool in likert type and the means of measure is comprised of two sections. The first one includes general knowledge while the second section involved 10 terms that pinpoint managerial expectations of the academic and administrative staff from the university. The pool also consists of 3 episodes which refer to the academic and administrative staff's expectations for the general knowledge of: (a) managerial expectations, (b) the level of realization of these expectations (c) effects of the level of realization of these expectations on my performance. As for the options for the episodes concerning the managerial expectations, they are as in the following (1) never (2) sometimes (3) mostly (4) Always. Concerning the level of the realization of managerial expectations, the options are: (1) never (2) sometimes (3) mostly (4) Always. When it comes to the answer options concerning the effects of managerial expectations on my performance, they are (1) affecting negatively (2) no effect (3) affecting positively. The level interval for the terms in the scale was found through n-1 (Table 1).

Table 1. Level intervals for the terms the scale.

Dimension	Level interval	Level of agreement
Managerial expectations	1.00-1.75	Never
	1.76-2.50	Sometimes
	2.51-3.25	Mostly
	3.26-4.00	Always
Level of realization of managerial expectations	1.00-1.75	Never
	1.76-2.50	Sometimes
	2.51-3.25	Mostly
	3.26-4.00	Always
Effects of the level of managerial expectations on their performance	1.00-1.66	Negatively affecting
	1.67-2.33	No effect
	2.34-3.00	Positively affecting

Table 2. Findings concerning the credibility of the means of measure.

Dimension	Question no	Level of expectation	Level of realization of the expectation	Effects of the realization on the performance	Total
Managerial expectations	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10	0.91	0.93	0.95	0.92

The scale developed by researcher for content validity was submitted for comments of nine study specialists and one language expert. Meanwhile, the credibility of the pool was tested via Cronbach Alpha and Guttman Split-half techniques while the credibility was 0.92. Meanwhile the credibility of the means of measure is indicated, based on sub-dimension, on the Table 2.

In the analysis of the data piled up by means of data collection, the statistical program of SPSS was used so as to obtain answers for the sub-matters of the study, a number of descriptive terms and techniques were utilized such as the frequency, percentage, arithmetical average, standard deviation. In addition, because the means of the measure used was both equal to interval and dispersion of measures concerning the related variations (academic expectations), it was meaningfully normal, while some parametrical and statistical techniques, such as t-test and variance analysis, were utilized.

FINDINGS

Findings concerning the first sub-problem

Here are the findings, in three headlines, concerning the first sub-problem

(a) Views of the academic and administrative staff concerning their managerial expectations from the university: Opinions of the academic and administrative staff in university concerning their managerial expectations are "never", and the opinions of the academic and administrative staff concerning their managerial expectations are "always" (3.2%), "mostly" (5.6%), "sometimes" (20.3 and "never" (67.3%). Therefore, it should be noted that the "never" (67.3%) is, in fact, critical in that it shows

they are not expecting the managerial expectations written down on the list of the pool terms. In this respect, the opinions of the academic and administrative staff concerning their managerial expectations would be found (Table 3). Based on arithmetical average, the first three managerial expectations of the academic and administrative staff concerns is orderly as follows: "managerial care for my personal problems", "managerial care for my administrative problems" and "leadership of the management for the society".

(b) Opinions of the academic and administrative staff concerning the realization level of their managerial expectations: Opinions of the academic and administrative staff concerning the realization level of their managerial expectations are "mostly" concerning the opinions of the academic and administrative staff about the realization level of their managerial expectations are "always" (26%), "mostly" (33.4%), "sometimes" (20.7%) and "never" (12.8%). It should be noted that the choice of "mostly" is highly meaningful because it indicates that the academic and administrative staff do believe, that their managerial expectations mentioned in the poll are mostly realized by the university management. In Table 4, the opinions of the academic and administrative staff concerning the realization level of their managerial expectations would be found.

Based on arithmetical average of the opinions of academic and administrative staff concerning the level of realization of their expectations, the first three realized expectations are orderly as follows: "Managerial care for my personal problems", "existence of an objective system in performance evaluation" and "applying to my opinions

Table 3. Opinions of the academic and administrative staff concerning their managerial expectations.

Order no.	Question no.	The pool question	Mean	Standard deviation	Meaning
1	8	Managerial care for my personal problems	2.19	1.12	Sometimes
2	9	Managerial care for my administrative problems	1.73	0.92	
3	4	Leadership of the management for the society	1.64	0.87	Never
4	6	Solution efforts of the management for managerial problems	1.59	0.85	
5	5	Sensitivity of the management for managerial problems	1.57	0.84	
6	1	Applying to my opinions concerning problems including me	1.53	0.85	
7	10	Objective criteria for the awards and punishment	1.52	0.88	
8	2	Existence of an objective system in performance evaluation	1.51	0.85	
9	7	Existence of an objective system in appointment	1.49	0.86	
10	3	Healthy communication with my exclusives	1.40	0.71	

Table 4. Opinions of the academic and administrative staff concerning the realization level of their managerial expectations.

Order no.	Question no.	The pool question	Mean	Standard deviation	Meaning
1	8	Managerial care for my personal problems	3.10	0.95	Mostly
2	2	Existence of an objective system in performance evaluation	3.09	1.00	
3	1	Applying to my opinions concerning problems including me	3.01	0.97	Sometimes
4	10	Objective criteria for the awards and punishment	2.90	1.01	
5	7	Existence of an objective system in appointment	2.89	0.97	
6	9	Managerial care for my administrative problems	2.84	0.94	
7	6	Solution efforts of the management for managerial problems	2.75	0.91	
8	4	Leadership of the management for the society	2.74	0.94	
9	5	Sensitivity of the management for managerial problems	2.71	0.93	
10	3	Healthy communication with my exclusives	2.40	0.96	

concerning problems including me".

(c) Opinions of the academic and administrative staff in universities concerning the effect of realization level of their managerial expectations on their performance: Opinions of the academic and administrative staff in universities concerning the effect of realization level of their managerial expectations on their performance are "affecting negatively". Opinions of the academic and administrative staff in universities concerning the effect of realization level of their managerial expectations on their performance are "affecting positively (24. %)", "no effect (20.3%) and "affecting negatively (47.2%)". The fact that the academic and administrative staff does declare the opinion of "affecting negatively" concerning the effect of the realization level of their expectations on their performance is critical because it clearly indicates that the "mostly" realized managerial expectations do affect their performance negatively and such a case is not functional indeed. In Table 5, the opinions of the academic and administrative staff concerning the effect of realization level of their managerial expectations on their performance would be found.

Of all managerial expectations which are realized based on the arithmetical average of the opinions of the academic and administrative staff concerning the realization level of their managerial expectations, the first three expectations are orderly: "Existence of an objective system in performance evaluation", "existence of an objective system in appointment" and "applying to my opinions concerning problems including me".

Findings as to the second sub-problem

Here are the 8 headlines concerning the findings as to the second sub-problem

1. Based on the gender: In the study, there is meaningful difference, based on their gender, about the opinions of the academic and administration staffs concerning the effect of realization level of their managerial expectations on their performance as well as their opinions about the managerial expectations.

According to Table 6, the level of managerial expectations of men in the university management is higher

Table 5. The opinions of the academic and administrative staff concerning the effect of realisation level of their managerial expectations on their performance.

Order no.	Question no.	The pool question	Mean	Standard deviation	Meaning
1	2	Existence of an objective system in performance evaluation	1.96	0.92	
2	7	Existence of an objective system in appointment	1.89	0.91	
3	1	Applying to my opinions concerning problems including me	1.88	0.95	
4	10	Objective criteria for the awards and punishment	1.87	0.90	
5	8	Managerial care for my personal problems	1.81	0.83	No effect
6	9	Managerial care for my administrative problems	1.80	0.87	
7	6	Solution efforts of the management for managerial problems	1.77	0.85	
8	5	Sensitivity of the management for managerial problems	1.74	0.84	
9	4	Leadership of the management for the society	1.70	0.81	
10	3	Healthy communication with my exclusives	1.60	0.84	Affecting negatively

Table 6. The difference of opinions managerial expectations released based on the gender of the academic and administrative staff and concerning realization level of these expectations and effect of realisation level of the managerial expectations on their performance.

Dimension	Sexuality	N	Mean	Standard deviation	t	Sig.(2-tailed)
Managerial expectations	Woman	422	1.49	0.60	-2.650	0.008*
	Man	664	1.60	0.71		
Realisation level of their managerial expectations	Woman	409	2.69	0.82	-1.308	0.191
	Man	632	2.76	0.84		
Effect of realization level of managerial expectations on performance	Woman	401	1.74	0.75	0.061	0.951
	Man	626	1.73	0.74		

*p < 0.05

than ones of women

2. Based on the age: In the study, there exist no meaningful difference between the age, about the opinions of the academic and administrative staff concerning the effect of realisation level of their managerial expectations on their performance because the value "p" is below 0.05.

According to Table 7, there exists a meaningful difference about the opinions of the academic and administrative staff concerning the effect of realisation level of their managerial expectations on their performance because the value "p" is below 0.05.

According to Table 8, opinions of the academic and administrative staff, based on age, concerning the effect of the realisation level of their managerial expectations indicate a dispersal between 1.56 to 1.80 and the most affected group, based on the age of academic and administrative staff in universities, is the one of 60 and over 60 years old while the least affected group is made up of 50 to 59 years old.

3. Based on the marital status: According to the study,

there exist no meaningful difference between the opinions concerning the managerial expectations of the academic and administrative staff in universities, based on their marital status, and realization level of their expectations and the effect of these expectations on their performance (Table 9).

4. Based on the educational status: According to the study, there exist a meaningful difference between the managerial expectations, based on their educational status of the academic and administrative staff and realization level of these expectations and effect of the realization level of these expectations on performance.

According to Table 10, the difference between the averages is meaningful because the value "p" is lower than 0.05 in terms of opinions, based on their educational status, of the academic and administrative staff concerning managerial expectations.

According to Table 11, opinions of the academic and administrative staff, based on their educational status, concerning the managerial expectations indicate a distribution between 0.88 and 1.63. According to the study,

Table 7. The difference based on the age, about the opinions of the academic and administration staff concerning the managerial expectations, realization level of these expectations and effect of realization level of their managerial expectations on their performance (variance analysis).

Dimension	Source of the variance	df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F	Sig.
Managerial expectations	Between groups	4	2.319	0.580	0.991	0.412
	Within groups	1081	632.625	0.585		
	Total	1085	634.944			
Realization level of their managerial expectations	Between groups	4	9.900	2.475	2.361	0.052
	Within groups	1036	1086.251	1.049		
	Total	1040	1096.152			
Effect of realization level of managerial expectations on performance	Between groups	4	10.136	2.534	3.385	0.009*
	Within groups	1022	765.076	0.749		
	Total	1026	775,212			

*p <0.05

Table 8. Based on the age, opinions of the academic and administration staff concerning the effect of the realization level of the managerial expectations on their performance.

Age	N	Mean	Standard deviation
20–29	302	1.64	0.82
30–39	420	1.84	0.88
40–49	255	1.64	0.86
50–59	45	1.56	0.90
60 and over	5	1.80	1.09

Table 9. The difference between the opinions concerning the managerial expectations of the academic and administration staff in universities, based on their marital status, and realization level of their expectations and the effect of these expectations on their performance (variance analysis).

Dimension	Source of the variance	df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F	Sig.
Managerial expectations	Between groups	3	1.833	0.611	1.044	0.372
	Within groups	1082	633.112	0.585		
	Total	1085	634.944			
Realization level of their managerial expectations	Between groups	3	6.165	2.055	1.955	0.119
	Within groups	1037	1089.986	1.051		
	Total	1040	1096.152			
Effect of realization level of managerial expectations on performance	Between groups	3	2.432	1.477	3.385	0.118
	Within groups	1023	770.780	0.753		
	Total	1026	775,212			

p <0.05

the group of ones who have got most expectations is made up of secondary school graduates while the group of ones who have got least expectations is comprised of

primary school graduates.

As shown in Table 10, there exists a meaningful difference, based on the educational status, between the

Table 10. The difference between the opinions concerning the managerial expectations, based on their educational status, of the academic staff and realization level of these expectations and effect of the realization level of these expectations on performance (variance analysis).

Dimension	Source of the variance	df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F	Sig.
Managerial expectations	Between groups	6	9.150	1.525	2.629	0.016*
	Within groups	1079	625.795	0.580		
	Total	1085	634.944			
Realization level of their managerial expectations	Between groups	6	25.400	4.233	4.088	0.000*
	Within groups	1034	1070.751	1.036		
	Total	1040	1096.152			
Effect of realization level of managerial expectations on performance	Between groups	6	35.298	5.883	8.110	0.000*
	Within groups	1020	739.913	0.725		
	Total	1026	775.212			

*p <0.05

Table 11. Opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on the educational status, about the managerial expectations.

Educational status	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Primary school	9	0.88	0.26
Secondary school	19	1.63	0.68
High school	126	1.39	0.79
pre-licence degree	125	1.61	1.04
Lecence degree	258	1.39	0.74
Post-graduation	199	1.37	0.72
Doctoral degree	350	1.37	0.67

Table 12. Opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on their educational status, concerning the realization level of the managerial expectations.

Educational status	N	Mean	Standart deviation
Primary school	9	1.68	0.95
Secondary school	17	2.47	0.87
High school	114	2.51	1.15
pre-licence degree	118	2.87	1.17
Lecence degree	246	2.71	1.01
Post-graduation	193	2.85	0.92
Doctoral degree	344	2.85	0.96

opinions of the academic and administration staff concerning the realization of the managerial expectations because the value "p" is lower than 0.05.

According to Table 12, opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on their education status, concerning the realization level of the managerial expectations indicate a distribution between 1.68 and 2.87. Meanwhile, according to the study, the group of ones whose managerial expectations have been realized at most is made up of ones of pre-licence graduates while

the group of ones whose managerial expectations have been realized at least is made up of primary school graduates.

As shown in Table 10, there exist meaningful differences in averages, based on their educational status, about the effect of realisation level of the managerial expectations on their performance because the value "p" is lower than 0.05.

As shown in Table 13, opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on educational status,

Table 13. Opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on educational status, concerning the effect of the realisation level of managerial expectations.

Educational status	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Primary school	9	1.20	0.89
Secondary school	17	1.64	0.78
High school	113	1.41	0.77
pre-licence degree	115	1.75	0.93
Lecence degree	240	1.53	0.80
Post-graduation	190	1.82	0.86
Doctoral degree	344	1.90	0.87

Table 14. The difference in terms of the opinions of academic and administration staff, based on the duration in service, concerning the managerial expectations, realisation level of managerial expectations and the effect of the realization level of managerial expectations on their performance (variance analysis).

Dimension	Source of the variance	df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F	Sig.
Managerial expectations	Between groups	4	5.044	1.261	2.164	0.071
	Within groups	1081	629.900	0.583		
	Total	1085	634.944			
Realisation level of their managerial expectations	Between groups	4	4.173	1.043	0.990	0.0412
	Within groups	1036	1091.979	1.054		
	Total	1040	1096.152			
Effect of on realization level of managerial expectations performance	Between groups	4	5.408	1.352	1.795	0.128
	Within groups	1022	769.804	0.753		
	Total	1026	775.212			

p <0.05

concerning the effect of the realisation level of managerial expectations indicate a distribution of between 1.20 and 1.90. Of all the academic and administration staff in the university, based on educational status, concerning the effect of realization level of managerial expectation, the most affected group includes graduates of doctoral education while the least affected group is comprised of primary school graduates.

5. Based on the duration in service: There exist no meaningful difference in terms of the opinions of academic and administration staff, based on the duration in service, concerning the realization level of managerial expectations and effect of the realization level of managerial expectations on their performance (Table 14).

6. Based on the duty: There exist a meaningful difference in terms of the opinions of academic and administration staff, based on their duties, concerning the managerial expectations and effect of the realization level of the managerial expectations on their performance; however, there exist no meaningful difference about their opinions concerning the effect of the realisation level of the managerial expectations.

As shown in Table 15, based on their opinions about the managerial expectations the administration staff does have higher expectations compared to the academic staff, and the academic staffs, concerning the effect of the realisation level of the managerial expectations on their performance, are affected more heavily than the administration staff.

7. Based on the status: According to the study, there exist a clear difference, based on the status, concerning the opinions of the academic and the administration staff about the managerial expectations, and the effect of realisation level of the managerial expectations on performance; however, a meaningful difference about the realisation level of the managerial expectations does not exist.

As shown in Table 16, there exist a meaningful difference between the averages, based on the status, concerning the managerial expectations of the academic and administration staff the value "p" is lower than 0.05.

As shown in Table 17, opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on the status, concerning the managerial expectations indicate a dispersion between

Table 15. The difference of the opinions of the academic and administration staff based on their duties, concerning the managerial expectations, the realisation level of the managerial expectations and the effect of the realisation level of the managerial expectations on performance.

Dimension	Sex	N	Mean	Standard deviation	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Managerial expectations	Academic staff	609	1.36	0.66	-2.330	0.020*
	Administration staff	477	1.47	0.86		
Realization level of their managerial expectations	Academic staff	595	2.79	0.94	.910	0.363
	Administration staff	446	2.73	1.12		
Effect of on realization level of managerial expectations performance	Academic staff	595	1.82	0.88	4.331	0.000*
	Administration staff	432	1.58	0.83		

*p <0.05

Table 16. The difference about the opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on their status, concerning the managerial expectations, realization of the managerial expectations and effect of the realization level of the managerial expectations on performance (variance analysis).

Dimension	Source of the variance	df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F	Sig.
Managerial expectations	Between groups	11	11.709	1.064	1.834	0.044*
	Within groups	1074	623.235	0.580		
	Total	1085	634.944			
Realisation level of their managerial expectations	Between groups	11	11.015	1.001	0.950	0.492
	Within groups	1029	1085.137	1.055		
	Total	1040	1096.152			
Effect of on realization level of managerial expectations performance	Between groups	11	21.147	1.922	2.588	0.003*
	Within groups	1015	754.065	0.743		
	Total	1026	775,212			

*p <0.05

1.26 and 1.66 and the study suggest that professors make up the group whose managerial expectations are at peak while head of departments comprise the group whose managerial expectations are at least.

As shown in Table 16, there exist meaningful differences between the averages, based on the status, concerning the effect of realization level of the managerial expectations because the value "p" is lower than 0.05.

As shown in Table 18, opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on their status, concerning the effect of realization level of the managerial expectations on performance indicate dispersion between 1.32 and 1.88. According to the study, based on their status, research assistants make up the group whose performance is affected at most concerning the effect of the

realisation level of managerial expectations on their performance, while assistant personnel are located in the group whose performance is affected at least based on the realisation level of managerial expectations.

8. Based on the university: According the study, there exist no meaningful difference about the opinions of the academic and administration staff their opinions the managerial expectations, there exist a meaningful difference concerning the realization level of the managerial expectations and the effect of the realization level of the managerial expectations on their performance.

As shown in Table 19, there exist meaningful differences of averages based on the university, in terms of their opinions concerning the realization level of the managerial expectations because the value "p" is lower

Table 17. Opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on the status, concerning the managerial expectations.

Status	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Professor	59	1.66	0.83
Assoc. Prof	49	1.48	0.81
Assist. Prof	181	1.32	0.60
Instructor	84	1.30	0.62
Lecturer	44	1.32	0.82
Research assistant	178	1.32	0.59
Specialist	31	1.41	0.71
Head of department	13	1.26	0.65
Chief	37	1.32	0.66
Officer	275	1.52	0.92
Technic staff	99	1.40	0.80
Assistant personal	36	1.43	0.87

Table 18. Opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on their status, concerning the effect of realization level of the managerial expectations on performance.

Status	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Professor	57	1.77	0.87
Assoc. Prof	48	1.82	0.86
Assist. Prof	178	1.86	0.87
Instructor	80	1.88	0.88
Lecturer	41	1.40	0.89
Research assistant	177	1.82	0.87
Specialist	31	1.67	0.90
Head of department	13	1.56	0.70
Chief	34	1.58	0.81
Officer	247	1.62	0.84
Technic staff	88	1.67	0.88
Assistant personal	33	1.32	0.69

than 0.05.

As shown in Table 20, opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on the university they are employed, concerning the realization level of the managerial expectations indicate dispersion between 2.57 and 2.94. The study also maintains that the staff in the University of Muğla remain the group whose managerial expectations have been, so far, realized at most whereas the University of Afyon Kocatepe remain the group whose managerial expectations have been, so far, realized at least.

As shown in Table 19, there exist a meaningful variation in averages, based on the university they are employed, because the value "p" is lower than 0.05 concerning the opinions of the academic and administration staff about the effect of the realization level of managerial expectations on performance.

As shown in Table 21, opinions of the academic and

administration staff, based on the university they are employed, concerning the realisation of the managerial expectations indicate a dispersion of between 1.61 and 1.93. The study also puts forward the reality that the staff in the University Muğla remains the group whose performance has been affected at most by the realisation level of the managerial expectations while the staff in Adnan Menderes University remains the group whose performance has been affected at least by the realisation level of the managerial expectations.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The two third of the attendants have declared "never" concerning the managerial expectations of the academic and administration staff. As for the realization level of such managerial expectations, the academic and

Table 19. The difference about the the difference about the opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on the university, concerning the managerial expectations, realization of the managerial expectations and effect of the realization level of the managerial expectations on performance (variance analysis).

Dimension	Source of the variance	df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F	Sig.
Managerial expectations	Between groups	6	5.231	0.872	1.920	0.074
	Within groups	1079	489.614	0.454		
	Total	1085	494.845			
Realization level of their managerial expectations	Between groups	6	13.705	2.284	3.317	0.003*
	Within groups	1034	712.051	0.689		
	Total	1040	725.756			
Effect of on realization level of managerial expectations performance	Between groups	6	12.899	2.150	3.890	0.001*
	Within groups	1020	563.618	0.553		
	Total	1026	576.517			

Table 20. Opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on the university they are employed, concerning the realization level of their managerial expectations.

University	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Adnan Menderes University	176	2.74	0.86
Afyon Kocatepe University	228	2.57	0.85
Celal Bayar University	88	2.70	0.90
Dokuz Eylül University	136	2.87	0.85
Muğla University	104	2.94	0.76
Pamukkale University	245	2.70	0.80
Uşak University	64	2.80	0.67

Table 21. Opinions of the academic and administration staff, based on the university they are employed, concerning the effect of the realization level of managerial expectations on performance.

University	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Adnan Menderes University	175	1.61	0.75
Afyon Kocatepe University	229	1.62	0.70
Celal Bayar University	84	1.77	0.82
Dokuz Eylül University	134	1.87	0.79
Muğla University	103	1.93	0.73
Pamukkale University	238	1.78	0.73
Uşak University	64	1.69	0.61

administration staffs have heavily declared “mostly”.

Concerning the opinions of the academic and administration staff about the effect of the realisation level of the managerial expectations on performance, they declare “negatively affecting”. The conclusion obtained by the study is abstracted in Table 22.

According to these results, it is clear that while the academic and administration staffs declare not to usually have any expectations concerning the managerial expectations, their expectations are mostly realized but anyway

the case is obvious to affect them in a negative way. In the analysis of opinions of the academic and administration staff, concerning the managerial expectations, realization level of the managerial expectations and the effect of the realization level of the managerial expectations on performance, the following facts were reached:

(1) Based on the sex, while managerial expectations of men academic and administration staff are higher than

Table 22. Opinions of the academic and administration staff concerning levels of managerial expectations, realisation level these expectations and effect of the managerial expectations on performance.

Level of the expectation	Percentage of the expectation (%)				Relisation level of the expectation (%)				Effect of the realisation level on performance (%)		
	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Never	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Never	Affective positively	Non-effective	Affecting negatively
Managerial expectation	3.2	5.6	20.8	67.3	26.0	33.4	20.7	12.8	24.0	20.3	47.2

Note: The reason why the percentages are not equal to 100% in total is that the percentages which are lack belong to ones who did not respond to the study; namely, they are not noticed in the study.

women, there exist no differences in the other two sections.

(2) Compared to the age, the groups of 60+ are affected more heavily than the group of 50 to 59 years old in terms of merely the effect of the realisation level of the managerial expectations on performance.

(3) There are meaningful differences between secondary school and primary school graduates on behalf of the former party. Thus, the effect of the realization level of the managerial expectations on performance is comparatively seen on ones whose education status are high than ones not.

(4) Concerning their responsibilities, the administration staffs do have higher level of managerial expectations than the academic staff, while the effect of realization level of the managerial expectations on performance is more heavily seen on the academic staff than the latter group.

(5) Compared to the level of managerial expectations depending on their status, it is obvious that the most important difference is seen on behalf of the professors and the head of depertmants. Concerning the effect of the realisation level of the managerial expectations on performance, the most important meaningful difference is seen, on behalf of the lecturer, a gap between lecturers and the assistant personnel. (6) Considering the university they are employed, the level of realisation

of managerial expectations is remarkably higher in the the University of Muğla while this rate courses in the lowest level in Afyon Kocatepe University. Meanwhile the effect of the realisation level of managerial expectations on performance is mostly seen in Muğla University, while is seen at least in The University of Adnan Menderes.

According to the findings obtained from the study, the following points are essentially advised:

- (1) Personnal problems of the staff should be concerned with.
- (2) Dealing with managerial problems of the staff.
- (3) Concerning the opinions of the staff into consideration in decision-making related to the staff.
- (4) Establishment of an objective system in promoting work.
- (5) Establishment of an objective system in performance evaluation.
- (6) Objective criteria in promoting work.
- (7) Making the university management a pioneer in the eye of the society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This article is a part of the project named as "Opinions of the academic and administration staff concerning their expectations from the University" which was supported by Pamukkale University Unit of BAP (Scientific Reserch Project), with

credit nr 2007 EĞTF 001

REFERENCES

- Anık C (2007). Factors affecting the performance of the instructor. *Bilig*, 43: 133-168.
- Arıkan R (2004). Search techniques and report preperatio. Asil Publishing. Ankara.
- Arimoto A (2007). Case Study: Trends in Higher Education and Academic Reforms from 1994 onwards in Japan. Retrieved July 15, 2007 from <http://www.chet.org.za/papers/Japan.doc>
- Aslan H (2007). Role of the university in development. Newspaper of Yeni Asır.
- Balcı A (2007). Search in social science (Way, Techniques and principles). 6th edition. Ankara: PEGEMA Publishing.
- Davis K (1982). Human behavior in organization. (Translations: by headed Kemal Tosun, Tomris Somay, Fulya Aykar, Can Baysal, Ömer Sadullah and Semra Yalçın). İstanbul: İstanbul University. Publishing No. 3028.
- Doğramacı I (2000). Rector election today and appointment crisis (Wiev to the higher educationin Turkey and the world). Ankara: Meteksan. Retrieved April 21, 2002 from www.dogramaci.org/r-bol5.html
- Erdem AR (2005). The reason for existence of university. Pamukkale University J. Educ. Fac., 17: 104-116.
- Erdem AR (2006). Change in higher education in the world. Selçuk University J. Soc. Sci. Inst. 15: 299-314.
- Gasset J O (2009). Mission of the university. Transaction Publishers. New Brunswick. New Jersey
- Gifford R, Hine DW (1997). Toward cooperation in commons dilemmas. *Canadian J. Behav. Sci.* 29(3): 167-178
- Goss Y, Hynes GE (2005). Strageies for successful repatriation. *J. Int. Bus. Real.* 4(1): 97-109
- Gürüz K (Editor), Şuhubi E A M, Şengör C, Türker K, Yurtsever E (1994). Higher education, science and technology in Turkey and ther world. İstanbul: Turkish Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association (TÜSİAD).

Karasar N (2007). Scientific searchy method (concepts, principles, techniques). Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Şimşek Ş, Akgemci T, Çelik A (2001). Entry to the behavior science and behavior in Organization. Ankara: Nobel Publishing, No. 56.