Teachers and School Administrators on Public Service Motivation and their Relationship with Work Ethic Attitudes [*]

İnayet Aydın [1], Nihan Demirkasımoğlu [2], Tuğba Güner Demir [3], Özge Erdemli [4]

Abstract

The aim of this study was to determine the views of primary and secondary school teachers and school administrators from different generations related to public service motivation and work ethics attitudes in terms of various variables and the relationship between public service motivation and work ethics. The research was carried out with single and relational survey models, which are quantitative research methods. A total of 384 teachers and 370 school administrators were included in the two-sample stratified design. Data of the study was collected with the "Public Service Motivation Scale" and "Work Ethics Scale" developed by the researchers. The Public Service Motivation scale consists of three dimensions as "commitment to the public interest", "public awareness" and "responsibility towards society", while the Work Ethics scale consists of two subscales as "study orientation" and "pleasure orientation". According to the results, public school teachers and school administrators have a high level of public service motivation. In the teachers' and school administrators' work ethics attitudes, Work-oriented attitudes were more dominant than pleasure-oriented tendencies. Lastly, there is a relationship between the public service motivations of teachers and school administrators and their work ethics attitudes. According to this, as the teachers' "being work-oriented" values strengthen, their "public service motivation" increases and as their "being pleasure-oriented" values strengthen, their public service motivations decrease. To this end, it would be useful to organize trainings for teachers and administrators to develop their awareness related to the values and obligations of public service. In addition, future study, which examines the views of public and private school teachers comparatively, can shed light on how education, which is a public service, resembles or differs from the principles of the public and private sector, which have their own rules.

[1] Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, iaydin@ankara.edu.tr
[2] Hacettepe University, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, nihansal@yahoo.com
[3] Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, tugbaguner87@gmail.com
[4] Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, ozge.erdemli8787@gmail.com

Introduction

Working in the public sector is becoming more and more important for many people because the public sector offers certain advantages to the public officers and the public officers value serving for the common good. Rainey (1982), Perry and Wise (1990) who found out that those who work in the public sector are less interested in wage incentives have stated that public workers wish to serve the public comes to the fore and have come up with the public service motivation (PSM) concept.

The concept of the "public service ideal", which is as old as the history of philosophy, was first seen in Aristotle's "Politics" and Plato's "State". It is defined as giving priority to public service by putting the personal interests of the public service provider aside. Although the meanings attributed to public service have changed according to different ideologies and countries in the historical process, the emphasis on keeping the social interest in the foreground in public services has not changed (Ökmen & Demir, 2010). Onar, the founder of public service theory in Turkey, defines public service as "continuous and orderly activities offered to the public in order to meet and satisfy general and collective needs and to provide public benefit by the state or other public legal entities or under their supervision and control". In addition, public service is defined by Onar (1966) in a narrow sense as "the activities and services of public administrations or institutions within the scope of methods specific to public law and based on the authorities arising from this law" (as cited in Çal, 2009). Although there is no legal definition of the concept of public service in Turkish law, it is possible to define public service as the practices carried out by the administration to ensure the public interest in the light of Article 39 of the Constitution (Çırakman, 1976). Bozkurt, Ergun, and Sezen (1998, p. 128) define public service as "services provided to the public either by a public institution itself or by a private enterprise under its close supervision". In addition, in order for a service to be considered a public service, it must provide public benefit and be performed by private legal persons under the supervision of public institutions.

There are many factors that differentiate the public service and the market from each other. The first one is the non-use of employment contracts in the employment of the workforce to be employed in the public service. For this reason, those who will take charge in the public service are employed with the title of a public officer, which is a common title. Thus, the status of the parties in the employment relationship of public officials is documented bylaws instead of parties. Taking part in the public service and demanding it is within the political rights in the Constitution. Compared to private property, the owner has very wide freedom of authority on private property, while public properties have to be used in accordance with the public interest (Karahanoğulları, 2002). For these reasons, and perhaps for reasons that are overlooked here, public officials are thought to have different responsibilities, roles, values and service motives from those who work in the private sector. Prysmakova's (2013) study, which includes 26 European countries in and out of the European Union, is perhaps one of the comprehensive comparative studies on public service motivation. In the research, private sector employees and public officials were compared in terms of whether their reward motivations were internal or external. Turkey, Cyprus and Israel were also included in the research. In the theoretical background of the research, it is assumed that the reasons for preferring public service are individual characteristics such as helping people rather than being economically rich. When the results of the study were examined, it was revealed that there is a positive relationship between the importance attributed to helping people in the public sphere and being a public official.

When the tendency to serve the public is analyzed in terms of the current number of working people, it is possible to say that there is a serious interest in the public sector in Turkey. According to the data dated December 2020 published by the Presidency Strategy and Budget Department in Turkey, the total number of public officials is 3.884.436 (Cumhurbaşkanlığı Strateji ve Bütçe Başkanlığı, 2020). When they are analyzed in terms of their fields of duty, the number of teachers serving as public officials is 942.936 and ranks as the first among other fields (Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 2020). From this point of view, it is possible to assert that teachers in Turkey have a serious amount of share in public service. Therefore, the underlying reason for choosing to serve for public service and its relationship

with work ethics according to teachers and school administrators deserves attention since the public service area involves quite a large number of people in Turkey.

Public Service Motivation

The concept of public service motivation is defined as "the tendency to answer the basic and unique motifs in public institutions and organizations" (Perry, 1996). Vandenabeele (2007) has defined this concept as a system of beliefs, values and attitudes in which organizational interests take precedence over personal interests. In another definition, PSM is expressed as "the motivational force which triggers individuals to display meaningful public services" (for instance, services related to the general public, community and society) (Brewer & Selden 1998, s. 254). In the light of these definitions, it is possible to express PSM as the wish to serve the public by giving priority to the public interest.

In 1982, the expression "public service motivation" was first used to describe a particular type of motivation public service. "Public service motivation" can be expressed as an orientation of people to serve society in order to do good for other people and society. In this context, public service motivation can be found between those working in the public sphere – governments associated with and public interest communities – and people in the private sector (Ökmen & Demir, 2010). According to Perry and Wise (1990) who aimed at forming the theoretical foundations of the concept of PSM, it is influenced by factors such as PSM levels and types of individuals and the motivational composition of workforce in an organization; personal work preferences, work performance and organizational effectiveness. According to the writers, the PSM of individuals is shaped by three basic factors. These have been classified as rational, normative and emotional reasons. Rational reasons consist of participation in the policy determination process, loyalty to public programs and protection of private and personal interests through identification. The wish to serve the public consists of factors that are based on norms such as loyalty to duty and the state as a whole and social equality. Due to their social significance, they are emotional reasons such as feeling loyalty to a program by believing in it from the heart and patriotism. In summary, PSM expresses the wish to serve the public most extensively and loyalty to duty, to the state as a whole and to social equality.

While Perry and Wise (1990) state that PSM is influenced by three different factors as explained above, Simeone (2004) states public service needs to contain nine different components. These are; self-sacrifice, civic duty, commitment to the public interest, compassion, social justice, attraction to public policymaking, economy, efficiency and effectiveness. When these components are evaluated in general, it can be stated that an individual with high PSM is disposed to convey service to other people, sees himself as a trustee of the sovereignty of the state due to the duty he has and thus feels an attraction to public policies.

When the literature is examined, it is seen that the subject of public service motivation has been investigated in various countries and in terms of various variables (Bright, 2005; Camilleri, 2007; Houston, 2000; Kim & Vandenabeele, 2010; Naff & Crum, 1999; Perry, 1996; Prysmakova, 2013). In a study investigating the relationship between public service motivation, personal characteristics, management level and monetary preferences, significant relationships were found between public service motivation, gender, education level and monetary preferences. More specifically, public service motivation was higher in women, those with higher education levels, and administrators (Bright, 2005). In a study by Naff and Crum (1999) on 10000 civil servants working in the United States, it was determined that civil service motivation was higher in female employees. Camilleri (2007), on the other hand, found that male civil servants have higher tendencies of commitment and self-sacrifice to the public interest. It is similar to the results obtained in Camilleri's (2007) study in which he investigated public service motivation in terms of various variables on 3400 Maltese civil servants. The researcher revealed that as individuals rise in the organizational hierarchy, their need to serve the public increases. Therefore, the duties and responsibilities undertaken by employees can also affect public service motivations. While some studies (Camilleri, 2007; Naff & Crum, 1999) reported that seniority did not make a difference in public service motivation, Moynihan and Pandey (2007) revealed that there was a

negative relationship between seniority and public service motivation. Therefore, it is clear that more studies are needed to better investigate the effects of these variables on public service motivation.

Considering the arguments up to now, public service officers are expected to have different roles, responsibilities and values than private-sector employees. When the above components are taken into consideration, it is inevitable that people who give public service have different roles, responsibilities and values compared to private sector workers; because as Houston (2000) expresses as well, the public sector expresses a sense of duty and a calling for duty rather than being an occupation. For instance, Rainey (1982, 1997) in his studies in which he compared the public sector and the private sector, has determined that public workers show greater interest to helping others and doing valuable things compared to the private-sector workers (as cited in Crewson, 1997). Houston (2000) in his study stated that, public workers are motivated based on factors such as sensitivity towards social issues and the wish to serve for the interest of the public, whereas private sector workers are motivated by factors such as high income and shorter working hours; because while the sole aim in the private sector is to gain profit, public organizations have responsibilities such as protecting the best interests of the society (Amundsen & Andrade, 2009).

Public service has an important place in educational institutions as well which is a public area. In Turkey, when 15.189.878 students who go to public schools are taken into consideration (MoNE, 2020), the importance of PSMs of teachers and school administrators who work in educational institutions in the public sector is better understood. Andersen, Heinesen, and Pedersen (2015) analyzed the PSMs and performance of teachers in their study and stated that the increase in the PSMs of teachers positively influences their performance. In addition, studies on teachers show that they are more motivated when they feel largely responsible for the development of the students (Paarlberg, Perry, & Hondeghem, 2008).

Although the wish to serve the public is an important source of motivation, public services need to consist of standards that involve certain values to be effective and productive (Raga & Taylor, 2005). At this point, public service ethics is defined as values that regulate the occupational life or moral behaviors of public workers, with the awareness that they are each a spokesman for a public authority in the workplace or outside the workplace (Dina, 2013). As Beck, Jorgensen, and Bozeman (2007, p. 355, as cited in MacCarthaigh, 2008) expressed as well, ethical values are extremely important in terms of public administration and policies. From this point of view, it is possible to think that there might be an important relationship between PSM and the work ethics of public workers.

Work ethics (WE)

Although the concept of working is an ambiguous and controversial concept that expresses different activities in different societies and historical contexts, it is in general defined as a human endeavor that is goal-oriented (Outhwaite, 2008). Working ethics expresses in general the positive attitudes, values and habits expected from the workers (Brauchle & Azam, 2003).

In the literature of Western origin, it is seen that the subject of WE is dealt with mostly within the scope of Puritan WE theory suggested by Weber (2014) with the purpose of defining people's values and attitudes towards working. Therefore, it is seen that those general definitions in Western literature about WE have a tendency to draw a human portrait who values working hard and who is unerring, honest, hardworking and ascetic (McCortney & Engels, 2003). Puritan ethics is a multi-dimensional concept related to basic values such as hard work, leading a simple life, asceticism, delayed gratification and being thrifty (Firestone, Garza, & Haris, 2005). In the hedonistic culture which gains importance against the Puritan WE, a view that advocates that seeking happiness or gratification by avoiding pain contrary to the Puritan culture and which praises delaying gratification and the virtue of asceticism is prevalent. Therefore, hedonism is an approach that acknowledges that the single good thing in life is "pleasure" and "avoiding pain" (Shaughnessy & Shaughnessy, 2002). From this point of view, the Puritan or hedonist attitudes and tendencies of people influence their attitudes and values towards working and work-life as well and determine the WE approach they acquire.

Several studies on work ethics tested its relationships in terms of various variables. In a study that investigated work ethics in terms of puritan ethical values, it has been determined that women generally have higher puritan ethical values than men (Furnham, 1991; Furnham & Rajamanickam, 1992; Hill, 1997). Meriac, Poling, and Woehr (2009) found that there was no significant difference between the views of men and women on work ethics, in contrast to previous studies, in their study investigating the effect of the gender factor on work ethics. There are also studies in which men internalize puritan ethical values more than women (Wentworth & Chell, 1997). In studies investigating the effect of age variable on work ethics values, it has been found that young people generally accept puritan ethical values more than older individuals (Tang & Tzeng, 1992; Wentworth & Chell, 1997). However, Furnham (1991) concluded that there is no relationship between the puritan work ethic values and the age factor. Tang and Tzeng (1992), who also examined the Puritan work ethic values in terms of education level, found that people with higher education levels adopted puritan ethical values less. Mudrack (1999) focused on puritan work ethic and type A personality traits and found that puritan work ethic values were positively related to type A personality traits. Therefore, variables such as gender, age, generation, duty, and seniority may affect work ethic values.

In studies related to PSM and WE, one of the analyzed variables is the relationship between the work attitudes and behavior of different generations in work life. The term "generation" expresses people who are "born in the same period", "experience history from the perspective of the same period of life" and "individuals being shaped by the period they are born in" (Bickel & Brown, 2005). In this study, Lancaster and Stillman's (2002) "Traditionalist (1946 and earlier), the Baby Boom generation (1946-1964), the X generation (1965-1981), the Millennium-Y generation-Future generation (1982-2000)" classification was adopted.

The X generation holds the status of the primary subject in the modern capitalist world, in free-market economy and in the years in which consumption is encouraged. This generation is known to be sensitive toward social problems, as having high work motivation, respectful to authority and contended (Çetin-Aydın & Başol, 2014). On the other hand, the Y generation is known to have a weaker sense of loyalty, narcissist, individualism and entrepreneurial and represents a generation that is noteworthy for its tendency to consume fast and impatience in reaching goals (Sedrak & Cahill, 2011). Although this classification of generations is shaped in the American sociological literature, it is increasingly used in the fields of business, marketing and public relations in Turkey. 7% of Turkey's population is the silent generation, 19% is the baby boom generation, 22% is the X generation, 35% is the Y generation (Bayhan, 2019).

Perhaps for the first time in history, this many people from different generations are working side by side or in a superior-subordinate relationship in many organizations. Personnel working in organizations belong to different generations and thus their beliefs, attitudes, work values and expectations from work life and the importance they attribute to work may differ concerning this (Aydın, 2016). One of the independent variables tested within the scope of this study being the teachers who belong to the X and Y generations is due to the idea that PSM and WE tendencies of the generations will display a difference as well.

Since the interest in the concept of public service motivation is relatively new, the dynamics that make up the concept are shaped according to the social, cultural and political contexts of the countries, and it is an underresearched topic in educational research in Turkey. Thus, it is necessary to examine this concept in terms of theoretical arguments and daily practices in Turkey. Examining the public service motivations of the educators working in the Turkish public sector will help to develop new insights into theory and practice. First of all, the concept of public service in Turkey has been and still is being discussed a lot, especially on the axis of old and new public administration, by scholars (Çal, 2009; Çırakman, 1976; Ökmen & Demir, 2010; Ulusoy, 1999). In these studies, the subject of public administration is approached in terms of the practices of public administration science and service ideals. However, in this study, the dynamics affecting public service motivation from the eyes of teachers and school administrators who perform public services are examined by moving the public

service debates in the Turkish public administration literature to the axis of education, perhaps taking it one step further and adding different perspectives.

It is highly likely that the service motivations of educators working in the Turkish public sector will differ according to their working conditions and examples from other countries. At this point, by establishing a link between the discussions in the international literature and the ideals of public service in the current public administration, this research will contribute to the theoretical knowledge. On the other hand, there is some evidence in this study that public service motivation is higher in employees who are members of the X generation, who have a high level of education, who have continued their education with the support of public resources, who have chosen their profession voluntarily and who have puritan work ethic values. These assumptions are also taken into account in the background of this study. Findings from the study will provide empirical evidence to test these assumptions. In addition, this research is expected to contribute to both national and international knowledge, as it is one of the first attempts to define and measure public service motivation in the Turkish public sector. The concept of public service motivation, which is at the center of the research, is discussed with the concept of work ethics, with the assumption that there may be a relationship between them.

The purpose of this study is to determine the views of teachers and school administrators who are from different generations[1] and work in public primary and secondary schools on PSM and WE attitudes. Within the general scope of the study, the answers to the following questions were sought:

1. In which level of the views of teachers and school administrators on PSM within the dimensions of loyalty to the public interest, public sensitivity and responsibilities towards the society?

2. Do the views of teachers and school administrators display a significant difference in terms of the variables of gender, title, generation, seniority and the graduated field of study?

3. In which level of the views of teachers and school administrators on WE attitudes within the dimensions of work-oriented and pleasure-oriented?

4. Do the WE attitudes of teachers and school administrators display a significant difference in terms of the variables of gender, title, generation, seniority and the graduated field of study?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the PSM and WE attitudes of teachers and school administrators?

Method

The Study Model

The quantitative research method was used in this study, which was designed with the single and relational survey models. In survey models, it is aimed to reach a general judgment about the universe in a universe consisting of a large number of elements, and it is made over the entire universe or a sample, group or sample to be taken from the universe. Single or associative searches can be performed using general survey models. While determining the type or amount of variables one by one is examined with single survey models, whether there is a change between two or more variables and the degree of change is determined by the relational survey model (Karasar, 2009). While the single survey model was used in identifying the PSMs and WE attitudes of public school teachers and school administrators in the study, the relationship between their PSMs and WE attitudes were analyzed with the relational model.

Sample

The target population of the study consists of teachers and school administrators who work in public primary and secondary schools in Turkey. It was estimated that 384 teachers would represent a total of 580.826 primary and secondary school teachers (MoNE, 2019) at a reliability level of 95% and

---

[1] In this study, Lancaster and Stillman's (2002) "Traditionalist (1946 and earlier), the Baby Boom generation (1946-1964), the X generation (1965-1981), the Millennium-Y generation-Future generation (1982-2000)" classification was adopted.

381 school administrators would represent a total of 38.820 primary and secondary school administrators (Sekaran & Bougie, 2009).

In the study, a stratified sampling method was used. The study was carried throughout Turkey, the cities and schools chosen for the sample were identified according to NUTS (Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics). According to NUTS, each region was accepted as a stratum and 12 cities and public schools from these cities were chosen through simple unbiased sampling to represent that each region. Schools in each province were numbered according to the number of schools in the province and schools were determined by drawing lots. Invitations have been sent to the selected schools. For the schools that did not accept to participate in the study, lots were renewed. This process was continued until the sample size was reached. According to this, teachers (196 primary, 188 secondary teachers) and school administrators (218 primary, 183 secondary school administrators) who work in the public primary and secondary schools chosen from the cities of İstanbul, Edirne, Kütahya, Eskişehir, Ankara, Adana, Sivas, Sinop, Giresun, Kars, Van and Şanlıurfa were contacted. In this context, two researchers went to the schools and applied the questionnaires to the volunteer participants.

57% of the teachers were female and 42% is male. While 16% of the school administrators were female, 82% were male. It was seen that 22% of the teachers had 1-5 years, 22% had 6-10 years, 14% had 11-15 years, 19% had 16-20 years and 21% had 21 years and over seniority. On the other hand, 3% of the school administrators had 1-5 years, 15% 6-10 years, 25% 11-15 years, 20% 16-20 years and 36% had 21 years and over seniority. When they were analyzed in terms of the generation variable, it was seen that 49% of the teachers belonged to the X, 42% belonged to the Y and 8% belonged to the baby boom generation. 65% of the school administrators belonged to the X, 18% belonged to the baby boom and 17% belonged to the Y generation. While 84% of the teachers and 77% of the school administrators had undergraduate degrees, 8% of the teachers and 10% of the school administrators had two-year degrees and 7% of the teachers and 13% of the school administrators had post-graduate degrees.

Research Instrument and Procedure

To analyze the views of teachers and school administrators about PSM and WE, "PSM of Teachers and School Principals" and "WE" scales were used. The scales are in a five-point Likert structure and necessary permissions have been obtained for use.

The Public Service Motivation (PSM) Scale was developed by Aydın, Demirkasımoğlu, Demir, and Erdemli (2017) and consists of three factors as "loyalty to the welfare of the public", "public sensitivity" and " responsibility towards the society " and 19 items. There are eight items in the dimension of loyalty to the welfare of the public, five items in the dimension of public sensitivity, and six items in the dimension of responsibility towards society. The total variance explained by the scale is 43.2%. The factor loads of the items range between .52 and .75. in the dimension of loyalty to the welfare of the public, between .45 and .75. in the dimension of public sensitivity and between .50 and .66 in the dimension of responsibility towards society. According to the result of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), the goodness fit indexes for three-dimensional structure are calculated as $x2/sd = 2.12$; RMSEA= 0.06; AGFI=.86; GFI=.90; NFI=.88; NNFI= .92; CFI=.93; SRMR=.06 with CFA. The Cronbach's-Alpha coefficients are .74 for loyalty to the welfare of the public, .75 for public awareness, .67 for community responsibility, and .81 for the overall scale.

The *Work Ethic* (WE) Scale was developed by the researchers using of Bozkurt's (2000) survey with his permission and consisted of two independent sub-scales as "work-oriented" and "pleasure-oriented" WE. The *Work-Oriented WE Scale* consisted of four factors as "dedication to work, "work discipline", "commitment to duty" and "integration with work" and 15 items. The factor loads of the items range between .53 ve .80 in the dimension of dedication to work, between .55 ve .82 in the dimension of work discipline, between .48 ve .81 in the dimension of commitment to duty, between .53 ve .76 in the dimension of integration with work. The work-Oriented WE Scale explains 60,2% of the total variance. According to the result of CFA, the goodness fit indexes for four-dimensional structure are calculated as $x2/sd = 2.25$; RMSEA= 0.07; AGFI=.86; GFI=.90; NFI=.92; NNFI= .95; CFI=.96; SRMR=.08.

The Cronbach's-Alpha coefficients are .83 for dedication to work, .77 for work discipline, .72 for commitment to duty, .63 integration with work and .84 for the overall scale. *Pleasure-Oriented WE Scale* consisted of three factors as "attributing external factors to success", "living the moment" and "pragmatism" and 11 items. The factor loads of the items range between .48 ve .78 in the dimension of attributing external factors to success, between .49 ve .76 in the dimension of living the moment and , between .62 ve .84 in the dimension pragmatism. Pleasure-Oriented WE Scale explains 55.94% of the total variance. The goodness fit indexes for three dimensional structure are calculated as $x2 /sd = 1.83$; RMSEA= .06; ; AGFI=.91; GFI=.95; NFI=.92; NNFI= .95; CFI=.96; SRMR=.05. The Cronbach's-Alpha coefficients are .75 for attributing external factors to success, .56 for living the moment, .67 for pragmatism and .79 for the overall scale.

Data Analysis

The data of the study were collected by the researchers. In the analysis of collected data, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 18.00 program was used. In order to be able to identify the views of teachers and school administrators on PSMs and WE, the arithmetical mean and standard deviation values for each sub-dimension of the scales were calculated. In the gap analysis, the unrelated samples t-test, one-way analysis of variance and the Kruskal Wallis H test were used. Univariate and multivariate normalities were examined to decide which of the parametric and non-parametric tests should be used. Accordingly, the Kruskal Wallis H test was used in the difference analyzes for this variable, since the assumption of multivariate normality could not be achieved in terms of the seniority variable. To determine the relationship between the PSMs and WE attitudes and work-oriented and pleasure-oriented tendencies of the teachers and the school administrators, the Pearson correlation coefficients of the variables were taken as the basis.

Research Ethics Committee Permission

In this research, all the rules stated to be followed within the scope of the Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive were followed. In addition, necessary permission has been obtained from Ankara University Social Sciences Sub-Ethics Committee in order to carry out the research.

Results

Findings Related to PSM

Opinions of the teachers and the school administrators on PSM were analyzed in terms of l*oyalty to the welfare of the public, public sensitivity and responsibility towards the society* dimensions.

Loyalty to the welfare of the public. The arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of participants related to "loyalty to the welfare of the public" were presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The Views of the Teachers and the School Administrators on the "Loyalty to the Welfare of The Public"

Expressions	Title	$\bar{X}$	SD
1. I believe that everyone within the same society influences each other's lives in positively or negatively.	Teacher	4.25	.85
	Administrator	4.29	.86
2. Producing policies for those who have financial and social problems should be one of the basic aims of those who administer the public.	Teacher	4.33	.90
	Administrator	4.39	.89
3. The obligations of a public servant to society should come before his obligations to his superior.	Teacher	4.31	.83
	Administrator	4.25	.91
4. Those who manage the public should develop social policies which will raise the welfare of the public and not only in profitable areas.	Teacher	4.72	.63
	Administrator	4.68	.57
5. I believe that public servants should gain the trust of the public by carrying out their duties in the best manner possible.	Teacher	4.60	.65
	Administrator	4.57	.71
Total	Teacher	4.44	.64
	Administrator	4.43	.78

As it can be seen in Table 1, both the teachers ($\overline{X}$ =4.72) and the school administrators ($\overline{X}$ =4.68) supported "Those who manage the public should develop social policies which will raise the welfare of the public and not only in profitable areas" view in the highest level. Among the PSMs, this was the dimension in which teachers have the highest ($\overline{X}$ =4.44) and school administrators have the second-highest scores. There was no significant difference in gender, title, generation and seniority variables related to the "loyalty to the welfare of the public" sub-dimension. In the loyalty to the welfare of the public dimension, the PSMs of the teachers and the school administrators were quite high.

Public sensitivity. The arithmetic mean and standard deviation of the views of the participants on "public sensitivity" were shown in Table 2.

Table 2. The Views of the Teachers and the School Administrators on the "Public Sensitivity"

Expressions	Title	$\overline{X}$	SD
1. I believe that I contribute to the society in which I live by working in a self-sacrificing manner.	Teacher	4.43	0.70
	Administrator	4.50	0.65
2. Protecting the public interests is a citizenship duty for me.	Teacher	4.63	0.66
	Administrator	4.69	0.62
3. I am aware of the responsibility brought by the service of education which is an indispensable public duty for society.	Teacher	4.86	1.62
	Administrator	4.67	0.61
4. When my personal interests and requirements of my duty conflict, I sacrifice my personal interests.	Teacher	4.02	0.95
	Administrator	4.40	1.82
5. Although I believe that public servants are rewarded for their efforts, I do my job willingly.	Teacher	4.30	0.81
	Administrator	4.33	0.81
6. Even if it is against my personal interests, I do what is good for the public.	Teacher	4.21	0.85
	Administrator	4.38	0.78
7. I voluntarily work out of office hours when needed to provide the continuity of public service.	Teacher	3.76	1.04
	Administrator	4.28	0.93
8. Even if I am not paid, I feel good when I serve the public.	Teacher	4.15	0.86
	Administrator	4.43	0.83
Total	Teacher	4.29	0.93
	Administrator	4.46	0.88

According to Table 2, while teachers ($\overline{X}$=4.86) were "aware of the responsibility brought by the service of education which is an indispensable public duty for the society," the school administrators ($\overline{X}$ =4.69) more focused on "protecting the public interests as a citizenship duty." In the public sensitivity dimension, the PSMs of the teachers and the school administrators were quite high.

Gender was not a significant variable in the "public sensitivity" while a significant difference was calculated related to the title [$t_{(752)}$= 3.62; p<.05; d= .03]. It was found that school administrators ($\overline{X}$ =4.46) have a higher level of public sensitivity compared to the teachers. However, when Cohen's d coefficient value is examined, it is seen that the effect of the value related to the task variable (d=.03) is weak. In addition, the views of the teachers ($\overline{X}$ = 4.29) in this dimension differentiated significantly according to the generations [$F_{(2,381)}$=17.26; p<0.05; η^2=.085]. Specifically, the teachers' public sensitivity scores in the baby boom ($\overline{X}$ =4.44) and X generations (M=4.44) were significantly higher than Y generation teachers ($\overline{X}$ =4.09. Eta square value showed that the effect of the value related to the generation variable (η^2=.085) is moderate. In terms of seniority, the views of the teachers [x^2 (4)] = 22.67, p<.05] and the school administrators [x^2 (4)] = 21.57, p<.05] showed a significant difference. The scores of the teachers with 1-5 years of seniority (SO=148.20) in the public sensitivity sub-dimension were higher than the scores of the teachers with 15 years and over seniority. In the public sensitivity sub-dimension, school administrators with 1-5 years of seniority (SO=148.20) have a higher score than the teachers with 11-15 years of seniority (SO=155.75). Additionally, the public sensitivity level of the school administrators with 21 years and over seniority was found to be higher than the school administrators

with 6-20 years of seniority. In the light of these findings, it is possible to think that during the early and late years of administrative duty, their public sensitivity tendencies were higher.

Responsibility towards society. The arithmetic mean and standard deviation of the views of the participants related to this dimension were shown in Table 3.

Table 3. The Views of the Teachers and the School Administrators on the "Responsibility Towards The Society"

Expressions	Title	M	SD
1. I believe that being a good citizen requires being interested in public policies.	Teacher	3.94	0.99
	Administrator	4.25	0.89
2. Since I have been educated with public resources, I feel in debt to the society.	Teacher	3.75	0.76
	Administrator	3.96	0.98
3. I notify the related authorities of deficiencies and flaws in the carrying out of public services.	Teacher	3.64	0.98
	Administrator	3.95	0.85
4. I believe that public service encumbers public servants with responsibilities that are not expected from other citizens.	Teacher	3.80	0.95
	Administrator	4.12	0.88
5. I follow current policy issues with interest.	Teacher	3.77	0.98
	Administrator	4.10	0.90
Total	Teacher	3.78	0.92
	Administrator	4.07	0.93
PSM Scale Total	Teacher	4.18	0.44
	Administrator	4.33	0.51

As it can be seen in Table 3, teachers' ($\overline{X}$ =3.78) and school administrators' ($\overline{X}$ =4.07) ratings of the "responsibility towards the society" were the lowest. Teachers ($\overline{X}$ =3.94) and the school administrators ($\overline{X}$ =4.25) agreed that "being a good citizen requires being interested in public policies" at the highest level. Although the "responsibility towards the society" dimension is relatively lower compared to the other dimensions, the PSMs of the teachers and the school administrators were quite high in this dimension.

In the "Responsibility towards the Society" sub-dimension, a significant difference was not found in the gender and seniority variables. On the other hand, the views of the teachers and the school administrators [$t_{(752)}$= 5.88; p<.05; d= .43] displayed a significant difference according to the title. Namely, school administrators ($\overline{X}$ =4.05) were found to be more responsible the society when compared to the teachers ($\overline{X}$ =3.26). However, although the difference between the means is significant, it is seen that the effect of the value related to the task variable (d=.43) is weak compared to Cohen's d value. It was found that only the views of the teachers [$F_{(2,381)}$=8.11; p<0.05, η^2= .04] displayed a significant difference related to the "generation" variable. The teachers in the baby boom generation ($\overline{X}$ =4.03) had a higher level of responsibility towards the society than the X ($\overline{X}$ =3.84) and Y generations ($\overline{X}$=3.61) which represent younger generations, whereas the teachers in the X generation had a higher level of responsibility towards the society score compared to the teachers in the Y generation. This effect regarding the generation variable is weak ($\eta2$=.04).

Findings on Work Ethics
The views of participants on WE were analyzed in terms of work-oriented and pleasure-oriented WE sub-scales.

Work-oriented WE. The arithmetic mean and standard deviation of the views of the participants on work-oriented WE were presented in Table 4.

Table 4. The Views of the Teachers and the School Administrators on Work-Oriented WE

	Expressions	Title	$\bar{X}$	SD
Dedication to Work	1. People should seek the reason why they are unsuccessful in being lazy.	Teacher	3.53	1.12
		Administrator	3.71	1.12
	2. We can measure a person's worth with the success he has in his job.	Teacher	2.88	1.23
		Administrator	3.37	1.14
	3. I think that people who do not have the habit of working hard are people with weak characters.	Teacher	2.75	1.17
		Administrator	3.20	1.18
	4. What makes me happiest in life is working.	Teacher	3.33	1.09
		Administrator	3.74	.99
	5. Even if the conditions of the two jobs are the same, I would prefer the one with more responsibilities.	Teacher	3.10	1.12
		Administrator	3.59	1.06
	Total	Teacher	3.11	1.14
		Administrator	3.52	1.09
Work Discipline	6. I am known as a hard-working person in my work environment.	Teacher	3.93	.82
		Administrator	4.24	.81
	7. I am known as a disciplined worker in my work environment.	Teacher	3.94	.85
		Administrator	4.15	.85
	8. I always do my best in my job.	Teacher	4.45	.69
		Administrator	4.53	.72
	9. I follow work hours/class hours meticulously.	Teacher	4.46	.70
		Administrator	4.49	.72
	Total	Teacher	4.19	.76
		Administrator	4.35	.77
Commitment to duty	10. I do not get a health report unless I am very sick.	Teacher	4.61	.71
		Administrator	4.68	.61
	11. I feel bad about frequently taking leave.	Teacher	4.72	.56
		Administrator	4.55	.87
	12. I believe that a person needs to work hard until he is successful in the job he has taken responsibility for.	Teacher	4.56	.69
		Administrator	4.47	.78
	Total	Teacher	4.63	.65
		Administrator	4.56	.75
Integration with work	13. Even if I have to right to retire, I would keep on working.	Teacher	3.07	1.34
		Administrator	3.54	1.27
	14. Even if I receive a big amount from the lottery, I would keep on working.	Teacher	3.43	1.35
		Administrator	3.55	1.37
	15. If we did not experience any hardships, life would have no meaning.	Teacher	3.62	1.14
		Administrator	3.73	1.24
	Total	Teacher	3.73	1.27
		Administrator	3.60	1.29
	Work-oriented Scale Total	Teacher	3.76	0.51
		Administrator	3.97	.56

As it can be seen in Table 4, participants mostly rated the "commitment to duty" dimension in the work-oriented WE. While the teachers ($\overline{X}$ =4.72) agreed that taking frequent leaves made them feel bad, the school administrators ($\overline{X}$ =4.68) agreed that "they would not get a health report unless they are very sick mostly". In the "work discipline" sub-dimension which follows the "commitment to duty" sub-dimension according to the participants' ratings, the teachers ($\overline{X}$ =4.46) agreed that "they follow their class hours meticulously" whereas the school administrators ($\overline{X}$ =4.68) stated higher participation that "they always do their best in their job". In the "integration with work" sub-dimension which takes the third place, both the teachers and the school administrators agree with the view that "life would have no meaning if they did not experience any hardships". In the "dedication to work" sub-dimension which has the last place according to the participation rates, the teachers ($\overline{X}$ =3.53) regarded laziness as the reason for failure, whereas the school administrators ($\overline{X}$ =3.74) stated that working is the thing that makes the happiest in their lives.

Participants' opinions related to the work-oriented WE did not significantly differ in terms of the gender variable in any of the sub-dimensions. On the other hand, school administrators were more committed to work [$t_{(752)}$=6.741; $p<.05$; d=50] and work discipline [$t_{(752)}$=3.478; $p<.05$;d=.25] and integration with work [$t_{(752)}$=3.557; $p<.05$, d=.26] than of teachers. When Cohen's d coefficient values are examined, it is seen that the effect of the gender variable in the sub-dimensions of work discipline (d=.25) and work engagement (d=.26) is weak, and the effect of the value on the commitment to work sub-dimension is moderate (d=.50). The older generations were more committed to work [$F(2,367)$=18.46; $p<0.05$; η^2= .09], and work discipline [$F(2,367)$=23.73; $p<0.05$; η^2= .10], and they were more loyal to work [$F(2,381)$=13.93; $p<0.05$; η^2= .07] when compared to the younger generations. In the "integration with work sub-dimension", both the teachers [$F_{(2,381)}$=9.36; $p<0.05$; η^2= .05] and the school administrators [$F_{(2,367)}$=9.10; $p<0.05$; η^2= .05] in the baby boom generation came to the fore. When the effects on the generation variable are examined, it is seen that the effect is moderate in the sub-dimensions of dedication to work, work discipline and commitment to the task, and weak in the sub-dimension of work integration. Although significant differences were observed in the teachers' opinions related to the commitment to work [$x^2 (4)$] = 29.50, $p<.05$], work discipline[$x^2 (4)$] = 41.68, $p<.05$], loyalty to work [$x^2 (4)$] = 24.07, $p<.05$] and integration with work [$x^2 (4)$] = 43.91, $p<.05$] dimensions, in general, it was found that the results were in support of the teachers who have higher seniority. A significant difference was observed in the sub-dimensions of commitment to work [$x^2 (4)$] = 9.88, $p<.05$] and integration with work [$x^2 (4)$] = 29.62, $p<.05$] and the difference was in support of the school administrators with low seniority and with high seniority.

Pleasure-oriented WE. The arithmetic mean and standard deviation of teachers' and the school administrators' on WE's being pleasure-oriented sub-scale are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. The Views of the Teachers and the School Administrators on Pleasure-Oriented WE

	Expressions	Title	$\overline{X}$	SD
Attributing external factors to success	1. In order to be successful in life, you need to have powerful people who support you.	Teacher	2.64	1.22
		Administrator	2.61	1.41
	2. The path to being successful and rich is through cunningness and not hard work.	Teacher	3.31	1.27
		Administrator	3.07	1.34
	3. A person should make use of opportunities to achieve a gain more easily.	Teacher	3.17	1.30
		Administrator	3.16	1.33
	Total	Teacher	3.04	1.26
		Administrator	2.93	1.36
Living the moment	4. A person should think of himself first before others	Teacher	2.64	1.22
		Administrator	2.61	1.41
	5. Since human life is limited, a person should find ways of living better in this world.	Teacher	3.31	1.27
		Administrator	3.07	1.34

Table 5. Continued

	Expressions	Title	$\overline{\text{X}}$	SD
Living the moment	6. There are no absolute rights or wrongs for me in life.	Teacher	3.17	1.30
		Administrator	3.16	1.33
	7. Life should not be taken very seriously; we should enjoy it as much as possible.	Teacher	2.95	1.27
		Administrator	2.65	1.30
	8. A person should live life the way he wants to.	Teacher	3.24	1.26
		Administrator	2.88	1.32
	Total	Teacher	3.06	1.26
		Administrator	2.87	1.34
Pragmatism	9. Since the past is left behind, historical issues have no importance for me.	Teacher	2.01	1.24
		Administrator	2.06	1.29
	10. I regard being idealistic as an outdated approach.	Teacher	2.00	1.23
		Administrator	2.07	1.30
	11. I prefer a high salary to a good career in work life.	Teacher	2.53	1.29
		Administrator	2.59	1.33
	Total	Teacher	2.18	1.25
		Administrator	2.24	1.30
	Being Pleasure-Oriented Scale Total	Teacher	2.67	0.76
		Administrator	2.61	0.89

As it can be seen in Table 5, while the teachers agreed the most with the expressions related to "living the moment" sub-dimension, school administrators rated the "attributing external factors to success". In the "living the moment" sub-dimension, while the teachers ($\overline{\text{X}}$ =3.31) agreed "Since human life is limited, a person should find ways of living better in this world" the most, the school administrators ($\overline{\text{X}}$ =4.68) agreed that there are no absolute rights and wrongs in their lives more. In the "attributing external factors to success" dimension, the teachers ($\overline{\text{X}}$ =3.31) agreed more that "the path to being successful and rich is through cunningness and not hard-work", whereas the school administrators ($\overline{\text{X}}$ =3.16) agreed that "a person should make use of opportunities to achieve a gain more easily". In the dimension of pragmatism which has the least ratings of both the teachers ($\overline{\text{X}}$ =2.53) and the school administrators ($\overline{\text{X}}$=2.59), participants stated that they would prefer a higher salary to a good career.

There was no significant difference in terms of the gender variable of pleasure-oriented in any of the sub-dimensions. Significant differences were determined related to the title variable with higher scores of school administrators in the "living the moment" [$t_{(752)}$=3.62; p<.05; d=.26] and "pragmatism" [$t_{(752)}$=5.88; p<.05; d=.43] dimensions. According to Cohen's d coefficient values, the effect of this effect on the task variable is weak in both sub-dimensions. In terms of the generation variable, the views of the teachers [$F_{(2,381)}$=14.40; p<.05; η^2= .07] and the school administrators [$F_{(2,366)}$=4.23; p<.05; η^2= .02] displayed a significant difference only in the living the moment sub-dimension. The Y generation teachers and school administrators displayed higher levels of agreement for living the moment compared to the ones in the X generation. However, according to eta square values, this effect of the generation variable is moderate for teachers ($\eta2$=.07), while it is weak for administrators ($\eta2$= .02). In terms of the seniority variable, it was seen that the school administrators with middle and high-level seniority participated at a higher level related to "attributing external factors to success" [$x^2 (4)$] = 12.68, p<.05]. The views of the teachers according to the seniority variable relatively displays a difference to the advantage of the teachers with low seniority in the "living the moment" dimension [$x^2 (4)$] = 16.07, p<.05].

The relationship between PSM and WE
The results of the analysis on the relationship between the PSM and WE values of the teachers are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. The Relationships Between the Teachers' PSM and WE Values

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Loyalty to the welfare of the public	1	.302**	.301**	-.007	.196**	.278**	-.007	-.058	.043	-.139**	.588**	.109*	-.044
2. Public sensitivity		1	.363**	.243**	.438**	.455**	.237**	-.185**	-.203**	-.291**	.842**	.449**	-.274**
3. Responsibility towards the society			1	.384**	.415**	.263**	.247**	.050	.009	-.068	.737**	.484**	.002
4. Dedication to work				1	.335**	.178**	.378**	.050	-.055	-.002	.329**	.823**	-.012
5. Work discipline					1	.484**	.155**	-.111*	.005	-.075	.493**	.648**	-.060
6. Commitment to duty						1	.201**	-.155**	-.067	-.187**	.465**	.527**	-.154**
7. Integration with work							1	.034	.010	-.004	.261**	.661**	.018
8. Attributing external factors to success								1	.452**	.465**	-.107*	-.026	.756**
9. Living the moment									1	.484**	-.113*	-.038	.865**
10. Pragmatism										1	-.244**	-.069	.772**
11. PSM											1	.524**	-.181**
12. Work-oriented												1	-.052
13. Pleasure-oriented													1

* p< 0.05, ** p< 0.01

Teachers' opinions reflecting the relationship between PSM and WE in Table 6 can be summarized as follows:

- There was a low level of a positive significant relationship between the *loyalty to the welfare of the public* and *work-oriented/work discipline* (r=.19) and *commitment to duty* (r=.27) dimensions (p< .01).

- There was a low level of a negative significant relationship between the *loyalty to the welfare of the public* and *pleasure-oriented/pragmatism* (r=.-13) (p< .01).

- There was a low level of a positive significant relationship between *public sensitivity* and *work-oriented/dedication to work* (r=.24), *integration with work* (r=.23) dimensions and a medium level positive significant relationship between *work discipline* (r=.43) and *commitment to duty* (r=.45) (p< .01).

- There was a low level of a negative significant relationship between *public sensitivity* and *pleasure-oriented/attributing external factors to success* (r=-18), *living the moment* (r=-20) and *pragmatism* (r=-.29) (p< .01).

- There was a medium level of positive significant relationship between *responsibility towards the society* and *work-oriented/dedication to work* (r=.38) and *work discipline* (r=.41) dimensions and a low level of positive significant relationship between *commitment to duty* (r=.26) and *integration with work* (r=.24) (p< .01).

When the scales are evaluated as a whole, a positive and medium level significant relationship was calculated between "PSM" and "work-oriented" (r=.52) attitudes and a negative and low-level significant relationship was calculated related to "pleasure-oriented" (r=- .18) attitudes (p< .01). The results of the relationship between the school administrators' PSM and WE values were shown in Table 7.

Table 7. The Relationships Between the School Administrators' PSM and WE Values

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Loyalty to the welfare of the public	1	.512**	.453**	.075	.391**	.419**	.146**	-.049	-.048	-.089	.725**	.301**	-.069
2. Public sensitivity		1	.562**	.367**	.605**	.523**	.386**	-.069	-.053	-.125*	.902**	.613**	-.091
3. Responsibility towards the society			1	.420**	.493**	.376**	.371**	.017	.043	-.028	.804**	.565**	.019
4. Commitment to work				1	.411**	.199**	.452**	.156**	.155**	.138**	.387**	.808**	.181**
5. Work discipline					1	.498**	.354**	-.099	-.016	-.096	.629**	.737**	-.072
6. Loyalty to duty						1	.309**	-.117*	-.095	-.177**	.546**	.580**	-.152**
7. Integration with work							1	.069	.075	.053	.395**	.739**	.076
8. Attributing external factors to success								1	.568**	.576**	-.053	.039	.815**
9. Living the moment									1	.568**	-.037	.074	.890**
10. Pragmatism										1	-.113*	.016	.817**
11. PSM											1	.638**	-.073
12. Work-oriented												1	.056
13. Pleasure-oriented													1

* p< 0.05, ** p< 0.01

When Table 7 was analyzed, the following findings were obtained:

- There was a medium level, positive significant relationship between *loyalty to the welfare of the public* and *work-oriented/work discipline* (r=.39) and *commitment to duty* (r=.41) dimensions (p< .01).

- There was a medium level, positive and significant relationship between *public sensitivity* and *all sub-dimensions of work-oriented* [dedication to work (r=.36), work discipline (r=.60), commitment to duty (r=.52) and integration with work (r=.38)] (p< .01)

- There was a low level negative and significant relationship between *public sensitivity* dimension and *pragmatism* (r=-.12) dimension *of pleasure-oriented* (p< .01).

- There was a medium level positive significant relationship between *responsibility towards the society* and *all sub-dimensions of work-oriented* [dedication to work (r=.42), work discipline (r=.49), commitment to duty (r=.37) and integration with work (r=.37)] (p< .01).

The total score of the school administrators' PSM scale and WE' "work-oriented" and "pleasure-oriented" scales indicated that there was a positive and medium level significant relationship only between "PSM" and "work-oriented" work attitudes (r=.63) (p< .01).

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

In this study in which the relationship between PSM and WE are analyzed, it was determined that the teachers and the school administrators had a high level of PSM. While the teachers have the highest level of PSM in the "loyalty to the welfare of the public" among the PSM components, "public sensitivity" comes to the fore for the school administrators. In a study by Prysmakova (2013), focusing on the PSM attitudes of public servants in 26 countries including Turkey, public servants were found to give more importance to "helping others" when compared to private-sector workers. Similarly, according to Wright (2001)'s study with similar results, the nature of work in the public sector attracts people with upper-level needs and sacrifice motives. It is possible to say that these findings are in line with the findings of the current study.

Teachers and administrators do not significantly differ in gender concerning the "loyalty to the welfare of the public", "public sensitivity" and "responsibility towards the society" sub-dimensions of PSM. However, studies in the literature had contradictory results. Naff and Crum (1999) and Bright (2005) have reported higher PSM in female workers. Camilleri (2007) has determined that male public servants have a higher tendency of loyalty to the welfare of the public and sacrifice.

PSM of the school administrators was higher in "public sensitivity" and "responsibility towards the society" dimensions than teachers which were in line with the findings of Camilleri (2007) and Bright (2005). As Bright has explained, the reason for this might be that school administrators work longer in public service compared to other workers and give more importance to public service due to having longer experience of socialization.

PSMs of the school administrators did not significantly differ across generations. On the other hand, baby boom-teachers have a higher level of "public sensitivity" than the teachers of the X and Y generations. In addition, baby boomers come to the fore in terms of social responsibility. Daloğlu (2013) expresses that the most loyal people among the generations to their workplace were the baby boomers. In addition, there are numerous studies in the literature that show that attitudes towards work are influenced by the characteristics of people who belong to different generations (Egri & Ralston, 2004; Wey Smola & Sutton, 2002).

Teachers who have less seniority have a higher level of PSM when compared to the teachers with more seniority. School administrators' public sensitivity is higher at the early and late periods of their administrative duties. In the literature analyzing the relationship between PSM and seniority, the findings are contradictory. While Camilleri (2007) and Naff and Crum (1999) assert that seniority does not create any difference in PSM, Moynihan and Pandey (2007) reported a negative relationship

between PSM and seniority. According to another study, the longer the employees work in the organization, the less likely they are to be motivated by financial rewards. In addition, it is claimed that senior civil servants achieve high levels of career success, and as a result, their expectations for promotion and salary increase decrease, so their extrinsic motivation decreases (Huang, 2019). Similarly, young teachers' professional motivations and community service responsibilities required by the profession may be stronger than that of senior teachers. In other words, the high career expectation of teachers at the beginning of their career may lead them to think more idealistically and be more sensitive to social issues.

In WE, which is the second main variable of this study, work-oriented WE attitudes of teachers and school administrators were more dominant than pleasure-oriented WE attitudes. While the teachers and the school administrators displayed the highest levels of work-oriented WE attitudes in the "commitment to duty" and "work discipline" dimensions, they have relatively perceptions related to the "commitment to work" dimensions respectively. This finding is similar to the findings of Celep, Doyuran, Sarıdede, and Değirmenci (2004). They concluded that teachers gave importance to hard work, focusing on work, using time efficiently and productively and ethical values which might positively influence working and productivity. The pleasure-oriented attitudes of the teachers and the school administrators are at a low level. They show a low tendency in their pleasure-oriented attitudes, in "attributing external factors to success", "living the moment" and "pragmatism" dimensions respectively. This result is in line both with their work-oriented attitudes and high PSMs. This finding is similar to Erdemli's (2015) study in which the teachers and the school administrators had low scores in the "attributing external factors to success", "living the moment" and "pragmatism" dimensions of being pleasure-oriented.

There is a significant relationship between the PSMs and WE attitudes of teachers and school administrators who work in public primary and secondary schools. As the teachers' "work-oriented" attitudes increase, their "PSMs" also increase; as their "pleasure-oriented" attitudes increase, their PSMs decrease. These results are also similar to the tendencies of teachers. The work-oriented tendencies of the school administrators have a positive relationship with their PSMs and a negative relationship with their pleasure-oriented tendencies. Consequently, the PSM and WE attitudes of the teachers and the school administrators who work in public primary and secondary schools have multi-dimensional structures which are related to each other.

In the light of these results regarding KHM and WE, some suggestions have been developed for practitioners and researchers. It has been understood that the attitudes of teachers and administrators in the dimension of "responsibility towards society" among the components of public service motivation are relatively low. Increasing the perception of sensitivity towards society, which is an important component of teachers' and administrators' obligations, will also increase their public service motivation in general. On the other hand, public service motivations of the administrators in the dimensions of public sensitivity and responsibility towards society are higher than the teachers. At this point, it is possible that raising the awareness and consciousness levels of teachers will reflect on the quality of the public service they provide. In this context, it would be appropriate to organize awareness and development training for teachers and administrators on the values and obligations required by the profession as a public service.

The views of teachers and administrators belonging to different generations differ in terms of public service ideals and work ethic attitudes. In general, it is one of the results of this research that newer generations have a higher level of a pleasure-oriented and lower level of public service ideals than previous generations. At this point, first of all, administrators should know the working values of three different generations working together in today's work life and they should harmonize these values with each other. In addition, considering that new generations' work ethic orientations are increasingly pleasure-oriented, it seems important to educate new generations on ideals and values to raise their awareness of public service ideals and distinguish public service from other service types.

In this study public primary and secondary school teachers' and school administrators' views related to public service motivation and its relationship with work ethics were analyzed. In future research, studies may compare the views of public and private school teachers revealing their unique characteristics. Thus, the public service ideals and work ethic attitudes of teachers and administrators, who are the main actors of education services in the public and private sectors, can be compared on the axis of certain parameters. In addition, this study is limited to the opinions of teachers and administrators in public primary and secondary schools in the sample. In future studies, studies with wider participation including other types of public schools will shed light on a better understanding of this concept. In addition, longitudinal studies can be conducted to reveal causal relationships.

References

Amundsen, I., & Andrade, V. P. (2009). *Public sector ethics*. Luanda and Bergen: Chr. Michelsen Institute.

Andersen, L. B., Heinesen, E., & Pedersen, L. H. (2015). Individual performance: From common source bias to institutionalized assessment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 26*(1), 1-25. doi:10.1093/jopart/muv010

Aydın, İ., Demirkasımoğlu, N., Demir T. G., & Erdemli, Ö. (2017). Kamu hizmeti motivasyonu ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi, *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, 50*(2), 105-125.

Aydın, İ. (2016). Yönetimde kuşak farklılıkları, birlikte çalışma ve kuşakların yönetimi. In A. Balcı & İ. Aydın (Eds.), *Prof. Dr. Ziya Bursalıoğlu'na armağan* (pp. 69-94). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Bayhan, V. (2019). Kuşaklar sosyolojisi ve Türkiye için yeni bir kuşak analizi. *Sosyoloji Divanı Dergisi,* 13, 29-46.

Bickel, J., & Brown, A. J. (2005). Generation X: Implications for faculty recruitment and development in academic health centers. *Academic Medicine, 80*(3), 205-210. doi:10.1097/00001888-200503000-00003

Bozkurt, Ö., Ergun, T., & Sezen, S. (1998). *Kamu yönetimi sözlüğü*. Ankara: TODAİE Yayınları.

Bozkurt, V. (2000). *Yeni çalışma etiği*. Bursa: Alesta.

Brauchle, P. E., & Azam, M. S. (2003). Supervisor's perceptions of the work attitudes of two groups of employees. *Journal of Technology Studies, 29*(2), 65-68. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ905111

Brewer, G. A., & Selden, S. C. (1998). Whistle blowers in the federal civil service: New evidence of the public service ethic. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 8*(3), 413-440. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024390

Bright, L. (2005). Public employees with high levels of public service motivation. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 25*(2), 138-154. doi:10.1177/0734371X04272360

Camilleri, E. (2007). Antecedents affecting public service motivation. *Personnel Review, 36*(3), 356–377. doi:10.1108/00483480710731329

Celep, C., Doyuran, S., Sarıdede, U., & Değirmenci, T. (2004). Multidimensional work ethics and organizational commitment in educational organizations. Retrieved from http://www.pegem.net/dosyalar/dokuman/145.pdf.

Crewson, P. E. (1997). Public-service motivation: Building empirical evidence of incidence and effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 7*(4), 499-518. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024363

Cumhurbaşkanlığı Strateji ve Bütçe Başkanlığı. (2020). Kamu sektörü istihdam sayıları. Retrieved from https://www.sbb.gov.tr/kamu-istihdami/

Çal, S. (2009). Kamu hizmeti kavramı üzerinde kimi düşünceler. Retrieved from http://www.idare.gen.tr/cal-kh-dusunceler.pdf

Çetin-Aydın, G., & Başol, O. (2014). X and Y generation: Is there a change in the meaning of work. *Electronic Journal of Vocational Colleges*, December, 1-15. doi:10.17339/ejovoc.41369

Çırakman, B. (1976). Kamu hizmeti. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi, 9*(4), 75-94.

Daloğlu, E. S. (2013). *An intergeneratonal analysis on the perception of working* (Unpublished master's thesis). Yaşar University, İzmir.

Dina, P. (2013). Ethics and deontology in public administration. *Knowledge Horizons, 5*(2), 1-4. Retrieved from http://www.orizonturi.ucdc.ro/arhiva/2013_khe_2_pdf/khe_vol_5_iss_2_197to200.pdf

Egri, C. P., & Ralston, D. A. (2004). Generation cohorts and personal values: A comparison of China and The United States. *Organization Science, 15*(2), 210-220. doi:10.1287/orsc.1030.0048

Erdemli, Ö. (2015). Teachers' withdrawal behaviors and their relationship with work ethic. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 15*(60), 201-220. doi:10.14689/ejer.2015.60.12

Firestone, J. M., Garza, R. T., & Harris, R. J. (2005). Protestant work ethic and worker productivity in a Mexican brewery. *International Sociology, 20*(1), 27-44. doi:10.1177/0268580905049908

Furnham, A. (1991). Work and leisure satisfaction. In F. Strack, M. Argyle, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Subjective well-being: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 235-259). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Furnham, A., & Rajamanickam, R. (1992). The Protestant work ethic and just world beliefs in Great Britain and India. *International Journal of Psychology*, *27*(6), 401-416.

Hill, R. B. (1997). Demographic differences in selected work ethic attributes. *Journal of Career Development*, *24*(1), 3-23.

Houston, D. J. (2000). Public-service motivation: A multivariate test. *Journal of Public Administration Research Theory, 10*(4), 713-727. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024288

Huang, W. L. (2019). The impact of extrinsic rewards and public service motivation on public employees' work performance: Does seniority matter?. *Chinese Public Administration Review, 10*(1), 12-27.Karahanoğulları, O. (2002). *Kamu hizmeti, kavram ve hukuksal rejim.* Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi

Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* (19th ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Kim, S., & Vandenabeele, W. (2010). A strategy for building public service motivation research internationally. *Public Administration Review*, *70*(5), 701-709.

Lancaster, L. C., & Stillman, D. (2002). *When generations collide. Who they are. Why they clash. How to solve the generational puzzle at work*. New York: Collins Business.

MacCarthaigh, M. (2008). *Public service values*. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.

McCortney, M. L., & Engels, D. W. (2003). Revisiting the work ethics in America. *The Career Development Quartery, 52*(2), 132-140. doi:10.1002/j.2161-0045.2003.tb00633.x

Ministry of National Education. (2019). Millî eğitim istatistikleri örgün eğitim 2018-2019. Retrieved from https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/www/icerik_goruntule.php?KNO=361

Ministry of National Education. (2020). Formal education statistics. Retrieved from http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2020_09/04144812_meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2019_2020.pdf

Meriac, J. P., Poling, T. L., & Woehr, D. J. (2009). Are there gender differences in work ethic? An examination of the measurement equivalence of the multidimensional work ethic profile. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *47*(3), 209-213.

Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2007). Finding workable levers over work motivation comparing job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Administration and Society, 39*(7), 803-832. doi:10.1177/0095399707305546

Mudrack, P. E. (1999). Time structure and purpose, Type A behavior, and the Protestant work ethic. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *20*(2), 145-158.

Naff, K. C., & Crum, J. (1999). Working for America: Does public service motivation make a difference. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 19*(4), 5-16. doi:10.1177/0734371X9901900402

Outhwaite, W. (2008). *Modern toplumsal düşünce sözlüğü.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Ökmen, M., & Demir, F. (2010). Kamu hizmetinin felsefi temelleri ve yeni kamu yönetiminde geçirdiği dönüşüm. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, *15*(3), 19-42.

Paarlberg, L. E., Perry, J. L., & Hondeghem, A. (2008). From theory to practice: Strategies for applying public service motivation. In J. L. Perry & A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service* (pp. 268-293). New York: Oxford University Press.

Perry, J. (1996). Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *6*(1), 5-22. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024303

Perry, J., & Wise, L. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, *50*, 367-373. doi:10.2307/976618

Prysmakova, P. (2013). Public service motivation in Europe: Testing attitudes toward work motives. Report. USA: Florida International University. Retrieved from https://www.nispa.org/files/conferences/speeches/201304221128240.Paper_for%20_presentation_ASPA_Prysmakova.pdf

Raga, K., & Taylor, D. (2005). Impact of accountability and ethics on public service delivery: A South African perspective. *Public Manager*, *34*(2), 22-26. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/openview/ab5a0db8ee2758ca1b1644f24d10e2b8/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=47605

Rainey, H. G. (1982). Reward preferences among public and private managers: In search of the service ethic. *The American Review of Public Administration, 16*(4), 288-302. doi:10.1177/027507408201600402

Sedrak, M., & Cahill, T. F. (2011). Age-related conflicts: The generational divide. Retrieved from https://www.chausa.org/publications/health-progress/article/july-august-2011/age-related-conflicts-the-generational-divide

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2009). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach.* Chichester: J. Wiley.

Shaughnessy, J., & Shaughnessy, N. J. (2002). Marketing the consumer society and hedonism. *European Journal of Marketing*, *36*(5/6), 524-547. doi:10.1108/03090560210422871

Simeone, A. E. (2004). *The ideal of public service: The Reality of the rhetoric* (Doctoral dissertation). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, USA.

Tang, T. L. P., & Tzeng, J. Y. (1992). Demographic correlates of the Protestant work ethic. *The Journal of Psychology*, *126*(2), 163-170.

Ulusoy, A. (1999). Fransız ve Avrupa Birliği kamu hizmeti anlayışlarının Türk hukukuna etkisi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, *48*(1), 165-176.

Vandenabeele, W. (2007). Toward a theory of public service motivation: An institutional approach. *Public Management Review, 9*(4), 545-556. doi:10.1080/14719030701726697

Weber, M. (2014). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (M. Ökten, Trans.). Ankara: Tutku.

Wentworth, D. K., & Chell, R. M. (1997). American college students and the Protestant work ethic. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *137*(3), 284-296.

Wey Smola, K., & Sutton, C. D. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *23*(4), 363-382. doi:doi.org/10.1002/job.147

Wright, B. E. (2001). Public-sector work motivation: A review of the current literature and a revised conceptual model. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *11*(4), 559-586. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a003515