İSTANBUL ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINEVİ

İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Dergisi

İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Dergisi 42(1): 45–63

DOI: https://doi.org/10.26650/SJ.2022.42.1.0101
http://iusd.istanbul.edu.tr

Submitted: 20 June 2021
Revision Requested: 24 August 2021
Last Revision Received: 27 October 2021
Accepted: 28 January 2022
Online Published: 30 March 2022

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Psychometric Evaluation of the Factors for University Choice Scale in a Military Academy

Hasan Hüseyin Balık [1], **Adem Başpınar** [2]

Abstract
Military service is seen as a sacred and respected profession in Turkish society. Many different factors play a role in the selection of this profession, and students choose military schools for various reasons. This study examines the reasons why students studying at military academies have chosen the military profession. The psychometric properties of the Factors for University Choice Scale were evaluated in this context over a sample from a military academy in Istanbul; and the scale's validity and reliability analyses were conducted. The research was carried out with 740 cadets studying at a military academy. The scale consists of 39 items and has eight sub-dimensions. The validity of the scale was tested through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. The obtained fit indices were determined to show sufficient fit between the model and the data. For similar scale validity, its relationship with the Career Decision Scale and Satisfaction with Life Scale was also examined, as these had previously been proven to be valid and reliable; a significant relationship was reported to exist with both scales. The reliability of the scale was examined by calculating Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency. The obtained findings obtained determined the internal consistency of the overall scale to be .79 and of its sub-dimensions to vary between .62 and .91. All these findings show the Factors for University Choice Scale to be both a valid and reliable measurement tool in the sample from a military higher education institution. The research results are discussed in light of the literature.
Keywords: University Choice • Occupation Choice • Military Profession • Military Academy

1 **Correspondence to:** Hasan Hüseyin Balık (Prof.), Department of Computer Engineering, Faculty of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul, Turkiye. Email: hasanbalik@gmail.com ORCID:0000-0003-3022-100X
2 Adem Baspinar (Assist. Prof.) Department of Sociology, Kırklareli University Kırklareli, Turkiye. Email: abaspinar@klu.edu.tr ORCID:0000-0002-2125-1832
To cite this article: Balik, H. H. , Baspinar, A. (2022). Psychometric evaluation of the Factors for University Choice Scale in a military academy. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Dergisi, 42,* 45-63. https://doi.org/10.26650/SJ.2022.42.1.0101

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Individuals have profession by receiving some training in order to earn and maintain their lives, and they work within the framework of certain job descriptions. When considering how the profession chosen can affect one's entire life, choosing the right profession can be said to be an important decision stage in a person's life. In the literature, individuals are stated to determine their lifestyle through the profession they choose (Sarıkaya & Khorshid, 2009). In line with this, choosing a profession that suits one's personality traits, interests, and abilities is thought to be important for individuals. Individuals who choose a profession they do not want due to external factors are said will not be satisfied with their work or life (Gülücü & Taslak, 2019). Therefore, choosing a profession in accordance with one's personality characteristics is necessary starting in high school by taking into account one's interests and abilities.

Choosing a profession is defined as determining a profession one thinks they'll be able to do throughout their life and believes they'll get satisfaction from it (Kuzgun, 2000). In this regard, Sigmund Freud revealed the importance profession has in individuals' lives by stating, "Love and work are the cornerstones of our humanness" (Yeşilyaprak, 2014). Pekkaya and Çolak (2013) also stated that, when choosing the right profession, one should focus on the field in which they think they'll be happy and successful. The choice of profession is considered important in terms of being beneficial to society as well as affecting one's life satisfaction. The benefits of career choice for both the individual and society are explained in the model developed by Blau et al. (1956). This model covers the wide scope of factors in the literature that affect the choice of profession. The model states that an individual who chooses the right profession and does useful work will engage in activities for the benefit of society and country.

Approximately 600 professions are mentioned in Turkey. Each of these professions has different training, fields of study, and job descriptions. One of these professions is the military profession, which this study discusses. Although exactly when the military was first accepted as a profession is unknown, human beings have had an instinct to protect themselves, their family, society, and where they live since the transition to sedentary life. The military profession emerged from the need for security and can be said to have an ancient history. The military profession is estimated to have emerged with the establishment of states and individuals to perform their military service in the name of protecting their own society. Bröckling (2001) stated military service to be a concept that combines heroism and patriotism. In Turkish society, the military profession has a cultural past in addition to being considered sacred. Therefore, individuals are considered to be affected by many different factors while choosing the military profession in Turkey. Individuals have points in common as well as differences when choosing the military profession compared with other professions.

Many different factors exist that affect individuals' preferred profession. When choosing a profession, individuals should primarily know themself, have knowledge about the professions, and determine whether the profession they intend to choose suits them or not (Aytaç, 2005). The basis of these criteria was put forward by Frank Parsons in 1908 (Büyükgöze-Kavas, 2005; Zytowski, 2001). These criteria are also the basis of vocational guidance. Shoffner (2006) stated vocational guidance to be important because it affects an individual's entire life. Apart from this, individuals' interests, abilities, gender, intelligence level, age, beliefs, value judgments, knowledge, individual characteristics, and both familial and environmental effects are other factors that affect the choice of profession (Brown, 2002; Çelik & Üzmez, 2014; Frady, 2005; Tokar et al., 1998; Zunker, 2006). Other performed studies have stated individual, social, economic, and psychological characteristics to be effective in one's choice of profession (Brown & Crace, 1996; Karaman et al., 2018; Reeves & Karlitz, 2005; Yu, 2011). Many theories in the literature on career choice mainly focus on two points: (1) personality traits defined as interests, values, abilities, and beliefs and (2) environmental effects defined as family, friends, and teachers (Atli & Gür, 2019; Kuzgun, 2006; Niles & Bowlsbey, 2005; Mashankhan, 2013; Sharf, 2006). All these factors discussed in different studies reveal choice of profession to actually require a comprehensive evaluation.

Prestige (Baker & Brown, 2007; Mourad, 2011), geographical location (Ming, 2010), economic conditions (Briggs & Wilson, 2007), occupational opportunities (Akın & Akyıldız, 2018), family and environmental effects (Hamamcı & Hamurlu, 2005; Sarsıkoğlu & Bacanlı, 2019), and many different demographic characteristics (Croson & Gneezy, 2009; Kılıç, 2019; Sathapornvajana & Watanapa, 2012) have been determined to have an impact on career choice. Apart from these, individuals' social status, economic income, and career goals also play decisive roles in their career choice (Dinç, 2008). Much research has been stated to have been carried out regarding youths' profession decisions and choices both in the domestic and international literature (Cernicova & Palea, 2014; Ceylan et al., 2017; Erdinç & Kahraman, 2012; Fuller & Delorey, 2016; İnce & Khorshid 2015; Kars et al., 2014; Korkut-Owen et al., 2012; Sverko & Babarovic, 2016). All these studies have determined various reasons to exist affecting youths' career preferences as well as diversity to be present in the choice of profession based on the unique characteristics of each culture. In addition, Yazıcı's (2019) study mentioned Generation Z to be different from Generations X and Y in terms of occupational preference. Studies are encountered in the Turkish literature that have examined people's reasons for choosing doctor (Ceylan et al., 2017; Genç et al., 2007), teaching (Tanrıverdi & Kavsut, 2015; Yılmaz & Doğan, 2015), academics (Kıbrıslıoğlu-Uysal, 2017), nursing (Bölükbaşı, 2018) and tourism guidance (Şahin & Acun, 2016) as a profession. Outside of these studies, few studies have been identified to exist that have examined the reasons for choosing the military as a profession. In

the literature, Köksal (2016) examined the reasons why students studying in a military academy had chosen the military profession. Kırmızıgül and Kolukırık (2005) additionally investigated the reasons why students studying at GATA Health NCO School had chosen the military profession. Apart from these two studies, no other study examining the reason for choosing the military profession has been found in the domestic literature.

More studies have been determined to exist abroad that deal with the military profession compared to in Turkey. Gore et al.'s (2006) study found many different demographic variables to be effective in choosing a military career. Apart from this study, the factors that play a role in why the military profession is chosen in Australia and the United States of America were presented to the Ministry of Defense as a report (Bailey et al., 2002; O'Brien & Rahmani, 1995; Sackett & Mavor, 2003). Apart from demographic variables, other characteristics have been examined such as the reasons why young people choose the military profession (Bachman et al., 2000), the importance of the military profession in the eyes of the public (Hussain & Ishaq, 2005), children and adolescents' perspectives toward the military profession (Rixon & McMahon, 2007), the tendencies of those who choose the military profession (Segal et al., 1999), the reasons why individuals do not prefer military service (Shevtsov, 2007), the reasons for interest in the military profession (Wadham et al., 2014), and the personalities and genetics of those who choose the military profession (Miles & Haider-Marker, 2019). Based on all this research, despite many studies having been conducted abroad, the fact that very few studies have been conducted in the field of military psychology/sociology in Turkey is striking. Turkey having only one study revealing the reasons why students prefer military academies or choose the military profession has made conducting this research a necessity. In line with this, the aim of this study is to make a psychometric evaluation of the Factors for University Choice Scale in a military academy in Istanbul. Thus the aim is to reveal the reasons for choosing a military academy. In addition, the students' demographic information was examined, and the factors affecting the choice of the military profession were determined.

Method

Study Group

The participants in the research are first-, second-, and third-year students studying at a military academy in the 2019 fall semester. Detailed information about the students is given in Table 1.

Table 1
Participants' Demographic Information

Variable	Group	*n*	%
Gender	Female	18	97.6
	Male	722	2.4
Age	0-18 years old	95	12.8
	19-21 years old	540	73
	21+ years old	105	14.2
Grade Level	Preparation	179	24.2
	1st year/freshman	246	33.2
	2nd year/sophomore	162	21.9
	3rd year/junior	153	20.7
Mother's Educational Status	No diploma	12	1.6
	Primary school graduate	217	29.3
	Middle school graduate	126	17
	High school graduate	231	31.2
	University graduate	141	19.1
	Graduate/postgraduate	13	1.8
Father's Educational Status	No diploma	3	0.5
	Primary school graduate	95	12.8
	Middle school graduate	94	12.7
	High school graduate	217	29.3
	University graduate	302	40.8
	No diploma	29	3.9
Number of Siblings	Only child	84	11.3
	1 sibling	299	40.4
	2 siblings	202	27.3
	3 siblings	113	15.3
	4+ siblings	42	5.7
Sibling Birth Order	Youngest	251	33.9
	Middle	119	16.1
	Oldest	370	50
Monthly Income	0-1499 TL	20	2.7
	1500-2499 TL	95	12.8
	2500-3499 TL	146	19.7
	3500-4499 TL	111	15
	4500-5499 TL	108	14.6
	5500-6499 TL	76	10.3
	6500-7499 TL	70	9.5
	7500+ TL	114	15.4
Perceived Socioeconomic Level	Low	29	3.9
	Medium Low	108	14.6
	Medium	472	63.8
	Medium High	118	15.9
	High	13	1.8

Area of Residence	Mediterranean Region	82	11.1
	Eastern Anatolia	35	4.7
	Aegean Region	98	13.2
	Southeast Anatolia	16	2.2
	Central Anatolia	188	25.4
	Marmara Region	252	34.1
	Black Sea Region	69	9.3
Place of Residence	City center	431	58.2
	Town center	256	34.6
	Township/Village	53	7.2
Type of High School Graduated From	Anatolian High School	441	59.6
	Social Sciences High School	2	0.3
	Anatolian Teacher High School	42	5.7
	Science High School	106	14.3
	Vocational School	8	1.1
	Anatolian Vocational Technical High School	25	3.4
	İmam Hatip High School	13	1.8
	Basic High School	80	10.8
	Other	23	3.1
Private Lesson Status	I've never received	200	27
	I enrolled in lessons at school	115	15.5
	I went to a course/study center	258	34.9
	I received private tutoring	87	11.8
	I went to a course/study center and also received private tutoring	77	10.4
	Other	3	0.4
High School Average Grade	61-70	31	4.2
	71-80	175	23.6
	81-90	360	48.6
	91-100	174	23.5
TOTAL		**740**	**100**

Data Collection Tools

The research data were collected using the Factors for University Choice Scale developed by Köksal (2016), the Career Decision Scale developed by Yusupu (2015), the Satisfaction with Life Scale developed by Köker (1991) and a personal information form developed by the researchers.

Factors for University Choice Scale

Developed by Köksal (2016) in a military academy, the scale aims to determine why people prefer a school that trains personnel with the aim of ensuring the security of the country. Despite the scale having 45 items that were developed in this context, six items in several different sub-dimensions were removed from the scale as a result of the exploratory factor analysis, with a final version of 39 items in total being created.

The scale has eight sub-dimensions: cultural, material, abilities, status, career opportunities, family effects, environmental effects, and opportunities. The Factors for University Choice Scale is scored using a 5-point scale (1 = Fully disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Partially disagree, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Completely agree). The scale has no reverse-scored items. The scale provides an overall score as well as total scores for each sub-dimension. The structure of the 8-dimensional scale explains 62.74% of the total variance. The scale's reliability analyses have reported Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency to be 0.85. Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency for the sub-dimensions were found to vary between .67 and .91. This study has calculated Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency as .79 for the overall scale and to vary between .62 and .91 for the sub-dimensions.

Career Decision Scale

Developed by Yusupu (2015), the scale aims to determine the factors that affect university students while making career decisions. The 30-item scale has three sub-dimensions: conscious career decision, unconscious career decision, and environmental factors. The scale's items are scored as 1 = Doesn't apply to me at all, 2 = Doesn't apply to me, 3 = Applies to me somewhat, 4 = Mostly applies to me, and 5 = Completely applies to me. All items from the dimension of conscious career decision (Items 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 27, 29) are reversed-scored. Total scores obtainable from the scale can range from a minimum of 30 to a maximum of 150. Higher scores on the scale indicate greater indecision, while lower scores indicate more consistency. The reliability analysis of the overall scale reported Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency to be .91. Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency for the sub-dimensions were calculated as .89 for the sub-dimension of conscious career decision, .85 for the sub-dimension of unconscious career decision, and .76 for the sub-dimension of environmental factors. Another study (Duru et al., 2020) in the literature analyzed Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency for the sub-dimensions of the scale as .89 for the sub-dimension of conscious career decision, .87 for the sub-dimension of unconscious career decision, and .77 for the sub-dimensions of environmental factors. The current study calculated Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency for the overall scale as .92 and as .88 for the sub-dimension of conscious career decision, .83 for the sub-dimension of unconscious career decision, and .74 for the sub-dimension of environmental factors. This obtained finding is consistent with the values reached in other studies in the literature.

Satisfaction with Life Scale

Developed by Diener et al. (1985) and adapted into Turkish by Köker (1991), the Satisfaction with Life Scale is used to determine participants' life satisfaction. The main

purpose of the scale is to measure the life satisfaction of those participating in a study by taking into account their subjective perceptions. The scale was developed in this direction and has one dimension consisting of five items. The scale has no reverse-scored items and is scored as a 7-point scale. The scores obtainable from the scale vary between 5 and 35, with higher scores indicating higher life satisfaction. A total of 150 participants (75 men and 75 women) were used within the scope of the scale's reliability study, with the test-retest method applied at three-week intervals. As a result of the test-retest, the reliability coefficient was calculated as .85. Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency for the scale was found to be .76. In different studies conducted in Turkey, the internal consistency coefficient for the Satisfaction with Life Scale was reported as .78 (Totan & Şahin, 2015) and .82 (Okur, 2019). This study determined Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency for the scale to be .78, which resembles those from the other studies.

Personal Information Form

The researchers developed this form in order to describe the demographic characteristics of the participants of the study by asking questions about gender, age, school year, parents' education level, number of siblings, sibling birth order, monthly income, perceived socio-economic level, region of residence, place of residence, type of high school graduated from, private tutoring status, and high school grade point average. The main purpose in the comprehensive preparation of this form is to obtain detailed information about the socio-demographic characteristics of the students studying at the military school.

Process

The necessary permissions were first obtained from the researcher who developed the Factors for University Choice Scale in order to conduct the psychometric evaluation of the scale over a military academy sample. Although no translation was carried out because the original scale is in Turkish, a pilot study was carried out for it over a small group of 20 people to determine the expressions that best represent each item. In this way, the final form was created for application over the selected military academy sample. Şeker and Gençdoğan (2006) felt that certain words were difficult to distinguish because of their similar meanings and stated that more clear and understandable options should be included in scales. Upon considering that the original form of the 5-point scale is appropriate in terms of intelligibility, no changes were made. Before collecting the data, the researchers introduced themselves to the students, explained the purpose of the research, and talked about the confidentiality and voluntary aspect of the scale. Afterwards, the research data were collected from the students on a voluntary basis. The data collection process occurred face to face using paper and pen and took an average of 15-20 minutes.

Studies that carry out scale adaptations should perform validity and reliability analyses even if the scale has a theoretical basis (DeVellis, 2014). Analyses were

carried out in line with this after collecting the data from the students. An item analysis was performed first, after which the construct validity of the scale was tested using exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. The assumption of normality was checked using the total scores from the sub-dimensions of the scale, and the scores were found to be normally distributed (Kolmogorov Smirnov $p \geq .05$). The relationships with the Career Decision Scale (Yusupu, 2015) and Satisfaction with Life Scale (Köker, 1991) were analyzed for convergent scale validity using the Pearson product-moment correlation analysis. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated for the reliability analysis of the scale.

Findings

The Reasons for University Preference Survey's validity and reliability analyses were conducted over the military academy sample. This section discusses the obtained results as well as explains the construct validity of the scale, its relationship with similar scales, and the reliability analyses, respectively.

Construct Validity

Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted for the construct validity of the Reasons for University Preference Survey. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity values were first examined to see if the data are suitable for factor analysis. The KMO value was found to be .89 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity chi-square value to be 14,412.09 ($p \leq .000$). The literature states that the KMO needs to be greater than .60 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value to be significant at the .05 level (Büyüköztürk, 2004; Durmuş et al., 2016). In line with this, the obtained findings can be said to be suitable for factor analysis. As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, a structure with eight sub-dimensions was arrived at that explains 62.40% of the total variance. These sub-dimensions retained the same names as in the original scale, and no items were removed due to the scale's factor loadings being greater than .30. The factor loading values for the items from the scale's sub-dimensions are given in Table 2.

Table 2
Item Factor Loadings for the Scale as a Result of the Exploratory Factor Analysis

Scale Sub-Dimensions	**Factor Loading Range**
Cultural	.41 - .59
Material	.56 - .67
Abilities	.46 - .65
Status	.66 - .71
Family Effect	.47 - .67
Environmental Effect	.77 - .87
Career Opportunities	.79 - .84
Opportunities	.61 - .75

Having been developed over a military academy in Ankara Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted in order to adapt to the selected military academy sample the eight-factor structure of the Reasons for University Preference Survey. In confirmatory factor analysis, A number of fit indices were examined in the confirmatory factor analysis in order to examine the data's goodness of fit with the model. These fit indices need to show acceptable or perfect fit. Table 3 includes the evaluation criteria for the fit index values:[1]

Table 3
Model Fit Assessment Criteria

Goodness-of-fit Indices	**Perfect Goodness-of-Fit Values**	**Acceptable Goodness-of-Fit Values**
$\chi 2$ / *df*	$0 \leq \chi 2 / df \leq 3$	$2 \leq \chi 2 / df \leq 5$
RMSEA	$0 \leq RMSEA \leq .05$	$.05 \leq RMSEA \leq .08$
SRMR	$0 \leq SRMR \leq .05$	$.05 \leq SRMR \leq .10$
CFI	$.97 \leq CFI \leq 1.00$	$.95 \leq CFI \leq .97$
GFI	$.95 \leq GFI \leq 1.00$	$.90 \leq GFI \leq .95$
AGFI	$.90 \leq AGFI \leq 1.00$	$.85 \leq AGFI \leq .90$
TLI	$.95 \leq TLI \leq 1.00$	$.90 \leq TLI \leq .95$

(Hoe, 2008; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Keith, 2019; Kline, 2015; Marsh et al., 2004; Meyers et al., 2006; Şimşek, 2007; Wang & Wang, 2012).

As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, the fit between the model and the data was seen to be insufficient and to require some modifications. Item error covariances were correlated in line with this by taking into account the necessary modifications. Confirmatory factor analysis was performed again by correlating Item 1 to Item 4 and Item 13 to Item 14 in the scale's cultural sub-dimension, Item 2 to Item 12 in the material sub-dimension, Item 5 to Item 6 in the abilities sub-dimension, and lastly Item 15 to Item 18 in the possibilities sub-dimension. The literature states these modifications need to be made one by one and also be suitable to the theoretical infrastructure (Çokluk et al., 2014; Diamantopoulos et al., 2000). The literature also states these modifications are made to strengthen the model (Çapık, 2014). Different opinions are found in the literature regarding how many modifications are necessary. Although the number of modifications is thought to be able to increase in direct proportion to the total number of items in the scale, Terzi (2019) suggested that no more than five modifications should be made in total. This study performed the second confirmatory factor analysis by making a total of five modifications, and the obtained results were seen to have acceptable or perfect fit values. In other words, a sufficient level of agreement has been determined to be present between the model and the data ($\chi 2 = 1835.61$, $p = .000$, $df = 667$, $\chi 2 / df = 2.75$, $GFI = 0.88$, $CFI = 0.92$, $TLI = 0.91$, $AGFI = 0.86$, $RMR = 0.06$, $RMSEA = 0.05$). The results obtained as a result of the confirmatory factor analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Fit Values Obtained as a Result of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis

χ2	*df*	*χ2 / df*	*GFI*	*CFI*	*TLI*	*AGFI*	*RMR*	*RMSEA*
1,835.61	667	2.75	0.88	0.92	0.91	0.86	0.06	0.05

In line with the findings, the items in each sub-dimension of the Factors for University Choice Scale can be said to be significant parameter estimators ($p \leq .05$). When examining the results, the estimated values of the items in each sub-dimension are given in Table 5.

Table 5
Item Estimation Values of the Items in the Sub-Dimensions of the Scale

Scale Sub-Dimensions	**Item Estimate Value Range**
Cultural	.48 - .72
Material	.50 - .79
Abilities	.53 - .83
Status	.67 - .75
Family Effect	.54 - .70
Environmental Effect	.81 - .93
Career Opportunities	.82 - .89
Opportunities	.73 - .87

Apart from that, correlation coefficients associated with item error covariances were calculated between Items 1 and 4 as .23, between Items 13 and 14 as .65, between Items 2 and 12 as .39, between Items 5 and 6 as .30, and between Items 15 and 18 as .47.

Similar Scale Validity

The Career Decision and Satisfaction with Life Scales were both previously proven to be valid and reliable and are used here to examine their similar scale validity with the Reasons for University Preference Survey. The scales' relationships in terms of the total score were examined in line with this. Before performing the analysis, the scales were checked to see if they provided the assumption of normality by looking at their skewness and kurtosis scores. Due to the skewness and kurtosis values values being between -1.96 and +1.96, they were determined to exhibit normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012), and the relationships among the scales were examined using the Pearson product moment correlation analysis. Table 6 presents the obtained findings.

Table 6
Correlation Coefficients, Means, and Standard Deviation Scores for the Similar Scale Validity

	(1)	**(2)**	***M***	***SD***
Factors for University Choice Scale (1)			134.98	13.68
Career Decision Scale (2)	-0.38*		60.86	18.07
Satisfaction with Life Scale (3)	.26*	-0.36*	13.98	4.58

*$p \leq .01$

According to Table 6, a moderately significant negative correlation has been determined to exist ($p \leq .01$) between scores from the Factors for University Choice

Scale and those from the Career Decision Scale (r^2 = .14), and a positive correlation with a low level of significance with the scores from the Satisfaction with Life Scale r^2 = .07). In addition, a moderately significant negative relationship (r^2 = .13) was determined to exist between the scores from the Career Decision Scale and those from the Satisfaction with Life Scale ($p \leq .01$).

Reliability

In order to test the reliability of the Reasons for University Preference Survey, Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency was calculated for the overall scale and for each of its sub-dimensions. In light of the literature, the calculated values being greater than 0.60 indicates the scale to be reliable (Karagöz, 2017). Table 7 shows the obtained findings.

Table 7
Cronbach's Alpha of Internal Consistency for the Overall Factors for University Choice Scale and Its Sub-Dimensions

Overall Scale and Sub-Dimensions	**Cronbach's Alpha of Internal Consistency**
Reasons for University Preference Survey	.79
Cultural	.87
Material	.77
Abilities	.81
Status	.77
Family Effect	.62
Environmental Effect	.91
Career Opportunities	.89
Opportunities	.91

Discussion, Results, and Recommendations

From past to present, military service has been among the prominent features of the nation of Turkey. This feature comes from its past and has enabled the Turkish nation to be characterized by the phrase military-nation (Köksal, 2016). Military service is a duty that is considered important in Turkish society and is presented as a prerequisite before work or marriage. Many different factors play a role in the preference of the military profession, which has such a cultural basis. At the heart of these are the love of homeland and the military-nation understanding, which have social values and *cultural reasons*. Apart from this, the sacredness of the military profession in society also plays a role in the military being preferred in terms of *status*. The fact that the military profession is shown as a role model from a young age in Turkish society also shows that *family* and *environmental effects* have an important place in the preference of this profession. Another factor that draws attention is that individuals consider themselves inclined to military service, to have *abilities* in this field, and to gain an identity by taking their place in society in this way.

Turkey also has individuals who consider economic concerns as a "guaranteed profession" and become oriented toward the military profession through *financial* considerations. These individuals are generally thought to be descendants of families of low socio-economic status. In this context, individuals who want to contribute to their family's livelihood more quickly can be said to be more inclined toward the military profession. Apart from this, the conditions of military school and military profession affect students in terms of *career* and *opportunities*. While the emergence of different career plans is attractive to students, especially after an education in a military academy, this also plays an important role in students' preference for this profession. All these results are considered important in terms of students preferring a military school and getting known. Based on the results obtained in this research, providing information to candidates who want to go to military school during activities held for the purpose of promoting the school is thought to be beneficial. In addition, emphasizing the results according to the expectations of the audience is believed to be more beneficial in promoting the university.

When examining the foreign literature, many studies have determined students to consider image, city, transportation, social opportunities, economic conditions, and university opportunities when choosing a university (Absher & Crawford, 1996; Briggs & Wilson, 2007; İsmail, 2009; Lin, 1997). Similar findings were also obtained in studies conducted in the Turkish literature (Ceylan et al., 2017; Ertoprak, 2015; Genç et al., 2007). Although some of these findings in the literature are consistent with the ones obtained in this study, others are not. The main reasons for this contradiction is that the sample group of this research was different, and the study was conducted in a military school.

The aim of this study has been to test the validity and reliability of the Factors for University Choice Scale in a military academy in Istanbul and perform its psychometric evaluation. The construct validity of the scale was examined using exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses within the framework of this purpose. Similar scale validity analysis was also performed to examine its relationship with different scales whose validity and reliability have already been proven. Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency was calculated for the reliability analysis of the scale. In the exploratory factor analysis performed to make the psychometric evaluation of the scale, item analysis was performed first; the item factor loading values were determined to be greater than .30 and thus no item needed to be removed (Büyüköztürk, 2004). Next, the scale was determined to have eight sub-dimensions that explain 62.40% of the total variance. This finding is similar to the result obtained by Köksal (2016). Confirmatory factor analysis was performed to see if the eight sub-dimensions of the scale were confirmed over the military academy sample; the results reported the model to have been confirmed. In other words, the fit indices show the model fit to be sufficient.

Confirmatory factor analysis is a powerful statistical method used in scale adaptation that looks at the compatibility between the model and the data (Graham et al., 2003; Levine et al., 2006). This analysis is used in scale adaptation studies.

When looking at the scale's relationship with other similar scales, it was determined to have a negative relationship with the Career Decision Scale and a positive relationship with the Satisfaction with Life Scale. A significant negative correlation was found between the Career Decision Scale and the Satisfaction with Life Scale. Within the scope of the scale's reliability analysis, Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency was calculated; both the scale and its sub-dimensions were seen to have alpha values greater than .60. The literature has been stated internal consistency values greater than .60 to be reliable (Karagöz, 2017). Based on all these findings, the Factors for University Choice Scale can be said to be both a valid and reliable measurement tool. In summary, the Factors for University Choice Scale consists of 39 items, has eight sub-dimensions, is scored as a 5-point scale, and has no reverse-coded items. This scale is thought to be able to meet an important need and to be useful for revealing the reasons why students choose a military academy.

This study also has some limitations. First of all, although the students are assumed to have answered sincerely, collecting data using paper and pencil without any interview can be seen as a limitation. When considering that the scales used in the research are limited to the features they measure, this situation can also be considered as a limitation because students are educated in a military school; being restricted to certain subjects within a discipline may affect their answers. Having future studies learn the reasons for choosing the school during the first enrollment period is thought to possibly reveal different results due to this limitation. Because this study is a scale adaptation study that examines the factors affecting the preference of a military academy, the validity and reliability of the scale can be studied using samples from other military schools in future studies.

Acknowledgement: This article is derived from the first author's master's thesis at National Defense University under the supervision of Adem Baspinar.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Ethics Committee Approval: This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of National Defence University.

Author Contributions: Conception/Design of Study- H.H.B., A.B.; Data Acquisition- H.H.B.; Data Analysis/Interpretation- H.H.B., A.B.; Drafting Manuscript- H.H.B.; Critical Revision of Manuscript- H.H.B., A.B.; Final Approval and Accountability- H.H.B., A.B.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Grant Support: The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

Absher, K., & Crawford, G. (1996). Marketing the community college starts with understanding students' perspectives. *Community College Review*, *23*(4), 59–67.

Akın, N. G., & Akyıldız, M. (2018). Fen lisesi öğrencilerinin meslek seçimini etkileyen faktörlerin bulanık TOPSIS yöntemi ile analizi. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *16*(1), 77–97.

Atli, A., & Gür, S. H. (2019). Lise öğrencilerinin meslek tercihleri ve bu tercihlerine etki eden faktörler. *Kariyer Psikolojik Danışmanlığı Dergisi*, *2*(1), 32–53.

Aytaç, S. (2005). *Çalışma yaşamında kariyer*. Ezgi Kitabevi.

Bachman, J. G., Segal, D. R., Freedman-Doan, P., & O'Malley, P. M. (2000). Who chooses military service? Correlates of propensity and enlistment in the US armed Forces. *Military Psychology*, *12*, 1–30.

Bailey, R. M., Stackbein, M. E., Hoskins, J. A., George, B. J., Lancaster, A. R., & Marsh, S. M. (2002). *Youth attitudes towards the military: Poll one.* https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a416458.pdf

Baker, S., & Brown, B. (2007). Images of excellence: Constructions of institutional prestige and reflections in the university choice process. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *28*(3), 377–391.

Blau, P. M., Gustad, J. W., Jessor R., Parnes, H. S., & Wilcock, R. C. (1956). Occupational choice: A conceptual framework. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, *9*, 534. https://doi.org/10.2307/2519672

Bölükbaşı, N. (2018). Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin meslek seçimi ve etkileyen faktörler. *Ordu Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Çalışmaları Dergisi*, *1*(1), 10–17.

Briggs, S., & Wilson, A. (2007). Which university? A study of the influence of cost and information factors on Scottish undergraduate choice. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *29*(1), 57–72.

Brown, D. (2002). The role of work and cultural values in occupational choice, satisfaction, and success: A theoretical statement. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *80*, 48–56.

Brown, D., & Crace, R. K. (1996). Values in life role choices and outcomes: A conceptual model. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *44*(3), 211–223.

Bröckling, U. (2001). *Disiplin, askeri itaat, üretiminin sosyolojisi ve tarihi*. Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Büyükgöze Kavas, A. (2005). Eğitim Fakültesi öğrencilerinin aldıkları mesleki rehberlik hizmetleri ve mesleklerini değiştirmek isteme düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *21*, 111–122.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2004). *Veri analizi el kitabı*. Pegem Akademi.

Cernicova, M., & Palea, A. (2014). Measuring the students perception chosen profession case study: Pr students in Western Romania. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *116*, 2825–2831.

Ceylan, E., Belkıs Cinser, B., Soytürk, S., Şengün, T., & Erbay, H. (2017). Bir Tıp Fakültesi öğrencilerinin meslek tercihinde etkili olan faktörler. *Journal of Medical Education and Informatics, 3*(1), 2–12.

Croson, R., &, Gneezy, U. (2009). Gender differences in preferences. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *47*(2), 448–474.

Çapık, C. (2014). Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışmalarında doğrulayıcı faktör analizinin kullanımı. *Anadolu Hemşirelik ve Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, *17*(3), 196–205.

Çelik, N., & Üzmez, U. (2014). Üniversite öğrencilerinin meslek seçimini etkileyen faktörlerin değerlendirilmesi: Çağrı merkezi hizmetleri örneği. *Elektronik Mesleki Gelişim ve Araştırma Dergisi*, *2*(1), 94–105.

Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G., & Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2014). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları* (3rd ed.). Pegem Akademi.

DeVellis, R. F. (2014). *Ölçek geliştirme kuram ve uygulamalar* [Scale development: Theory and applications] (T. Totan, Tran. & Ed.). Nobel Yayıncılık.

Diamantopoulos, A., Siguaw, J. A., & Cadogan, J. W. (2000). Export performance: The impact of cross-country export market orientation. In J. P. Workman, Jr. & W. D. Perreault, Jr. (Eds.), *Marketing theory and application*. *Proceedings of the American Marketing Association Winter Conference* (Vol. 11, pp. 177–178). American Marketing Association.

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *49*(1), 71–75.

Dinç, E. (2008). Meslek seçiminde etkili faktörlerin incelenmesi: Meslek Yüksekokulu muhasebe programı öğrencileri üzerine bir araştırma. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *16*(2), 90–106.

Durmuş, B., Yurtkoru, E. S., & Çinko, M. (2016). *Sosyal bilimlerde SPSS ile veri analizi* (6th ed.). Beta Yayınları.

Duru, H., Bayraktar, M., & Gültekin, F. (2020). Öğretmen adaylarının kariyer kararlarının algılanan kariyer engelleri ve kariyer geleceği açısından incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, *28*(2), 613–629.

Erdinç, S. B., & Kahraman, S. (2012, April 12-15). Turizm mesleğini seçme nedenlerinin incelenmesi. *VI. Lisansüstü Turizm Öğrencileri Araştırma Kongresi*, Kemer, Antalya (pp. 229–237).

Ertoprak, D. G. (2015). Üniversite tercihlerinde etkili olabilecek özellikleri belirlemeye yönelik bir ölçekleme çalışması. *Amasya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *4*(2), 153–174.

Frady, W. P. (2005). *A study of high school student's career interest inventories and their relationships to students completion of occupational programs* (Doctoral dissertation). Clemson University, USA.

Fuller, A. M., & Delorey, R. (2016). Making the choice: University and program selection factors for undergraduate management education in Maritime Canada. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *14*, 176–186.

Genç, G., Kaya, A., & Genç, M. (2007). İnönü Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi öğrencilerinin meslek seçimini etkileyen faktörler. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *8*(14), 49–63.

Gore, J., Fray, L., Wallington, C., Holmes, K., & Smith, M. (2006). Australian school student aspirations for military careers: Traditional perceptions in shifting contexts. *Armed Forces & Society*, *43*(2), 238–259.

Graham, J. M., Guthrie, A. C., & Thompson, B. (2003). Consequences of not interpreting structure coefficients in published CFA research: A reminder. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *10*(1), 142–153.

Gülücü, H., & Taslak, S. (2019). Meslek seçimi ile kişilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişki: İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi öğrencileri üzerine bir araştırma. *International Social Sciences Studies Journal*, *5*(29), 13–26.

Hamamcı, Z., & Hamurlu, M. K. (2005). Anne babaların meslek gelişimine yardımcı olmaya yönelik tutumları ve bilgi düzeylerinin çocuklarının mesleki kararsızlıkları ile ilişkisi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *6*(10), 55–69.

Hoe, S. L. (2008). Issues and procedures in adopting structural equation modeling technique. *Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods*, *3*(1), 76–83.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6*(1), 1–55.

Hussain, A., & Ishaq, M. (2005). Public attitudes towards a career in the British Armed Forces. *Defense and Security Analysis*, *21*, 79–95.

İnce, S., & Khorshid, L. (2015). Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin meslek seçimini etkileyen faktörlerin belirlenmesi. *Anadolu Hemşirelik ve Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, *18*(3), 163–171.

İsmail, N. (2009, July 24-26). Mediating effect of information satisfaction on college choice. Paper presented at *Oxford Business & Economics Conference Program*. St. Hugh's College, Oxford University, Oxford, UK.

Karagöz, Y. (2017). *SPSS ve AMOS uygulamalı nitel-nicel-karma bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri ve yayın etiği*. Nobel Yayıncılık.

Karaman, A., Yıldırım, M. N., & Ertürk, İ. E. (2018). Uşak Üniversitesi Banaz Meslekyüksekokulu öğrencilerinin iç mekân tasarımı programını tercih etme nedenleri. *Karabük Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *8*(1), 156–172.

Kars, V., Arslan, N., Erik, L., Avcı, N., Bucaktepe, P. G., Celepkolu, T., & Şahin, H. A. (2014). Lise son sınıf öğrencilerinin meslek seçiminde karşılaştığı sorunlar ve bu sorunların anksiyete ve depresyonla ilişkisi. *Dicle Tıp Dergisi*, *41*(1), 187–190.

Keith, T. Z. (2019). *Multiple regression and beyond: An introduction to multiple regression and structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). Taylor & Francis Group.

Kıbrıslıoğlu Uysal, N. (2017). Araştırma görevlilerinin meslek tercih nedenlerinin ikili karşılaştırma yöntemi ile ölçeklenmesi. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, *7*(1), 24–27.

Kılıç, E. (2019). *Meslek seçiminde ailenin etkisine yönelik bir araştırma* (Yüksek lisans tezi, Maltepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul). https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/

Kırmızıgül, P., & Kolukırık, S. (2005). Askeri okul öğrencilerinin meslek tercihi ve algısı: GATA Sağlık Astsubay okulları örneği. *Savunma Bilimleri Dergisi*, *4*(2), 1–2.

Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). The Guilford Press.

Korkut-Owen, F., Kepir, D. D., Özdemir, S., Ulaş, Ö., & Yılmaz, O. (2012). Üniversite öğrencilerinin bölüm seçme nedenleri. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *8*(3), 135–151.

Köker, S. (1991). *Normal ve sorunlu ergenlerin yaşam doyumu düzeyinin karşılaştırılması* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara). https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/

Köksal, K. (2016). Üniversite ve meslek tercihini etkileyen unsurlara yönelik bir alan araştırması. *Kara Harp Okulu Bilim Dergisi*, *26*(2), 39–69.

Kuzgun, Y. (2000). *Meslek danışmanlığı*. Doğuş Matbaacılık.

Kuzgun, Y. (2006). *Meslek gelişimi ve danışmanlığı.* Nobel Yayın.

Levine, T., Hullett, C. R., Mitchell-Turner, M., & Lapinski, M. K. (2006). The desirability of using confirmatory factor analysis on published scales. *Communication Research Reports*, *23*(4), 309–314.

Lin, L. (1997). What are the student education and educational related needs? *Marketing and Research Today*, *25*(3), 199–212.

Marsh, H. W., Hau, K., & Wen, Z. (2004). In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *11*, 320–341.

Mashankhan, A. (2013). *Yabancı uyruklu öğrencilerin kariyer tercihlerini etkileyen faktörler üzerine bir araştırma* (Yüksek lisans tezi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Isparta). https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/

Meyers, L. S., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. J. (2006). *Applied multivariate research. Design and interpretation*. Sage Publications.

Miles, M. R., & Haider-Marker, D. P. (2019). Personality and genetic associations with military service. *Armed Forces & Society*, *45*(4), 1–22.

Ming, J. S. K. (2010). Intuitional factors influencing students' college choice decision in Malaysia: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *1*(3), 53–58.

Mourad, M. (2011). Role of brand related factors in influencing student's choice in higher education market. *International Journal of Management in Education*, *5*(2-3), 258–270.

Niles, S. G., & Bowlsbey, J. H. (2005). *Career development interventions in the 21st century.* Pearson Educations Inc.

O'Brien, K., & Rahmani, Z. (1995). Career aspirations of young Australians in relation to the Defence Force. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, *4*, 51–53.

Okur, S. (2019). *Lise öğrencilerinin temel psikolojik ihtiyaçları ile problemli internet kullanımları arasındaki ilişkide yaşam doyumunun aracılık rolü* (Yüksek lisans tezi, Ege Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir). https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/

Pekkaya, M., & Çolak, N. (2013) Üniversite öğrencilerinin meslek seçimini etkileyen faktörlerin derecelerinin AHP ile belirlenmesi. *International Journal of Social Science*, *6*(2), 797–818.

Rixon, K., & McMahon, M. (2007). The career development of rural Queensland children. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, *16*, 39–50.

Reeves, D. L., & Karlitz, G. (2005). *Career ideas for teen education and training.* Bright Futures Press.

Sackett, P., & Mavor, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Attitudes, aptitudes, and aspirations of American youth: Implications for military recruitment.* National Academies Press.

Sarıkaya, T., & Khorshid, L. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinin meslek seçimini etkileyen etmenlerin incelenmesi: Üniversite öğrencilerinin meslek seçimi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *7*(2), 393–423.

Sarsıkoğlu, A. F., & Bacanlı, F. (2019). Üniversite öğrencilerinin kariyer engelleri ile kariyer uyumlulukları arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *7*(13), 95–113.

Sathapornvajana, S., & Watanapa, B. (2012). Factors affecting students intention to choose it program. *Procedia Computer Science*, *13*, 60–67.

Segal, D. R., Bachman, J. G., Freedman-Doan, P., & O'Malley, P. M. (1999). Propensity to serve in the U.S. military: Temporal trends and subgroup differences. *Armed Forces & Society*, *25*, 407–427.

Sharf, R. S. (2006). *Applying career development theory to counseling.* Thompson Brooks/Cole.

Shevtsov, V. V. (2007). School and college students' attitudes toward military service. *Russian Education and Society*, *49*, 92–98.

Shoffner, M. F. (2006). Career counseling, theoretical perspectives. In D. Capuzzi & M. D. Stauffer (Eds.), *Career counseling foundations, perspectives and applications* (pp. 40–68). Pearson Educations, Inc.

Sverko, I., & Babarovic, T. (2016). Integrating personality and career adaptability into vocational interest space. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *94*, 89–103.

Şahin, S., & Acun, A. (2016). Turizm rehberliği öğrencilerinin mesleğe yönelik tutumları. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, *15*(2), 563–580.

Şeker, H., & Gençdoğan, B. (2006). *Psikolojide ve eğitimde ölçme aracı geliştirme*. Nobel Yayıncılık.

Şimşek, Ö. F. (2007). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesine giriş (Temel ilkeler ve LISREL uygulamaları).* Ekinoks Yayıncılık.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2012). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Tanrıverdi, H., & Kavsut, B. A. (2015). Anadolu Öğretmen Lisesi öğrencilerinin öğretmenliğe yönelik tutumları ve meslek seçimini etkileyen faktörler arasındaki ilişki. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *14*(54), 1–18.

Terzi, Y. (2019). *Anket, güvenirlik-geçerlik analizi.* Retrieved from: https://personel.omu.edu.tr/docs/ders_dokumanlari/1030_32625_1500.pdf

Tokar, D. M., Fisher, A. R., & Subich, L.M. (1998). Personality and vocational behavior: A selective review of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *53*, 115–153.

Totan, T., & Şahin, R. (2015). The stepwise effect emotional self-efficacy process and emotional empathy on young peoples' satisfaction with life. *European Scientific Journal*, *11*(14), 442–456.

Wadham, B., Skrzypiec, G., & Slee, P. (2014). Young Australians' attitudes to the military and military service. *SAGE Open*, *4*, 1–10.

Wang, J., & Wang, X. (2012). *Structural equation modeling: Applications using Mplus.* Higher Education Press.

Yazıcı, S. (2019). *Z kuşağının iş yaşamına ilişkin beklentileri, iş ve meslek tercihlerine ilişkin algılamalarıyla X ve Y kuşağına mensup insan kaynakları yöneticilerinin Z kuşağına ilişkin beklenti ve algılamaları üzerine sağlık sektöründe görgül bir araştırma* (Yüksek lisans tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul). https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/

Yeşilyaprak, B. (2014). Mesleki rehberlik ve kariyer danışmanlığına giriş. In *Mesleki rehberlik ve kariyer danışmanlığı kuramdan uygulamaya* (5th ed., pp. 2–39). Pegem Akademi.

Yılmaz, N., & Doğan, N. (2015). İlköğretim matematik öğretmen adaylarının meslek tercihlerini etkileyen faktörler: Hacettepe Üniversitesi örneği. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *15*(1), 405–421.

Yu, C. (2011). Chinese knowledge employees' career values, perceived organizational support and career success. *Business*, *3*, 274–282.

Yusupu, R. (2015). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde kariyer kararları ile mükemmeliyetçilik, öğrenme motivasyonu ve akademik başarı arasındaki ilişkiler* (Yüksek lisans tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir). https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/

Zunker, V. G. (2006). *Career counseling: A holistic approach.* Brooks/Cole Product.

Zytowski, D. G. (2001). Frank Parsons and the progressive movement. *The Career development Quarterly*, *50*, 57–65.