Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 150 (2014) 251 – 262

Procedia
Social and Behavioral Sciences

10th International Strategic Management Conference

Adopting mission and vision statements by employees: The case of TAV Airports

Gamze Orhan*, Dilek Erdoğan, Vildan Durmaz

Anadolu University, Eskişehir, 26555, Turkey

Abstract

Mission and vision statements are popular both in the extant literature and the practice for the companies' strategic management. While many studies have been realized about relationship between vision-mission statements and firm performance, there is very little studies which ask the answer if vision and mission is adopted by employees in an organization. Our study focus on the perspectives of employees about the vision and mission statements of their firms in which they work. Based on a survey of employees in TAV Airports, this paper aimed to explore the employees' state of awareness, perceptions and attitudes towards the firm's vision and mission statements.

© 2014 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Peer-review under responsibility of the International Strategic Management Conference.

Keywords: Mission and vision; Employee knowledge and opinions; Level of education; Working position

1. Introduction

Mission and vision are very important management tools which cannot be separated from a corporate strategy and they provide firms to achieve high performance and to survive in a long time period. Developing a vision statement is often considered the first step in strategic planning, preceding even development of a mission statement. Many organizations generally have both a vision and mission statement (Ülgen and Mirze, 2007). The vision is the statement of the desired future state of the

* *Corresponding author. Tel. + 90-222-321-3550 / 6833 fax. +90-222-322-1619*
Email address: gozsoy@anadolu.edu.tr

1877-0428 © 2014 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Peer-review under responsibility of the International Strategic Management Conference.
doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.051

organization within the arena of competition. It is a future orientated term (Raynor, 1998). The mission statement is a declaration of an organization's "reason for being". It answers the vitally important questions "What is our business? Why do we exist? What are we trying to accomplish?"(Bart, 1997). A good mission statement describes an organization's purpose, products and services, markets, philosophy, and basic technology (Kemp and Dwyer, 2003). A vision statement describes what the firm wants to be in the future while a mission statement describes what the firm does and mission is a special task which is given to the firm to reach the desired future of the firm defined in the vision.

A number of studies show that having a vision and a mission affects a firm's most aspects of organizational performance. Business Week reports that firms with well-crafted mission statements have a 30% higher return on certain financial measures than firms that lack such documents (David and David, 2003). In addition, however, some studies have found that having vision and mission statements does not directly contribute positively to financial performance (Sufi and Lyons, 2003; Benligiray et al., 2010), a number of academic studies suggest that there is a positive relationship between vision, mission statements and organizational performance (Bart and Baetz, 1998; Bart and Baetz, 1995; Bart, 1997; Doğan and Hatipoğlu, 2009). It is thought that, for the expressions of mission and vision to create a positive effect on the organizational performance, first of all, the organization's mission and vision must be known and accepted by the employees. In this regard, our study focuses on finding out the employees' knowledge levels, perceptions and opinions about their own organization.

2. Literature Review

Firms create their vision and mission statements in written form and announce to their employees and external shareholders. However, just getting vision and mission statements on the walls and web sites of the company is not sufficient (Benligiray et al., 2013). To have an efficient vision and mission, it is necessary to share them with the employees. Sharing vision and missions mean not to just tell, also make the statements being learning, adopting and exercising by the employees. Leaders are responsible for creating and maintaining vision and mission statements, but it can be achieved through whole employees in an organization. (Stovel and Bontis, 2002). After the employees adopt the vision and mission of the firm, they can make over into their own missions to achieve the overall goals of the organization. Several works suggest that vision and mission of an organization can impact positively on employee performance providing a high levels of commitment of the employees and shaping their behaviors in line with organization's objectives (Bart et al., 2001; Campbell, 1997; Collins and Poras, 1996; Ireland and Hitt, 1992; Klemm et al., 1991). A vision and mission statement for the organization can serve as powerful vehicles to help achieve shared understanding and support from employees for the firm's strategic plan road map. Employees want to believe that their efforts are important in supporting the organization to achieve exciting, satisfying and worthy goals (Stokely, 2004).

While many studies have been realized about relationship between vision-mission statements and firm performance, there is very little studies which ask the answer if vision and mission is adopted and how they are perceived by employees in an organization. Aydemir (2000) highlights the importance of sharing visions in the organizations to develop learning organizations. Doğan (2008) compared the academic and the administrative (non-academic) personnel perceptions and attitudes in a university. He found that academic and administrative personnel believe the necessity of a vision and a mission for their university but, they do not believe that the vision and mission of the university is not sufficient in being original, convincing and motivating. He also highlighted there is a difference between academic and administrative personnel's level of knowledge about the organization's vision and mission. Forbes and Seena (2006)

highlights the importance of examining the views of staff both in senior management and different groups of employees in other positions in not-for-profit hospitals. They found that there is a variance between the views of senior management staff and the others. Darbi (2012) provides the knowledge and perceptions of employees of a public but profit oriented institution about the vision and mission statements of the organization. Brown and Yoshioka (2003), with a work in a non-profit organization, investigates the relationship between employee attitudes toward the mission and their intention to remain with the organization. They suggest that mission might be more effective in attracting employees but less effective in retaining them in the organization. Kim and Lee (2007) found that mission attachment is still an important factor in employee retention in a non-profit organization despite dissatisfaction with pay, carrier opportunities and other working conditions.

The-above mentioned studies mainly focused on the non-profit organizations. Because it is claimed that "Providing a common purpose" is the main driver of fulfilling the organization's activities (Bart, 1998). Hence, these organizations focus more on mission than strategy (Rangan, 2004). Whereas, we know relatively little about profit oriented organizations. Our study especially emphasizes the knowledge level and attitudes toward the vision and mission statements for a private and profit-oriented organization, TAV Airports Terminal Operating Company.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Goal

In this study, we aimed to define the level of knowledge and opinions of TAV Airports employees about the vision and mission of their company and vision and mission concepts generally according to their work positions and level of education. In the scope of this research aim, we propose the 12 hypotheses following:

H1: According to employees' work positions their opinions about the quality of the vision and mission of the company differ.

H2: According to employees' level of education their opinions about the quality of the vision and mission of the company differ.

H3: According to employees' work positions their level of knowledge about the vision and mission components of the company differ.

H4: According to employees' level of education their level of knowledge about the vision and mission components of the company differ.

H5: According to employees' work positions their level of knowledge about the vision and mission of the company differ.

H6: According to employees' level of education their level of knowledge about the vision and mission of the company differ.

H7: According to employees' work positions their perception of the need and conditions for success for vision and mission differ.

H8: According to employees' level of education their perception of the need and conditions for success for vision and mission differ.

H9: According to employees' work positions their level of knowledge about the concepts of vision and mission differ.

H10: According to employees' level of education their level of knowledge about the concepts of vision and mission differ.

H11: According to employees' work positions their opinions about the renewal the vision and mission of the company differ.

H12: According to employees' level of education their opinions about the renewal the vision and mission of the company differ.

3.2. Sample and Data Collection

The questionnaire was administered to a total of 9530 employees of TAV Airports, which operates in the domestic and international airport management field. Of these employees, 2724 were employed at İstanbul Atatürk Airport, 686 at İzmir Adnan Menderes Airport, 921 at Ankara Esenboğa Airport, 29 at Alanya Gazipaşa Airport, and the remaining 5170 were at service companies (ATÜ, BTA, TAV Management Services, TAV Informatics, TAV Private Security) in Turkey. TAV Airports' international airport management companies and HAVAŞ, of which it is a stakeholder, were excluded from the scope of this study. The web-based questionnaires were sent to the employees through e-mails. Within about a month, a total of 453 TAV Airports employees responded.

The questionnaire items were adapted from Doğan's (2008) questionnaire that he used for the employees of Adnan Menderes University. In addition to Doğan's (2008) items, our questionnaire include items that address the components that make up TAV's vision and mission. Covering a total of 37 items and 4 sections, our questionnaire's first section is composed of 6 items that aim to find out the demographics of the participants. In the second section, there are 13 items that aim to elicit the general knowledge of the participants about mission and vision concepts and their specific knowledge level of the mission and vision of their organization. In the third section, first, participants are presented with the mission and vision statements of their organization for their perusal and then given 12 questions aiming to find out participants' opinions about the nature of the mission and vision statements of their own organization. The fourth section comprises 6 items asking about their opinions of the need and conditions of success for vision and mission.

Questionnaire items are in a 7-point Likert Scale (1: none, 7: very much / 1: I don't agree at all, 7: I completely agree/ 1: none, 7: very high / 1: very complex, 7: very simple / 1: very far, 7: very close / 1: very low, 7: very high).

3.3. Analyses and Results

Data obtained from 465 respondents were analyzed through the SPSS statistical program. Firstly, to ensure the structural validity and reliability of the scale, and to identify the factor loading of the items, a factor analysis was carried out. Kass and Tinsley (1979) state that if the number of participants exceed 300, regardless of the ratio of participant number and item number, test results will be reliable. Field (2009), Tabachnick and Fidell (1966) also asserted that to be able to run a factor analysis, the minimum required number of participants is 300. Accordingly, it can be said that 465 participants in our study is a good number for factor analysis.

As a result of the factor analysis, 5 items with weak factor loading and multiple factor overlapping (3, 6, 15, 26, 28) were removed from the scale. Principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted on the 26 items with orthogonal rotation (varimax) and these items were grouped under 6 factors. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis, KMO = .905 ('superb' according

to Field, 2009), which is well above the acceptable limit of .5 (Field, 2009). Bartlett's test of sphericity = 7744,509, $p < .001$, indicated that correlations between items were sufficiently large for PCA. An initial

Table 1. Factor Analysis Results

Variables and Factor Groups	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Alpha
Opinions about the Quality of the Vision and Mission of the Company							**0.918**
Q24	0.787						
Q20	0.745						
Q17	0.721						
Q22	0.718						
Q21	0.706						
Q23	0.702						
Q18	0.663						
Q14	0.636						
Q16	0.615						
Level of Knowledge about the Vision and Mission Components of the Company							**0.843**
Q5		0.784					
Q4		0.775					
Q8		0.745					
Q7		0.624					
Level Of Knowledge About The Vision And Mission Of The Company							**0.851**
Q9			0.832				
Q10			0.813				
Q12			0.570				
Q13			0.514				
Q11			0.468				
Need For Vision And Mission And Conditions For Success							**0.800**
Q30				0.845			
Q31				0.840			
Q29				0.756			
Q27				0.600			
Level Of Knowledge About The Concepts Of Vision And Mission							**0.951**
Q1					0,906		
Q2					0,904		
Opinions About The Renewal Of The Vision And Mission Of The Company							**0.800**
Q19						0.891	
Q25						0.869	

analysis was run to obtain eigenvalues for each component in the data. Six components had eigenvalues over Kaiser's criterion of 1 and in combination explained 69,189% of the variance. Table 1 shows the factor loadings after rotation and Cronbach's alpha value of each component. The items that cluster on the same components suggest that component 1 represents "*opinions about the quality of the vision and mission of the institution*", component 2 "*level of knowledge about the vision and mission components of the institution*" , component 3 "*level of knowledge about the vision and mission of the ınstitution*", component 4 "*need for vision and mission and conditions for success*", component 5 "*level of knowledge about the concepts of vision and mission*", component 6 "*opinions about the renewal of the vision and mission of the ınstitution*".

Table 2 gives the demographic characteristics of TAV Airports employees which participated to the survey.

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Parameter		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Work Position	Lower-Level Worker	112	24.7	24.7
	Middle-Level Worker	242	53.4	78.1
	Higher-Level Worker	99	21.9	100
	Total	**453**	**100.0**	
Level of Education	High School and Lower	76	16.8	6.8
	Associate	83	18.3	35.1
	Undergraduate	234	51.7	86.8
	Postgraduate	60	13.2	100.0
	Total	**453**	**100.0**	
Years of Work at TAV	0-1	44	9.7	9.7
	2-5	130	28.7	38.4
	6-10	207	45.7	84.1
	>10	72	15.9	100
	Total	**453**	**100.0**	
Companies under TAV	Atatürk Airport	136	30.0	30.0
	TAV Holding	100	22.1	52.1
	Adnan Menderes Airport	42	9.3	61.4
	Ankara Esenboğa Airport	45	9.9	71.3
	TAV Gazipaşa Airport	5	1.1	72.4
	TAV Security	42	9.3	81.7
	ATU Dutyfree	36	7.9	89.6
	TAV Information Technology	15	3.3	92.9
	BTA Food and Beverage Services	32	7.1	100.0
	Total	**453**	**100.0**	

To obtain the descriptive information about the factors on the scale, descriptive statistics are utilized, statistical calculations such as mean, standard error of mean and standard deviation of mean are made.

The descriptive statistics regarding sub-factors in the scale are analyzed and the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Factorial Descriptive Statistics

	$\bar{X}$	$S_{\bar{X}}$	S
Opinions about the Quality of the Vision and Mission of the Company	**5.85**	**.03997**	**.85**
Q(24)I see TAV as the…… of this vision now	5.73	.05200	1.10
Q(20)Degree of motivation/incentiveness of the TAV vision	5.99	.04900	1.04
Q(17)Credibility of the TAV mission	5.98	.05000	1.07
Q(22)Credibility of the TAV vision	6.01	.04700	1.01
Q(21)Authenticity/originality of the TAV vision	5.84	.05300	1.12
Q(23)Content of the TAV vision	5.67	.05400	1.16
Q(18)I see TAV as the…… of this mission now	5.87	.04800	1.02
Q(14)Degree of motivation/incentiveness of the TAV mission	5.86	.05500	1.16
Q(16)Content of the TAV mission	5.69	.05400	1.15
Level of Knowledge about the Vision and Mission Components of the Company	**6.42**	**.03649**	**.78**
Q(5)TAV's vision emphasizes being a pioneer in the region	6.45	.04500	.96
Q(4)TAV's vision emphasizes being a leader in the region	6.40	.04600	.98
Q(8)TAV's mission emphasizes client-centeredness	6.51	.03900	.82
Q(7)TAV's mission emphasizes "creating the highest value for all shareholders"	6.32	.04700	1.00
Level Of Knowledge About The Vision And Mission Of The Company	**5.74**	**.04131**	**.88**
Q(9)My belief in TAV workers' having sufficient knowledge about the vision of the institution	5.26	.05900	1.25
Q(10)My belief in TAV workers' having sufficient knowledge about the mission of the institution	5.21	.05900	1.26
Q(12)My opinion about what is expected of me as an individual by TAV in its institutional objective	5.99	.05200	1.10
Q(13)My opinion about what our common values, principles and beliefs are for institutional success	6.09	.04400	.94
Q(11)My opinion about where TAV aims to reach as an institution	6.15	.04500	.96
Need For Vision And Mission And Conditions For Success	**6.50**	**.03283**	**.70**
Q(30)My belief in the need for vision in an organization	6.54	.03700	.78
Q(31)My belief in the need for mission in an organization	6.52	.03700	.78
Q(29)My belief in the idea that vision and mission must not just remain in words but also be reflected in actions	6.55	.04100	.88
Q(27)My belief in the idea that for the vision and mission to be realized, first the administrators must believe in and act upon them	6.41	.05000	1.06
Level Of Knowledge About The Concepts Of Vision And Mission	**6.08**	**.04473**	**.95**
Q(1)The opinion that the TAV mission needs to be revised/renewed	6.06	.04600	.98
Q(2)My knowledge about "Mission"	6.09	.04500	.96
Opinions About The Renewal Of The Vision And Mission Of The Company	**4.46**	**.08163**	**1.74**
Q(19)The opinion that TAV's mission needs to be revised/renewed	4.47	.08900	1.90
Q(25)The opinion that TAV's vision needs to be revised/renewed	4.45	.08900	1.90

To see whether there is a statistical difference between mean scores of the participants according to their positions and education levels, one-way ANOVA is used. However, one of the assumptions of this study, when the assumption that the distribution of comparison group scores has a normal distribution

without excessive deviation is not met, a non-parametric test, Kruskal Wallis H, which aims the same thing with one-way ANOVA, is utilized. Whether the distribution meets the normalcy hypothesis or not is decided based on Skewness and Kurtosis values (Field, 2009).

As a result of one-way ANOVA, for the cases with significant difference, Post Hoc tests are used to see between which groups there is a difference. When a significant difference is found as a result of Kruskal Wallis H test, Mann Whitney U test is used for paired comparisons to see between which groups there is a difference. In these cases, for paired comparisons, Bonferronni adjustment is done and adjusted alpha level (alpha level = .05/comparison number) is taken as the base.

Whether the overall mean scores from the first factor of the scale "Opinions about the Quality of the Vision and Mission of the Company" showed a significant difference according to position and education level is analyzed through one-way ANOVA and the results are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Opinions about the Quality of the Vision and Mission of the Company Factor ANOVA Results

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sig.Diff.
Working position						
Between Groups	3.678	2	1.839	2.559	.079	-
Within Groups	323.370	450	.719			
Total	327.048	452				
Level of education						
Between Groups	8.288	3	2.763	3.892	.009	2-5
Within Groups	318.760	449	.710			
Total	327.048	452				

According to ANOVA results, "Opinions about the Quality of the Vision and Mission of the Company" factor mean scores do not indicate a significant difference according to position ($F_{2,452}$ = 2.559; $p > .05$). However, according to education level, "Opinions about the Quality of the Vision and Mission of the Company" factor mean scores show difference for at least two education levels ($F_{3, 452}$ = 3.892; $p < .05$). In order to determine between which education levels this difference exist, a Post Hoc test, Scheffe test is carried out, and the mean score of the participants with high school or lower ($\overline{X}$ = 6.06) is found to be significantly higher ($p < .05$) than the mean score of the participants with post graduate education ($\overline{X}$ = 5.61). (**H1: rejected, H2:accepted**).

Whether the "Level of Knowledge about the Vision and Mission Components of the Company" factor mean scores differed according to participants' position and education level is analyzed by using Kruskal Wallis H test and the results are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Level of Knowledge about the Vision and Mission Components of the Company Factor Kruskal Wallis H Test Result

	N	Mean Rank	df	χ^2	p
Working Position					
Lower-level worker	112	209.58			
Middle-level worker	242	218.96	2	12.994	.002
Higher-level worker	99	266.35			
Level of Education					
High school or lower	76	218.44			
Associate	83	229.89	3	2.321	.509
Undergraduate	234	223.33			
Postgraduate	60	248.15			

According to Kruskal Wallis H test result, "Level of Knowledge about the Vision and Mission Components of the Company" factor mean scores indicate a significant difference according to participants' position (χ^2 = 12.994; p < .05). In order to determine between which groups is this difference, paired comparisons are made by using Mann Whitney U test, and this revealed that, one difference (Z = -3.311; p < .025) was between lower-level position employees ($\bar{X}$ = 6.30) and higher-level position employees ($\bar{X}$ = 6.61), and another difference (Z = -3.212; p < .025) was between middle-level position employees ($\bar{X}$ = 6.40) and higher-level position employees ($\bar{X}$ = 6.61). (**H3:accepted**).

In the comparison based on education level, mean scores regarding this factor are found not to differ significantly according to education level (χ^2 = 2.321; p > .05). (**H4: rejected**)

Whether the participants' "Level of Knowledge about the Vision and Mission of The Company" factor mean scores differed according to position and education level variables is analyzed by Kruskal Wallis H test and the findings are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Level of Knowledge about the Vision and Mission of the Company Factor Kruskal Wallis H Test Result

	N	Mean Rank	df	χ^2	p
Working Position					
Lower-level worker	112	232.99			
Middle-level worker	242	215.69	2	4.583	.101
Higher-level worker	99	247.86			
Level of Education					
High school or lower	76	250.31			
Associate	83	238.55	3	5.999	.112
Undergraduate	234	222.33			
Postgraduate	60	199.71			

"Level of Knowledge About The Vision And Mission of The Company" factor mean scores are found not to show a significant difference according to participants' position (χ^2 = 4.583; p > .05) and education level (χ^2 = 5.999; p > .05). **(H5:rejected, H6:rejected).**

Whether the "Need for Vision and Mission and Conditions for Success" factor mean scores show a significant difference according to position and education level is analyzed by using Kruskal Wallis H test and the results are given in Table 7.

Table 7. Need For Vision and Mission and Conditions for Success Factor Kruskal Wallis H Test Result

	N	Mean Rank	df	χ^2	p
Working Position					
Lower-level worker	112	221.22			
Middle-level worker	242	224.24	2	1.536	.464
Higher-level worker	99	240.30			
Level of Education					
High school or lower	76	194.97			
Associate	83	229.48	3	6.386	.094
Undergraduate	234	235.37			
Postgraduate	60	231.52			

According to Kruskal Wallis H test results, the "Need For Vision And Mission And Conditions For Success" factor mean scores do not show a significant difference according to participants' position (χ^2 = 1.536; p > .05) and education level (χ^2 = 6.386; p > .05). **(H7: rejected, H8: rejected).**

Whether the participants' "Level of Knowledge about the Concepts of Vision and Mission" factor mean scores show a significant difference according to position and education level variables is analyzed by using Kruskal Wallis H test and the results are given in Table 8.

Table 8. Level of Knowledge about the Concepts of Vision and Mission Factor Kruskal Wallis H Test Result

	N	Mean Rank	df	χ^2	p
Working Position					
Lower-level worker	112	189.77			
Middle-level worker	242	229.18	2	18.696	.000
Higher-level worker	99	263.79			
Level of Education					
High school or lower	76	200.81			
Associate	83	210.41	3	8.759	.033
Undergraduate	234	234.02			
Postgraduate	60	255.73			

Kruskal Wallis H test results reveal that, according to position, "Level of Knowledge About The Concepts of Vision And Mission" factor mean scores show significant difference (χ^2 = 18.696; p < .05). In order to determine between which groups this difference exists, paired comparisons are made by using Mann Whitney U test and a significant difference (p < .025) is found between lower-level position employees ($\bar{X}$ = 5.80) and middle-level position ($\bar{X}$ = 6.11) and higher level position employees ($\bar{X}$ = 6.31) and between higher-level position employees ($\bar{X}$ = 6.31) and middle-level position employees ($\bar{X}$ = 6.11). **(H9: accepted)**

According to education level comparison results, this factor mean scores are found to show significant difference (χ^2 = 8.759; p < .05) and to determine between which groups is this difference, paired comparisons are made by using Mann Whitney U test. According to this, there is a significant difference (p < .017) between the mean scores of participants with high school or lower education ($\bar{X}$ = 5.86) and the mean scores of participants with post-graduate education ($\bar{X}$ = 6.30). **(H10: accepted)**

Whether the participants' "Opinions About The Renewal of The Vision And Mission of The Company" factor mean scores show a significant difference according to position and education level variables is analyzed by using one-way ANOVA and the results are given in Table 9.

Table 9. Opinions about the Renewal of the Vision and Mission of the Company" Factor ANOVA Results

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sig.Diff.
Working position						
Between Groups	3.678	2	1.839	2.224	.109	-
Within Groups	323.370	450	.719			
Total	327.048	452				
Level of education						
Between Groups	5.904	3	1.968	.651	.583	-
Within Groups	1358.381	449	3.025			
Total	1364.285	452				

According to one-way ANOVA Results, "Opinions About The Renewal of The Vision And Mission of The Company" factor mean scores do not indicate significant difference both for position ($F_{2,452}$ = 2.224; p > .05) and education level ($F_{3,452}$ = .651; p > .05). **(H11: rejected, H12: rejected)**

4. Conclusion

This study found that employees' opinions about TAV's mission and vision differ based on their education level. Thus, the employees with high school or lower level education view the quality of the mission and vision statements of their company more adequate than those who have a post graduate degree. It might be safe to attribute this result to employees' knowledge level about vision and mission concepts. Hence, when the tests about the knowledge of vision and mission concepts are analysed, it is clear that employees with high school and lower level degrees think that they are less informed about these concepts than the employees with post graduate degrees. This leads us to think that the fact that employees with high school and lower level education are less knowledgeable about vision and mission influences their evaluation of their own company's mission and vision statements, which results in their being less critical of those statements. On the other hand, employees with post graduate degrees may be viewing their own vision and mission statements qualitatively less adequate due to the effect of their general conceptual knowledge. In addition, when the possibility that post graduate level employees can work in higher-level positions and thus can better see the overall structure of their company is considered, it can be concluded that this might be leading them to think more critically.

Different from Doğan's (2008) study, adding an extra factor to our study resulted in another finding. This new factor regarding employees' knowledge level about the vision and mission components of their company revealed that lower, middle, and higher level employees' knowledge levels are different. Lower-level employees think that they are better informed than the higher-level employees about the vision and mission components of their company. Likewise, the higher-level employees think that they know the components better than the middle-level employees. Another point that must be stressed is that when the factorial mean scores from all the employees are compared, it becomes apparent that while they have less knowledge of the vision and mission of their company, they have more knowledge of the components. This shows that, although the employees do not thoroughly know the vision and mission statements by heart, they indeed know what actually is emphasized in those statements.

Some limitations of this study can be mentioned. First, the data were collected from only single company. Thus, it is not claimed that the findings can be generalized to all profit-oriented companies. Second, in this study we investigated only two dependent variables effect, working position and education level of employees. In future works, more important variables can be investigated.

This study wouldn't have been possible without support of TAV Airport Holding. We sincerely thank to the CEO of TAV, Dr. Eng. M. Sani SENER.

References

Aydemir, N. (2000). Öğrenen organizasyonların oluşturulmasında vizyon paylaşımı. *İktisat, İşletme ve Finans*, 15(168), 27-34.

Bart, C.K. (1998). Mission statement rationales and organizational alignment in the not-for-profit health care sector. Health Care Management Review, 23, 54-69.

Bart, C. K. (1997). Sex, lies, and mission statements. *Business Horizons*/November-December, 9-18.

Bart, C. K. (1997). Industrial firms and the power of mission. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 26, 371-383.

Bart, C. K. & Baetz, M. C. (1998). The relationship between mission statements and firm performance: An exploratory study. *Journal of Management Studies*, 35(6), 823-853.
Bart, C. K. & Baetz, M. C. (1995). Do mission statements matter? Working Paper 345, School of Business, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, 1995.
Bart, C. K., Bontis N. & Tagger , S. (2001). A model of the impact of mission statements on firm performance. *Management Decision*, 39(1), 9-18.
Bartkus, B. & Glassman, M. and Mcafee, B. (2005). Mission statement quality and financial performance. *European Management Journal*, 24(1), 86–94.
Benligiray, S., Geylan, A. & Duman, E. (2010). İnsan kaynakları yönetiminin stratejik olarak yönlendirilmesinin finansal performansı etkileyip etkilemediğinin analizi. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(1), 61-84.
Benligiray, S., Ozsoy, G. & Bukec, C. M. (2013). An exploratory research regarding the visibility of the mission statements on the airline company websites. *Journal of Management Research*, 5(1), 41-63.
Brown, W. A. & Yoshioka, C. F. (2003). Mission attachment and satisfaction as factors in employee retention. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 14 (1), 5-18.
Campbell, A. (1997). Mission statements. *Long Range Planning*, 30(6), 931-932.
Collins, J. C. & Porras, J. I. (1996). Building your company's vision. *Harvard Business Review*, September-October, 65-77.
David, F. R. & David, F. R. (2003). It's time to redraft your mission statement. *Journal of Business Strategy*, January/February, 11-14.
Darbi, W. P. K. (2012). Of mission and vision statements and their potential impact on employee behaviour and attitudes: The case of a public but profit-oriented tertiary institution. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(14), 95–109.
Doğan, S. & Hatipoğlu, C. (2009). Küçük ve orta boy işletmelerde vizyon açıklamasının işletmenin performansına etkisine ilişkin bir araştırma. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 23(2), 81-99.
Doğan, H. (2008). Örgütlerde vizyon ve misyonların çalışanlarca kabulü ve Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Örneği. *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10 (3), 93-110.
Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS for windows*. London: Sage Publications.
Forbes, D. J. & Seena, S. (2006). The value of a mission statement in an association of not-for-profit hospitals. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 19 (5), 409-419.
Ireland, R. D. & Hitt, M. A. (1992). Mission statements: importance, challenge and recommendations for development. *Business Horizons*, 33 (3), 34-42.
Kass, R.A. & Tinsley, H. E. A. (1979). Factor analysis. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 11, 120-138.
Kemp, S. & Dwyer, L. (2003). Mission statements of international airlines: a content analysis. *Tourism Management*, 24(6), 635-653.
Kim, S. E. & Lee, J. W. (2007). Is mission attachment an effective management tool for employee retention? An empirical analysis of a nonprofit human services agency. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 27(3), 227-248.
Klemm, M. , Sanderson, S. & Luffman, G. (1991). Mission statements: selling corporate values to employees. *Long Range Planning*, 24(3), 73-78.
Rangan, V.K. (2004). Lofty missions, down-to-earth plans. *Harvard Business Review*, 82(3), 112-9.
Raynor, M. E. (1998). That vision thing: Do we need it? *Long Range Planning*, 31(3), 368-376.
Stokely, C. R. (2004). Getting everybody on the same page. *Handbook of Business Strategy*, 171-172.
Stovel, M. & Bontis, N. (2002). Voluntary turnover: knowledge management friend or foe?. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 3(3), 303-22.
Sufi, T. & Lyons, H. (2003). Mission statements exposed. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15(5), 255-262.
Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics*. (3rd edition). New York: Harper & Row.