T.C.
TED UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL
PSYCHOLOGICAL COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE

WORK PLACE NOMADS: CAREER SUSTAINABILITY OF EMPLOYEES

ALPEREN ARSLAN

ANKARA, 2024

WORK PLACE NOMADS: CAREER SUSTAINABILITY OF EMPLOYEES

A Thesis Submitted To
The Graduate School
of
TED University

by

Alperen Arslan

In Partial Fulfillment of The Requirements
For
The Degree of Master of Science
In
Psychological Counseling and Guidance

ANKARA, 2024

Approval of the Graduate School

Prof. Dr. Ayça Tekin Koru

Dean, Graduate School

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tolga Erdoğan

Program Chair

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Asst. Prof. Olcay Yılmaz

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Metin Pişkin (Committee Chair)
Ankara University
Department of Educational Sciences _____

Asst. Prof. Begüm Serim-Yıldız (Member)
TED University
Department of Educational Sciences _____

Asst. Prof. Olcay Yılmaz (Supervisor)
TED University
Department of Educational Sciences _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Alperen, Arslan

Signature :

ABSTRACT

WORK PLACE NOMADS: CAREER SUSTAINABILITY OF EMPLOYEES

ALPEREN ARSLAN

Master of Science, Psychological Counseling and Guidance

Supervisor : DR. OLCAY YILMAZ

July, 2024

The main purpose of this research is to determine whether employees' career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy significantly predict employees' career sustainability. In the study, data was collected from 461 people between the ages of 25-65 who live and work in Türkiye. In this research, demographic form, Career Satisfaction Scale, Career Goal Discrepancy Scale and Career Sustainability Scale were used as data collection tools. Multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine whether employees' career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy significantly predicted employees' career sustainability. Independent samples t test was used to determine whether participants' career satisfaction, career goal

discrepancy and career sustainability varied according to age, institution type and marital status, and one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether it varied according to age and monthly income. As a result of the research, it was determined that career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy significantly predicted the career sustainability of currently working people between the ages of 25-65. Career satisfaction predicts career sustainability positively, and career goal discrepancy predicts career sustainability negatively. Results and recommendations are discussed.

Keywords: Career, Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction, Career Goal Discrepancy

ÖZET

İŞ YERİ GEZGİNLERİ: ÇALIŞANLARIN KARİYER SÜRDÜRÜLEBİLİRLİĞİ

ALPEREN ARSLAN

Yüksek Lisans, Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık

Tez Yöneticisi : Dr. Olcay Yılmaz

Temmuz, 2024

Bu araştırmanın temel amacı, çalışanların kariyer tatmini ve kariyer hedefi tutarsızlığının çalışanların kariyer sürdürülebilirliğini anlamlı bir şekilde yordayıp yordamadığını belirlemektir. Araştırmada, 25-65 yaş arasında Türkiye'de yaşayan ve halihazırda çalışan 461 kişiden veri toplanmıştır. Bu araştırmada demografik form, Kariyer Memnuniyeti Ölçeği, Kariyer Hedefi Tutarsızlıkları Ölçeği ve Kariyer Sürdürülebilirliği Ölçeği veri toplama araçları olarak kullanılmıştır. Çalışanların kariyer tatmini ve kariyer hedefi tutarsızlığının çalışanların kariyer sürdürülebilirliğini anlamlı bir şekilde yordayıp yordamadığını belirlemek için çoklu doğrusal regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Katılımcıların kariyer doyumlarının, kariyer hedefi tutarsızlıklarının ve kariyer sürdürülebilirliklerinin yaşa, kurum tipine ve medeni durumuna göre değişip değişmediğini belirlemek için bağımsız örneklemler t testi, yaşa ve aylık gelire göre değişip değişmediğini belirlemek için de tek yönlü varyans

analizinden yararlanılmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda kariyer tatmini ve kariyer hedefi farklılığının, 25-65 yaş aralığında halihazırda çalışan kişilerin kariyer sürdürülebilirliğini anlamlı düzeyde yordadığı belirlendi. Kariyer tatmini, kariyer sürdürülebilirliğini pozitif yönde, kariyer hedefi tutarsızlığı ise kariyer sürdürülebilirliğini negatif olarak yordamaktadır. Sonuçlar ve öneriler tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kariyer, Kariyer Sürdürülebilirliği, Kariyer Doyumu, Kariyer Hedefi Uyuşmazlığı

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to many individuals for their guidance, support, and contributions to the completion of this thesis.

First and foremost, I am deeply thankful to my thesis advisor, Dr. Olcay Yılmaz, who has consistently supported me both personally and academically. Her patience, wisdom, and invaluable guidance at every stage of my thesis were instrumental in its completion. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Begüm Serim-Yıldız and Prof. Dr. Metin Pişkin, who served on my thesis jury and enriched my work with their insights.

I am profoundly grateful to my mother, father, and sister. Your unwavering support, encouragement, and presence throughout this journey mean the world to me.

I also wish to express my sincere thanks to my friends who motivated and cheered me on during this process, and to İnci Bademci, who has been by my side through every path I've taken.

Lastly, heartfelt thanks to my loved ones who provided me with the support I needed to complete my thesis. Your presence and encouragement were indispensable in achieving this milestone.

Thank you all once again.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ÖZET v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vii

TABLE OF CONTENTS viii

LIST OF TABLES x

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xi

INTRODUCTION 1

1.1. Purpose of the Study 1

1.2. Research Questions and Hypotheses of the Study 4

1.3. Significance of the Study 4

1.4. Definition of the Terms 7

LITERATURE REVIEW 8

2.1. Career Sustainability 8

2.1.1. Theories of Career Sustainability 11

2.2. Career Satisfaction 14

2.3. Career Goal Discrepancy 15

2.4. Relevant Studies 16

METHOD 20

3.1. Research Design 20

3.2. Study Group 20

3.3. Instruments 22

3.3.1. Demographic Information Form 22

3.3.2. Career Satisfaction Scale 22

3.3.3. Career Goal Discrepancy Scale 23

3.3.4. Career Sustainability Scale 24

3.4. Procedure 25

3.5. Data Analysis Procedure 26

3.6. Limitation of the Study 28

RESULTS 29
4.1. Findings and Comments on the Relationship of Career Sustainability with Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy 29
4.2. Findings and Comments on Whether Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy Change According to Demographic Variables 31
4.3 Hypothesis Testing 41
DISCUSSION 43
5.1. Discussion on the Relationship of Career Sustainability with Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy 43
5.2. Discussion on the Relationship of Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy 46
5.3. Discussion on the Relationship of Career Satisfaction and Career Sustainability with Demographics 47
5.4. Discussion on the Relationship of Career Sustainability with Career Sustainability Theories 52
5.5. Recommendations 53
5.5.1. Recommendations for Researchers 53
5.5.2. Recommendations for Policymakers 54
5.5.3. Recommendations for Psychological Counselors 54
REFERENCES 55
APPENDICES 73
A. APPROVAL OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE 73
A-2. OTHER PERMISSIONS 74
B. INFORMED CONSENT FORM 77
C. INSTRUMENTS 78
D. CURRICULUM VITAE 81
E. THESIS PERMISSION FORM 82

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of Participants.....29
Table 2 Descriptive Analysis Results of the Scales.....41
Table 3 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis on Predictors of Career Sustainability 43
Table 4 Correlations 44
Table 5 T-Test Results of Participants' Mean Scores of Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Gender, Institution Type and Marital Status 46
Table 6 Descriptive Statistics on Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Age of the Participants 48
Table 7 One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Results Regarding Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Participants' Age 49
Table 8 Multiple Comparisons Results Regarding Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Participants' Age 50
Table 9 Descriptive Statistics on Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Monthly Income of the Participants 53
Table 10 One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Results Regarding Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Participants' Monthly Income 55
Table 11 Multiple Comparisons Results Regarding Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Participants' Monthly Income 56

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

COR	Conservation of Resources
SOC	Selection Optimization and Compensation
SST	Socio-emotional Selectivity Theory
SDT	Self-Determination Theory
ANOVA	One-Way Analysis of Variance

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the introduction part of this research, purpose of the study, research question and hypotheses of the study, significance of the study, and definitions of the terms are given.

1.1. Purpose of the Study

The traditional organizational structures, employer-employee relationships, and work contexts have been altered by environmental changes such as growing globalization, rapid technological advancements, increasing workforce diversity, outsourcing, and the increasing number of part-time and temporary employees. These changes have had an impact on how people pursue their careers (Sullivan & Baruch, 2009). Employees are experiencing instability in their current work environments and workplaces as a result of frequent changes (Di Fabio & Kenny, 2016). Furthermore, according to Hooley et al. (2020), the pandemic has changed the global economy, way of life and health. Many have concluded that the COVID-19 pandemic is a health and economic crisis, with updates on its evolution addressing employment losses and fatalities (Hite & McDonald, 2020). Due to these situations, it is necessary to examine the concept of career sustainability together with the concepts of career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy.

Due to intense competition in the workplace, many organizations are under pressure to find, choose, and keep multitasking professionals in the face of globalization and technological advancements. To remain competitive, companies must be able to keep employees and lower labor turnover rates (Mohlala et. al., 2012) because retaining employees and decreasing their desire to leave the organization is becoming more and more crucial for organizations (Anafarta & Yılmaz, 2019). Furthermore, in the contemporary, dynamic business environment, the pursuit of career satisfaction and the discrepancy of personal career goals with professional goals are crucial considerations for both employees and organisations. Despite the increased emphasis on these aspects, numerous challenges remain that pose significant obstacles to individual well-being and organisational success.

Achieving career satisfaction, career goal discrepancy, and career sustainability for employees is essential to the organization's capacity to retain and grow its workforce. Employees' feelings about their accomplishments and the work environment are reflected in their career satisfaction, which has a significant effect on turnover intention (Aburumman et al., 2020). Even with employers' attempts to improve career satisfaction through various initiatives, a sizeable percentage of workers could not be content with their careers. This dissatisfaction affects organizational performance as well as individual morale and commitment, resulting in higher staff turnover, lower productivity, and lower-quality work (Bowling et al., 2015; Judge et al., 2001). The literature on employee recruitment and retention in the post-COVID-19 period was systematically reviewed by the Integrated Benefits Institute in 2023. The review focused on how organizations are prioritizing and adjusting to employee well-being and satisfaction. This study revealed that 61% of employers said they had trouble retaining employees. According to FlexJobs' Spring 2023 Job Insights Survey, which involved over 2,600 employees, 58% of workers are actively looking to change careers. As per the Morning Consult conducted Prudential Pulse of the American Worker Survey in 2021, one out of every five employees reported that they had changed their line of work completely during the last year, with half of them stating that these shifts were permanent. Better income (26%) and attempting something new (26%), as well as work-life balance (27%), are the main drivers of these shifts. Moreover, the CIPD report of 2017 reports that more than four-fifths of organizations struggled in 2016 to retain one or more categories, an increase from previous years. However, only two-fifths of organizations took specific initiatives to improve employee retention in 2016. The majority of organizations faced some kind of retention challenge in 2019, according to the same organization's 2020 report, which was similar to that of 2017. There was a slight increase in the proportion of organizations reporting difficulty retaining most categories of employees. The CIPD report released in 2022 showed that the proportion of organizations taking initiatives to improve employee retention increased from 29% in 2021 to 37% in 2022. The most common action taken was raising wages (2022: 54%; 2021: 32%), followed by improving support for employee wellbeing (45%), albeit with notable sectoral differences.

A key concept in understanding people's motivation and agency in pursuing their career goals is career goal discrepancy. It describes the apparent discrepancy between a person's aspirations for their career and the strides they are making toward realizing those aspirations (Creed & Hood, 2015). A number of outcomes, including decisions to pursue

further education (Seibert et al., 2013), career-related distress (Creed et al., 2015), and decreased motivation to pursue career goals (Widyowati et al., 2023) might result from this discrepancy. In spite of these insights, more empirical research is still required to improve our comprehension of career goal discrepancy and its effects on people and organizations.

When the literature on career sustainability is examined, it is seen that international studies (e.g., Chin et al., 2019; Chin et al., 2022; De Vos et al., 2020) generally remain at the theoretical level, while national studies (see Arar et al., 2023; Bulgur et al., 2023; Doğru, 2023) are at the scale development level. In addition, theoretically based international studies have included certain models for career sustainability. This study differs from other studies as it includes all models in the career sustainability literature. Although there are international studies (i.e., Fang et al., 2021; Kong et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023; Luo et al., 2022; Talluri et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022) on the concepts related to career sustainability in the related literature, there is no study on the concepts of career satisfaction and discrepancy in career goals. It is also noteworthy that most of the studies have been conducted in recent years. For these reasons, career sustainability stands out as a topic that needs to be studied.

All studies and reports show that the labour turnover rate among employees has increased in recent years and the importance of studying the concepts of career satisfaction, career goal discrepancy and career sustainability. Within the scope of this study, it is aimed to investigate how individuals' career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy affect their career sustainability. In addition, it is planned to investigate the relationship between the career satisfaction, career goal discrepancy and career sustainability with the scales to be used within the scope of the research. In this way, it is envisaged to deepen the scope of the related field studies and to enable the concept of career sustainability, which has not been studied much in the field of psychological counselling and guidance, to be associated with different subjects. This situation is expected to be useful for mental health professionals, human resources specialists, managers and educators who will work on this subject. The results of the study are expected to improve work efficiency, promote work-life balance and help evaluate career goals.

1.2. Research Questions and Hypotheses of the Study

In accordance with the purpose of the study, research question addressed by the study is as follows:

R.Q.1. Do the career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy of currently working people between the ages of 25-65 significantly predict their career sustainability?

Based on the purpose and research question, the study will test the following specific hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Career satisfaction of employees predicts career sustainability

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Career goal discrepancy of employees predicts career sustainability

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Career satisfaction of employees predicts career goal discrepancy

Hypothesis 4 (H4): Employees' career satisfaction and career sustainability increase while career goal discrepancy decreases with increasing age

Hypothesis 5 (H5): Employees' career satisfaction, career goal discrepancy and career sustainability increased with increasing income while participants' career goal discrepancy decreases with increasing income

Hypothesis 6 (H6): Male employees have higher career satisfaction, career goal discrepancy and career sustainability than female employees

Hypothesis 7 (H7): Career satisfaction, career goal discrepancy and career sustainability are higher among the employees working in public institutions than private institutions

Hypothesis 8 (H8): Single employees have higher career satisfaction and career sustainability while married employees have higher career goal discrepancy

1.3. Significance of the Study

Career is a set of events that covers a large part of a person's life and continues throughout life, a comprehensive view of professional life, professional roles and different life tasks that follow each other, and a concept that refers to the development, sometimes stagnation and regression in the stages of professional maturation (Kuzgun, 2011). In these stages of professional maturation, people make decisions and try to shape

their careers. People make career choices about their educational paths, the kind of jobs they apply for, the organizations they join, when to take on a new challenge, how to balance work and family life, whether to take a career break, and when to retire throughout their lives (Verbruggen & De Vos, 2020) and these decisions start with the university entrance process. The best chance of success for university students who want to start a sustainable career rather than just a string of jobs is to choose their career before or during their time in school (Park et al., 2020). Good career choices can lead to sustained career growth because early career decisions are thought to be essential for undergraduate students' long-term career success (Jung et al., 2015).

The technological, social, and economic environment has evolved dramatically and quickly in the last few decades. The changing nature of enterprises, the rate at which technological innovation is adopted (Pryor & Bright, 2011), the globalization of the labor and consumer markets, the aging of the working population (Newman, 2011), and the organizations are some of the new realities of the workplace in the twenty-first century. The socioeconomic and technical environments have undergone substantial change in the twenty-first century, which has had a big impact on people's careers and how they view them (Rapuano, 2020). These disruptive changes have consequences for the individuals who work in them as their jobs change and even disappear, making some competencies obsolete and increasing the need for new competencies (Quendler & Lamb, 2016). Moreover, these changes can make it difficult for working people to have a sustainable career. For this reason, the decisions people make about their careers have become even more crucial. According to Gati and Tal (2008), career-related decisions are among the most significant decisions people make throughout their lives. They also stressed that these decisions have a significant long-term impact on people's lifestyles, emotional wellbeing, economic status, and feelings of personal productivity and social contribution. Having a sustainable career is especially important for the community and the business world as it is for the individuals themselves. The definition of career sustainability by Van der Heijden and De Vos (2017, p. 43) was "sequences of career experiences reflected through a variety of patterns of continuity over time, thereby crossing several social spaces, characterized by individual agency, and herewith providing meaning to the individual." The sequence of various career experiences can alternate between times of employment and periods of part-time job, volunteering, unemployment, sabbatical leave, caregiving, and so forth due to varying patterns of continuity over time (Van der Heijden

& De Vos, 2017). Even though every career involves a succession of work experiences over time, not every sequence typology is equally sustainable, and a variety of circumstances might affect a person's capacity to maintain a job throughout the course of their working life (De Vos et al., 2020). The traditional organizational structures, employer-employee relationships, and work contexts have been altered by environmental changes such as growing globalization, rapid technological advancements, increasing workforce diversity, outsourcing, and the increasing number of part-time and temporary employees. These changes have had an impact on how people pursue their careers (Sullivan & Baruch, 2009). Additionally, a person's career is shaped by a complex interplay between subjective evaluations and objective experiences, giving rise to a variety of personal opinions regarding the development of a career and its sustainability (De Vos et al., 2020).

Building on the idea of sustainability in general, career sustainability refers to the preservation and promotion of human and career growth with an emphasis on balance and renewal (as opposed to its exploitation) (Newman, 2011). Herman and Lewis (2012) compared women and men in order to address the question of sustainability and stressed the significance of non-work circumstances for career growth (such as the influence of motherhood). Based on this perspective, sustainable jobs are defined as the capacity to advance professionally in line with human capital in addition to being able to remain in employment. Similar to this idea, Greenhaus and Kossek (2014) regard the career sustainability perspective as a place to start when understanding how people's work and home lives are intertwined. A wide range of non-work responsibilities and environments are referred to as home, including immediate and extended families, friendships, community involvement, leisure activities, and personal development pursuits. As a result, debates about job burnout and finding a balance between work and fulfilling personal and family lives show that the idea of career sustainability is becoming more popular. Even if the idea of sustainable careers is starting to gain traction at significant academic conferences and in scientific journals, it is still very much in its infancy (De Vos et al., 2020).

1.4. Definition of the Terms

Career sustainability: The definition of career sustainability by De Vos and Van der Heijden (2017, p. 43) is "sequences of career experiences reflected through a variety of patterns of continuity over time, thereby crossing several social spaces, characterized by individual agency, and herewith providing meaning to the individual."

Career satisfaction: Career satisfaction is defined as an individual's general emotional orientation toward his/her career or job role (Gattiker & Larwood, 1988) as well as their level of satisfaction with the degree to which they have achieved the goals they have set for themselves in their career (Yüksel, 2010).

Career goal discrepancy: Career goal discrepancy was defined by Creed and Hood (2015, p. 4) as "the perceived gap between the career goal set by the individual (future self or situation) and the progress in the career goal (current self or situation)".

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this part of the study, the literature review of the concepts of career sustainability, career satisfaction, career goal discrepancies and related studies are explained.

2.1. Career Sustainability

The concept of career sustainability, which has been the guiding principle of career research for many years, is a new concept with both practical and theoretical significance (De Vos et al., 2020; Lawrence, 2015). The definition of career sustainability by De Vos and Van der Heijden (2017, p. 43) is "sequences of career experiences reflected through a variety of patterns of continuity over time, thereby crossing several social spaces, characterized by individual agency, and herewith providing meaning to the individual." The sequence of various career experiences can alternate between times of employment and periods of part-time job, volunteering, unemployment, sabbatical leave, caregiving, and so forth due to varying patterns of continuity over time (Van der Heijden & De Vos, 2015).

The four primary elements of sustainable careers are defined as follows (Li et al., 2020; Van Der Heijden & De Vos 2015): time, social space, agency, and meaning according to definition of career sustainability. The first of these elements, time, stands for the professional experiences that develop throughout a person's life. It covers the temporal dimension of work and how they evolve over time. The social domain element, which is the second of these parts, is concerned with the different settings - such as work, home, friends, and leisure -where careers are pursued. It emphasizes how various social realms are interconnected and how a person's career is impacted by their larger social and organizational environment. The agency element, which makes up the third of these components, is concerned with how people make decisions and take action in ways that impact the longevity of their careers. Resilience and individual initiative are crucial for career self-management. Meaning, the fourth element, is related to the professional and broader life settings. It places a strong emphasis on integrating careers into a fulfilling

personal and family life that is consistent with one's basic principles and offers security and flexibility. Sustainable careers are shaped overall by these factors that support development, maintenance, and renewal of workers' career-related resources. Furthermore, these components emphasize the dynamic and multifaceted character of sustainable careers and the interaction of the person, context, and time dimensions in the career development process.

When looking at the theoretical information about career sustainability, it is seen that there are some theories and theoretical perspectives. To make sense of the concept of sustainable careers, it is also necessary to look at existing theoretical perspectives. It is important to note that this perspective is just one of many theoretical approaches to career sustainability. Newman's (2011) model proposes three necessary qualities for career sustainability throughout one's lifetime: renewability, flexibility, and integrity. Renewability emphasizes the need for regular opportunities for career renewal. The aim of renewability is to prevent burnout and promote job longevity. The model emphasizes the importance of adaptability and flexibility in the workplace. As work is rapidly evolving, individuals and organizations must be lifelong learners who are adaptable and prepared to tackle new challenges and opportunities as they arise. To achieve a sense of fulfilment and purpose in one's work, integration across life domains and experiences is crucial. To ensure a more meaningful and enduring career, it is important to align work with personal values and experiences.

Newman's (2011) sustainable career model was expanded and improved by Chin et al. (2019), who also introduced a fourth factor called resourceful to create a new career sustainability model. The resourceful dimension of career sustainability has significant importance when it comes to manufacturing innovation. It emphasizes how important it is to have a reliable source of income and to reduce the number of jobs lost during the manufacturing transition. This component deals with the worries of workers who want to preserve their steady income and long-term employability in the face of the prospect of automation and smart machines replacing them. It encompasses traits like preserving one's level of life, staying out of danger, and preserving one's long-term employability. The skilled component captures the modern attitudes of industrial workers toward their careers and their efforts to stay employable throughout their lives in a changing environment.

In the framework they created, De Vos et al. (2020) took into consideration three categories of career sustainability dimensions and career sustainability indicators. These dimensions are person, context and time and indicators are health, happiness, and productivity. Examining three crucial interacting dimensions of sustainable careers—person, context, and time—as well as three important indicators of a sustainable career—happiness, productivity, and health—is vital to comprehend what makes a sustainable career. According to the authors, these indicators are the fundamental components that support an individual's well-being as well as those of their peers, family, workplace, and society at large. The authors contend that the foundation of sustainable careers is the idea of a dynamic person-career fit in terms of productivity, happiness, and health (Chin et al., 2022). According to this model, a person's career is more sustainable when they are healthier, happier and more productive (Arar & Çetiner, 2023).

The first of these dimensions, the person dimension, focuses on the individual as the central actor in defining sustainable careers (De Vos et al., 2020). It includes agency, meaning and person-career fit. Agency demonstrates how an individual's career evolves over time and is a product of numerous decisions made by the individual as well as external pressures and limitations in this social sphere (Van der Heijden & De Vos, 2015). Meaning is crucial because people must think about what matters to them in a profession and whether it aligns with their values and career anchors (Hennekam et al., 2022). The context dimension is the second of these dimensions. According to Hirschi et al. (2020) and Kelly et al. (2020), this dimension acknowledges that professions do not grow in a vacuum but are instead influenced by a variety of settings, including the work environment, personal context, sectoral context, labor market context, and country culture. Analyzing sustainable careers requires an understanding of how people move between opportunities and restrictions in various circumstances (De Vos et al., 2020). Careers are dynamic because they change with time and in response to other dimensions. The third dimension is therefore time (Hennekam et al., 2022) which acknowledges that these professions change throughout time and engage with multiple levels of context. Sustainable careers are a self-regulating, cyclical process where people gradually gain the ability to deal with and adjust to a changing environment. In addition, the model was developed by De Vos et al. (2020) on the basis of Conservation of Resources Theory (COR), Self-Determination Theory (SDT), Selection Optimization and Compensation Theory (SOC) and Socio-emotional Selectivity Theory (SST) (Arar & Çetiner, 2023).

2.1.1. Theories of Career Sustainability

It is only recently that researchers have begun to consider careers from the perspective of sustainability. The conceptualizations are frequently impacted by the research interests of researchers in the field (Rapuano, 2020).

2.1.1.1 Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory

Resources fall into two categories: contextual and personal (Hobfoll, 2002). Psychological attributes that exist within an individual, such as physical, emotional, cognitive, intellectual, and psychological features, are examples of personal resources. Job performance and employability are personal resources when seen in the context of a career because they can help accomplish important goals including career success and advancement, job stability, and well-being (Bozionelos & Lee, 2020). Conversely, friends and family in the person's local or larger area are contextual resources. The growth of personal resources is accelerated by the availability and accessibility of contextual resources, such as friends and family, according to COR theory (Hobfoll, 2001).

Regarding career sustainability, the Conservation of Resources (COR) principle has crucial implications. The primacy of resource loss, which states that "it is psychologically more harmful for individuals to lose resources than it is helpful for them to gain the resources that they lost," is the first principle of COR theory (Halbesleben et al., 2014). The second principle of COR theory, resource investment, is an extension of the conservation tenet. It states that individuals invest resources for three reasons: (1) to get resources for themselves; (2) to recover from resource loss; and (3) to protect against resource loss (Hobfoll, 2001). Furthermore, a resource should be worth more to a person if it may assist in meeting a need or advancing a career, according to the COR theory's concept of resource investment. Additionally, the ability to handle setbacks well increases the likelihood of a sustainable career. Thus, it is argued that individuals who invest in acquiring and maintaining alternative, useful resources in response to external and internal forces may be better equipped to sustain their careers. This is evidenced by higher levels of happiness, control orientation, well-being, and good health (Aşkun, 2023; De Vos et al., 2020).

The COR hypothesis states that people work hard to obtain, retain, and protect resources; the threat to these precious resources comes from the possibility or actual loss

of them (Hobfoll, 1989). Loss of resources or the fear of losing them can cause stress and have detrimental effects on people, including turnover, job discontent, and burnout. Thus, in order to maintain a sustainable career, it is critical that individuals and organizations give priority to the acquisition and protection of resources (Hobfoll, 2001).

2.1.1.2 Selection Optimization and Compensation (SOC) Theory

Similar to COR theory, Baltes' (1997) Selection Optimization and Compensation (SOC) theory is centred on resource gain and loss, as well as the natural loss of resources that comes with ageing. To make up for the lost resources, SOC calls for a reallocation of available resources (Hobfoll et al., 2018).

Abraham and Hansson (1995) presented the first study to apply the SOC model to the workplace. The authors created a tool to assess SOC practices at work and suggested that the SOC model may help in understanding successful aging at work (Moghimi, 2019).

The SOC model states that effective development includes selecting which functional areas to concentrate one's efforts on, optimizing one's capacity for development, and compensating for losses to maintain functioning (Freund, 2008). Selection, optimization, and compensation are the three functions that it uses to coordinate the pieces of the whole (Baltes, 1997). Selection is the process of deciding which goals to prioritize, optimization is the process of optimizing performance, and compensation is the process of making adjustments to existing or projected constraints (Burnett-Wolle & Godbey, 2017). Regarding the sustainability of a career, selection could entail strategically choosing which career opportunities to pursue and which to pass up, so concentrating their efforts on the most crucial aspects of their work; optimization could entail learning new skills to maximize career success and satisfaction, completing additional training, or utilizing current strengths; compensation could entail looking for other career paths, learning new skills, or utilizing outside resources to get past obstacles and maintain career trajectories (Knecht & Freund, 2017).

The usefulness of Selection Optimization and Compensation theory in the workplace has been evaluated in terms of job performance. The link between the two has been determined to be largely positive (Moghimi, 2019). Moreover, employee commitment to work should be highest, according to SOC theory, if they make extensive use of all three SOC strategies. However, their work engagement ought to be lower if

they employ little or none of the three SOC techniques and if they don't reinforce each other's motivational impacts (Marsiske et al., 1995).

Because they explain how goals change over the lifespan, the lifespan theories of Socio-emotional Selectivity Theory (SST) (Carstensen, 1995) and Selection Optimization and Compensation (SOC) (Baltes et al., 1999) provide pertinent theoretical perspectives to advance our understanding of sustainable careers.

2.1.1.3 Socio-emotional Selectivity Theory (SST)

Socio-emotional selectivity theory states that an individual's projected life expectancy has an impact on the order in which personal aspirations are prioritized (Penningroth & Scott, 2012). The theory states that objectives pertaining to knowledge and emotions together form a crucial constellation of goals that drives social conduct throughout life (Carstensen et al., 1999). According to theory, age has a major moderating role in relationship changes, and the type of connection has an impact on how age affects a relationship (Finn, 2017). Time is seen as a finite and quickly exhausting resource in late adulthood and old age, which leads to a complete change in social goals from knowledge-oriented to emotion-related. As a result, only fulfilling and positive relationships are kept, while all other kinds are discarded (Sathyamurthi, 2019). Given a more expansive understanding of time, it is expected that young adults will prioritize objectives pertaining to learning or creativity (Penningroth & Scott, 2012).

SST is linked to prioritizing social and emotional goals at work in the context of career sustainability. Individuals' priorities may change from obtaining information and advancing their careers to maintaining their emotional health and deep social relationships as they advance in their careers and near later stages of their career. This change in priorities could have an impact on career choices, such as choosing jobs that make one feel emotionally and fulfilled rather than concentrating only on conventional measures of success (Carstensen, 1995; Carstensen, 2006).

2.1.1.4 Self-Determination Theory (SDT)

Demonstrating proactive behavior and personal growth is a crucial approach to preserving and advancing one's career sustainability (De Vos et al., 2020). Self-Determination Theory (SDT) offers valuable insights into the relationship between psychological needs and career sustainability (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The three fundamental psychological requirements of autonomy, competence, and relationship

needs are the foundation of Self-Determination Theory (SDT). It is argued that meeting these three requirements is crucial for human functioning and should be prioritized in and of itself (Gagné & Vansteenkiste, 2013). Meeting these psychological demands is crucial for career sustainability as it fosters worker engagement, job satisfaction, and general wellbeing. People are more likely to be intrinsically driven, which increases job satisfaction and commitment to their jobs, when they feel competent in their roles, have a sense of autonomy in their work, and have positive relationships with their coworkers (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

2.2. Career Satisfaction

The idea of career success has been around since the 1950s, has been the subject of numerous studies (Ayaz, 2021), and is significant for career research (Spurk et al., 2015). One's career experiences determine their level of success in their career. The accomplishment of intended associated with employment outcomes at any moment of a person's employment experiences over time can be characterized as career success (Arthur, 2005).

There are objective and subjective aspects to career success (Judge et. al., 1995; Seibert et al., 2001). According to Dries et al. (2009), objective career success is defined as those components of professional success that are observable and tangible by others. It is associated with external metrics like professional status and salary, as stated by Kuijperset al. (2006). A person's positive assessment of their career is known as subjective success (Volmer & Spurk, 2011). Typically, career satisfaction is used to operationalize it (Heslin, 2005) and the degree of career satisfaction that employees will experience is positively correlated with their level of career success. In such a situation, the significance of employees' aspirations for success and career fulfillment in their work life becomes evident (Demirdelen, 2013). Moreover, according to Spurk et al. (2015), career satisfaction is a key indication of subjective career success and is thought to play a significant role in determining career success for actual labor market generations.

Career satisfaction is defined as an individual's general emotional orientation toward his/her career or job role (Gattiker & Larwood, 1988) as well as their level of satisfaction with the degree to which they have achieved the goals they have set for themselves in their career (Yüksel, 2005). The job itself, salary and grading opportunities, working circumstances, relationships with supervisors and coworkers, the benefits the job

provides, and the employee's degree of knowledge and competence are the aspects that support people experience career satisfaction (Kitapçı & Sezen, 2002). However, working conditions, unequal reward distribution, stress, workload, and conflicts between people's personal and professional lives can also have a detrimental impact on career satisfaction (Lepnurm, et al., 2007). In addition, discrimination based on an employee's gender, race, or other characteristics lowers career satisfaction (Karakullukçu, 2018).

There are two dimensions thought to exist in career satisfaction. Individuals' perceptions of their existing occupations' success and pleasure make up the first dimension, while their expectations for their future careers make up the second (Nauta et al., 2009). According to Greenhaus et al. (1990), there are five fundamental characteristics that are important for employees' career satisfaction. These objectives include career accomplishments, the extent to which all career goals have been attained, the degree of progress made toward income goals, the degree of progress made toward self-development goals, and the degree of progress made toward learning new abilities and competencies. The achievement of these fundamental objectives by the individual becomes a factor in determining their level of career satisfaction (Yüksel, 2005).

2.3. Career Goal Discrepancy

People make many decisions every day about their lives or about various issues. In today's world where the importance of the concept of career is increasing day by day, the concept of career goal is very important for people who will start their careers. It is an inevitable necessity for today's conditions that people set out with consistent planning, a correct start and a suitable career goal for career processes that affect their whole life (Gökbaraz, 2021). Career-related decisions is one of the most crucial choices a person will ever make. These decisions have a significant long-term impact on people's lives, mental health, social and economic standing, sense of personal productivity, and sense of social contribution (Gati & Tal, 2008).

A career goal is a particular aim or target that a person sets for themselves in order to succeed professionally along the route of their choice. Achieving a particular position, obtaining a given set of skills or credentials, taking on more responsibility, reaching a particular wage threshold, or leaving a lasting impression in a particular industry are examples of career objectives. Individuals can maintain motivation, concentration, and

initiative in their career development by setting and achieving career goals (Austin & Vancouver, 1996).

Career goal discrepancy was defined by Creed and Hood (2015, p. 4) as "the perceived gap between the career goal set by the individual (future self or situation) and the progress in the career goal (current self or situation)" in the context of career development. There are two types of goal discrepancies: positive and negative. According to Carver & Scheier (1998) and Lord et al. (2010), it is negative if performance or progress falls below of goals or standards and positive if it surpasses them.

Three areas of positive career goal discrepancy were found in the study carried out by Akmal et al. (2022). Positive achievement and ability discrepancy is the first domain. This domain evaluates the belief that one's present accomplishments and personal competencies surpass those necessary to realize one's intended professional objectives. The standard discrepancy domain is the second one. This area focuses on the evaluation that higher career goals may be set and that the current standard of career advancement may exceed expectations. Effort discrepancy is the last category. This area looks at the difference between the work that has been put in thus far and the effort needed to reach professional objectives. The term negative career goal discrepancy describes the apparent discrepancy or mismatch between a person's intended career objectives and their actual achievement, as well as expectations placed on them by important people like parents or peers. Individuals may experience emotions of discontent, worry, and unease when they recognize that their professional objectives are not being fulfilled or matched with societal norms. A person may modify their goals or give up on their initial job goals in order to ease the discomfort brought on by a negative career goal inconsistency, which can generate a variety of negative emotions (Widyowat et al., 2024).

Ilies and Judge (2005) indicate that positive and negative goal inconsistencies are not mutually exclusive, but rather have distinct mechanisms and boundary conditions. In other words, a positive discrepancy is not an opposite of a negative one. Consequently, previous studies have demonstrated that positive and negative goal discrepancies are distinct conceptions (Akmal et al., 2022).

2.4. Relevant Studies

The central tenet of career-related research has long been sustainable careers, which emphasize people's ongoing employability in positions that support their long-term

personal development (Lawrence et al., 2015), but this paradigm has only recently begun to gain traction (Rapuano, 2020). In addition, the idea of career sustainability is still in its infancy (Chin et al., 2022). Studies on the idea of career sustainability are crucial considering this circumstance.

The idea of sustainable careers and the effects of mass career customization in a professional services firm are examined in the study by Straub et al. (2020). The study examines how upward or downward customisation impacts objective and subjective career outcomes over time by gender and parental status using a multi-wave research methodology. Mass Career Customization reveals negative outcomes linked to flexibility stigma, particularly for fathers who deviate from the ideal employee norm in Professional Service Firms. However, it also reveals some positive outcomes, such as improved performance evaluations for down-customizing mothers and increased career satisfaction for down-customizing fathers. The findings add to the discussion on organizational strategies for long-term employment. According to the study's findings, an organization's ability to match its policies and procedures to the expectations, preferences, norms, and values of its workforce is crucial. Stated differently, the maintenance and improvement of employees' career sustainability depends on their interactions with corporate stakeholders.

Barthauer et al.'s (2020) study explores the relationship between burnout and career exit intentions in order to investigate the idea of career sustainability. Over the course of two years, 385 academic scientists participated in the study, which employed a moderated mediation analysis methodology. The significance of protecting and developing the resources required for a successful career path is underlined in order to guarantee professional sustainability. The Conservation of Resources (COR) theory highlights how burnout can exhaust these essential resources, resulting in unhappiness and inefficiency that can eventually cause turnover. According to the study, burnout lowers one's own resources, including one's sense of internal marketability and level of professional satisfaction, which in turn influences one's plans to change careers. Furthermore, it is proposed that by serving as a barrier to unsustainable career progression, the contextual source of perceived departmental support moderates these correlations. The interaction between people and organizational stakeholders in determining career sustainability is thus once again highlighted by their study.

The idea of improving employees' career sustainability through training is examined in the study by Bozionelos et al. (2020), with a particular emphasis on the roles of career actors' transparency and supervisor support. The study employed a quasi-experimental design with four measurement points and involved 334 salespeople who took part in an internal job training session on improving service quality. It emphasizes how resilient careers are defined by employability and job performance, enabling people to continue their desired level of employment and personal goals throughout time. The study emphasizes the value of education for jobs that are sustainable and the noteworthy contribution that employer-sponsored training makes to improving job performance and employability. The findings imply that training investments made by the business, specialized supervisor support, and personal traits like receptivity to new experiences all contribute significantly to the development of lasting careers. The study suggests that in order to support long-term career sustainability, companies should take these aspects into account when hiring and training new staff members.

A study conducted in 2020 by Hite and McDonald highlights the significance of career sustainability in the post-COVID-19 era. It discusses how people must always be learning in order to maintain a profession that is sustainable, and it views learning as a meta-competency for career sustainability. The authors emphasize that in order to effectively overcome the pandemic-caused crises, creativity, learning, and adaptation are necessary. The study also looks at how context affects people's decisions about their careers, proposing that people base their decisions on their own needs as well as the priorities of their organizations and society. It is recommended that organizations provide assistance in retaining talent and cultivate a long-lasting culture to guarantee sustained employee engagement and development.

Yaşar and Demir (2019) investigate how employer branding affects employees' career planning within the framework of career sustainability. Examining the factors influencing employees' career planning in terms of long-term career chances was the main goal of the hotel industry research. 417 undergraduate and associate degree tourism students from Süleyman Demirel University and Isparta University of Applied Sciences make up the research sample. Six demographic questions, twenty-eight Likert-type items, and a questionnaire that the researchers created and verified for validity and reliability were all used in the study. The SPSS program was used to analyze the data after they were gathered through face-to-face interviews. The study found that, in terms of long-

term career chances, company brand significantly influences employees' career planning. It was discovered that a number of factors, including chances for advancement, stable employment, individual development plans, talent management initiatives, and international work experience, have an impact on employees' career planning, and that long-term career possibilities are essential to this process. The study's findings highlight the need of offering employees sustainable opportunities in their career planning, enhancing workplace branding, and encouraging employers to take proactive measures in this area. Sustainable career prospects are said to boost workers' motivation, fortify their allegiance to the company, and assist them in realizing their long-term career goals.

A content analysis on corporate sustainability and sustainable human resources management was carried out by Özgül and Gürol in 2019. The study's data is made up of the sustainability reports from 44 companies that were listed in the BIST Sustainability Index from 2017 to 2018. The need of incorporating human resources management into goals for sustainability is stressed. It is said that leaders in human resources should be adept at coming up with sustainable strategies and at integrating them so that all stakeholders are involved. Human resources strategies should assess not just economic but also social and environmental consequences in order to maximize the sustainability of employee welfare. Additionally, it was mentioned that companies can get a sustainable competitive edge by developing into employer brands and that younger generations will find their products more appealing if they implement sustainable HR practices. It was mentioned that competency development programs that assist employees' career growth are important for implementing sustainability-oriented HR practices and that they can boost a company's sustainability performance.

As a result of the studies on career sustainability, it is seen that what organisations can do and what they should pay attention to in order to improve the career sustainability of employees is underlined. In parallel with the survey researches, academic studies in the literature offer a perspective on how organisational managers and human resources departments can support their employees. When the studies are examined, it is seen that the average age ranges and numbers of the participants are similar and the participants are selected from working people. Although the relevant studies are related to the issues studied in the field of career, the lack of studies that examine the relationships between concepts in the context of career sustainability is noticeable.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This section contains details on the research model, study group, data collection tools, how these tools were applied, collecting data, and the statistical techniques used in data analysis.

3.1. Research Design

This study aims to examine the effect of career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy on career sustainability of people aged 25-65 living and currently working in Türkiye. To investigate the connections between two or more variables, correlational designs are used. After examining the link between two variables, a basic correlational design applies statistical analysis to characterize the relationship between the variables.

3.2. Study Group

The study group of this research consists of 461 participants between the ages of 25-65, living and currently working in Türkiye. In order to determine the participants in the research, purposive and snowball sampling techniques were used (Patton, 2002; Neuman, 2014). The demographic characteristics of the participants are given in the table (Table 1) below.

Table 1 *Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=461)*

Demographic Characteristics		***F***	***%***
Gender			
	Male	210	45.55
	Female	251	54.45
	Total	461	100
Age (years)			
	25-30	158	34.27
	31-45	167	36.22

	46-65	136	29.50
	Total	461	100
Institution Type			
	Public institution	268	58.13
	Private institution	193	41.87
	Total	461	100
Marital Status			
	Single	166	36
	Married	295	64
	Total	461	100
Monthly Income			
	0-11400 TL	21	4.55
	11401-21400 TL	93	20.17
	21401-31400 TL	184	39.92
	31401-41400 TL	101	21.91
	41401 and above	62	13.45
	Total	461	100

The age factor, which is one of the demographic characteristics, is indicated in the table by considering career stages. Two significant factors that influence career growth are age and stages. There is a discussion of four commonly used age-based and stage-based career development models (Büker, 2015). The career stages developed by Hall and Nougaim (1968) were taken into consideration in terms of compliance with the criterion of being between the ages of 25-65, which is one of the conditions for participation in the study. According to this model, 25-30 years old is called establishment, 30-45 years old is called advancement and 45-65 years old is called maintenance.

When the distribution of 461 participants in the study group according to their gender is examined; it is seen that 210 (45,55%) of the participants in the study group consisting of 461 people are male and 251 (54,45%) are female.

Examining the age distribution of the 461 participants in the study group, 158 participants (34,27%) are between the ages of 25 and 30, 167 participants (36,22%) are between the ages of 31-45, and 136 participants (29,50%) are between the ages of 46 and 65.

193 participants (41.87%) work in private institutions, while 268 participants (58%) work in public institutions, according to an analysis of the 461 research group's distribution by type of institution.

Examining the distribution of the 461 participants in the study group by marital status, it is observed that 295 participants are married (%64) and 166 participants (36%) are single.

When the income ranges of the 461 respondents are analyzed according to the minimum wage at the time of data collection, it is seen that 21 participants (4.55%) earned between 0 and 11400 TL, 93 participants (20.17%) earned between 11401 and 21400 TL, 184 participants (39.92%) earned between 21401 and 31400 TL, 101 participants (21.91%) earned between 31401 and 41400 TL and 62 participants (13.45%) earned 41401 and above.

3.3. Instruments

In this research, a demographic form, Career Satisfaction Scale (Akın & Alabucak, 2017), Career Goal Discrepancies Scale (Yeğintürk & Siyez, 2023) and Career Sustainability Scale (Arar & Çetiner, 2023) were used. Information about the data collection instruments is explained below.

3.3.1. Demographic Information Form

Demographic information form developed by the researcher to acquire information about demographics such as age, gender, education level, occupation, marital status, monthly income.

Career-related national and international studies were analyzed to determine demographic characteristics. The concepts selected for the research are those that can be associated with the target group.

3.3.2. Career Satisfaction Scale

The original form of the scale was developed by Spurk, Abele, and Volmer (2015). The purpose of the development of the scale is to analyze the processes associated with career success, work-life balance, and life satisfaction. The scale consists of 5 items in total, and there are no reverse scored items. The scale has a 5-point Likert-type rating: "1=Not at all appropriate for me, 2=Not appropriate for me, 3=I am undecided, 4=Appropriate for me, 5=Fully appropriate for me". The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 5 and the highest score is 25. Getting high scores from this scale means

that the responder has high levels of career satisfaction. 729 people participated in the development of the scale and these participants consisted of doctors, economists, engineers, and teachers. The internal consistency reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as .90. With a satisfactory model fit (x^2= 39.69, *df*= 20, CFI= 0.99, RMSEA= .07, SRMR= .02) for the baseline model (configural invariance), it can be concluded that a one-factorial solution adequately describes the data for all occupational groups.

Turkish adaptation study of the scale was conducted by Akın and Alabucak (2017). The Turkish adaptation of the scale was carried out on 196 employees (male: 86 female: 110) aged between 21 and 57. As a result of confirmatory factor analysis, it was seen that the unidimensional model gave an excellent fit (x^2= 0.68, sd= 4, RMSEA= .000, SRMR= .0071, CFI= 1.00, GFI= 1.00, AGFI= .99, NFI= 1.00). Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliability coefficient of the Turkish version of Career Satisfaction Scale was found to be .81. The corrected item-total correlation coefficients of the scale ranged between .49 and .69.

3.3.3. Career Goal Discrepancy Scale

The original form of the scale was developed by Creed and Hood (2015). The purpose of developing the scale is to evaluate the perceived differences between determined career goals and career goal progress. The scale consists of four sub-dimensions: achievement discrepancies, effort discrepancies, standard discrepancies, and ability discrepancies (Yeğintürk & Siyez, 2023). The scale consists of 12 items in total, and there are no reverse coded items in the scale. The scale has a 6-point Likert-type rating: "1= I strongly disagree, 2= I do not agree, 3= I slightly disagree, 4= I somewhat agree, 5= I agree, 6= I totally agree". The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 6 and the highest score is 36. Higher scores on the scale represent higher levels of perceived goal discrepancy. 615 young adults (25% male, 75% female; mean age = 20.88 years, SD = 3.96; range: 17-35 years) were involved in the study. For the construct validity of the scale, the factor structure was first analyzed by first level confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and then second level factor analysis was performed. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for the whole scale was found to be .87 and the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for all subscales was above .70 (Creed & Hood, 2015).

Turkish translation and adaptation of the scale was conducted by Yeğintürk and Siyez (2023). 350 students (222 females and 128 males) pursuing their undergraduate degrees at a public university in the age range of 18 to 32 (M = 21.36, SD = 1.86) made up the study group for the study. Among the participants, the faculty of education accounted for 24% (n = 84), the faculty of economics and administrative sciences for 22.9% (n = 80), the faculty of engineering for 31.4% (n = 110), and the faculty of science and letters for 21.2% (n = 74). The internal consistency of the scale was analyzed with Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient. While the item total score correlations for the whole scale ranged between .40-.70, Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was determined as .87 (Yeğintürk & Siyez, 2023). When the factor structure of the scale, which had four factors in the original, was analyzed by confirmatory factor analysis, the goodness of fit indices obtained were χ^2=89.87, sd =48, χ^2/sd=1.87, GFI=.96, CFI=.97, RMSEA=.05, SRMR=.03. Prior to multiple group comparison, confirmatory factor analysis was carried out for the male and female groups in order to ensure measurement invariance. The scale's fit indices were determined to be at a good level for males (χ^2=62.12, sd =48, χ^2/sd=1.29, GFI=.98, RMSEA=.05, SRMR=.04) and women (χ^2=112.99, sd =48, χ^2/sd=1.87, GFI=.92, CFI=.93, RMSEA=.07, SRMR=.05).

3.3.4. Career Sustainability Scale

The original form of the scale was developed by Chin, Jawahar, and Li (2022). Since there is no scale to measure this concept in empirical research on career sustainability, the main purpose of developing the scale is to develop and validate a new scale on career sustainability. The scale consists of four sub-dimensions: resourceful, flexible, renewable, integrative. The scales for measuring independent variable (i.e., career sustainability) and dependent variables (i.e., environmental mastery, autonomy, and personal growth) had a 6-point Likert-type scale format with anchors ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The scores that can be obtained from the scale ranges from 12 to 72, and high scores indicate that the sustainability obtained from the career is high. The first study includes three stages. For the first stage, a sample of 75 part-time business master's (MBA) students from Zhejiang University of Technology who work full-time in manufacturing organizations were recruited. For the second stage, a sample consisting of 846 workers in Guangdong Province and Guangxi Province of China. For the third stage, the sample consisted of 197 part-time MBA students in Beijing Normal University who were employed full-time in a variety of positions in local

manufacturing and service organizations. In the second study, the sample included 152 US citizens reached through Amazon Mechanical Turk. In the third study, participants were employees of large manufacturing organizations in two well-known industrial cities (i.e., Dongguan and Guangzhou) in Guangdong Province and one (i.e., Wuzhou) in Guangxi Province of China. The sub-topics for the second study are job content plateau and hierarchical plateau, and career satisfaction, and for the third study, the subtitles are Psychological Well-Being and The Moderating Role of Type of Worker. The reliability of the scale was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, which yielded a value of .91. This indicates a high level of internal consistency among the items in the scale. Regarding validity, the research demonstrated the Career Sustainability Scale's discriminant and convergent validity. Furthermore, confirmatory factor analysis revealed concept validity for the scale, with factor loadings ranging from .81 to .91 and composite reliability values from .84 to .91.

Turkish translation and adaptation of the scale was conducted by Arar and Çetiner (2023). The statements in the scale were grouped under two factors as a result of the EFA carried out with the survey data of 402 white-collar employees between the ages of 18 and 65 in the energy, health, education, and IT sectors within the scope of the public and private sectors in Türkiye; the factor loadings of the statements were between 0.730 and 0.910, and the total variance explained was calculated as 67%. The CFA analysis revealed that the Career Sustainability Scale, which has 12 statements with two components, was the Turkish version (chi-square = 105.153 df = 51, p <.001; CMIN/DF = 2,062; RMSEA =.73; NFI = 0,957; RFI = 0.945; IFI = 0.978; TLI = 0.971; CFI = 0.977). Internal consistency test was applied for the reliability of the career sustainability scale and as a result of the analysis, Cronbach's Alpha values were 0.963 for the whole scale, 0.948 for the professionalism and adaptation factor and 0.921 for the complementarity factor. As a result of the findings, it is seen that the scale has internal consistency.

3.4. Procedure

In order to carry out the research, firstly, permission to use the scale of the Career Satisfaction Scale (Appendix A.2), Career Goal Discrepancies Scale (Appendix A.3), and Career Sustainability Scale (Appendix A.4) were obtained. After obtaining permission to use the scales, TED University Human Research Ethics Committee was applied and Approval of the Ethics Committee (Appendix A) was received.

The Demographic Information Form, Career Satisfaction Scale, Career Goal Discrepancy Scale, and Career Sustainability Scale prepared by the researcher for data collection were transferred to Google Form after obtaining the necessary permissions to conduct the study. Scale descriptions and inform consent were added.

Afterwards, the Google Form link with the scales was sent to the participants via e-mail, social media, and closed groups. The participants first answered the voluntary participation form. The voluntary participation form is attached in the appendix. Then, Demographic Information Form (Appendix B), Career Satisfaction Scale (Appendix C.1), Career Goal Discrepancies Scale (Appendix C.2) and Career Sustainability Scale (Appendix C.3) were applied to the participants. The demographic information form used in the research, the items belonging to the scales and the permissions for the use of the scales are attached.

3.5. Data Analysis Procedure

The data gathered as part of the study was analyzed using SPSS 22.00 (Statistical Package the Social Science) software. It was initially determined whether there were any incorrect data entries in the data set before any analysis of the data was conducted. Subsequently, the data set's unidirectional and multidirectional outliers were examined. One-way outliers were identified by calculating the standard z scores on each scale. One-way outliers are defined as values that are greater than + 3.29 and - 3.29 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). As a result, it was seen that the data set remained unchanged and that there were no outliers among the scale responses.

Multivariate outliers are found using the Mahalanobis distance method (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Using the Mahalanobis distance, multivariate outliers were found. Individuals with a Mahalanobis chi-square value of .001 and lower were characterised as outliers and excluded from the data set. As a result, eight participants were removed from the dataset. Additional analyses were conducted on the 461 participants who remained.

Following the identification and elimination of univariate and multivariate outliers from the data set, the normality of each scale's scores was assessed. The kurtosis and skewness values were examined in order to determine whether the distribution is normal. Histogram graphs and the skewness and kurtosis coefficients were also examined. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), the skewness and kurtosis coefficients of the

scores for all scales remain between -1.5 and + 1.5. According to George and Mallery (2010), a distribution can be considered normal if the skewness and kurtosis coefficients range between -2 and +2. As a result, it was discovered that the distribution remained within normal bounds.

The t-test for independent samples and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) are the analyses that were carried out to ascertain whether the career satisfaction, career goal discrepancy, and career sustainability of persons who are currently employed between the ages of 25 and 65 differ according to their gender, age, workplace type, educational status, marital status, and monthly income, respectively. The distribution must be normal and the variances must be homogeneous in order to execute the t-test for independent samples and one-way analysis of variance. Levene's test was therefore employed to ascertain whether the variances were homogeneous. It was observed that all subgroups had homogenous variances.

In order to determine whether career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy predict career sustainability of current employees between the ages of 25-65, a multiple linear regression analysis was conducted. A statistical technique called multiple regression is used to look at the individual and combined effects of one or more predictor variables on a dependent variable's variance (Wampold & Freund, 1987).

Considering the reliability values of the scales, Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliability coefficients were .88 for the Career Satisfaction Scale, .93 for the Career Goal Discrepancy Scale and .95 for the Career Sustainability Scale. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliability coefficient for the items of all scales was .83.

The Durbin-Watson coefficient was examined to ascertain whether the mistakes were independent of one another. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), this value needs to be between 1.5 and 2.5 in order for the errors to be deemed unconnected. The result for the Durbin-Watson coefficient was 1.86. It is seen that the errors are uncorrelated.

To prevent multicollinearity, there shouldn't be a high correlation between the independent variables. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), the variance increase factor should be less than 10 and the tolerance value larger than .20. The tolerance value and variance increase factor were looked at in order to evaluate this hypothesis. None of the variance increase factor values exceeded 10, and all tolerance levels were found to be

greater than .20. There isn't a multicollinearity issue, according to the tolerance and variance increase factor settings. Consequently, it can be observed that the prerequisites for regression analysis are met.

Descriptive statistics for each scale used in the study are explained below.

Table 2 *Descriptive Analysis Results of the Scales (N=461)*

Variables	N	$\bar{X}$	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Career Satisfaction	461	16.32	4.66	-.377	-.273
Career Goal Discrepancy	461	32.30	14.00	.343	-.817
Career Sustainability	461	46.40	15.00	-.248	-.764

Table 2 provides an explanation of the findings from the participants' descriptive analyses of the measures. Upon analysis of the table, it can be shown that the participants' mean career satisfaction score was 16.32, with a standard deviation of 4.66. When the skewness and kurtosis coefficients of the scale are examined, it is seen that the scores show a normal distribution. On examining the table, it becomes evident that the mean score of the participants on the career discrepancy scale is 32.30, with a standard deviation of 14.00. The scores have a normal distribution when the scale's skewness and kurtosis coefficients are examined at. The mean score of the participants on the career sustainability scale is 46.40 and the standard deviation is 15.00. When the skewness and kurtosis coefficients of the scale are examined, it is seen that the scores show a normal distribution.

3.6. Limitation of the Study

i. This research findings are limited to the data collected from people aged 25-65, currently employed and living in Türkiye. The findings obtained can only be generalized to similar groups.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The findings of the analyses related to the research's problems are described in this part. In the problem of the study, it was examined whether career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy of current employees aged between 25-65 years significantly predict career sustainability. In this direction, multiple linear regression analysis was conducted. The findings of the analysis are given below.

4.1. Findings and Comments on the Relationship of Career Sustainability with Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy

Table 3 *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis on Predictors of Career Sustainability (N=461)*

Variables	B	SD	β	t	p	Zero-order r	Partial r
Career Sustainability	22.207	2.767		8.026	.000*		
Career Satisfaction	1.878	.120	.584	15.713	.000*	656	592
Career Goal Discrepancy	-.200	.040	-.187	-5.019	.000*	-.412	-.228
R=.679 F(2,460)=195.501	R^2=461 p=.000						

(* p< .05)

Table 4 *Correlations (N=461)*

	Career Sustainability	Career Satisfaction	Career Goal Discrepancy
Career Sustainability	1.000	.656*	-.412*
Career Satisfaction	.656*	1.000	-.386*
Career Goal Discrepancy	-.412*	-.386*	1.000

(* p< .05)

Upon examining the multiple linear regression analysis results presented in Table 3 and Table 4, it is seen that all of the independent variables were included in the analysis to determine the predictive power. As a consequence of the investigation, the regression equation's variance analysis result is shown to be significant ($F_{(2,460)=}195.501$; p<.000). As a result, it is possible to conclude that the variables included in the multiple linear regression analysis have at least one significant regression coefficient.

Together, the variables measuring career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy demonstrate a high and significant correlation with career sustainability. About 46% of the variation in participants' career sustainability scores can be explained by the combined effects of the career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy (R=.679; R^2=.461).

The independent variables' standardized regression coefficients (β) and significance value (p) were investigated. The results show that participants' career sustainability is significantly and negatively predicted by the career goal discrepancy variable (β=-.187; p<.05), but significantly and positively predicted by the career satisfaction variable (β=.584; p<.05). Also participants' career satisfaction (β=.584; p<.05) is significantly and negatively predicted by the career goal discrepancy variable (β=-.187; p<.05).

The partial correlation coefficients (partial r) of the independent variables show that career satisfaction (partial r =.592) and career goal discrepancy (partial r =-.228) are the two factors that have a relative impact on career sustainability.

4.2. Findings and Comments on Whether Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy Change According to Demographic Variables

This section explains the research's findings and interpretations on whether the research participants' career sustainability, career satisfaction, and career goal discrepancy differ depending on demographic variables such gender, age, type of institution, marital status, and monthly income. Demographic variables for gender, institution type and marital status, were tested using the t-test, while the demographic data for age and monthly income were tested using one-way analysis of variance.

Table 5 *T Test Results of Participants' Mean Scores of Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Gender, Institution Type and Marital Status (N=461)*

Variables			n	$\bar{X}$	SD	df	t	p
Career Satisfaction	Gender	Male	210	14.74	4.51	459	-6.983	.291
		Female	251	17.64	4.37			
	Institution Type	Government Institution	268	15.15	4.62	459	-6.621	.073
		Private Institution	193	17.94	4.23			
	Marital Status	Single	166	14.42	4.37	459	-6.888	.579
		Married	295	17.39	4.49			
Career Sustainability	Gender	Male	210	44.05	14.45	459	-3.106	.309
		Female	251	48.36	15.17			
	Institution Type	Government Institution	268	44.18	14.75	459	-3.799	.929
		Private Institution	193	49.48	14.79			
	Marital Status	Single	166	43.71	14.20	459	-2.914	.436
		Married	295	47.91				
Career Goal Discrepancy	Gender	Male	210	33.25	13.48	459	1.334	.193
		Female	251	31.50	14.40			
	Institution Type	Public Institution	268	33.36	13.54	459	1.922	.114
		Private Institution	193	30.82	14.52			
	Marital Status	Single	166	33.07	13.32	459	.884	.164
		Married	295	31.86	14.38			

* ($p < .05$)

As a result of the independent sample t-test conducted to examine whether the participants' career satisfaction (t(461) = -6.983, p = .291); t(461) = -6.621, p = .073); t(461) = -6.888, p = .579), career sustainability (t(461) = -3.106, p = .309); t(461) = -3.799, p = .929; t(461) = -2.914, p = .436), and career goal discrepancy (t(461) = 1.334, p = .193; t(461) = 1.922, p = .114; t(461) = .884, p = .164) differed according to gender, type of institution and marital status, it was found that the difference between the averages was not significant in terms of demographic variables.

Table 6 *Descriptive Statistics on Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Age of the Participants (N=461)*

Variables	Age	n	$\bar{X}$	SD
Career Satisfaction	25-30	158	14.26	4.4035
	30-45	167	16.66	4.6006
	45-60	136	18.29	4.0678
Career Goal Discrepancy	25-30	158	33.77	13.2280
	30-45	167	32.32	14.3503
	45-60	136	30.55	14.3516
Career Sustainability	25-30	158	43.21	14.1142
	30-45	167	46.12	15.6293
	45-60	136	50.46	14.3201

One-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether participants' career satisfaction, career goal discrepancy and career sustainability varied according to their age. The results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7 *One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Results Regarding Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Participants' Age (N=461)*

Variables	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	p
Career Satisfaction	Between Groups	1216.040	2	608.020	31.674	.000*
	Within Groups	8791.722	458	19.196		
	Total	10007.761	460			
Career Goal Discrepancy	Between Groups	758.310	2	379.155	1.941	.145
	Within Groups	89461.976	458	195.332		
	Total	90220.286	460			
Career Sustainability	Between Groups	3859.312	2	1929.656	8.881	.000*
	Within Groups	99509.448	458	217.270		
	Total	103368.759	460			

(* $p < .05$)

When the table is analyzed, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference in career satisfaction ($F= 31.674$; $p < .05$) and career sustainability ($F= 8.881$; $p < .05$) of the participants according to their ages. In other words, the career satisfaction and career sustainability of people currently working in the 25-65 age range show a significant difference according to their age. Tukey test, one of the Post Hoc tests, was used to test the source of the difference.

When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference in the career goal discrepancy of the participants according to their ages ($F= 1.941$; $p > .05$). In other words, there is no significant difference in the career goal discrepancy of the people currently working in the 25-65 age range according to their ages.

Table 8 *Multiple Comparisons Results Regarding Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Participants' Age (N=461)*

Variables			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Career Satisfaction	25-30	30-45	-2.3992*	.4862	.000*
		45-60	-4.0273*	.5125	.000*
	30-45	25-30	2.3992*	.4862	.000*
		45-60	-1.6281*	.5061	.004*
	45-60	25-30	4.0273*	.5125	.000*
		30-45	1.6281*	.5061	.004*
Career Goal Discrepancy	25-30	30-45	1,4488	1.5511	.619
		45-60	3.2207	1.6348	.121
	30-45	25-30	-1.4488	1.5511	.619
		45-60	1.7719	1.6143	.516
	45-60	25-30	-3.2207	1.6348	.121
		30-45	-1.7719	1.6143	.516
Career Sustainability	25-30	30-45	-2.9109	1.6359	.178
		45-60	-7.2470*	1.7242	.000*
	30-45	25-30	2.9109	1.6359	.178
		45-60	-4.361*	1.7025	.030*
	45-60	25-30	7.2470*	1.7242	.000*
		30-45	4.361*	1.7025	.030*

(* $p < .05$)

In Table 8, the source of differentiation in participants' career satisfaction and career sustainability according to their ages is explained. When the table is examined, there is a significant difference in the career satisfaction of individuals between the ages of 25-30 and individuals between the ages of 30-45 and 45-60 ($p<.05$). There is a significant difference ($p<.05$) in the career satisfaction of individuals between the ages of 30-45 and individuals between the ages of 25-30 and 45-60. There is a significant difference between the career satisfaction of individuals aged 45-60 and individuals aged 25-30 and 30-45 ($p<.05$).

Examining the table indicates that there is no significant difference in career sustainability between those in the 25–30 age range and those in the 30-45 age range ($p>.05$). There is a significant difference between the career sustainability of individuals aged 25-30 and individuals aged 45-60 ($p<.05$). There is no significant difference between individuals aged 30-45 and individuals aged 25-30 in terms of career sustainability

(p>.05). There is a significant difference between the career sustainability of individuals aged 45-60 and individuals aged 25-30 and 30-45 (p<.05).

Table 9 *Descriptive Statistics on Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Monthly Income of the Participants (N=461)*

Variables	Monthly Income	n	x̄	SD
Career Satisfaction	0-11400 TL	21	11.000	4.6904
	11401-21400 TL	93	14.333	4.4632
	21401-31400 TL	184	16.380	4.3100
	31401-41400 TL	101	17.574	4.3089
	41401 and above	62	18.855	3.9664
Career Goal Discrepancy	0-11400 TL	21	36.238	10.9859
	11401-21400 TL	93	33.806	14.2052
	21401-31400 TL	184	32.484	13.5836
	31401-41400 TL	101	32.842	15.1445
	41401 and above	62	27.258	13.0521
Career Sustainability	0-11400 TL	21	40.143	14.5989
	11401-21400 TL	93	43.129	14.3846
	21401-31400 TL	184	45.582	15.3528
	31401-41400 TL	101	48.297	14.4011
	41401 and above	62	52.774	13.6543

(* p < .05)

One-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether participants' career satisfaction, career goal discrepancy and career sustainability varied according to their monthly income. The results are presented in Table 10.

Table 10 *One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Results Regarding Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Participants' Monthly Income (N=461)*

Variables	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	p
Career Satisfaction	Between Groups	1519.339	4	379.835	20.405	.000*
	Within Groups	8488.423	456	18.615		
	Total	10007.761	460			
Career Goal Discrepancy	Between Groups	2148.673	4	537.168	2.781	.026
	Within Groups	88071.613	456	193.140		
	Total	90220.286	460			
Career Sustainability	Between Groups	4823.031	4	1205.758	5.579	.000*
	Within Groups	98545.728	456	216.109		
	Total	103368.759	460			

(* $p < .05$)

Table 10 shows that there is a statistically significant difference in career satisfaction ($F= 20.405$; $p < .05$) and career sustainability ($F= 5.579$; $p < .05$) according to the monthly income of the participants. In other words, career satisfaction and career sustainability of currently employed people between the ages of 25-65 show a significant difference according to their monthly income. Tukey test, one of the Post Hoc tests, was used to test the source of the difference.

It is seen that there is no statistically significant difference in career goal discrepancy according to the monthly income of the participants ($F= 2.781$; $p > .05$). In other words, there is no significant difference in the career goal mismatches of currently employed people between the ages of 25-65 according to their monthly income.

Table 11 *Multiple Comparisons Results Regarding Career Sustainability, Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy According to Participants' Monthly Income (N=461)*

Variables			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Career Satisfaction	0-11400	11401-21400	-3.3333*	1.0424	.013*
		21401-31400	-5.3804*	.9938	.000*
		31401-41400	-6.5743*	1.0348	.000*
		41401 and above	-7.8548*	1.0893	.000*
	11401-21400	0-11400	3.3333*	1.0424	.013*
		21401-31400	-2.0471*	.5489	.002*
		31401-41400	-3.2409*	.6201	.000*
		41401 and above	-4.5215*	.7074	.000*
	21401-31400	0-11400	5.3804*	.9938	.000*
		11401-21400	2.0471*	.5489	.002*
		31401-41400	-1.1938	.5343	.169
		41401 and above	-2.4744*	.6336	.001*
	31401-41400	0-11400	6.5743*	1.0348	.000*
		11401-21400	3.2409*	.6201	.000*
		21401-31400	1.1938	.5343	.169
		41401 and above	-1.2806	.6961	.352
	41401 and above	0-11400	7.8548*	1.0893	.000*
		11401-21400	4.5215*	.7074	.000*
		21401-31400	2.4744*	.6336	.001*
		31401-41400	1.2806	.6961	.352
Career Goal Discrepancy	0-11400	11401-21400	2.4316	3.3577	.951

		21401-31400	3.7544	3.2011	.767
		31401-41400	3.3965	3.3331	.847
		41401 and above	8.9800	3.5089	.080
	11401-21400	0-11400	-2.4316	3.3577	.951
		21401-31400	1.3228	1.7682	.945
		31401-41400	.9649	1.9973	.989
		41401 and above	6.5484*	2.2786	.034*
	21401-31400	0-11400	-3.7544	3.2011	.767
		11401-21400	-1.3228	1.7682	.945
		31401-41400	-.3579	1.7210	1.000
		41401 and above	5.2256	2.0408	.080
	31401-41400	0-11400	-3.3965	3.3331	.847
		11401-21400	-.9649	1.9973	.989
		21401-31400	.3579	1.7210	1.000
		41401 and above	5.5835	2.2422	.095
	41401 and above	0-11400	-8.9800	3.5089	.080
		11401-21400	-6.5484*	2.2786	.034*
		21401-31400	-5.2256	2.0408	.080
		31401-41400	-5.5835	2.2422	.095
Career Sustainability	0-11400	11401-21400	-2.9862	3.5517	.918
		21401-31400	-5.4387	3.3861	.494
		31401-41400	-8.1542	3.5257	.143
		41401 and above	-12.6313*	3.7117	.006*
	11401-21400	0-11400	2.9862	3.5517	.918
		21401-31400	-2.4525	1.8704	.684
		31401-41400	-5.1680	2.1127	.105

	41401 and above	-9.6452*	2.4103	.001*
21401-31400	0-11400	5.4387	3.3861	.494
	11401-21400	2.4525	1.8704	.684
	31401-41400	-2.7155	1.8205	.568
	41401 and above	-7.1927*	2.1587	.008*
31401-41400	0-11400	8.1542	3.5257	.143
	11401-21400	5.1680	2.1127	.105
	21401-31400	2.7155	1.8205	.568
	41401 and above	-4.4772	2.3718	.325
41401 and above	0-11400	12.6313*	3.7117	.006*
	11401-21400	9.6452*	2.4103	.001*
	21401-31400	7.1927*	2.1587	.008*
	31401-41400	4.4772	2.3718	.325

(* $p < .05$)

In Table 11, the source of differentiation in participants' career satisfaction and career sustainability according to their monthly income is explained. When Table 11 is examined, there is a significant difference between the career satisfaction of individuals with monthly income between 0-11400 and individuals with monthly income of 11401-21400, 21401-31400, 31401-41400, 41401 and above ($p<.05$). There is a significant difference between the career satisfaction of individuals with monthly income between 11401-21400 and individuals with monthly income 0-11400, 21401-31400, 31401-41400, 41401 and above ($p<.05$).

There is a significant difference between the career satisfaction of individuals with monthly income between 21401-31400 and individuals with monthly income of 0-11400, 11401-21400, 41401 and above ($p<.05$). There is no significant difference between the career satisfaction of individuals with monthly income between 21401-31400 and individuals with monthly income between 31401-41400 ($p>.05$).

There is a significant difference between the career satisfaction of individuals with monthly income between 31401-41400 and individuals with monthly income between 0-

11400 and 11401-21400 (p<.05). There is no significant difference between the career satisfaction of individuals with monthly income between 31401-41400 and individuals with monthly income of 21401-31400, 41401 and above (p>.05).

There is a significant difference in career satisfaction between individuals with monthly income of 41401 and above and individuals with monthly income of 0-11400, 11401-21400, 21401-31400 (p<.05). There is no significant difference between the career satisfaction of individuals with monthly income of 41401 and above and individuals with monthly income between 31401-41400 (p>.05).

When the table is examined, there is no significant difference between the career sustainability of individuals with monthly income between 0-11400 and individuals with monthly income of 11401-21400, 21401-31400, 31401-41400 (p>.05). There is a significant difference between the career sustainability of individuals with monthly income between 0-11400 and individuals with monthly income of 41401 and above (p<.05).

There is no significant difference between the career sustainability of individuals with monthly income between 11401-21400 and individuals with monthly income of 0-11400, 21401-31400, 31401-41400 (p>.05). There is a significant difference between the career sustainability of individuals with monthly income between 11401-21400 and individuals with monthly income of 41401 and above (p<.05).

There is no significant difference between the career sustainability of individuals with monthly income between 21401-31400 and individuals with monthly income of 0-11400, 11401-21400, 31401-41400 (p>.05). There is a significant difference between the career sustainability of individuals with monthly income between 21401-31400 and individuals with monthly income of 41401 and above (p<.05).

There is a significant difference between the career sustainability of individuals with monthly income of 41401 and above and individuals with monthly income of 0-11400, 11401-21400, 21401-31400 (p<.05). There is no significant difference between the career sustainability of individuals with monthly income of 41401 and above and individuals with monthly income of 31401-41400 (p>.05).

4.3.Hypothesis Testing

The aim of this study is to investigate how individuals' career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy affect their career sustainability. In addition, it is planned to investigate the relationship between the career satisfaction, career goal discrepancy and career sustainability with the scales to be used within the scope of the research. In light of this, the detailed hypotheses mentioned in the introduction are expanded upon as follows:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Career satisfaction of employees predicts career sustainability. This hypothesis was confirmed ($\beta = .584$; $p < .05$).

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Career goal discrepancy of employees predicts career sustainability. This hypothesis was confirmed ($\beta = -.187$; $p < .05$).

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Career satisfaction ($\beta = .584$; $p < .05$) of employees predicts career goal discrepancy ($\beta = -.187$; $p < .05$). This hypothesis was confirmed.

Hypothesis 4 (H4): Employees' career satisfaction and career sustainability increase while career goal discrepancy decreases with increasing age. This hypothesis was confirmed for career satisfaction and career sustainability (Table 6) but when Table 7 is examined, it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference in the career goal discrepancy of the participants according to their ages ($F = 1.941$; $p > .05$).

Hypothesis 5 (H5): Employees' career satisfaction, career goal discrepancy and career sustainability increased with increasing income while participants' career goal discrepancy decreases with increasing income. This hypothesis was confirmed for career satisfaction and career sustainability (Table 9) but when Table 10 is examined, it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference in the career goal discrepancy of the participants according to their incomes ($F = 2.781$; $p > .05$).

Hypothesis 6 (H6): Male employees have higher career satisfaction, career goal discrepancy and career sustainability than female employees. This hypothesis wasn’t be confirmed. As a result of the independent sample t-test conducted to examine whether the participants' career satisfaction ($t(461) = -6.983$, $p = .291$), career sustainability ($t(461) = -3.106$, $p = .309$), career goal discrepancy ($t(461) = 1.334$, $p = .193$) differed according to gender it was found that the difference between the averages was not significant.

Hypothesis 7 (H7): Career satisfaction, career goal discrepancy and career sustainability are higher among the employees working in public institutions than private institutions. This hypothesis wasn't be confirmed. As a result of the independent sample t-test conducted to examine whether the participants' career satisfaction (t(461) = -6.621, p = .073), career sustainability (t(461) = -3.799, p = .929), career goal discrepancy (t(461) = 1.922, p = .114) differed according to type of institution it was found that the difference between the averages was not significant.

Hypothesis 8 (H8): Single employees have higher career satisfaction and career sustainability while married employees have higher career goal discrepancy. This hypothesis wasn't be confirmed. As a result of the independent sample t-test conducted to examine whether the participants' career satisfaction (t(461) = -6.888, p = .579), career sustainability (t(461) = -2.914, p = .436), career goal discrepancy (t(461) = .884, p = .164) differed according to marital status it was found that the difference between the averages was not significant.

DISCUSSION

Discussion of the research findings is given below.

5.1. Discussion on the Relationship of Career Sustainability with Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy

As a result of the research, it was determined that career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy significantly predicted the career sustainability of people currently working between the ages of 25-65. It is found that career satisfaction has a positive correlation with career sustainability while career goal discrepancy has negative correlation with career sustainability. Also career satisfaction has negative correlation with career goal discrepancy.

According to the results of the study, career satisfaction significantly and positively predicts the career sustainability of current employees between the ages of 25-65. When the related literature is examined, it is seen that there are various studies that find a relationship between career sustainability and career satisfaction.

According to the focal career actor's particular definition of success, career satisfaction serves as a particular indicator of subjective career success (Hall & Chandler, 2005; Spurk et al., 2019). As such, it may be viewed as an indicator of the happiness dimension within a sustainable career framework (De Vos et al., 2018).

Moreover, as a result of their expected contentment with both their current and future professional possibilities, those who feel that their career are sustainable are likely to report greater levels of career satisfaction (Chin et al., 2022).

The association between organizational support for career development and career satisfaction was found to be mediated by career management practices, as reported by Barnett & Bradley (2007). This finding emphasizes the significance of proactive activities in raising career satisfaction. Furthermore, it was shown by Salleh et al. (2020) that career planning and career satisfaction had a negative influence on employees' desire to leave their jobs, with career satisfaction acting as a partial mediator in this relationship.

According to research conducted by Jyoti and Saharma in 2015, career satisfaction is positively impacted by career development support elements such career planning, training and assessment centers, networking opportunities, coaching, mentorship, and employee perceptions of organizational career support. This implies that companies with employees who receive career development and growth support are more likely to have contented and motivated staff members.

Furthermore, Karsili et al. (2021) cast light on the significance of workplace flexibility and subjective perceptions of satisfaction by emphasizing the subjective sustained contentment of an employee's career within the workplace as a vital aspect for effective career sustainability. Onyishi et al. (2019) emphasized the complex interplay between career satisfaction and commitment in the healthcare industry by highlighting the mediation function of career satisfaction in the relationship between fundamental psychological needs satisfaction and career commitment among nurses. Career satisfaction is a crucial component of career sustainability in the nursing profession, as evidenced by another study in which nurses participated. Subjective career success, which is influenced by individual and job characteristics, was found to be positively associated with job satisfaction and professional commitment, and negatively associated with turnover intention (Sönmez et al., 2021).

Additionally, it was shown that flourishing acted as a moderator in the relationship between authentic leadership and career satisfaction (Chang et al., 2020), underscoring the importance of both thriving and leadership in determining career satisfaction. Singh (2018) also found that career satisfaction and organizational career management techniques were mediated by organizational experience, highlighting the impact of organizational experience on satisfaction levels.

The relation between career sustainability and career satisfaction is also supported by theoretical frameworks. The career sustainability perspective provides a framework for a theoretical analysis that highlights the interconnectedness of the various actors that have an impact on individual careers, the dynamics of the influence of multiple contexts for the continuity of individual paths, career continuity through time movements and decisions made, the necessity of a process that fosters adaptive capability, and the creation of opportunities for sustainability (Müller & Scheffer, 2022). These are all related, and when employees feel challenged, engaged, and supported in their careers, they are more

likely to have a favorable association between career sustainability and career satisfaction.

As a result of the study, it was found that participants' career goal discrepancy significantly and negatively predicted their career sustainability. Career goal discrepancy was defined by Creed and Hood (2015) as "the perceived gap between the career goal set by the individual (future self or situation) and the progress in the career goal (current self or situation)" in the context of career development. This discrepancy, especially among high school and college students, can cause negative feelings including anxiety, a sense of failure, exhaustion, and inadequacy (Kayhalak et al., 2022). The search results do not specifically address the relationship between career goal discrepancy and career sustainability; however, some studies imply that career goal-progress discrepancy is related to career distress, which may impact career sustainability (Creed et al., 2015; Creed et al., 2017).

According to Marini et al. (2023), there exists a positive correlation between perceived obstacles to career progression, such as financial limitations, and career goal discrepancy. This suggests that these barriers may worsen the discrepancy between an individual's desired career path and present career standing. This may negatively affect career sustainability. Moreover, according to one study when choosing a potential destination city, early career-stage academics who decide to relocate for work typically give top priority to aspects like first impressions, livability, familiarity, political stability, and expectations for professional growth (Arifa et al., 2022). This implies that a person's capacity to suitably balance their personal and professional demands while achieving their career goals and actual career outcomes may have an impact on a career's sustainability.

In general, a person's values, chances for personal growth and development all have an impact on the complex interaction between career goal discrepancy and career sustainability. Individuals and organizations can endeavor to support the long-term success and contentment of employees by promoting career sustainability and recognizing these aspects and figuring out how to match career goals with actual career outcomes. There are several possible factors for this assessment and these findings. Regarding the cultural structure and dynamics of the workplace, Türkiye's cultural structure and workplace dynamics may have an impact on how people identify their career

goals and choose career pathways that align with them. For instance, social norms, family expectations, and economic conditions can all influence an individual's career choices. Additionally, variables like changes in the economy and job security in Türkiye with regard to the labor market and employment conditions may have an impact on the career goals and satisfaction of employees. Concerns about employee turnover may rise during periods of economic instability, and because Türkiye's labor market is dynamic and competitive, people's levels of career fulfillment and satisfaction may vary based on changes in their workplace. For instance, an employee's level of career satisfaction may be impacted by variables including benefits, pay, and unemployment rates. Working conditions, flexibility, and career development and support programs offered by companies can all help address these issues by improving employee career satisfaction, which in turn affects career sustainability.

5.2. Discussion on the Relationship of Career Satisfaction and Career Goal Discrepancy

As a result of the study, it was found that participants' career goal discrepancy significantly and negatively predicted their career satisfaction. The relationship between career goal discrepancy and career satisfaction among information technology people is investigated in Chang and Wu's (2023) study. They highlight that a person's level of career satisfaction might be impacted by discrepancies between their present career goals and the opportunities they have for employment outside of themselves. Using the goal-achievement gap theory, the study looks into how people's happiness levels may be impacted by the discrepancy between their career goals and the chances they really have. According to this discrepancy theory, an individual's level of satisfaction is based on the difference between their goals or expectations and their actual performance or rewards. It also argues that having higher initial expectations may result in a bigger expectation-performance gap (Jiang et. al., 2018; Liang et. al., 2023).

In addition, research have demonstrated a positive correlation between career satisfaction and optimism and the Positive Career Goal Discrepancy Scale, which measures how much a person's present work advancement surpasses their established career goals (Akmal et al., 2021). This shows that higher levels of career satisfaction are more likely to be experienced by people who believe their career success has exceeded their goals.

The Discrepancies Between Individual-Set and Parent-Set Career Goals Scale was found to be negatively correlated with life satisfaction and positively correlated with career stress in a study looking at the relationship between career goal inconsistencies between individuals and parents (Köksal & Yam, 2023). This implies that differences in one's parents' and one's own career goals may have a negative impact on one's general well-being and level of career satisfaction.

The findings in this text may have emerged by considering the career and business dynamics in Türkiye. Family ties are typically strong in Türkiye when taking into account cultural characteristics and career expectations among family members. People may feel a discrepancy between their own career goals and their parents' or families' expectations as a result of this. For instance, people may have many interests and skills, even if families may often prefer particular careers. Furthermore, people may feel that there is a mismatch between their career goals and the opportunities for employment available to them due to high unemployment rates in specific industries, economic uncertainty, and the difficulties in finding employment. In terms of gender, although women's employment rates are rising quickly in Türkiye, gender norms and expectations may still have a significant influence. Women may feel that their career goals and societal expectations don't align as a result of this.

In summary, a variety of factors such as career barriers, self-efficacy, external career opportunities, and career goal discrepancies between individuals and parents, affect the complex relationship between career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy. The mismatch between people's career goals and reality is shaped by cultural, economic, and social variables, which also have a big influence on career satisfaction. As a result, taking these things into account is crucial to improving career development and satisfaction in Türkiye. To properly comprehend the subtleties of this relationship and to create successful career development plans for fostering career success and satisfaction, more research is required.

5.3. Discussion on the Relationship of Career Satisfaction and Career Sustainability with Demographics

The study found that the participants' career satisfaction differed statistically significantly depending on their age. According to Tschopp's (2016) study on the aging workforce, employees who have a more independent career orientation and are less

satisfied with their jobs may be more likely to plan to leave their jobs. This implies that older workers can be less satisfied with their careers due to differing expectations and preferences for their careers. A study conducted on young adults, having better internet skills is already linked to greater career satisfaction in the present, and those who have better internet skills also have more optimistic future prospects for both life and career satisfaction (Tóth et al., 2023). This shows that young individuals' career satisfaction may be significantly influenced by their internet skills.

The study found that the participants' career satisfaction differed statistically significantly depending on their income. Carvajal et al. (2021) discovered that pharmacists' career satisfaction is significantly influenced by their incomes. The study found a positive relationship between pharmacists' career satisfaction and their income and salary earnings, with higher earnings being associated with higher career satisfaction. Moreover, Maharjan (2019) discovers that college teachers' salaries and job satisfaction are positively correlated, suggesting that having more money may help one feel more fulfilled in their career. The study demonstrates that employee satisfaction and income levels are positively correlated. More specifically, higher job satisfaction is correlated with higher salaries.

The study found that the participants' career sustainability differed statistically significantly depending on their age. Carlo and Buscicchio's (2023) study looks into how older people' use of digital media and career choices relate to each other. It is stressed that older people' professional histories and present employment situations have a big impact on how they absorb digital skills and what kinds of gadgets they utilize. The study emphasizes how older people's employment situation and prior employment have a significant impact on how technologies are domesticated and used online. The study also emphasizes the importance employment status is to active aging, as it allows older adults to continue contributing to their families and communities. The article underlines the potential of Information and Communication Technologies to alleviate the negative impacts of aging and promote healthy living among older people. It suggests that working conditions and the development of digital competencies positively influence active ageing. In summary, the study makes the case that age and career sustainability are related, and that older people' experiences and possibilities in the digital age are significantly shaped by their work environment and digital competencies.

Several theories emerge when examining the relation between career sustainability and age. One of these theories is Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory. The microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem are some of the systems that Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory identifies as having an impact on human development (Park & Kim, 2020). The ways in which these systems interact influence individual career opportunities and experiences. Career development is influenced by a variety of factors at several levels, including sociocultural contexts, individual views within their circumstances, and the educational and economic systems (Xie et al., 2019).

The Chronosystem, a key element of Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory, is directly related to career sustainability. The patterning of environmental events and transitions across a person's life is known as the chronosystem (Souza, 2022). This idea emphasizes the importance of alterations and continuity over time in people's living and working environments in the context of career sustainability. A cyclical, self-regulatory process is involved in sustainable careers, where people gradually adjust to different occurrences in their personal and larger context (De Vos et al., 2020). Through its impact on a person's career trajectory, the chronosystem also affects the sustainability of careers. For instance, the study on German language instructors in China discovered that an imbalance between the demands of the classroom and the availability of resources might have a long-term effect on a teacher's career, influencing their capacity to support themselves in the future (Lui et al., 2022). Furthermore, the relation between career satisfaction and the Chronosystem is that career satisfaction can evolve over time, influenced by various factors within the Chronosystem. Research has shown that major life events, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, can significantly impact individuals' career concerns and development (Belser & Prescod, 2021). Career satisfaction can also be influenced by generational factors, such as cultural and societal norms, technological advancements, and economic conditions. These factors can shape an individual's career choices and satisfaction over time (Tong et. al., 2022). The interconnected systems framework proposed by Bronfenbrenner can help professionals in understanding how contextual factors, like pandemics, influence career trajectories and satisfaction.

Moreover, there is a close relationship between career tasks and developmental tasks and career sustainability. Career tasks are the particular tasks people take to progress in their chosen career, whereas developmental tasks are the social and psychological

obstacles people face as they get older in their careers. For long-term career success and adaptation in a changing work environment, these two task kinds must work in harmony.

Havighurst's Developmental Task Theory, which emphasizes the significance of appropriate tasks that people must engage in at various stages of life, is strongly related to career sustainability. According to Havighurst, completing these tasks successfully can lead to happiness and provide opportunities for success in other tasks, but failing them can lead to unhappiness and difficulties in other tasks (Seiffge-Krenke & Gelhaar, 2008). Completing developmental tasks related to career choice, vocational coping strategies, and decision-making attitudes is crucial in the context of career sustainability (Savickas, 1997). These assignments help with immediate career decisions as well as long-term career satisfaction, performance, and psychological well-being (Lauermann et al., 2017).

In order to support career adaptability, Savickas (1997) emphasizes the need of counselors helping people anticipate and participate in developmental tasks. To do this, one must develop decision-making attitudes and competences that are in line with the changing needs of the workplace. Furthermore, research by Hlad'o et al. (2019) and Lan & Chen (2020) highlights the beneficial impact of career adaptability and social support on career planning and sustainable development, emphasizing the necessity of addressing both adaptability and career-related tasks for long-term success. Furthermore, Johnston (2018) highlights the importance that professional adaptability plays in moderating responses to diverse developmental tasks by discussing how it serves as a resource that helps people navigate both expected and unexpected career shifts.

Also career sustainability is shaped in significant manner by generational differences in viewpoints and ways of approaching the concept. A career that is truly sustainable must contribute to the well-being of both present and future generations, according to the intergenerational responsibility inherent in sustainability (Bal et al., 2021). This viewpoint emphasizes how individual professional selections have an impact on society as a whole and how important it is to think through the long-term effects of career decisions. Furthermore, in order to improve career sustainability across generations, elements including career construction, lifelong learning, and career adaptability are essential (Talluri et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2022). To ensure long-term sustainability, these characteristics help people learn new skills, adjust to changes, and proactively shape their career pathways.

The study found that the participants' career sustainability differed statistically significantly depending on their income. Since obtaining a living is frequently the main motivation for pursuing career, career sustainability and income are strongly correlated. Nonetheless, there are many facets and a complex interaction between the two.

On the one hand, having a steady income is necessary for financial wellness. A sustainable career can offer a reliable source of income that helps people support their families, take care of their basic needs, and reach their financial objectives. In this way, income and career sustainability are closely related since a solid income is frequently a prerequisite for having a sustainable career. On the other hand, more general social and economic issues may also have an impact on the relationship between income and career sustainability. For instance, research have demonstrated that companies have obligations to society that go beyond earning profits (Gandhi, 2023). This involves causing societal issues as well as assisting in the development of a just and sustainable society. In this way, financial security and career sustainability are social and economic issues as well as personal ones.

Lastly, personal characteristics like affective conduct and emotional intelligence might also have an impact on the relationship between income and career sustainability. Self-awareness, emotional regulation, social awareness, and emotional receptivity can all affect affective behavior toward success in a chosen vocation, according to research by Bakare et al. (2022). This implies that the relationship between career sustainability and income may also be influenced by individual characteristics.

The structure of the workforce and economic conditions in Turkey can help us understand how these findings might emerge. These findings can be related to Turkey's current situation, especially when considering Turkey's demographic structure, level of economic development, and trends in the labor market.

The labor market's age-related career differences may be impacted by Türkiye's aging population. Older workers may have different career goals and choices as a result of population aging. The fact that young people are more adept at using the internet, particularly in the digital age, and that this improves career satisfaction could be attributed to the characteristics of Turkey's youthful labor force. An other significant element can be the elder workforce in Turkey's acquisition of digital skills and technology access. Improving older workers' knowledge of digital technologies and giving them access to technology in particular may boost their capacity to pursue long-term careers and remain employed. Economically, for some occupational groupings in Turkey, the correlation

between income level and career satisfaction may be quite strong. For example, higher salaries are typically linked to greater career satisfaction in some occupational groups, such as those in the health industry. This could be in line with studies that demonstrate a clear correlation between salary and career happiness in specific occupational groups, like pharmacists.

5.4. Discussion on the Relationship of Career Sustainability with Career Sustainability Theories

The concept of career sustainability is complex and influenced by a variety of theories. The theories of Conservation of Resources Theory, Selection Optimization and Compensation Theory, Socio-emotional Selectivity Theory, and Self-Determination Theory are important for comprehending and advancing career sustainability.

According to Hobfoll's (1989) Conservation of Resources Theory, individuals should make an effort to preserve their material, psychological, social, and physical resources in order to preserve their well-being. This theory suggests that in order to secure long-term career success and well-being, individuals will prioritize maintaining their resources (such as skills, networks, and reputation).

According to Baltes and Baltes's (1990) Selection, Optimization, and Compensation Theory, people adjust to changing conditions by choosing realistic goals, maximizing their performance, and making up for diminishing abilities. According to theory, when it comes to career sustainability, people will modify their methods and goals as they get older, concentrating on preserving their strengths and adjusting to changes in their workplace. In this direction, people engage in selection by selecting goals that are consistent with their values and interests, making the most use of their resources and skills to achieve those goals, and making adjustments to their approach or seeking out assistance in order to make up for obstacles or setbacks.

According to Carstensen's (1992) Socio-emotional Selectivity Theory, people value connections to others and emotional experiences over other goals as they get older. In accordance with Socio-emotional Selectivity Theory, elder workers may place a higher value on establishing trusting relationships and finding career fulfillment than other factors when it comes to career sustainability. Because of this, people might start choosing careers more carefully that are compatible with their interests, values, and interpersonal

interactions. Situation in the career can lead to increased career satisfaction and engagement, which in turn can support career sustainability.

According to Deci and Ryan's (2000) Self-Determination Theory, people have three basic psychological needs: relatedness, competence, and autonomy. Based on the Self-Determination Theory, people who have a feeling of autonomy, competence, and relatedness in their work are more likely to keep a sustainable career.

The theories mentioned above emphasize the significance of conserving resources, adaptability, psychological satisfaction, and internal motivation in upholding a career that is sustainable in the over time.

5.5. Recommendations

In this section, various recommendations are given based on the results obtained in the research.

5.5.1. Recommendations for Researchers

- In the study, whether the concepts of career satisfaction and career goal discrepancy predict the concept of career sustainability was analyzed by multiple linear regression analysis. These relationships can be investigated by using mediating variables with different analysis methods.

- Education level was also considered as a demographic variable, but it was not included because sufficient information was not obtained from the participants. In future studies, educational status can be added as a demographic variable.

- A qualitative study can be conducted to examine individual experiences and experiences related to career sustainability more deeply.

- The majority of the participants of the study were from the education sector. Research can be conducted with participants predominantly from different sectors.

- Only a few studies on career sustainability in Türkiye were found in the form of scale adaptations. Considering the importance of this issue for career choice and work-life family balance, more studies are needed.

5.5.2. Recommendations for Policymakers

- Courses on career sustainability can be included in high school and university curricula in order to ensure the continuity of people's awareness of their career paths and professional choices. With these courses, students' interests, abilities and aspirations that are necessary for them to have a sustainable career in which they are satisfied and have compatible career goals can be determined.

- Policies on career sustainability can be developed and employees in all organizations can be trained on this issue. In this way, employees can be made aware of career sustainability and more predictable and productive work environments can be provided for both employees and organizations.

5.5.3. Recommendations for Psychological Counselors

- Psychological counselors can provide trainings, apply personalized programs and conduct group counseling sessions in order for individuals to get satisfaction from their careers, set goals compatible with their careers and ensure career sustainability. In this way, individuals can be more conscious about their careers and make better decisions about the choices they will make.

- The results of this study may be helpful for psychological counselors who provide career counseling. Job loss can be an opportunity for clients to reassess their career goals. Counselors can help clients assess their current skills and interests and, if necessary, provide guidance on vocational training options.

- The results of this study may be useful for psychological counselors who provide loss and grief counseling because when clients experience job loss, it can be emotionally challenging. Counselors should help clients process their emotional burden while guiding them on strategies to cope with job loss.

REFERENCES

Abraham, J. D., & Hansson, R. O. (1995). Successful aging at work: An applied study of selection, optimization, and compensation through impression management. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *50*(2), P94-P103. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/50B.2.P94

Aburumman, O., Salleh, A., Omar, K., & Abadi, M. (2020). The impact of human resource management practices and career satisfaction on employee's turnover intention. *Management Science Letters*, *10*(3), 641-652. http://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2020.8.1(14)

Akın, A., & Alabucak, E. (2017). *Kariyer Doyumu Ölçeği (KDÖ) Türkçe formu: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması.* 1st International Symposioum of Silkroad Academic Studies, 21-23 September, Nevsehir, Turkey.

Akmal, S. Z., Hood, M., Creed, P. A., & Duffy, A. L. (2022). Young Adults' Self-Regulatory Responses to Positive Career Goal Discrepancies: Testing Cross-Lagged Relationships. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *30*(4), 802-820. https://doi.org/10.1177/10690727211068106

Anafarta, A., & Yılmaz, Ö. (2019). Kariyer tatmini ve işten ayrılma niyeti arasındaki ilişkide işe adanmışlığın aracılık rolü. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *11*(4), 2944-2959. https://isarder.org/index.php/isarder/article/view/951

Arar, T., & Çetiner, N. (2023). Kariyer Sürdürülebilirliği Ölçeğinin Türkçeye Uyarlanmasi. *Journal of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Economics and Administrative Sciences Faculty*, *10*(2), 1119-1135. https://doi.org/10.30798/makuiibf.1218928

Arifa, Y. N., Khapova, S. N., & El Baroudi, S. (2022). Early Career Stage Academics and Their Expatriation Destination: What Drives Their City Choice in Enhancing Regional Sustainability?. *Sustainability*, *14*(22), 14712. https://doi.org/10.3390/su142214712

Arthur, M. B., Khapova, S. N., & Wilderom, C. P. (2005). Career success in a boundaryless career world. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 26*(2), 177-202. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.290

AŞKUN, V. (2023). Türkiye'de Sürdürülebilir Kariyer: Kaynaklarin Korunması Perspektifi. *Akademik Yaklaşımlar Dergisi*, *14*(2), 533-554. https://doi.org/10.54688/ayd.1267791

Athanasou, J. A., & Van Esbroeck, R. (2008). *International handbook of career guidance* (pp. 115-129). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Austin, J. T., & Vancouver, J. B. (1996). Goal constructs in psychology: Structure, process, and content. Psychological bulletin, 120(3), 338. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.120.3.338

Ayaz, A. (2021). *Öğretmenlerin öznel kariyer başarısını etkileyen faktörler: Bir karma yöntem araştırması* (Publication No. 682993) (Doctoral dissertation, Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi).

Bakare, J., Ohanu, I. B., & Shodipe, T. O. (2023). Hypothesized model of the relationship between affective behaviour, emotional intelligence and success of out-of-school youths in cell phone maintenance enterprise. *Rajagiri Management Journal*, *17*(3), 254-277. https://doi.org/10.1108/RAMJ-06-2022-0102

Bal, P. M., Matthews, L., Dóci, E., & McCarthy, L. P. (2020). An ideological analysis of sustainable careers: Identifying the role of fantasy and a way forward. *Career Development International*, *26*(1), 83-101. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-05-2020-0114

Baltes, P. B. (1997). On the incomplete architecture of human ontogeny: Selection, optimization, and compensation as foundation of developmental theory. *American Psychologist*, *52*(4), 366. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.4.366

Baltes, P. B., Staudinger, U. M., & Lindenberger, U. (1999). Lifespan psychology: Theory and application to intellectual functioning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *50*(1), 471-507. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.471

Barnett, B. and Bradley, L. (2007). The impact of organisational support for career development on career satisfaction. *Career Development International*, 12(7), 617-636. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430710834396

Barthauer, L., Kaucher, P., Spurk, D., & Kauffeld, S. (2020). Burnout and career (un) sustainability: Looking into the Blackbox of burnout triggered career turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *117*, 103334. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103334

Belser, C. and Prescod, D. (2021). Conceptualizing covid-19-related career concerns using bioecological systems: implications for career practice. The Career Development Quarterly, 69(4), 355-370. https://doi.org/10.1002/cdq.12279

Bowling, N. A., Eschleman, K. J., & Wang, Q. (2010). A meta-analytic examination of the relationship between job satisfaction and subjective well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *83*(4), 915-934. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317909X478557

Bozionelos, N., Lin, C. H., & Lee, K. Y. (2020). Enhancing the sustainability of employees' careers through training: The roles of career actors' openness and of supervisor support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *117*, 103333. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103333

Bulgur, N. E., Karçika, Ö., & Yasemin, B. A. L. (2023). Kariyer Sürdürülebilirliği Ölçeğinin Türkçe Geçerlilik Ve Güvenilirliğinin Değerlendirilmesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *The Journal of Academic Social Science*, *143*(143), 341-352. http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/ASOS.70762

Burnett-Wolle, S., & Godbey, G. (2007). Refining research on older adults' leisure: Implications of selection, optimization, and compensation and socioemotional selectivity theories. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *39*(3), 498-513. https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2007.11950119

Carlo, S., & Buscicchio, G. (2023). Digital Media Domestication and Job Paths Among Older People: An Ethnographic Investigation. *Media and Communication*, *11*(3), N-A. https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v11i3.6710

Carstensen, L. L. (1995). Evidence for a life-span theory of socioemotional selectivity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *4*(5), 151-156. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep11512261

Carstensen, L. L. (2006). The influence of a sense of time on human development. *Science*, *312*(5782), 1913-1915. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1127488

Carstensen, L. L., Isaacowitz, D. M., & Charles, S. T. (1999). Taking time seriously: A theory of socioemotional selectivity. *American Psychologist*, *54*(3), 165. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.3.165

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). *On the self-regulation of behavior*. New York: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139174794

Carvajal, M. J., Popovici, I., & Hardigan, P. C. (2018). Gender differences in the measurement of pharmacists' job satisfaction. *Human resources for health*, *16*, 1-8. https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmacy9040173

Chang, L. H., & Wu, S. (2023). The Relationship between Discrepancies in Career Anchors of Information Technology Personnel and Career Satisfaction. *Behavioral Sciences*, *13*(9), 785. 785. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13090785

Chang, W., Busser, J., & Liu, A. (2020). Authentic leadership and career satisfaction: the meditating role of thriving and conditional effect of psychological contract fulfillment. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 32(6), 2117-2136. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijchm-06-2019-0551

Chin, T., Jawahar, I. M., & Li, G. (2022). Development and validation of a career sustainability scale. *Journal of Career Development*, *49*(4), 769-787. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845321993234

Chin, T., Li, G., Jiao, H., Addo, F., & Jawahar, I. M. (2019). Career sustainability during manufacturing innovation: a review, a conceptual framework and future research agenda. *Career Development International*, *24*(6), 509-528. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-02-2019-0034

Creed, P. A., & Hood, M. (2015). The development and initial validation of a scale to assess career goal discrepancies. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *23*(2), 308-317. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072714535175

Creed, P. A., & Hood, M. (2015). The development and initial validation of a scale to assess career goal discrepancies. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *23*(2), 308-317. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072714535175

Creed, P. A., Hood, M., & Hu, S. (2017). Personal orientation as an antecedent to career stress and employability confidence: The intervening roles of career goal-performance discrepancy and career goal importance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *99*, 79-92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2016.12.007

Creed, P. A., Wamelink, T., & Hu, S. (2015). Antecedents and consequences to perceived career goal–progress discrepancies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *87*, 43-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.12.001

de Souza, B. (2022). Reframing policy trajectory for inclusive education in Malawi. *Journal of Education (University of KwaZulu-Natal)*, (88), 69-86. http://dx.doi.org/10.17159/2520-9868/i88a05

De Vos, A., & Van der Heijden, B. I. (2017). Current thinking on contemporary careers: the key roles of sustainable HRM and sustainability of careers. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, *28*, 41-50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.07.003

De Vos, A., Van der Heijden, B. I., & Akkermans, J. (2020). Sustainable careers: Towards a conceptual model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *117*, 103196. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.06.011

De Vos, A., Van der Heijden, B. I., & Akkermans, J. (2020). Sustainable careers: Towards a conceptual model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *117*, 103196. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.06.011

Demirdelen, D. (2013). *Yöneticilerin kariyer tatminine ilişkin görüş ve algılamaları: Antalya'da 5 yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma* (Doctoral dissertation, Sakarya Universitesi).

Di Fabio, A., & Kenny, M. E. (2016). From decent work to decent lives: Positive Self and Relational Management (PS&RM) in the twenty-first century. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7*, 361. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00361

Doğru, H. B. (2023). *Kariyer sürdürülebilirlik ölçeği'nin (Career sustainability scale) Türkçeye uyarlanma geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması* (Publication No. 829907) (Doctoral dissertation, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi).

Dries, N., Pepermans, R., Hofmans, J., & Rypens, L. (2009). Development and validation of an objective intra-organizational career success measure for managers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *30*(4), 543–560. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.564

Fang, Y. C., Ren, Y. H., Chen, J. Y., Chin, T., Yuan, Q., & Lin, C. L. (2021). Inclusive leadership and career sustainability: mediating roles of supervisor developmental feedback and thriving at work. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 671663. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.671663

Finn, C., Zimmermann, J., & Neyer, F. J. (2017). Personality development in close relationships. In *Personality Development Across the Lifespan* (pp. 357-369). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-804674-6.00022-3

FlexJobs. (2023, May 21). *The Changing Work Landscape: Layoff Fears and Career Shifts on the Rise.*

https://www.flexjobs.com/blog/post/changing-work-landscape-career-shifts/

Freund, A. M. (2008). Successful aging as management of resources: The role of selection, optimization, and compensation. *Research in Human Development*, *5*(2), 94-106. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427600802034827

Gagné, M., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2013). Self-determination theory's contribution to positive organizational psychology. In *Advances in Positive Organizational*

Psychology (pp. 61-82). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S2046-410X(2013)0000001006

Gandhi, S. K. (2023). Corporate And Society: A Symbiotic Relationship of Service and Sustainability. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, *5*(5), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2023.v05i05.6266

Gattiker, U. E., & Larwood, L. (1988). Predictors for managers' career mobility, success, and satisfaction. *Human Relations*, *41*(8), 569-591. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678804100801

George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, 17.0 update (10th ed.)*. Boston: Pearson.

Gökbaraz, N. (2021). *Birey-ebeveyn kariyer hedefi tutarsızlığı ölçeği: Spor bilimleri fakültesi öğrencileri örneği* (Master's thesis, Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).

Greenhaus, J. H., & Kossek, E. E. (2014). The contemporary career: A work–home perspective. *Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav.*, *1*(1), 361-388. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091324

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, *33*(1), 64-86. https://doi.org/10.5465/256352

Halbesleben, J. R., Neveu, J. P., Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., & Westman, M. (2014). Getting to the "COR" understanding the role of resources in conservation of resources theory. *Journal of Management*, *40*(5), 1334-1364. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527130

Hall, D. T., & Chandler, D. E. (2005). Psychological success: When the career is a calling. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *26*(2), 155-176. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.301

Hennekam, S., de Becdelievre, P., & Grima, F. (2022). A sustainable career for interim managers: the role of career communities. *Personnel Review*, *51*(4), 1277-1297. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-09-2020-0670

Herman, C., & Lewis, S. (2012). Entitled to a sustainable career? Motherhood in science, engineering, and technology. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(4), 767-789. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2012.01775.x

Heslin, P. A. (2005). Conceptualizing and evaluating career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *26*(2), 113-136. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.270

Hirschi, A., Steiner, R., Burmeister, A., & Johnston, C. S. (2020). A whole-life perspective of sustainable careers: The nature and consequences of nonwork orientations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *117*, 103319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103319

Hite, L. M., & McDonald, K. S. (2020). Careers after COVID-19: Challenges and changes. *Human Resource Development International*, *23*(4), 427-437. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2020.1779576

Hlad′ o, P., Kvasková, L., Ježek, S., Hirschi, A., & Macek, P. (2020). Career adaptability and social support of vocational students leaving upper secondary school. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *28*(3), 478-495. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072719884299

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, *44*(3), 513. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology*, *50*(3), 337-421. https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00062

Hobfoll, S. E. (2002). Social and psychological resources and adaptation. *Review of General Psychology*, *6*(4), 307-324. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.6.4.307

Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J. P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *5*, 103-128. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640

Hooley, T., Sultana, R. G., & Thomsen, R. (2020). Why a social justice informed approach to career guidance matters in the time of coronavirus. *Studies in Continuing Education*, *42*(2), 137-140. https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2020.1811995

Ilies, R., & Judge, T. A. (2005). Goal regulation across time: the effects of feedback and affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(3), 453. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.453

Integrated Benefits Institute. (2023, Jul 13). *Reimagining Strategies to Improve Employee Attraction and Retention.*

https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/reimagining-strategies-to improve-employee-attraction-and-retention-according-to-integrated- enefits-institute-study-301876770.html

Jiang, J. J., Huang, W. W., Klein, G., & Tsai, J. C. A. (2018). The career satisfaction of IT professionals with mixed job demands. *IEEE transactions on engineering management*, *67*(1), 30-41. DOI: 10.1109/TEM.2018.2870085

Judge, T. A., Cable, D. M., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz Jr, R. D. (1995). An empirical investigation of the predictors of executive career success. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*(3), 485-519. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01767.x

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: the role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(1), 17. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.1.17

Jung, H., Park, I. J., & Rie, J. (2015). Future time perspective and career decisions: The moderating effects of affect spin. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *89*, 46-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.04.010

Jyoti, J., & Sharma, P. (2015). Impact of mentoring functions on career development: moderating role of mentoring culture and mentoring structure. *Global Business Review, 16*(4), 700-718. DOI:10.1177/0972150915581110

Karakullukçu, Ö. F. (2018). Spor yöneticilerinin öz yeterlilik inancı ve öz liderlik inançları ile yönetsel yetkinlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkilerde kariyer tatmininin aracılık rolü. TEZ BAK

Karsili, H., Yeşiltaş, M., & Berberoglu, A. (2021). Workplace flexibility for sustainable career satisfaction: case of handling in the aviation sector in north cyprus. *Sustainability*, 13(12), 6878. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126878

Kayhalak, F., Durhan, T. A., & Kurtipek, S. (2022). Investigation of career goal discrepancy of Individuals who are preparing for PVTC exams and their reasons for preference. *International Journal of Recreation and Sports Science*, *6*(1), 27-32. https://doi.org/10.46463/ijrss.1135459

Kelly, C. M., Strauss, K., Arnold, J., & Stride, C. (2020). The relationship between leisure activities and psychological resources that support a sustainable career: The role of leisure seriousness and work-leisure similarity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *117*, 103340. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103340

Kitapçi, H., & Sezen, B. (2002). Çalışanların Tatminini Belirleyici Unsurlar Üzerine Bir Araştırma: Kariyer Süreci Örneği. *Journal of Social Science*, 219.

Knecht, M., & Freund, A. M. (2017). The use of selection, optimization, and compensation (SOC) in goal pursuit in the daily lives of middle-aged adults. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *14*(3), 350-366. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2016.1207518

Köksal, B., & Yam, F. C. (2023). A Measurement Tool for Evaluating Career Goal Inconsistencies Between Individuals and Parents: A Validity and Reliability Study of the Turkish Version. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, *13*(68), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.17066/tpdrd.1271212b

Kong, H., Yin, Z., Baruch, Y., & Yuan, Y. (2023). The impact of trust in AI on career sustainability: The role of employee–AI collaboration and protean career

orientation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *146*, 103928. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2023.103928

Kuijpers, M. A. C. T., & Scheercns, J. (2006). Career competencies for the modern career. *Journal of Career Development*, *32*, 303-319. https://doi.org/10.1177/089484530528300

Kuzgun, Y. (2011). *Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışma*, 11th Edition, Ankara: Nobel Publications.

Lan, Y., & Chen, Z. (2020). Transformational leadership, career adaptability, and work behaviors: the moderating role of task variety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 489219. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02922

Lauermann, F., Tsai, Y. M., & Eccles, J. S. (2017). Math-related career aspirations and choices within Eccles et al.'s expectancy–value theory of achievement-related behaviors. *Developmental Psychology*, *53*(8), 1540. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000367

Lawrence, B. S., Hall, D. T., & Arthur, M. B. (2015). Sustainable careers then and now. In *Handbook of research on sustainable careers* (pp. 432-450). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781782547037.00033

Lepnurm, R., Dobson, R., Backman, A., & Keegan, D. (2007). Factors associated with career satisfaction among general practitioners in Canada. *Can J Rural Med*, *12*(4), 217-230. DOI: 10.1177/070674370605100406

Li, Q., Chin, T., & Peng, B. (2023). How Paradoxical Leadership Promotes Employees' Career Sustainability: Evidence from the Chinese Cross-Border E-Commerce Industry. *Sustainability*, *15*(16), 12407. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151612407

Li, Y., Li, X., Chen, Q., & Xue, Y. (2020). Sustainable Career Development of Newly Hired Executives—A Dynamic Process Perspective. *Sustainability*, *12*(8), 3175. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12083175

Liang, Z., Suntrayuth, S., Sun, X., & Su, J. (2023). Positive verbal rewards, creative self-efficacy, and creative behavior: A perspective of cognitive appraisal theory. *Behavioral Sciences*, *13*(3), 229. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13030229

Liu, S., Chen, Y., Shen, Q., & Gao, X. (2022). Sustainable professional development of German language teachers in China: Research assessment and external research funding. *Sustainability*, *14*(16), 9910. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14169910

Lord, R. G., Diefendorff, J. M., Schmidt, A. M., & Hall, R. J. (2010). Self-regulation at work. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *61*, 543-568. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100314

Luo, H., Li, F., Agbanyo, G. K., Tachega, M. A., & Chin, T. (2022). Family-supportive supervisor behaviors and career sustainability of e-commerce female workers: A mixed-method approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 992458. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.992458

Maharjan, S. (2012). Association between work motivation and job satisfaction of college teachers. *Administration and Management Review*, *24*(2), 45-55.

Marini, M., Livi, S., Prislei, L., Parisse, C., Cecalupo, A., Scarci, F., & Benvenuto, G. (2023). The Impact of Perceived Barriers to Career Advancement: A Study with a Sample of Italian University Students. *Sustainability*, *15*(11), 8874. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15118874

Marsiske, M., Lang, F. R., Baltes, P. B., & Baltes, M. M. (1995). Selective optimization with compensation: Life-span perspectives on successful human development. *Compensating for Psychological Deficits and Declines: Managing Losses and Promoting Gains*, 35-79.

Moghimi, D., Scheibe, S., & Freund, A. M. (2019). The model of selection, optimization, compensation. In *Work Across the Lifespan* (pp. 81-110). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-812756-8.00004-9

Mohlala, J., Goldman, G. A., & Goosen, X. (2012). Employee retention within the information technology division of a South African bank. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, *10*(2), 1-11. http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v10i2.438

Morning Consult. (2021, October 11). *Building the Future of Work Requires Skills Training, Flexibility*.

https://news.prudential.com/latest-news/feature-stories/feature-stories-details/2021/Building-the-future-of-work-requires-skills-training-flexibility-10-11-2021/default.aspx

Müller, C. V., & Scheffer, A. B. B. (2022). Why Adopt a Sustainability Approach in Career Studies? A Theoretical Essay about the Foundations and the Relevance of the Discussion. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, *62*, e2020-1006. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020220506

Nauta, A., Van Vianen, A., Van der Heijden, B., Van Dam, K., & Willemsen, M. (2009). Understanding the factors that promote employability orientation: the impact of employability culture, career satisfaction, and role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *82*(2), 233-251. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317908X320147

Newman, K. L. (2011). Sustainable careers. *Organizational Dynamics*, *40*(2), 136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2011.01.008

Onyishi, I., Enwereuzor, I., Ogbonna, M., Ugwu, F., & Amazue, L. (2019). Role of career satisfaction in basic psychological needs satisfaction and career commitment of nurses in nigeria: a self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 51(4), 470-479. https://doi.org/10.1111/jnu.12474

Özgül, B., & Gürol, Y. (2019). Kurumsal sürdürülebilirlikte sürdürülebilir insan kaynakları yönetiminin rolü üzerine bir içerik analizi. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, *20*(1), 107-126.

Park, I. J., Gu, M., & Hai, S. (2020). How can personality enhance sustainable career management? The mediation effects of future time perspective in career decisions. *Sustainability*, *12*(3), 1167. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12031167

Park, T., & Kim, C. (2020). Predicting the variables that determine university (re-) entrance as a career development using support vector machines with recursive feature elimination: The case of south korea. *Sustainability*, *12*(18), 7365. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12187365

Penningroth, S. L., & Scott, W. D. (2012). Age-related differences in goals: Testing predictions from selection, optimization, and compensation theory and socioemotional selectivity theory. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 74*(2), 87-111. https://doi.org/10.2190/AG.74.2.a

Pryor, R., & Bright, J. (2011). *The chaos theory of careers: A new perspective on working in the twenty-first century*. Routledge.

Quendler, E., & Lamb, M. (2016). Learning as a lifelong process-meeting the challenges of the changing employability landscape: competences, skills and knowledge for sustainable development. *International Journal of Continuing Engineering Education and Life Long Learning*, *26*(3), 273-293. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJCEELL.2016.078447

Rapuano, V. (2020). Toward sustainable careers: Literature review. *Contemporary Research on Organization Management and Administration (CROMA journal)*. *8*(1), 41-54.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 68. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

Salleh, A. M. M., Omar, K., Aburumman, O. J., Mat, N. H. N., & Almhairat, M. A. (2020). The impact of career planning and career satisfaction on employee's turnover intention. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 8(1), 218. http://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2020.8.1(14)

Sathyamurthi, K. (2019). *Elderly Wellbeing and Intergenerational Bonding*. Today Publication.

Savickas, M. L. (1997). Career adaptability: An integrative construct for life-span, life-space theory. *The career development quarterly*, *45*(3), 247-259. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.1997.tb00469.x

Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Liden, R. C. (2001). A social capital theory of career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*(2), 219-237. https://doi.org/10.5465/3069452

Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., Holtom, B. C., & Pierotti, A. J. (2013). Even the best laid plans sometimes go askew: Career self-management processes, career shocks, and the decision to pursue graduate education. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*(1), 169. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030882

Seiffge-Krenke, I., & Gelhaar, T. (2008). Does successful attainment of developmental tasks lead to happiness and success in later developmental tasks? A test of Havighurst's (1948) theses. *Journal of adolescence*, *31*(1), 33-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2007.04.002

Singh, S. (2018). Organizational career management practices, career satisfaction, and intention to quit among indian employee: examining the moderating effect of 'four types of work experience'. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 27(3), 150-159. https://doi.org/10.1177/1038416218768896

Sönmez, B., Gül, D., İspir Demir, Ö., Emiralioğlu, R., Erkmen, T., & Yıldırım, A. (2021). Antecedents and outcomes of nurses' subjective career success: a path analysis. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, *53*(5), 604-614. https://doi.org/10.1111/jnu.12660

Spurk, D., Hirschi, A., & Dries, N. (2019). Antecedents and outcomes of objective versus subjective career success: Competing perspectives and future directions. *Journal of Management*, *45*(1), 35-69. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318786563

Spurk, D., Kauffeld, S., Barthauer, L., & Heinemann, N. S. (2015). Fostering networking behavior, career planning and optimism, and subjective career success: An intervention study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *87*, 134-144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.12.007

Straub, C., Vinkenburg, C. J., & van Kleef, M. (2020). Career customization: Putting an organizational practice to facilitate sustainable careers to the test. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *117*, 103320. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103320

Sullivan, S. E., & Baruch, Y. (2009). Advances in career theory and research: A critical review and agenda for future exploration. *Journal of Management*, *35*(6),

1542-1571.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309350082

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. (6th edition). Boston: Pearson.

Talluri, S. B., Schreurs, B., & Uppal, N. (2022). How do individual factors affect career sustainability? An investigation of cascading effects through the career construction model of adaptation. *Career Development International*, *27*(6/7), 584-600. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-05-2022-0120

Tong, P., An, I. S., & Zhou, Y. (2022). Developmental ecosystems of study abroad in a turbulent time: an Australian-Chinese's experience in multilingual Hong Kong. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 43(8), 796-812. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2101654

Tóth, B., Gulácsi, L., & Zrubka, Z. (2023, September). The Relationship Between Young Adults' Internet Skills and their Satisfaction with Life and Career. In *2023 IEEE 21st Jubilee International Symposium on Intelligent Systems and Informatics (SISY)* (pp. 000309-000314). IEEE. DOI: 10.1109/SISY60376.2023.10417880

Tschopp, C., Grote, G., & Köppel, N. (2016). Disentangling effects of age and career preferences on the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention and behavior: An examination in three samples. *Work, Aging and Retirement*, *2*(1), 73-85. https://doi.org/10.1093/workar/wav022

Van der Heijden, B. I., & De Vos, A. (2015). Sustainable careers: Introductory chapter. In *Handbook of research on sustainable careers* (pp. 1-19). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781782547037.00006

Verbruggen, M., & De Vos, A. (2020). When people don't realize their career desires: Toward a theory of career inaction. *Academy of Management Review*, *45*(2), 376-394. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2017.0196

Volmer, J., & Spurk, D. (2011). Protean and boundaryless career attitudes: Relationships with subjective and objective career success. *Zeitschrift für*

ArbeitsmarktForschung, *43*(3), 207-218. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12651-010-0037-3

Wampold, B. E., & Freund, R. D. (1987). Use of multiple regression in counseling psychology research: A flexible data-analytic strategy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*(4), 372–382. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.34.4.372

Widyowati, A., Creed, P., Hood, M., & Duffy, A. (2023). Motivational conflict and volitional career actions in young adults: Ego depletion as an explanatory mechanism. *Journal of Career Development*, *50*(4), 917-932. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845322113428

Widyowati, A., Hood, M., Duffy, A., & Creed, P. (2024). Negative Career Goal Discrepancy and Goal Adjustment in Young Adults: The Underlying Mechanism of Negative Emotions. *Journal of Career Development*, 08948453241235406. https://doi.org/10.1177/08948453241235406

Xie, D., Kong, N., Skaggs, S., & Yang, A. (2019). An ecological perspective on youth career education in transitioning societies: China as an example. *Journal of Career Development*, *46*(6), 651-664. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845318824673

Yaşar, E., & Demir, M. (2019). İşgörenlerin kariyer planlamasında işveren markasının rolü: Otel işletmeleri örneği. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research*, 5(4), 502-514. https://doi.org/10.24289/ijsser.659515

Yeğintürk, G., & Siyez, D. M. (2023). Kariyer Hedeflerinde Uyuşmazlık Ölçeği'nin Türkçe Formu'nun Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Psikometrik Özelliklerinin İncelenmesi. *İşletme Akademisi Dergisi*, *4*(2), 143-154. https://doi.org/10.26677/TR1010.2023.1247

Yüksel, İ. (2010). İş-Aile Çalışmasının Kariyer Tatmini, İş Tatmini Ve İş Davranışları İle İlişkisi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, *19*(2), 301-314.

Zhang, W., Chin, T., Li, F., Lin, C. L., Shan, Y. N., & Ventimiglia, F. (2022). The impact of career competence on career sustainability among Chinese expatriate managers amid digital transformation in Vietnam: the role of lifelong

learning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 791636. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.791636

Zhao, L., Li, W., & Zhang, H. (2022). Career adaptability as a strategy to improve sustainable employment: a proactive personality perspective. *Sustainability*, *14*(19), 12889. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141912889

APPENDICES

A. APPROVAL OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

TED ÜNİVERSİTESİ
İNSAN ARAŞTIRMALARI ETİK KURULU
ETİK KURUL KARARLARI
Sayı: 2023-16 Tarih: 12.10.2023

Toplantı Sayısı: 2023-16

Toplantı Tarihi: 12 Ekim 2023

Toplantı Saati: 12.45

Toplantı Yeri: Zoom üzerinden yapılmıştır.

Katılanlar: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Kıymet Duygu ERDAŞ - Başkan
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Duygu Onay Çoker - Raportör
Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali KÖKPINAR - Üye
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Çağla Öneren ŞENDİL - Üye
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Şule Akdoğan KILINÇ – Üye
Doç. Dr. Melike Ünal GEZER - Üye
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Elçin Emre AKDOĞAN - Üye
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Beril Türkoğlu DEMİREL - Üye

Raportör: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Duygu Onay Çoker - Raportör

GÖRÜŞME MADDELERİ

G.05 : TED Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık Anabilim Dalı Başkanı Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Olcay Yılmaz "İş Yeri Gezginleri: Çalışanların Kariyer Sürdürülebilirlikleri" başlıklı çalışmasının araştırma etiğine uygunluğu görüşüldü.

Karar 2023-16/05 : TED Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık Anabilim Dalı Başkanı Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Olcay Yılmaz "İş Yeri Gezginleri: Çalışanların Kariyer Sürdürülebilirlikleri" başlıklı çalışmasına

KOŞULLU ONAY KARARI VERİLDİ.

A-2. OTHER PERMISSIONS

Appendix A.2

PERMISSION FOR CAREER SATISFACTION SCALE

Ynt: Kariyer Doyumu Ölçeği Kullanım İzni

AA 14.07.2023 21:25

Kime:

229. Kariyer Doyum Ölçeği.doc
37,37 KB

Kullanabilirsiniz iyi çalışmalar

Prof. Dr. Ahmet Akın
İstanbul Medeniyet University
Faculty of Educational Sciences
Department of Psychological counseling

Gönderen:
Gönderildi: 14 Temmuz 2023 Cuma 20:04:44
Kime:
Bilgi:
Konu: Kariyer Doyumu Ölçeği Kullanım İzni

Sayın Prof. Dr. Ahmet AKIN & Ezgi ALABUCAK,

Ben Alperen Arslan, TED Üniversitesi Psikolojik Danışmanlık ve Rehberlik Bölümü'nde Dr. Olcay Yılmaz danışmanlığında yüksek lisans tezimi yazıyorum. Araştırmamızda Kariyer Doyumu Ölçeği'ni kullanmak için izninizi rica ediyorum. Sizler için uygunsa ölçeği ve ölçek ile ilgili bilgileri benimle paylaşabilir misiniz?

Saygılarımla,
Alperen Arslan.

Appendix A.3

PERMISSION FOR CAREER GOAL DISCREPANCY SCALE

Re: Kariyer Hedeflerinde Uyuşmazlık Ölçeği Kullanım İzni

GY 15.07.2023 13:56

Kime:

Kariyer Hedefleri Uyuşmazlık...
15,24 KB

Selamlar.

"Kariyer Hedeflerinde Uyuşmazlık Ölçeği"ni yüksek lisans çalışmanızda kullanabilirsiniz. Ölçeğin maddelerini mail ekinde paylaşıyorum.

Çalışmalarınızda başarılar dilerim.

Alperen Arslan , 14 Tem 2023 Cum, 15:44 tarihinde şunu yazdı:

> Sayın Uzm. Gürkan YEĞİNTÜRK & Prof. Dr. Didem Müge SİYEZ,
>
> Ben Alperen Arslan, TED Üniversitesi Psikolojik Danışmanlık ve Rehberlik Bölümü'nde Dr. Olcay Yılmaz danışmanlığında yüksek lisans tezimi yazıyorum. Araştırmamızda Kariyer Hedeflerinde Uyuşmazlık Ölçeği'ni kullanmak için izninizi rica ediyorum. Sizin için uygunsa ölçeği ve ölçek ile ilgili bilgileri benimle paylaşabilir misiniz?
>
> Saygılarımla,
>
> Alperen Arslan.

Appendix A.4

PERMISSION FOR CAREER SUSTAINABILITY SCALE

Re: Kariyer Sürdürülebilirliği Ölçeği

NÇ 10.08.2023 13:19

Kime: Bilgi:

10.30798...
584,56 KB

Merhaba Alperen Bey,
Ekli dosyada ölçeğimizle ilgili bilgileri bulabilirsiniz (1130. sayfa son hali)
Kaynak göstererek ölçeği kullanmanızda bir sakınca yoktur.
Çalışmanızda başarılar dilerim.

Öğr. Gör. Dr. Nurcan ÇETİNER

Atıf için: Arar, T. ve Çetiner, N. (2023). Kariyer sürdürülebilirliği ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması, *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi,* 10(2), 1119-1135, https://doi.org/10.30798/makuiibf.121892

Kimden: "Alperen Arslan"
Kime: "nurcancetiner"
Kk: "Olcay Yılmaz"
Gönderilenler: 10 Ağustos Perşembe 2023 13:04:08
Konu: Kariyer Sürdürülebilirliği Ölçeği

Sayın Dr. Tayfun Akar & Dr. Nurcan Çetiner,

Ben Alperen Arslan, TED Üniversitesi Psikolojik Danışmanlık ve Rehberlik Bölümü'nde Dr. Olcay Yılmaz danışmanlığında yüksek lisans tezimi yazıyorum. Araştırmamızda Kariyer Sürdürülebilirliği Ölçeği'ni kullanmak için izninizi rica ediyorum. Sizler için uygunsa ölçeği ve ölçek ile ilgili bilgileri benimle paylaşabilir misiniz?

Saygılarımla,
Alperen Arslan.

B. INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Bu araştırma, TED Üniversitesi Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık Anabilim Dalı Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Olcay Yılmaz danışmanlığında, yüksek lisans öğrencisi Psikolojik Danışman Alperen Arslan tarafından yürütülmektedir. Bu form sizi araştırma koşulları hakkında bilgilendirmek için hazırlanmıştır.

Çalışmanın Amacı Nedir?

Bu çalışma, 25-65 yaş aralığında, Türkiye'de yaşayan, halihazırda bir işte çalışan kişilerin kariyer doyumlarının ve kariyer hedef uyuşmazlıklarının kariyer sürdürülebilirliklerine etkisini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Bize Nasıl Yardımcı Olmanızı İsteyeceğiz?

Araştırma için veriler çevrimiçi anket yoluyla toplanacaktır. Çalışmada sizden çevrimiçi ankette yer alan demografik form, Kariyer Doyumu Ölçeği, Kariyer Hedeflerinde Uyuşmazlık Ölçeği ve Kariyer Sürdürülebilirliği Ölçeğinde yer alan soruları yanıtlamanız istenecektir. Bunun için ortalama 10 dakika ayırmanız yeterli olacaktır.

Katılımla ilgili bilmeniz gerekenler:

Çalışma süresince ve sonrasında hiçbir bilginiz araştırmacı dışındaki hiç kimseyle paylaşılmayacaktır. Bu çalışma kapsamında elde edilecek olan bilimsel bilgiler sadece araştırmacı tarafından yapılacak bilimsel yayınlarda ve sunumlarda kullanılacaktır. Toplanan veriler bilgisayarda şifreli bir dosyada tutulacaktır ve araştırmacı dışında kimsenin erişimine açık olmayacaktır. Bu çalışmaya katılım gönüllülük esasına dayalıdır. Maksimum 10 dakika sürecek bu uygulamada ölçek setinde yer alan sorular sizde herhangi bir rahatsızlık yaratırsa uygulamaları nedenini açıklamaksızın yarıda bırakıp araştırmadan çıkmakta serbestsiniz. Böyle bir durumda vermiş olduğunuz bilgilerin araştırmacı tarafından kullanılması ancak sizin onayınızla mümkün olacaktır. Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz.

Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak ve yanıtlanmasını istediğiniz sorularınız için araştırmacı Psikolojik Danışman Alperen Arslan ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

C. INSTRUMENTS

C.1 SAMPLE ITEMS FROM CAREER SATISFACTION SCALE

	Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadeleri okuduktan sonra kendinizi değerlendirip sizin için en uygun seçeneğin karşısına çarpı (X) işareti koyunuz.	Bana hiç uygun değil	Bana uygun değil	Kararsızım	Bana uygun	Bana tamamen uygun
2	Kariyerimde şu ana kadar kaydettiğim ilerleme, kariyer hedeflerimi karşılama açısından beni tatmin ediyor.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Kariyerimde şu ana kadar kaydettiğim ilerleme, maddi kazançla ilgili hedeflerimi karşılama açısından beni tatmin ediyor.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Kariyerimde şu ana kadar kaydettiğim ilerleme, yeni beceriler geliştirmeyle ilgili hedeflerimi karşılama açısından beni tatmin ediyor.	1	2	3	4	5

C.2 SAMPLE ITEMS FROM CAREER GOAL DISCREPANCY SCALE

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Planlarım, gerçekten yapmak istediğim kariyeri elde etmede şuanda işe yaramıyor. 4. Elimden gelenin en iyisini yapmama rağmen idealindeki kariyere ulaşamayacağımı düşünüyorum						

C.3 SAMPLE ITEMS FROM CAREER SUSTAINABILITY SCALE

Kod	İfade
ks1	Kariyerim bana iyi bir yaşam standardı sunuyor.
ks2	Kariyerim, becerilerimi/yeteneklerimi iyi kullanmama imkân verdiği için beni mutlu ediyor.
ks8	Kariyerim kabiliyetlerimi yeniden değerlendirme/gözden geçirme şansı sunuyor.
ks10	Kariyerim farklı kaynaklardan elde ettiğim bilgileri birleştirerek kullanmama olanak sağlıyor.
ks11	Kariyerim farklı kaynaklardan elde edilen bilgileri eleştirel olarak değerlendirmeme olanak sağlıyor.