

AN EXAMINATION OF SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION OF GENERATION Z LIVING IN TURKEY ACCORDING TO DIFFERENT VARIABLES

Yunus KARA*

Filiz ER

Çiğdem CANATAN

Ayşe Sezen SERPEN

Abstract

In this study, the social dominance orientations of the generation Z were examined according to different variables (gender identity, view of socio-economic class, occupation field, identity attitudes, purposive and instrumental values). The research sample consists of 640 individuals aged between 19-25 and living in different regions of Turkey. Socio-demographic Information Form, Social Dominance Orientation Scale, Identity Attitudes Scale and Rokeach Values Inventory were applied to the participants within the scope of the research. The results of the study show that the social dominance orientations differ significantly between the gender identities. In addition, social dominance orientation differs significantly according to occupation field. There were positive or negative correlations between social dominance orientation and some of the purposive and instrumental values. In addition, social dominance orientation predicts gender identity, education, and income status assessment.

Keywords: Generation Z, Identity Attitudes, Social Dominance Orientation, Values

Türkiye'de Yaşayan Z Kuşağının Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimlerinin Farklı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi

Öz

Bu çalışmada Z kuşağının sosyal baskınlık yönelimleri farklı değişkenlere (cinsiyet kimliği, sosyo-ekonomik sınıfa bakış, meslek alanı, kimlik tutumları, amaçlı ve araçsal değerler) göre incelenmiştir. Araştırmanın örneklemini Türkiye'nin farklı bölgelerinde yaşayan 19-25 yaş arasındaki 640 birey oluşturmaktadır. Araştırma kapsamında katılımcılara Sosyo-demografik Bilgi Formu, Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelim Ölçeği, Kimlik Tutumları Ölçeği ve Rokeach Değerler Envanteri uygulanmıştır. Araştırmanın sonuçları, sosyal baskınlık yönelimlerinin cinsiyetler arasında anlamlı farklılık gösterdiğini göstermektedir. Ayrıca sosyal baskınlık yönelimi, meslek alanlarına göre önemli ölçüde farklılık göstermektedir. Sosyal baskınlık yönelimi ile bazı amaçsal ve araçsal değerler arasında pozitif veya negatif yönde korelasyonlar vardır. Ek olarak, sosyal baskınlık yönelimi cinsiyet kimliği, eğitim ve gelir durumu değerlendirmesini yordamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Z Kuşağı, Kimlik Tutumları, Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi, Değerler

* Doç. Dr., Sinop Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi, Sosyal Hizmet Anabilim Dalı, kara.yunus93@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7812-5845>
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Sinop Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi, Sosyal Hizmet Anabilim Dalı, filiztokgoz@hotmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5065-3809>
Dr., Sağlık Bakanlığı, cigdemcanatan@outlook.com.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3031-5965>
Prof. Dr., Ankara Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi, Sosyal Hizmet Anabilim Dalı, aysesezenbayoglu@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6220-4709>

Introduction

It is considered important to define the term “generation” in profiling studies carried out to determine different generations from various perspectives. Generations are defined as those who were born in similar temporal periods, formed from economic and social movements or belong to a certain social environment (Adıgüzel et al., 2014; Costanza et al., 2023; Popescu, 2019). In other words, generation; it is used to indicate a structure that is common in many aspects (years of birth, the society in which one was born and the cultural climate of that society, economic, political, legal, and social movements and understandings prevailing in the relevant year intervals, value judgments, behavior, and attitude patterns) (Kırık and Köyüstü, 2018). In this context, it becomes possible to say that each generation has different qualities and criteria for evaluating events and phenomena (Keleş, 2011).

Generations are shaped according to the norms within the culture they live in (Altuntuğ, 2012). Each generation has the ability to influence the social culture climate in which it has the opportunity to develop, as well as positively or negatively. Basic generations are divided into four groups, namely Traditionalists, Baby Boomers, generation X and generation Y (Yüksekbilgili, 2013). However, it is known that especially in recent years, generation Z has come to the fore as a new generation.

Generation Z, which is generally used to express people born in 2000 and later in literature, is in a close relationship with technology as in the previous generation. In different studies, it is seen that generation Z is also used for people born after 1995 (Lev, 2021). It can be stated that this generation has easy access to information, can deal with many different tasks at the same time and can use communication tools effectively. This generation, which can access the opportunities of the period quickly and use them effectively, is also the bridge of the social habitat in which they live to the future (Sarıbaş et al., 2016). From this point of view, the importance of studies on the generation Z is increasing. Within the scope of this study, it is aimed to examine the social dominance orientations of generation Z according to different variables. In addition, it is thought that this study can fill an important gap in the literature about the social dominance orientations of the generation Z. Moreover, it is estimated that this study can make an important contribution to both national and international literature in terms of showing the profile of generation Z.

No study has been found in Turkey that examines the social dominance orientations of the generation Z according to different variables (gender identity, view of socio-economic class, occupation field, identity attitudes, purposive and instrumental values). The reason for this may be that studies involving the generation Z have gained popularity in the last 5 years in Turkey (Genç, 2020; Kırık and Köyüstü, 2018; Uğurbulduk, 2022). Especially the limited literature on the generation Z in Turkey reveals the importance of this study. This study aims to fill an important research gap by examining the social dominance tendencies of the generation Z living in Turkey according to different variables. The hypotheses within the scope of this research are as follows:

1. What are the socio-economic characteristics of the generation Z living in Turkey?
2. What is the social dominance orientation of the generation Z living in Turkey?

3. What are the identity attitudes of the generation Z living in Turkey?
4. What are the purposive and instrumental values of the generation Z living in Turkey?
5. What is the relationship between the socio-economic characteristics of the generation Z living in Turkey and their social dominance orientation?
6. What is the relationship between the social dominance orientations of the generation Z living in Turkey and their identity attitudes and purposive and instrumental values?

1. Method

1.1. Procedures

An exploratory study was conducted to examine the social dominance orientation of generation Z in Turkey according to different variables. A convenience sample of participants born between 1998 and 2004 was recruited. Exploratory designs are appropriate when very few earlier studies documenting the nature of the phenomena exist (Alston and Bowles, 2019). The inclusion criterion for the participants was that they belong to the generation Z (participants born between 1998 and 2004 were reached for this study). Before starting the research, ethical approval for human subjects, dated 05.12.2022 and numbered 41858, was received from Altınbaş University Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee. At the same time, the data of this study were obtained within the framework of the ethical rules specified in the "World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki". Potential participants for the study were recruited via invitations posted on the following online applications: Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter. In addition, an official letter was sent to the universities in Turkey, and support was requested in order to announce the study through the alumni systems within their own structure. Potential participants were invited to complete a 15-min survey, hosted on a major cloud-based survey provider website. Participants were asked to read an information sheet about the research study and to complete the survey if satisfied with the motives and procedures of the study. The survey required demographic information and asked a series of questions about the experiences of participants.

1.2. Participants

A complete census of the population was not feasible; therefore, participants from seven regions of Turkey were targeted. However, neither a clear information on which years the generation Z covers, nor the number of generation Z in Turkey could be reached. For this reason, it was aimed to reach seven regions of Turkey. A total of 668 potential participants accessed the survey and were able to review the informed consent. Of these potential participants twenty-eight did not meet the eligibility criteria for the study or did not complete the survey. The final sample of 640 people represented a 95.8% completion rate of those who initially accessed the survey. It is not possible to determine the response rate because the number of people who viewed the recruitment announcement and yet decided to forego participation is unknown.

1.3. Data Collection Tools

Four instruments were used to assess the social dominance orientations of the generation Z according to different variables: (1) a demographic questionnaire, (2) Social Dominance Orientation

Scale, (3) Identity Attitudes Scale, (4) Rokeach Values Inventory. In this study, a demographic questionnaire was used to determine the participants' gender identity/expression, age, education, occupation field, income status assessment and view of socio-economic class.

Social Dominance Orientation Scale: Social dominance orientation was assessed using the 16-item Social Dominance Orientation Scale developed by Pratto et al. (1994). Participants were asked to rate how strongly they agree or disagree with the items such as: "It's okay if some groups have more of a chance in life than others" and "Group equality should be our ideal" on a scale from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 7 ("strongly agree"). The highest score that one can get from each item is 7 and the lowest score is 1. Items 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14 and 15 are reverse-coded. The lowest score one can receive from the total scale is 16 while the highest is 112. The higher scores on the SDO scale indicate a higher social dominance orientation while the lower scores indicate a lower social dominance orientation. The Cronbach's alpha of the original scale is .91 (Pratto et al., 1994). The 16-item SDO scale has been adapted to Turkish by Karacanta (2002) as part of their doctoral dissertation. The Cronbach's alpha of Turkish version of the SDO scale was .85. The reliability analysis conducted in this study showed Cronbach's coefficient alpha of $\alpha = .77$.

Identity Attitudes Scale: This scale, developed by Yazıcı (2016) and analyzed for validity and reliability, measures attitudes towards gender, national, ethnic, political, and religious identity differences, which are five different categories of collective identities. The scale consists of 28 items and 5 factors (gender, national, ethnic, political, and religious identity). The highest score that one can get from each item is 5 ("strongly agree") and the lowest score is 1 ("strongly disagree"). A high score on the scale is an indicator of acceptance for different identities. The Cronbach's alpha of Turkish version of the Identity Attitudes Scale was .85. The reliability analysis conducted in this study showed Cronbach's coefficient alpha of $\alpha = .88$.

Rokeach Values Inventory: This inventory was developed by Rokeach (1973) and adapted into Turkish by Çalışkur and Aslan (2013). The Rokeach Values Inventory consists of two dimensions, the first being purposive values and the second instrumental values. Purposeful values express the situation and environment that a person wants to be in their life and to reach. These consist of values such as a comfortable life, freedom, family security. Instrumental values express the preferred behavior to reach the goal values. Instrumental values consist of values such as being ambitious, brave, polite, and honest. Within the scope of the inventory, participants are expected to rank from 1 to 18, separately for their purposive and instrumental values.

1.4. Data Analysis

Before analyzing the results, data cleaning and transformation were conducted to evaluate whether statistical assumptions were met to justify the planned analyses. Data was reviewed and analyzed by using IBM SPSS Statistics version 22. Independent and dependent variables were examined in SPSS for accuracy of data entry, missing values, outliers, and fit between their distributions and the statistical assumptions of the planned analysis. Independent and dependent variables were examined

using descriptive statistics, t-tests, and ANOVA to determine the relationships between social dominance orientation and the various demographic and identity variables.

2. Results

While the ages of the individuals participating in the study ranged between 19 and 25, their average age was 22.42 ± 1.23 . Approximately 288 (45%) of the participants defined themselves as woman and 352 (55%) as man. Most of the respondents (84.7%) considered themselves to be in the middle socio-economic class, and 14.8% as in the lower socio-economic class. The rate of those who think that they are in the upper socio-economic class is quite low (0.5%). Considering the inequalities in income distribution in Turkey, the evaluations of the participants regarding the socio-economic level are thought to be related to education and social status rather than the economic level and are not compatible with the socio-economic level determinants determined by TURKSTAT. Because the distribution in the middle socio-economic level in Turkey is not as in the research. While 32.2% of the participants do not work in any job, 17.7% work in a professional profession and 16.7% as service and salespersons. All socio-demographic information of the participants is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Sample Demographics

	<i>M (SD) or n (%)</i>
Gender Identity/Expression	
Woman	288 (45%)
Man	352 (55%)
Age	22,42 (1,23)
Education	
Secondary school	38 (5,9%)
High school graduate	274 (42,8%)
Junior college degree	6 (0,9%)
College degree	316 (49,4%)
Master's degree	6 (0,9%)
View of Socio-economic Class	
Upper class	3 (0,5%)
Middle class	542 (84,7%)
Lower class	95 (14,8%)
Income Status Assessment	
Too bad	39 (6,1%)
Bad	177 (27,7%)
Middle	345 (53,9%)
Good	77 (12,0%)
Very good	2 (0,3%)
Occupation Field	

Managers	1 (0,2%)
Professional members of the profession	113 (17,7%)
Technicians and associate professionals	63 (9,8%)
Staff working in office services	33 (5,2%)
Service and salespersons	107 (16,7%)
People in art related jobs	31 (4,8%)
Machine operators and installers	38 (5,9%)
Employees in non-qualification jobs	48 (7,5%)
Not working in any job	206 (32,2%)

2.1. t-test Analysis of Variables

The results of the independent groups t-test applied to analyze whether the social dominance orientations and identity attitudes of the participants differ according to gender are presented in Table 2. As can be seen in Table 2, a gender identity difference is observed in social dominance orientation and identity attitudes. According to these results, the social dominance orientation of the men in the generation Z (\bar{X} =70.88, SD=13.00) are higher than the social dominance orientation of the women in the generation Z (\bar{X} =63.23, SD=15.14). Women's characteristics of national identity (\bar{X} =12.97, SD=4.32), ethnic identity (\bar{X} =16.99, SD=3.69), political identity (\bar{X} =19.51, SD=5.07), religious identity (\bar{X} =20.42, SD=5.73) and gender (\bar{X} =22.26, SD=4.92) are higher than men's characteristics of national identity (\bar{X} =11.32, SD=3.65), ethnic identity (\bar{X} =15.06, SD=3.54), political identity (\bar{X} =17.64, SD=4.77), religious identity (\bar{X} =19.25, SD=6.54) and gender (\bar{X} =19.45, SD=5.03).

Table 2: t-test Results by Gender Identity

N = 640	Gender Identity		t	p
	Woman \bar{X} (SD)	Man \bar{X} (SD)		
Social Dominance Orientation Scale	63.23 (15.14)	70.88 (13.00)	-6.875	.000***
National Identity Subscale	12.97 (4.32)	11.32 (3.65)	5.257	.000***
Ethnic Identity Subscale	16.99 (3.69)	15.06 (3.54)	6.723	.000***
Politic Identity Subscale	19.51 (5.07)	17.64 (4.77)	4.797	.000***
Religious Identity Subscale	20.42 (5.73)	19.25 (6.54)	2.367	.017**
Gender Subscale	22.26 (4.92)	19.45 (5.03)	7.098	.000***

***p<.001, **p<.05

2.2. ANOVA Analysis of Variables

The results of the ANOVA test applied to analyze whether the participants in generation Z differ according to their occupation field are given in Table 3. In order for the ANOVA analysis to be applied correctly and efficiently, the category of managers, which includes only 1 participant, was not included in the analysis. In Table 3, professional members of the profession (1), technicians and associate

professionals (2), staff working in office services (3), service and salespersons (4), people in art related jobs (5), machine operators and installers (6), employees in non-qualification jobs (7), not working in any job (8) has been numbered.

According to the results of the ANOVA analysis, it was observed that there was a significant difference between the social dominance orientation and the occupation field of the participants in generation Z. In the post-hoc analysis (Games-Howell) conducted to test which group differs significantly from the other, the social dominance orientation of the participants in the professional members of the profession ($\bar{X}=50.42$, $SD=13.64$) are less than the social dominance orientation of the participants in the technicians and associate professionals ($\bar{X}=74.97$, $SD=9.08$), staff working in office services ($\bar{X}=69.91$, $SD=5.62$), service and salespersons ($\bar{X}=68.33$, $SD=9.41$), people in art related jobs ($\bar{X}=65.74$, $SD=8.70$), machine operators and installers ($\bar{X}=76.16$, $SD=6.60$), employees in non-qualification jobs ($\bar{X}=72.35$, $SD=6.85$), not working in any job ($\bar{X}=71.07$, $SD=15.39$). In the analyzes, it was found that the social dominance orientation of the participants in the technicians and associate professionals are higher than the participants in the professional members of the profession, service and salespersons and people in art related jobs groups. In addition, it was found that the social dominance orientation of the participants in the people in art related jobs less than the participants in the technicians and associate professionals, machine operators and installers, and employees in non-qualification jobs. In addition, the social dominance orientation of the participants in the machine operators and installers are higher than the participants in the professional members of the profession, staff working in office services, service and salespersons, people in art related jobs and not working in any job.

In the analyzes, it was observed that there were significant differences between all sub-dimensions of the Identity Attitudes Scale and the occupation field of the participants in the generation Z. In the post-hoc analysis (Games-Howell) carried out to test which group differed significantly from the other, the national identity of the participants in the professional members of the profession ($\bar{X}=13.26$, $SD=3.91$) less than the technicians and associate professionals ($\bar{X}=16.17$, $SD=3.65$). In addition, the national identity of the participants in the professional members of the profession are higher than the staff working in office services ($\bar{X}=8.76$, $SD=3.19$), service and salespersons ($\bar{X}=11.28$, $SD=2.94$), people in art related jobs ($\bar{X}=9.71$, $SD=3.26$), machine operators and installers ($\bar{X}=8.76$, $SD=3.53$), employees in non-qualification jobs ($\bar{X}=9.79$, $SD=3.32$).

Table 3: ANOVA Results by Occupation Field

	Occupation Field								F	p
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
N=639	\bar{X} (SD)	\bar{X} (SD)	\bar{X} (SD)	\bar{X} (SD)	\bar{X} (SD)	\bar{X} (SD)	\bar{X} (SD)	\bar{X} (SD)		
Social Dominance Orientation Scale	50.42 (13.64)	74.97 (9.08)	69.91 (5.62)	68.33 (9.41)	65.74 (8.70)	76.16 (6.60)	72.35 (6.85)	71.07 (15.39)	42.999	.000***
National Identity Subscale	13.26 (3.91)	16.17 (3.65)	8.76 (3.19)	11.28 (2.94)	9.71 (3.26)	8.76 (3.53)	9.79 (3.32)	12.53 (3.67)	29.003	.000***
Ethnic Identity Subscale	21.14 (2.03)	16.14 (1.48)	15.18 (0.76)	13.60 (2.48)	13.45 (2.17)	12.11 (0.50)	13.10 (0.37)	16.08 (3.61)	105.505	.000***
Politic Identity Subscale	22.79 (3.75)	18.30 (4.29)	15.06 (3.97)	16.58 (4.51)	20.48 (3.19)	13.63 (3.79)	13.77 (3.59)	19.41 (4.39)	42.827	.000***
Religious Identity Subscale	26.24 (3.29)	17.30 (4.60)	15.76 (4.28)	17.47 (4.61)	27.61 (3.45)	10.79 (4.31)	12.25 (4.47)	21.06 (3.85)	123.306	.000***
Gender Subscale	21.40 (5.48)	22.59 (3.79)	17.42 (2.93)	20.38 (4.52)	26.87 (3.24)	21.47 (2.56)	16.88 (3.07)	20.30 (5.76)	16.028	.000***

***p<.001, **p<.05

2.3. Correlation Analysis of Variables

Before analyzing the relationship between purposive and instrumental values and social dominance orientation and identity attitudes, it was examined whether there was a correlation between social dominance orientation and identity attitudes. As a result of the correlation analysis, a moderate negative relationship ($r = -.475$) was found between social dominance orientation and identity attitudes. According to this relationship, as social dominance orientation increases, negative attitudes towards different identities are exhibited. It is thought that this negative relationship may help to draw a clearer picture of the relationship between purposive and instrumental values, social dominance orientation and identity attitudes.

Table 4 contains the statistical results regarding the ranking of the purposive values. Purposive values discussed in this context are the peace of the hereafter (happiness in the next world, going to heaven), family safety (providing the security of family members), a world in peace, a sense of achievement (having done good things in life), wisdom (looking at life maturely, philosophically), equality (fraternity, equal opportunity for everyone), true friendship, world of beauties (nature, aesthetic values and art), an exciting life (living in color and activity), inner peace (being at peace with oneself), self-respect, happiness (satisfied with oneself), mature love (physical and spiritual intimacy), freedom (being able to choose independently), a comfortable life (not having a livelihood), social approval (to be appreciated, respected), national security (protect the country from attack), and pleasure (Müftüoğlu, 2019). When Table 4 is examined, "a comfortable life", which is one of the purposive values, was evaluated as 1st degree important at the highest rate. In addition, it has been seen that the values that the participants in generation Z consider the most unimportant are "the peace of the hereafter" and "mature love".

Table 4: Ranking of Purposive Values as Statistical

	1st degree important		Most unimportant	
	Woman	Man	Woman	Man
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Family safety	34 (11,8)	91 (25,9)	2 (0,7)	1 (0,3)
The peace of the hereafter	6 (2,1)	2 (0,6)	115 (39,9)	175 (49,7)
A world in peace	2 (0,7)	2 (0,6)	1 (0,3)	52 (14,8)
Sense of achievement	2 (0,7)	2 (0,6)	1 (0,3)	1 (0,3)
Wisdom	1 (0,3)	2 (0,6)	2 (0,7)	1 (0,3)
Equality	2 (0,7)	2 (0,6)	1 (0,3)	151 (42,9)
True friendship	1 (0,3)	2 (0,6)	1 (0,3)	1 (0,3)
World of beauties	1 (0,3)	1 (0,3)	3 (1,0)	31 (8,8)
An exciting life	1 (0,3)	1 (0,3)	3 (1,0)	1 (0,3)
Inner peace	3 (1,0)	1 (0,3)	1 (0,3)	72 (20,5)
Self-respect	31 (10,8)	2 (0,6)	1 (0,3)	22 (6,3)
Happiness	18 (6,3)	1 (0,3)	1 (0,3)	30 (8,5)
Mature love	1 (0,3)	1 (0,3)	115 (39,9)	145 (41,2)
Freedom	80 (27,8)	30 (8,5)	1 (0,3)	1 (0,3)
A comfortable life	132 (45,8)	196 (55,7)	1 (0,3)	2 (0,6)
Social approval	2 (0,7)	2 (0,6)	3 (1,0)	1 (0,3)
National security	118 (41,0)	4 (1,1)	4 (1,4)	1 (0,3)
Pleasure	2 (0,7)	31 (8,8)	40 (13,9)	28 (8,0)

The results of the correlation analysis applied to determine whether social dominance orientation and identity attitudes are related to the purposive values of the participants in generation Z are given in Table 5. As seen in Table 5, there are variables showing significant correlation at $r > .30$ levels.

There is a moderate negative relationship between “a world in peace” and social dominance orientation ($r = -.479$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value a peaceful world, they do not want dominance among the groups. There is a moderate positive relationship between “a world in peace” and national identity ($r = .334$) and ethnic identity ($r = .361$) sub-scales. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value a peaceful world, they have a positive perspective towards different national and ethnic identities.

There is a moderate negative relationship between “equality” and social dominance orientation ($r = -.462$). According to this relationship, when the participants in the generation Z value equality, they do not want the groups to dominate each other. There is a moderate positive correlation between “equality” and ethnic identity ($r = .379$) sub-scale. According to this relationship, if the participants in generation Z value equality, they have a positive perspective towards different ethnic identities.

There is a moderate positive relationship between “true friendship” and the sub-scales of political identity ($r = .333$) and religious identity ($r = .491$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value true friendship, they have a positive perspective towards different political and religious identities.

There is a moderate positive relationship between the “world of beauties” and the sub-scales of political identity ($r = .304$) and religious identity ($r = .379$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value the world of beauties, they have a positive perspective towards different political and religious identities.

There is a moderate positive relationship between “an exciting life” and sub-scales of gender ($r = .326$), political identity ($r = .357$) and religious identity ($r = .440$). According to this relationship, when the participants in the generation Z value an exciting life, they have a positive perspective towards different gender stereotypes, political identities, and religious identities.

Table 5: Correlation Analysis Results for the Relationship of Purposive Values with Social Dominance Orientation and Identity Attitudes

	Social Dominance Orientation	National Identity Subscale	Gender Subscale	Ethnic Identity Subscale	Politic Identity Subscale	Religious Identity Subscale
Family safety	-0,096	0,177	-0,025	0,284	-0,050	-0,232
The peace of the hereafter	0,101	-0,031	0,160	0,181	0,129	0,132
A world in peace	-0,479*	0,334*	-0,141	0,361*	-0,248	-0,219
Sense of achievement	-0,040	0,212	0,089	0,177	0,136	0,152
Wisdom	0,007	0,080	0,010	-0,065	-0,153	-0,134
Equality	-0,462*	-0,217	-0,003	0,379*	-0,182	-0,246
True friendship	0,258	-0,090	-0,212	-0,133	0,333*	0,491*
World of beauties	0,012	0,242	0,288	0,011	0,304*	0,379*
An exciting life	0,007	0,293	0,326*	0,027	0,357*	0,440*
Inner peace	0,203	-0,110	-0,132	-0,152	-0,198	0,345*
Self-respect	0,036	-0,144	-0,109	0,373*	0,332*	-0,287
Happiness	0,097	-0,050	-0,005	-0,209	-0,084	-0,007
Mature love	0,253	-0,296	0,376*	0,373*	0,426*	0,484*
Freedom	-0,366*	0,308*	-0,271	0,393*	-0,207	-0,217
A comfortable life	-0,386*	0,309*	0,251	0,389*	0,337*	0,390*
Social approval	0,527*	0,133	0,050	0,257	0,233	-0,344*
National security	0,676*	0,153	0,116	-0,362*	0,293	-0,302*
Pleasure	0,483*	-0,385*	0,153	-0,354*	0,258	-0,306*

*Correlation ($r > .30$) is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

There is a moderate positive correlation between the "inner peace" and the sub-scale of religious identity ($r = .345$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value inner peace, they have a positive perspective towards different religious identities.

There is a moderate positive relationship between "self-respect" and ethnic identity ($r = .373$) and political identity ($r = .332$) sub-scales. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value self-respect, they have a positive perspective towards different ethnic and political identities.

There is a moderate positive relationship between "mature love" and sub-scales of gender ($r = .376$), ethnic identity ($r = .373$), political identity ($r = .426$) and religious identity ($r = .484$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value mature love, they have a positive perspective on different gender stereotypes, ethnic identities, political identities, and religious identities.

There is a moderate negative correlation between "freedom" and social dominance orientation ($r = -.366$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value freedom, they do not want the groups to dominate each other. There is a moderate positive correlation between "freedom" and gender ($r = .308$) and ethnic identity ($r = .393$) sub-scales. According to this relationship, when the participants in the generation Z value freedom, they have positive perspective on different gender stereotypes and ethnic identities.

There is a moderate negative relationship between "a comfortable life" and social dominance orientation ($r = -.386$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value a comfortable life, they do not want the groups to dominate each other. There is a moderate positive relationship between "a comfortable life" and sub-scales of gender ($r = .309$), ethnic identity ($r = .389$), political identity ($r = .337$) and religious identity ($r = .390$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value a comfortable life, they have a positive perspective on different gender stereotypes, ethnic identities, political identities, and religious identities.

There is a moderate positive relationship between "social approval" and social dominance orientation ($r = .527$). According to this relationship, when the participants in the Z generation value social approval, they want the groups to dominate each other. There is a moderate negative correlation between "social approval" and religious identity ($r = -.344$) sub-scale. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value social approval, they have a negative perspective towards different religious identities.

There is a highly positive correlation between "national security" and social dominance orientation ($r = .676$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value national security, they want the groups to dominate each other. There is a moderate negative correlation between "national security" and ethnic identity ($r = -.362$) and religious identity ($r = -.302$) sub-scales. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value national security, they have a negative perspective towards different ethnic and religious identities.

There is a moderate positive relationship between “pleasure” and social dominance orientation ($r = .483$). According to this relationship, when the participants in the generation Z value pleasure, they want the groups to dominate each other. There is a moderate negative relationship between “pleasure” and national identity ($r = -.385$), ethnic identity ($r = -.354$) and religious identity ($r = -.306$) sub-scales. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value pleasure, they have a negative perspective towards different national identities, ethnic identities, and religious identities.

Table 6 shows the statistical results regarding the ranking of instrumental values. The instrumental values discussed in this context are independence (self-confident, self-sufficient), forgiveness (not holding grudges), courageous (defending their beliefs without hesitation), honesty (sincere, truthful), intellectuality, broad-minded (open-minded, looking at ideas without prejudice), ambitious, imaginative, submissiveness (mild, rule-following), self-controlled, politeness (kind, decent), reasonable (reasoning correctly and consistently), capableness (adequate, resourceful), cheerful, compassion (friendly, loving), responsible, clean (orderly) and helpfulness (Müftüoğlu, 2019). When Table 6 is examined, "independence", which is one of the instrumental values, was evaluated as 1st degree important at the highest rate. In addition, it was seen that the most unimportant value of the participants in the generation Z was "submissiveness".

Table 6: Ranking of Instrumental Values as Statistical

	1st degree important		Most unimportant	
	Woman	Man	Woman	Man
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Independence	93 (32,3)	126 (35,8)	3 (1,0)	1 (0,3)
Forgiveness	1 (0,3)	1 (0,3)	1 (0,3)	49 (13,9)
Courageous	19 (6,6)	27 (7,7)	3 (1,0)	1 (0,3)
Honesty	82 (28,5)	37 (10,5)	2 (0,7)	1 (0,3)
Intellectuality	3 (1,0)	2 (0,6)	1 (0,3)	1 (0,3)
Broad-minded	4 (1,4)	3 (0,9)	36 (12,5)	54 (15,3)
Ambitious	4 (1,4)	1 (0,3)	82 (28,5)	36 (10,2)
Imaginative	1 (0,3)	2 (0,6)	2 (0,7)	1 (0,3)
Submissiveness	2 (0,7)	2 (0,6)	116 (40,3)	208 (59,1)
Self-controlled	47 (16,3)	51 (14,5)	2 (0,7)	2 (0,6)
Politeness	1 (0,3)	2 (0,6)	3 (1,0)	2 (0,6)
Reasonable	9 (3,1)	57 (16,2)	2 (0,7)	1 (0,3)
Capableness	25 (8,7)	57 (16,2)	2 (0,7)	1 (0,3)
Cheerful	2 (0,7)	2 (0,6)	2 (0,7)	1 (0,3)
Compassion	3 (1,0)	2 (0,6)	3 (1,0)	1 (0,3)
Responsible	4 (1,4)	3 (0,9)	4 (1,4)	1 (0,3)
Clean	2 (0,7)	2 (0,6)	6 (2,1)	1 (0,3)
Helpfulness	5 (1,7)	30 (8,5)	7 (2,4)	1 (0,3)

The results of the correlation analysis applied to determine whether social dominance orientation and identity attitudes are related to the instrumental values of the participants in generation Z are given in Table 7. As seen in Table 7, there are variables with significant correlation at $r > .30$ levels.

There is a moderate negative correlation between “independence” and social dominance orientation ($r = -.529$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value independence, they do not want the groups to dominate each other.

There is a moderate negative correlation between “forgiveness” and social dominance orientation ($r = -.427$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value forgiveness, they do not want the groups to dominate each other. There is a moderate positive relationship between “forgiveness” and ethnic identity ($r = .314$), political identity ($r = .316$), and religious identity ($r = .318$) sub-scales. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value forgiveness, they have a positive perspective towards different ethnic identities, political identities, and religious identities.

There is a moderate negative correlation between “intellectuality” and social dominance orientation ($r = -.312$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value intellectuality, they do not want the groups to dominate each other. There is a moderate positive relationship between “intellectuality” and ethnic identity ($r = .309$), political identity ($r = .318$) and religious identity ($r = .342$) sub-scales. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value intellectuality, they have a positive perspective towards different ethnic identities, political identities, and religious identities.

There is a moderate negative relationship between “broad-minded” and social dominance orientation ($r = -.379$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value broad-minded, they do not want the groups to dominate each other. There is a moderate negative relationship between “broad-minded” and gender ($r = .341$), political identity ($r = .341$) and religious identity ($r = .422$) sub-scales. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value broad-minded, they have a positive perspective towards different gender stereotypes, political identities, and religious identities.

Table 7: Correlation Analysis Results for the Relationship of Instrumental Values with Social Dominance Orientation and Identity Attitudes

	Social Dominance Orientation	National Identity Subscale	Gender Subscale	Ethnic Identity Subscale	Politic Identity Subscale	Religious Identity Subscale
Independence	<i>0,529*</i>	-0,118	0,127	-0,123	0,101	0,009
Forgiveness	<i>-0,427*</i>	0,021	-0,093	<i>0,314*</i>	<i>0,316*</i>	<i>0,318*</i>
Courageous	-0,076	0,113	0,174	0,166	0,235	0,276
Honesty	-0,012	-0,002	-0,080	-0,247	-0,165	-0,137
Intellectuality	<i>-0,312*</i>	0,159	0,015	<i>0,309*</i>	<i>0,318*</i>	<i>0,342*</i>
Broad-minded	<i>-0,379*</i>	-0,263	<i>0,341*</i>	-0,291	<i>0,341*</i>	<i>0,422*</i>
Ambitious	<i>0,388*</i>	0,230	<i>-0,326*</i>	0,282	<i>-0,355*</i>	<i>-0,381*</i>
Imaginative	0,008	-0,061	-0,046	-0,157	-0,225	-0,199
Submissiveness	<i>0,438*</i>	<i>-0,376*</i>	<i>-0,301*</i>	<i>-0,320*</i>	<i>-0,359*</i>	<i>-0,349*</i>
Self-controlled	-0,196	-0,019	-0,233	0,166	-0,186	-0,177
Politeness	0,126	-0,031	-0,065	<i>-0,441*</i>	-0,106	-0,095
Reasonable	<i>-0,437*</i>	0,194	0,137	<i>0,384*</i>	0,178	0,118
Capableness	<i>0,522*</i>	<i>-0,442*</i>	<i>-0,305*</i>	0,113	0,259	0,245
Cheerful	-0,184	0,080	0,094	0,126	0,104	0,120
Compassion	-0,023	0,033	-0,069	-0,260	-0,259	-0,197
Responsible	0,279	-0,247	<i>0,342*</i>	<i>0,300*</i>	<i>0,354*</i>	<i>0,433*</i>
Clean	0,093	-0,221	-0,030	0,107	-0,002	-0,011
Helpfulness	<i>-0,308*</i>	-0,122	0,126	-0,012	0,011	-0,028

*Correlation ($r > .30$) is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

There is a moderate positive relationship between “ambitious” and social dominance orientation ($r = .388$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value ambition, they want the groups to dominate each other. There is a moderate negative relationship between “ambitious” and gender ($r = -.326$), political identity ($r = -.355$) and religious identity ($r = -.381$) sub-scales. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value ambition, they have a negative perspective towards different gender stereotypes, political identities, and religious identities.

There is a moderate positive relationship between “submissiveness” and social dominance orientation ($r = .438$). According to this relationship, when the participants in the generation Z value submissiveness, they want the groups to dominate each other. There is a moderate negative correlation between “submissiveness” and national identity ($r = -.376$), gender ($r = -.301$), ethnic identity ($r = -.320$), political identity ($r = -.359$) and religious identity ($r = -.349$) sub-scales. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value submissiveness, they have a negative perspective towards different gender stereotypes, national identities, ethnic identities, political identities, and religious identities.

There is a moderate positive correlation between “politeness” and ethnic identity ($r = .441$) sub-scale. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value politeness, they have a positive perspective towards different ethnic identities.

There is a moderate negative relationship between “reasonable” and social dominance orientation ($r = -.437$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value reasonable, they do not want the groups to dominate each other. There is a moderate positive correlation between “reasonable” and ethnic identity ($r = .384$) sub-scale. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value reasonable, they have a positive perspective towards different ethnic identities.

There is a moderate positive relationship between “capableness” and social dominance orientation ($r = .522$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value capableness, they want the groups to dominate each other. There is a moderate negative correlation between “capableness” and national identity ($r = -.442$) and gender ($r = -.305$) sub-scales. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value capableness, they have a negative perspective towards different gender stereotypes and different national identities.

There is a moderate positive relationship between “responsible” and gender ($r = .342$), ethnic identity ($r = .300$), political identity ($r = .354$) and religious identity ($r = .433$) sub-scales. According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value responsibility, they have a positive perspective towards different gender stereotypes, ethnic identities, political identities, and religious identities.

There is a moderate negative correlation between “helpfulness” and social dominance orientation ($r = -.308$). According to this relationship, when the participants in generation Z value being helpful, they do not want the groups to dominate each other.

2.4. Regression Analysis of Variables

A regression equation was created to predict the measurements. In the equation created, it has been examined whether the gender identity, education, and income status assessment of the participants in generation Z influence their social dominance orientation. When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that the evaluation of gender identity, education and income status assessment explains 32% of the total variance in social dominance orientation. According to the results of the regression analysis, as the education of the participants in the generation Z ($\beta = -.51$, $p < .001$) increases, their social dominance orientation decreases. In addition, as the income status assessment of the generation Z ($\beta = .09$, $p < .05$) increase, their social dominance

orientation also increases. In addition, the gender identity variable ($\beta=.34$, $p<.001$) predicted social dominance orientation.

Table 8: Regression Results of Variables

	B	Standard Error (SD) for B	β	t	p
Gender identity	10.613	1.016	.34	10.447	.000***
Education	-6.757	.537	-.51	-12.577	.000***
Income status assessment	1.779	.777	.09	2.290	.022**
R²	.32				
F	103.599				

*** $p<.001$, ** $p<.05$

Discussion and Conclusion

This study fills an important research gap by examining the social dominance orientation of the generation Z in Turkey according to different variables (gender identity, view of socio-economic class, occupation field, identity attitudes, purposive and instrumental values). In this section, the results of the study will be discussed within the framework of the research questions.

One of the research questions is concerned with the social dominance orientation of generation Z. The results of the t-test analysis show that the social dominance orientation of the men is higher than the women in the generation Z. The results of this study show that the men in the Z generation are more inclined to the idea that there should be a hierarchical order among the different groups in the society. In addition, these results reveal that men think that groups have influence and power over each other. The reasons for men having higher social dominance orientation than women are thought to include factors such as gender roles and socialization, desire for power and status, cultural and institutional structures, as well as social

pressures and expectations (Fischer and Luiz, 2024; Kosar et al., 2023; Mori et al., 2023). Men are socialized according to traditional gender roles with values of power and competition, and they generally have a greater desire for power and status. Historically, men's tendencies to control resources and engage in competition may have contributed to the higher social dominance orientation. Additionally, current cultural and institutional structures may support this tendency among men, while societal expectations to maintain certain levels of power and control for men can also increase social dominance orientations.

Another research question concerns the identity attitudes of generation Z. The results of the t-test analysis show that women's characteristics of national identity, ethnic identity, political identity, religious identity and gender are higher than men's characteristics of national identity, ethnic identity, political identity, religious identity and gender. The reasons for women having higher national identity, ethnic identity, political identity, religious identity, and gender characteristics compared to men can be attributed to various sociological, psychological, and cultural factors. Traditional gender roles and expectations may lead women to express their identities in more distinct and diverse ways (Çelik and Lüküslü, 2012; Glick et al., 2016; Sakallı et al., 2018). Women are often expected to be the guardians of family, culture, and societal values, which can lead to a stronger attachment to their national and ethnic identities. From childhood, women may be exposed to socialization processes that emphasize their social identities more. Social interactions within the family and society play a significant role in shaping women's identities. Historically, women have been among disadvantaged groups in many societies (Cayli Messina, 2022; Kandiyoti, 2016; Kara, 2022; Stubbs-Richardson et al., 2023). This situation can cause their identities to be shaped and expressed more strongly. By asserting their identities, they can find social power and solidarity. Additionally, in many societies, women are expected to adhere to certain religious and cultural norms. These norms can lead women to adopt and express their religious identities more strongly. Women fighting against gender inequality may make their

political and gender identities more prominent (Arat, 2015). Feminist movements and women's rights advocacy can strengthen women's political identities. These identity developments and processes also apply to generation Z women, but it can be said that they have become more complex due to the impact of the digital world and globalization (Dinçer, 2023). Generation Z women can express their identities more strongly and diversely on platforms provided by the internet and social media (Lixian, 2020). Additionally, this generation is growing up with a higher political and social consciousness under the influence of global feminist movements and gender equality advocacy. In this context, generation Z women can communicate their identities to a wider audience and advocate for these identities more actively with the opportunities provided by the digital age.

Another research question concerns the purposive and instrumental values of generation Z. When the statistical results regarding the ranking of instrumental values is examined, "independence", was evaluated as 1st degree important at the highest rate. In addition, it was seen that the most unimportant value of the participants in generation Z was "submissiveness". The fact that generation Z participants rated the instrumental value of "independence" as the most important and "submissiveness" as the least important can be explained by various sociological and cultural factors. The ease of access to information brought by the digital age promotes individual thinking and independence, while social media and global connections allow young people to freely express their own identities and opinions (Kushwaha, 2021; Yağmur, 2024). This contributes to making independence an important value for generation Z. Additionally, this generation tends to challenge authority and make their own decisions (Kutlak, 2021). Therefore, they are likely to view a value like "submissiveness" as restrictive to individuality and freedom.

Growing up in a period of rapid social and cultural change, where individual rights and freedoms are increasingly emphasized, generation Z embraces these values and rejects concepts and values that constrain them. When the statistical results regarding the ranking of purposive values is examined, "a comfortable life"

was evaluated as 1st degree important at the highest rate. In addition, it has been seen that the values that the participants in generation Z consider the most unimportant are "the peace of the hereafter" and "mature love". Generation Z has grown up in a period marked by rapid technological advancements, globalization, and economic uncertainties (Grenman et al., 2024). Therefore, material security and comfort, or a "comfortable life," have become significant goals for this generation. Economic difficulties and uncertainties have increased young people's anxieties about the future and led them to adopt a more pragmatic approach. The fact that "the peace of the hereafter" and "mature love" are seen as the least important values may be related to this generation generally adopting a more secular lifestyle and tending to be more individualistic and independent in relationships. Growing up in the digital age, generation Z has faster and easier access to information and different worldviews, allowing them to approach traditional religious and social norms more critically. Additionally, individual freedom and personal development may be more prominent for this generation.

Consequently, generation Z's high regard for the value of a "comfortable life" can be explained by current socioeconomic conditions and their desire for individual freedom, while their disregard for "the peace of the hereafter" and "mature love" can be seen as a reflection of their more secular and individualistic attitudes. Other research question is whether there is a relationship between the socioeconomic characteristics of generation Z and their social dominance orientations. According to the results of the ANOVA analysis, it was observed that there was a significant difference between the social dominance orientation and the occupation field of the participants in generation Z. The social dominance orientation of the participants in the professional members of the profession are less than the social dominance orientation of the participants in the technicians and associate professionals, staff working in office services, service and salespersons, people in art related jobs, machine operators and installers, employees in non-qualification jobs, not working in any job. In the analyzes, it was found that the social dominance

orientation of the participants in the technicians and associate professionals are higher than the participants in the professional members of the profession, service and salespersons and people in art related jobs groups. In addition, it was found that the social dominance orientation of the participants in the people in art related jobs less than the participants in the technicians and associate professionals, machine operators and installers, and employees in non-qualification jobs. In addition, the social dominance orientation of the participants in the machine operators and installers are higher than the participants in the professional members of the profession, staff working in office services, service and salespersons, people in art related jobs and not working in any job. When the interactions of the generation Z with the employment system are examined, it is seen that they have a serious and intense anxiety about finding a job, they frequently encounter insecurity, and they think that the working conditions and conditions are extremely difficult in jobs that bring labor (Ayoobzadeh et al., 2024; Ekinçi, 2022; Uysal, 2019). In addition, generation Z also talk about the importance of working in a business environment with flexible working hours, the efficiency of the business environment and the realization of entrepreneurial business opportunities (Anders, 2020). Moreover, working individuals belonging to generation Z do not adopt autocratic (authoritarian) leadership and stay close to democratic leadership (Bencsik et al., 2016; Çavuş, 2023). For generation Z, it is also stated that factors such as being valued in the workplace, being noticed, and supported, being appreciated, giving responsibility, transparency, and sincerity in workplace communication, supporting individual freedoms, and establishing a work-private life balance are more effective (Barhate and Dirani, 2021; Çaşın, 2022; Uğurbulduk, 2022). In the research, it is thought that the reason for the differentiation of the social dominance orientations of the generation Z towards the occupation field is due to the aforementioned factors. It is stated that the service sector or other jobs that require physical labor cause many discriminations, and these discriminations can create problems in relating to groups and people in the society (Yazejian et al., 2017). In addition, youth unemployment

is at a high level in Turkey (Ekiz and Örk-Özel, 2020) and young people cannot work in jobs related to the departments they graduated from. This situation may cause anger towards other young people or groups (for example, refugees) who can take part in employment due to the fact that young people in generation Z cannot work in the field related to their profession (Rüzgar, 2022).

A different research question is whether there is a relationship between the social dominance orientation of the generation Z living in Turkey and their identity attitudes and purposive and instrumental values. Within the scope of this research, correlation analysis was also conducted to determine whether social dominance orientation was related to the purposive and instrumental values of the participants in the generation Z. Correlation analyzes were ranked first with susceptibility to dominance among the groups, then with no susceptibility to dominance. According to the correlation analysis, when the participants in generation Z value a world in peace, they do not want dominance among the groups. When the participants in generation Z value equality, they do not want groups to dominate each other. When the participants in generation Z value freedom, they do not want groups to dominate each other. When the participants in generation Z value a comfortable life, they do not want groups to dominate each other. When the participants in generation Z value independence, they do not want groups to dominate each other. When the participants in generation Z value forgiveness, they do not want groups to dominate each other. When the participants in generation Z value intellectuality, they do not want groups to dominate each other. When the participants in generation Z value broad-mindedness, they do not want groups to dominate each other. When the participants in the generation Z value reasonable, they do not want groups to dominate each other. When the participants in generation Z value helpfulness, they do not want the groups to dominate each other. When the participants in generation Z value ambition, they want the groups to dominate each other. When the participants in generation Z value submissiveness, they want the groups to dominate each other. When the participants in the generation Z value capableness, they want

the groups to dominate each other. When the participants in the generation Z value social approval, they want the groups to dominate each other. When the participants in generation Z value national security, they want the groups to dominate each other. When the participants in generation Z value pleasure, they want the groups to dominate each other. In the research on generation Z, it is seen that this generation attaches importance to peace communication, freedom, conflict resolution, and independence (Eryılmaz-Çetinkaya, 2022; Kavas, 2019).

Generation Z also thinks that they are not given enough space in their interactions with the political system, decision-making mechanisms, and that the political plane should take place from a different window (Ekinci, 2022). It is also seen that generation Z does not want to be pressured by different people and they want a comfortable life in a secure society. Freedom of thought and self-expression are considered important for generation Z (Kılıç, 2021). In addition, individuals in generation Z can be more autonomous and develop an autonomous-relational self-compared to other generations (Bulgur, 2023). generation Z, who also define themselves as open-minded, especially want their lifestyles not to be interfered with. Generation Z is also expressed as a new generation that seeks their rights against inequality, speaks out against injustice, and is critical because they were born into technology (Emecen, 2019).

It is also stated that generation Z is more prone to show psychological symptoms in the current situation such as the social conditions, expectations, future anxiety, and identity search. Global wars, crimes in the city where they live, terrorism and increasing anxiety about the future negatively affect the perspective of generation Z. In addition, they cause the generation Z to have high levels of anxiety, depression, negative self, and hostility (Bahcaci, 2022). All this information is in parallel with the results of the Z generation in our research regarding the relationship between social dominance orientations and identity attitudes, their purposive and instrumental values.

It is considered appropriate to make some recommendations based on the research findings. First, it is important to restructure educational programs for all generations, including generation Z. These programs could address generation Z's social dominance orientations through gender equality education. Such education can offer content that challenges social norms and promotes gender equality, thereby reducing perceptions and attitudes related to social dominance. Educational materials that provide information about various gender identities can help young people develop a more inclusive and egalitarian perspective. Additionally, education could focus on the diversity of individual and social identities. In-depth discussions on the effects of values and social norms during the identity formation process can assist young people in understanding their own identities and establishing a more conscious relationship with social norms.

Second, on a more macro level, it is necessary to develop policies and legal regulations for both generation Z and all generations. Considering that social dominance orientations may deepen gender inequalities, policies that prevent gender-based discrimination and promote equal opportunities should be strengthened. Implementing gender equality standards in workplaces, educational institutions, and social services can help mitigate the effects of these orientations. Additionally, to reduce the impact of social dominance in different career fields, it is important to encourage equitable and inclusive practices across various sectors. Programs that increase the representation of women and other genders in male-dominated industries should be developed. Youth projects and workshops where generation Z can share their thoughts on social dominance and value priorities can be organized. These projects can help young people shape their own values and societal role models. Mentorship and guidance services can be offered to assist young people in making career choices aligned with their values and raising awareness about issues like social dominance. Awareness campaigns through media and public channels can highlight societal values and identity diversity. These campaigns can reach broad audiences and potentially shift societal perceptions by

presenting content that questions social norms and values. Effective campaigns on social media platforms focusing on gender equality, individual freedoms, and the importance of values can help young people become more conscious and sensitive to these issues.

Third, it is important to further support cultural research. More comprehensive studies should be conducted on the identities and values of generation Z. These studies could be expanded to understand the differences in values and identity perceptions among young people from various socio-economic backgrounds. Such data can be used to develop more effective responses to social changes. Additionally, long-term or longitudinal observations on the social and individual values of generation Z could be beneficial for understanding how these values change over time and their societal impacts. Long-term research can uncover the causes and effects behind these changes, allowing for the development of more effective strategies.

References

- Adigüzel, O., Batur, H. Z., & Ekşili, N. (2014). Kuşakların değişen yüzü ve Y kuşağı ile ortaya çıkan yeni çalışma tarzı: Mobil yakalılar. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(19), 165-182.
- Alston, M., & Bowles, W. (2019). *Research for social workers: An introduction to methods*. Routledge.
- Altuntuğ, N. (2012). Kuşaktan kuşağa tüketim olgusu ve geleceğin tüketici profili. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(1), 203- 212.
- Anders, E. (2020). Generation Z and Their Perception Towards the Working Environment- Analyzed in Times of Covid-19. Universidade NOVA de Lisboa (Portugal).
- Arat, Z. F. K. (2015). Feminisms, women's rights, and the UN: Would achieving gender equality empower women? *The American Political Science Review*, 109(4), 674-689. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24809503>
- Ayoobzadeh, M., Schweitzer, L., Lyons, S., & Ng, E. (2024). A tale of two generations: a time-lag study of career expectations. *Personnel Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2022-0101>
- Bahcaci, İ. E. (2022). X, Y Ve Z Kuşağındaki Bireylerin Yaşam Doyumları ve Psikolojik Belirtileri Arasındaki İlişki (*Yüksek Lisans Tezi*). İstanbul Arel Üniversitesi.
- Barhate, B., & Dirani, K. M. (2021). Career aspirations of generation Z: A systematic literature review. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 46(1/2), 139-157. doi:10.1108/EJTD-07-2020-0124
- Bencsik, A., Juhász, T., & Horváth-Csikós, G. (2016). Y and Z generations at workplaces. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 6(3), 90-106. doi:10.7441/joc.2016.03.06

- Bulgur, S. (2023). Bireyin İçine Doğduğu Aile İklimi İle Benlik Gelişimi Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi (*Yüksek Lisans Tezi*). Demiroğlu Bilim Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Cayli Messina, B. (2022). Breaking the silence on femicide: How women challenge epistemic injustice and male violence. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 73(4), 859–884. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12968>
- Costanza, D. P., Rudolph, C. W., & Zacher, H. (2023). Are generations a useful concept? *Acta Psychologica*, 241, 104059. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2023.104059>
- Çalışkur, A. & Aslan, A. E. (2013). Rokeach Değerler Envanteri güvenilirlik ve geçerlik çalışması. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16(29), 81-105.
- Çaşın, S. (2022). Çalışma Hayatında Yeni Kuşaklar ve İş Yaşamına Etkisi: Z Kuşağı Çalışanların İnsan Kaynakları Yöneticileri Açısından Değerlendirilmesi (*Yüksek Lisans Tezi*). Hitit Üniversitesi, Çorum.
- Çavuş, T. (2023). Liderlik Algısı ve Z Kuşağı Üzerine Bir İnceleme (*Yüksek Lisans Tezi*). Bilecik Şeyh Edebali Üniversitesi, Bilecik.
- Çelik, K., & Lüküslü, D. (2012). Spotlighting a silent category of young females: The life experiences of “house girls” in Turkey. *Youth & Society*, 44(1), 28–48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0044118X10391636>
- Dinçer, P. (2023). Digital feminist activism in Turkey: Has long-awaited fourth wave feminism arrived? *Akdeniz Kadın Çalışmaları ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet Dergisi*, 6(1), 282-303. <https://doi.org/10.33708/ktc.1175381>
- Ekinci, L. (2022). Ekolojik Yaklaşım Temelinde Z Kuşağı'nın Deneyimleri: Sorunlar ve Beklentiler (*Yüksek Lisans Tezi*). Başkent Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Ekiz, F. M., & Örk Özel, S. (2020). Genç işsizliğini belirleyen unsurlar: Türkiye örneği. *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19(39), 1022-1045. DOI: 10.46928/iticusbe.768646
- Emecen, S. (2019). Hayatı Anlamlandırmada Kuşaklararası Analiz: Atilla Uras Anadolu Lisesi Örneği (*Doktora Tezi*). Yalova Üniversitesi.
- Eryılmaz-Çetinkaya, A. (2022). Kamusal Olaylarda Barış İletişiminin Siyasi Aktörler ve Z Kuşağı Açısından Değerlendirilmesi (*Doktora Tezi*). Ege Üniversitesi, İzmir.
- Fischer, I., & Da Silva Luiz, J. (2024). Exploring gender differences in Gen Z students' attribution of obstacles influencing their academic and professional success. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 22, 100989. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2024.100989>
- Genç, Z. M. (2020). Z Kuşağı Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Psikolojik Yardım Almaya İlişkin Tutum ile Öz Şefkat ve Bilişsel Esneklik Seviyesi Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi (*Yüksek Lisans Tezi*). Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Glick, P., Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Akbaş, G., Metin Orta, I., & Ceylan, S. (2016). Why do women endorse honor beliefs? Ambivalent sexism and religiosity as predictors. *Sex Roles*, 75, 543-554. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-015-0550-5>
- Grénman, M., Hakala, U., Mueller, B., & Uusitalo, O. (2024). Generation Z's perceptions of a good life beyond consumerism: Insights from the United States and Finland. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 48(1), Article e12994. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12994>
- Kandiyoti, D. (2016). Locating the politics of gender: Patriarchy, neoliberal governance and violence in Turkey. *Research and Policy on Turkey*, 1(2), 103-118.

- Kara, Y. (2022). Kadınlara yönelik şiddetin karşılaştırmalı bir analizi: Cadı avlarından Türkiye'deki kadın cinayetlerine. *International Journal of Social Inquiry*, 15(1), 69-84. <https://doi.org/10.37093/ijsi.937007>
- Karaçanta, H. (2002). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi ve Başka Bazı Değişkenler Açısından Karşılaştırılması (*Doktora Tezi*). Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Kavas, A. (2019). The Perception of the Managers Related to Conflict Management Styles Upon Generation Z (*Master's Thesis*). Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir.
- Keleş, H. N. (2011). Y kuşağı çalışanlarının motivasyon profillerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(2), 129-139.
- Kiliç, Ç. (2021). Understanding Generation Z: Their Attitudes Towards to Family, Education and Social Life (*Master's Thesis*). Boğaziçi University, İstanbul.
- Kirik, A. M., & Köyüstü, S. (2018). Z kuşağı konusunda yapılmış tezlerin içerik analizi yöntemiyle incelenmesi. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi*, 6(2), 1497-1518. DOI: 10.19145/e-gifder.443304
- Kosar, S. A., Muruthi, B. A., Shivers, C., Zarate, J., & Byron, J. (2023). Millennials and generation Z: Men's perspectives on hashtag feminism. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 31(3), 478-499. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10608265231175832>
- Kushwaha, B. P. (2021). Paradigm shift in traditional lifestyle to digital lifestyle in Gen Z: a conception of consumer behaviour in the virtual business world. *International Journal of Web Based Communities*, 17(4), 305-320.
- Kutlák, J. (2021). Individualism and self-reliance of Generations Y and Z and their impact on working environment: An empirical study across 5 European countries. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 19(1), 39-52. doi:10.21511/ppm.19(1).2021.04
- Lev, T. A. (2021). Generation Z: Characteristics and challenges to entering the world of work. *Cross-Cultural Management Journal*, 23(1), 107-115.
- Lixian, H. (2020). Rewriting "The Personal Is Political": Young women's digital activism and new feminist politics in China. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, 21(3), 337-355.
- Mori, G., Alejandria, Y. M., Quijano, B., Salazar, A. B., & Sanchez, A. (2023). Feminism through the Lens of the Gen Z. *American Journal of Youth and Women Empowerment*, 2(1), 8-16. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajywe.v2i1.1796>
- Müftüoğlu, S. (2019). Tüketicilerin Reklamlara Yönelik Güvenleri ile Kişilik Özellikleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi: Üniversite Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma (*Doktora Tezi*). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Popescu, A. (2019). The brief history of generation – defining the concept of generation. An analysis of literature review. *Journal of Comparative Research in Anthropology and Sociology*, 10(2), 15-30.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(4), 741-763. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741>
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: The Free Press.
- Rüzgar, M. T. (2022). Sosyal Dışlanma Bağlamında Genç İşsizliğe Yönelik Devletin Mali Çözüm Önerileri: Türkiye ve Seçilen Ülkelerde Uygulanan İstihdam Politikaları (*Doktora Tezi*). Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi.
- Sakallı, N., Türkoğlu, B., Kuzlak, A. (2018). How are women and men perceived? Structure of gender stereotypes in contemporary Turkey. *Nesne Dergisi*, 6(13), 309 - 336. 10.7816/nesne-06-13-04

- Sarıbaşı, Ö., Kömürcü, S., & Güler, M. E. (2016). Yavaş şehirlerde yaşayan Z kuşağının çevre ve sürdürülebilir kalkınma algıları: Seferihisar örneği. *Uluslararası Türk Dünyası Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(2), 107-119.
- Stubbs-Richardson, M., Gilbreath, S., Paul, M., & Reid, A. (2023). It's a global #MeToo: a cross-national comparison of social change associated with the movement. *Feminist Media Studies*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2023.2231654>
- Uğurbulduk, H. (2022). The Expectations of The Generation Z from Work Life and the Effect of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Their Expectations (*Master's Thesis*). Adana Alparslan Türkeş Science and Technology University.
- Uysal, S. (2019). Z Kuşağının Çalışma Hayatından Beklentileri: Bir Alan Araştırması (*Yüksek Lisans Tezi*). Yalova Üniversitesi.
- Yağmur, Y. (2024). An exploratory research to reveal the habits, motivations, and tendencies of generation Z to use social media platforms as a leisure activity. *Advances in Hospitality and Tourism Research (AHTR)*, 12(2), 172-199. <https://doi.org/10.30519/ahtr.1452356>
- Yazejian, A., Morganson, V., & Cornelius, A. (2017). Subtle discrimination in the service sector. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 10(1), 100-107. doi:10.1017/iop.2016.109
- Yazıcı, F. (2016). Kimlik Tutumları Ölçeği: Bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, 5(4), 41-54.
- Yüksekbilgili, Z. (2013). Türk tipi y kuşağı. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(45), 342-353.