Research Article

Investigating the Goal Orientations for Teaching of Teachers in Turkey According to Different Variables*

Yunus Emre AVCU[1] **Caner BÖREKCI**[2] **Burçin ATEŞ**[3] **Gizem Ezgi KAYA**[4]

Abstract

The research aimed to examine the teachers' goal orientations for teaching in terms of different variables. The relational survey method was used in the research. The participants of this research consists of 496 teachers. The "Goal Orientations for Teaching Scale" developed by Butler and Shibaz (2014) and adapted into Turkish by Yıldız Saban and Baştuğ (2016) was used as a data collecting tool. The scale consists of four sub-dimensions which are the ability approach, mastery, student relations, and work avoidance. The teachers who volunteered to participate in the research filled out the prepared data collection tool over the internet. While analyzing the data; mean, standard deviation, mode, median, skewness, and kurtosis values of each sub-dimension were calculated. Pearson correlation was used to determine the relationship between sub-dimensions. Independent samples t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to determine the effect of gender, educational level, years of work experience, branch, and weekly course load on the goal orientations for the teaching of teachers. According to the findings; there was a low linear correlation between student relations, mastery and ability approach goal orientations. A low level of a linear relationship between the ability approach and work avoidance goal orientations has been found. As a result of the difference tests, it was determined that the dimensions of mastery and work avoidance differed according to gender, while the mastery and ability approach differed according to the education level, and ability approach and work avoidance differed according to weekly course load.

Keywords: Goal orientations for teaching, learning environment, motivation, teacher

1. INTRODUCTION

The attention and care of students in the learning process are linked to the atmosphere of the class and the standard of educational learning settings greatly impacts the motives of students (Yıldızlı, Saban & Baştuğ, 2016). Although a stimulating environment for the person to learn is the learning setting, it is also an area for the instructor to be encouraged to educate. As per Jesus and Lens (2005), for three main reasons, eagerness and motivation of teachers are essential issues in the educational plan: the motivation of the teacher has an essential influence on student morale, and it is essential for the implementation of educational changes, and it is critical for themselves to be content and happy. Considering the literature of motivation, the information allows us to gain fresh perspectives regarding incentives of teachers to choose to pursue the teaching as a profession, their goals for future professional practice and advancement opportunities, future vocational plans, and effects on pupil's learning and achievement (Richardson & Watt, 2010). The principle of expectancy-

Received Date: 01/08/2020 **Accepted Date:** 29/09/2020 **Publication Language:** English

*__To cite this article:__ Avcu, Y. E., Börekci, C., Ateş, B., & Kaya, G. E. (2020). Investigating the goal orientations for teaching of teachers in Turkey according to different variables. *International e-Journal of Educational Studies (IEJES). 5* (9), 41-54. DOI: 10.31458/iejes.776274

[1,2]*Dr., Şehit Prof. Dr. İlhan Varank Science and Art Center, yunus1099@hotmail.com, canerborekci@hotmail.com*
[3] *Principal, Mustafa Necati Primary School, burcinates221982@hotmail.com*
[4] *Teacher, Veli Efendi Primary School, gizemezgist@hotmail.com*
Corresponding Author e-mail address: yunus1099@hotmail.com

value, self-determination, and achievement-goal are the three current motivational theories that illustrate the aspects of a teacher's motivation (Schieb & Karabenick, 2011).

The hypothesis of expectancy-value theory offers a structure for comprehending the incentive of teachers to choose teaching as a profession, by taking effects for self-improvement, educational institutions, and government policies into consideration (Watt & Richardson, 2007). Internal and external motivations and a collection of fundamental psychological factors that encompass incentives are the key parts of self-determination theory (Gagné & Deci, 2005). The hypothesis predicts that the implementation of internal motives or the acceptance of further self-determined forms of external motives depends on the fulfillment of following three fundamental emotional factors: the need for communication (need to build relationships with others), success (the need to feel successful in achieving desired results), and autonomy (the need to personality initiate and control the behaviors). Based on the dualistic framework which is suggested by achievement-goal theory (AGT) (Nicholls, 1989), the prime motivation of a person is to show proficiency or capability when engaged in a setting of performance (e.g., classroom). Two key components are included in the AGT: objective orientation (i.e. understanding of the ability of a person for a task) and psychological atmosphere (i.e. interpretation of the social context). Therefore, the inclination of a person may be changed (i.e. skill / focusing on tasks vs. success / ego-centered) to accomplish a task based on how the achievement is described by the social context (Pintrich, 2000).

Besides, to decide how numerous factors cultivate or restrict the motivations of teachers, responsive, clear, rigorous hypotheses and measures are important at the basis of effects setting where the object is present (Catalán, Serrano, Lucas, Clemente & García-González, 2018). AGT has enabled the carrying out many studies in which the teachers' goal orientations were investigated in different socio-cultural contexts (Butler & Shibaz, 2008; Dresel, Fasching, Steuer & Nitsche, 2013; Han, Yin & Wang, 2015, 2016; Malmberg, 2008; Schiefele, 2017; Yıldızlı, Saban & Baştuğ, 2016). Goal orientations reflect the efforts of teachers and individual goal preferences in their careers to become successful (Butler, 2007; Butler & Shibaz, 2014; Elliot & Mcgroger, 2001). In recent years, goal orientations for teaching have been recognized as a key aspect of teacher motivation, and its different aspects which are considered significant have been questioned for the quality of the learning and teaching process (Butler & Shibaz, 2014; Cho & Shim, 2013; George & Richardson, 2019; Mansfield & Beltman, 2014; Saban & Yıldızlı, 2017). The hypothetical framework of these studies is based on the AGT.

The fundamental premise of AGT can be stated as various achievement-goal orientations create different motivation systems and this condition results in different cognitive, affective and behavioral outcomes (Elliott, 2005). In other terms, the theory of achievement-goal offers a clear basis for interpreting the underlying goals of cognition, behavior, and emotions of teachers in the teaching process (Butler, 2007; Retelsdorf & Günther 2011). The achievement goal theory focuses on why individuals try to achieve a certain goal (Urdan & Maehr, 1995). Issues regarding why an individual who sets a goal for himself/herself in the learning process determines this specific goal, how s/he will reach this goal, and according to which standards s/he will evaluate his/her performance are all related to the goal orientation. This structure also provides a framework for the individual to understand why s/he has shown this performance (Yıldızlı, Saban & Baştuğ, 2016). Consequently, the achievement-goal orientations are linked to the personal actions of individuals as well as the motivations that drive them and can lead individuals to adopt the behavior directly (Maehr & Zusho, 2009). Butler (2007) noted that schools and classrooms provide an achievement context not just for students but also for teachers and claimed that the achievement-goal theory also offers a basis for examining the teachers' goal orientation for teaching.

Butler (2007) gathers teachers' goal orientation in the teaching process under four factors such as mastery, ability approach (i.e., performance approach), ability avoidance (i.e., performance avoidance), and work avoidance. According to Elliot (2005), the goal orientations are expressed as teachers' efforts which are cognitively represented for the specific goals during the teaching process. Teachers seeking mastery goal orientation, looking to enhance their professional skills, assess their professional skills based on task demands and prior outcomes (Mansfield & Beltman, 2014). Teachers with the ability-approach goal aim to show their superior teaching skills to their colleagues, while those with the ability-avoidance goal tend to avoid showing low teaching skills (George & Richardson, 2019). Finally, teachers with a work-avoidance goal are motivated to reduce their workload and effort made for a specific work (Mascret, Elliot & Cury, 2017). Butler (2012) expanded the teachers' goal-orientation model, which was a four-factor framework, by introducing the dimension of student relations. Teachers who adopt student relations goal orientation care about establishing personal relationships with students and strive to make them feel that they are sincere and value them (Butler, 2012).

Goal orientations guide thoughts, behaviors, and emotions (Schutz, Crowder & White, 2001). Teachers with different goal orientations for teaching play a role as social agents who affect the determination of the students' individual goal orientation by creating a particular motivational environment in the classroom (Dresel, Fasching, Steuer, Nitsche & Dickhäuser, 2013; Senko, Hulleman & Harackiewicz, 2011). Teachers' goal orientation for teaching directly affects teaching activities, students' perceptions about these activities, as well as students' learning and motivation (Butler & Shibaz, 2014; Dresel et al., 2013; Kucsera, Roberts, Walls, Walker & Svinicki, 2011; Retelsdorf & Günther 2011; Schiefele & Schaffner, 2015; Wolters & Daugherty, 2007). It can be seen from the relevant literature that teachers' goal orientation for teaching influences not just their teaching motivation but also the motivation of their students to learn and their perception of learning activities. This condition is considered as having a significant role on all educational levels in terms of the quality of teaching service.

The researches in the literature reveal the relationship between teachers' goal orientation and various variables. Teachers' mastery goal orientation is a significant predictor of teacher commitment (Han, Yin & Wang, 2016), student-centered teaching understanding (Han, Yin & Wang, 2015), help-seeking behaviors, cognitively stimulating instructions (Butler, 2007; Butler & Shibaz, 2014). There is a positive relationship between mastery goal orientation and "perceived teacher support for students asking questions and help-seeking" (Butler & Shibaz, 2008), "high self-efficacy perception for teaching" (Nitsche, Dickhauser, Fasching, & Dresel, 2011). Besides, negative relationships were observed between mastery goal orientation and student perceptions regarding teachers' prevention of seeking help and asking questions (Butler & Shibaz, 2008) and stress and professional burnout (Fasching, Dresel, Dickhäuser & Nitsche, 2010). It has been observed that there is a positive relationship between ability approach goal orientation and loyalty to students and teaching (Han, Yin & Wang, 2016). Teachers with goal orientation of the ability approach perceive help-seeking positively (Butler, 2007). Teachers who have work avoidance goal orientation are determined with characteristics of having higher social norms, supporting more shallow learning strategies (Retelsdorf & Gunther, 2011), having less commitment to their students (Han, Yin, & Wang, 2016), making less investment in their students and wishing to finish working days with the least workload (Butler, 2012). Significant relationships between student relations goal orientation and different teaching practices/approaches of teachers were also revealed (Butler, 2012). Furthermore, student relations goal orientation is the only goal orientation that predicts the outcome of social support, a framework that determines the relationship between teacher and student (Butler & Shibaz, 2014).

Related researches show that teachers' goal orientation for teaching is related to classroom behaviors and various psychological variables. Nevertheless, very little yet understood regarding how contextual and personal factors form the teachers' goal orientation for teaching. To understand the factors that affect teachers' motivation in educational environments, it is important to consider teachers' goal orientation for teaching. At the same time, it is assumed that further empirical research should be conducted to document the variables that play a significant role in the goal orientation of teachers for teaching in different cultures. By taking into account the fact that the researches about goal orientation for the teaching of teachers in Turkey are limited in number (Saban & Yıldızlı, 2017; Yıldızlı, Saban & Baştuğ, 2016), the current research was planned to be carried out in the different provinces of Turkey with teachers working in different branches and was intended to examine the teachers' goal orientations for teaching.

To this end, answers were sought to the following questions:

1) What are the levels of teachers' goal orientation for teaching?
2) Is there a relationship between goal orientations?
3) Do goal orientations differ according to gender, educational background, years of work experience, branch, and weekly course load?

2. METHOD

This section includes details on the design of the research, the participants, the tool for data collection, data collecting procedure, and data analysis.

2.1. Research Model

In the research, a relational survey model, which is a subtype of the general survey model, was applied in order to examine teachers' goal orientations for teaching in terms of different variables (gender, educational background, years of work experience, branch, and weekly course load) and to demonstrate to relationship between goal orientations. Using this model, attempts have been made to evaluate the direction and extent to which the relationships between two or more variables change (Karasar, 2014).

2.2. Participants

The participants of this research were all teachers working in various provinces of Turkey in the 2017-2018 academic year, which consists of 496 people. 59.7% (n=296) of the participants are female and 40.3% (n=200) are male. 24.2% (n=120) of teachers work in basic sciences and 75.8% (n=376) of them work in social sciences. Considering their educational status, 9.9% of them received postgraduate education and 90.1% of them received undergraduate education. The years of work experience of 14.1% (n=70) is between 1-5 years, 23.6% (n=117) of them worked for 6-10 years, 19.8% (n=98) of them worked for 11-15 years and 42.5% (n=211) of them worked for 15 years and more. Considering the course hours they have in a week, 13.9% (n=69) of them have 6-15 hours, 21% (n=104) of them have 15-25 hours, 40.3% (n=200) of them have 25-30 hours, and 24.8% (n=123) of them have 30 and more hours.

2.3. Data Collecting Tool

In the research, "Goal Orientations for Teaching Scale", which was developed by Butler and Shibaz (2014) and adapted to Turkish by Yıldızlı, Saban, and Baştuğ (2016), was utilized. The scale consists of four sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are "student relations", "mastery", "ability approach" and "work avoidance". Butler (2012) explained the goal orientation of teachers in the teaching process as follows:

- The teaches who have student relations goal orientation, aim to establish good relations with the students, to show that they value them and to behave sincerely;

- Teachers, who have mastery goal orientation, aim to learn and develop professional skills;
- Teachers who have the ability approach goal orientation aim to show their superior teaching skills;
- The teachers, who have work avoidance goal orientation, aim to finish the day with little effort.

The scale is a Likert type scale and the participants were asked to select the most appropriate one among the options between 1-never agree and 5-fully agree for the statements of the scale items. In the adaptation study, the reliability of the student relations factor has found as α =.673, the reliability of the mastery factor as α =.638, reliability of ability approach factor as α =.787, reliability of work avoidance factor as α =.605 and the reliability of whole-scale as α =.761. In this study, the reliability of the student relations factor is α =.792, the reliability of the mastery factor is α =.770, reliability of ability approach factor is α =.816, reliability of work avoidance factor is α =.792 and the reliability of the whole-scale is α =.751. Since the coefficients of scale validity are over 70, it was concluded that the questionnaires were reliable (Büyüköztürk, 2006; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

2.4. Data Collecting Procedure

The research is limited to 496 teachers working in Turkey in the 2017-2018 academic year in various cities, and it is limited to quantitative data collected from these teachers using the "Goal Orientations for Teaching Scale". After taking the permission of the school principals, the data collection tool created in google form was delivered to teachers from instant messaging applications. Teachers were reminded that participating in the research was voluntary and that the results of this research could also only be used for scientific purposes, and their personal information will be protected and secured. The teachers who volunteered to participate in the research filled out the prepared data collection tool over the internet. The online data collection tool includes a Personal Information Form and Goal Orientations for Teaching Scale. The instruction was given to teachers to complete the surveys and explained in the google form to avoid any confusion. The justification helped to a great extent to reduce biased feedback. Researchers checked the completed surveys via google drive website.

2.5. Data Analysis

While analyzing the data of the research, firstly, the mean, standard deviation, mode, median, skewness, and kurtosis values of each sub-dimension were calculated and after analyzing the distribution, it was decided to apply parametric tests. Pearson correlation was applied to determine the relation of sub-dimensions with each other. Independent samples t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to determine the effect of gender, educational status, years of work experience, branch, and weekly course load on teachers' goal orientation for teaching. While multiple comparison techniques were used to determine the difference between groups during the one-way analysis of variance, the Games-Howell test was preferred because the variances of the mean values of the variables and the sample numbers were not equal (Kayri, 2009). To determine the effect of independent variables on dependent variables Cohen's d value was calculated (Cohen, 1988; Sawilowsky, 2009).

3. FINDINGS

Analyzes were performed and summarized in the tables in this section to show the the levels of teachers' goal orientation for teaching, the relationship between goal orientations, and the teachers' goal orientations for teaching in terms of different variables.

In the first question of the research, the levels of teachers' goal orientation for teaching were tried to be determined. The data regarding the levels of teachers' goal orientation for teaching are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

Goal Orientations	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mode	Median	Skewness	Kurtosis
Student Relations	4.30	.65	5.00	4.33	-.739	-.019
Mastery	4.50	.48	5.00	4.50	-.889	.494
Ability Approach	3.63	1.00	4.00	3.75	-.671	-.131
Work Avoidance	2.28	.87	2.00	2.25	.562	-.058

In Table 1 which shows the values regarding the sub-dimensions of teachers' goal orientation for teaching, the mean score of the answers provided by the teachers to the items belonging to the sub-dimensions is mastery ($\bar{x} = 4.50$), student relations ($\bar{x} = 4.30$), ability approach ($\bar{x} = 3.63$) and work avoidance ($\bar{x} = 2.28$) respectively. This situation reveals that the teachers agreed with the items included in the mastery and ability dimension in their goal orientation. Even they were close to the status of agreeing with items of ability approach dimension, at the same time, they were indecisive about this status and they were not agreed with the work avoidance dimension. The mean values indicate that the teachers involved in the research plan their educational activities based on their professional knowledge to enhance their teaching and establish relationships with their students. Given the professional challenges they encountered, however, it was found that they did not tend to avoid work they did not agree with the related statements in the scale.

To determine which tests can be applied for analyzing the data; the values of mean, mode, median, skewness, and kurtosis of the variables that are the basis of the study were calculated. When we look at the distribution of the scores of the sub-dimensions, mean, mode, and median values are close to each other, and the skewness and kurtosis values indicate whether the series is normally distributed or not. The skewness and kurtosis coefficients are between +1 and -1, so this indicates that the data showed a normal distribution (Büyüköztürk, 2006; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

In the second question of the research, the direction and level of the relationship between the sub-dimensions of teachers' goal orientation for teaching were tried to be determined. The data regarding these relationships are provided in Table 2.

Table 2. Correlation table of teachers' goal orientation for teaching

Goal Orientations	Mean	Std. Deviation	1	2	3	4
(1) Student Relations	4.30	.65	1	.379*	.291*	-.010
(2) Mastery	4.50	.48		1	.292*	-.011
(3) Ability Approach	3.63	1.00			1	.277*
(4) Work Avoidance	2.28	.87				1

*p< .05

When the relations between the sub-dimensions of the teachers ' goal orientation for teaching are evaluated according to the data in Table 2, it is found that there is a low linear correlation between the sub-dimensions of the student relations, mastery and ability approach and these three sub-dimensions operate together. A low level of a linear relationship between the ability approach sub-dimension and the work avoidance sub-dimension (r =.277) has been found.

To observe whether teachers' goal orientation for teaching change according to the gender, education level and branch, years of work experience and weekly course load; independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether teachers' goal orientation for teaching varies according to gender, educational status, and branch, while one-way analysis of variance performed to observe if these goal orientations change according to the years of work experience and course load.

Table 3. Independent group t-test findings to assess whether teachers' goal orientation for teaching differentiates according to their gender

Goal Orientations	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	$Sh_{\bar{X}}$	t-Test t	sd	p	Difference	Effect V.
Student Relations	F	290	4.30	.65	.038	-.118	494	.906		
	M	200	4.31	.65	.046					
Mastery	F	290	4.54	.47	.027	2.297	494	.022*	F> M>	.20
	M	200	4.44	.49	.035					
Ability Approach	F	290	3.59	1.05	.061	-1.22	494	.222		
	M	200	3.70	.92	.065					
Work Avoidance	F	290	2.18	.82	.047	-3.313	494	.003*	M > F	.29
	M	200	2.42	.93	.049					

*p< .05

According to Table 3, teachers' goal orientation for teaching has a statistically significant difference in favor of women in mastery sub-dimension (p =.022). In other words, female teachers could be said to show higher mastery skills in educational and training activities than male teachers. In the work avoidance sub-dimension, the mean of male teachers is higher than female teachers in a statistically significant way (p =.003), in other words, it was concluded that male teachers tend to avoid professional problems more than their female peers. Cohen's d values calculated for the gender variable's effect on differentiation in both dimensions (d =.22 and d =.29) and it has shown that the effect observed is low (Cohen, 1988; Sawilowsky, 2009).

Table 4. Independent group t-test findings to assess whether teachers' goal orientation for teaching differentiates according to educational status

Goal Orientations	Edu. Status	N	$\bar{X}$	sd	$Sh_{\bar{X}}$	t-Test t	sd	P	Difference	Effect Level
Student Relations	Undergrad.	447	4.29	.65	.030	-1.126	494	.221		
	Post Grad.	49	4.21	.69	.099					
Mastery	Undergrad.	447	4.49	.49	.023	-2.447	67.62	.016*	PG> G	.28
	Post Grad.	49	4.63	.37	.054					
Ability Approach	Undergrad.	447	3.60	1.01	.048	-2.556	64.92	.013*	PG> G	.32
	Post Grad.	49	3.93	.83	.118					
Work Avoidance	Undergrad.	447	2.28	.88	.041	.052	494	.958		
	Post Grad.	49	2.27	.80	.114					

*p< .05

Independent group t-test findings which were conducted to assess whether teachers' goal orientations differentiate according to their educational status are provided in Table 4. In the Mastery (p= .016) and ability approach (p = .013) sub-dimensions, the mean scores of teachers who completed their postgraduate education are higher than the teachers who completed their undergraduate degree in a statistically significant way. Cohen d values which are calculated to determine educational status' effect on differentiation (d =.28 and d =.32) show that the effect observed is low (Cohen, 1988; Sawilowsky, 2009).

Table 5. Independent group t-test findings to assess whether teachers' goal orientation for teaching differentiates according to their branches

Goal Orientations	Branch	N	$\bar{X}$	sd	$Sh_{\bar{X}}$	t-Test t	sd	p	Difference	Effect Level
Student Relations	Soc. Sci.	376	4.32	.67	.034	1.175	494	.240		
	Basic	120	4.24	.59	.054					
Mastery	Soc. Sci.	376	4.50	.48	.025	-.380	494	.704		
	Basic	120	4.52	.48	.044					
Ability Approach	Soc. Sci.	376	3.63	1.02	.052	-.213	494	.831		
	Basic	120	3.62	.96	.087					
Work Avoidance	Soc. Sci.	376	2.26	.88	.045	-.739	494	.460		
	Basic	120	2.33	.86	.079					

*p< .05

Independent group t-test findings which were conducted to assess whether teachers' goal orientations differentiate according to their branches are provided in Table 5. The branches of teachers are grouped as social sciences (Turkish, Turkish Language, and Literature, Social Studies, History, Philosophy, Class Education, Religious Studies, English, German, Physical Education) and basic sciences (Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Mathematics, Primary School Mathematics, Science, Informatics Tech., Geography) and the significance of the difference between these two groups was examined. According to the test's findings, the goal orientations of the teachers participating in the research do not differentiate according to the branch.

Table 6. One-way variance analysis test results to determine whether teachers' goal orientations for teaching are differentiated according to their years of work experience

Goal Orientations	ANOVA Results											Post-hoc	Dif.
	Group	N	$\bar{X}$	sd	Var. Comp.	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	P	Effect V.		
Student Relations	1-5	70	4.22	0.64	Between groups	1.498	3	.499	1.159	.325			
	6-10	117	4.25	0.72	Within-group	212.014	492	.431					
	11-15	98	4.32	0.69	Total	13.512	95						
	15+	211	4.36	0.61									
	Total	496	4.31	0.66									
Mastery	1-5	70	4.47	0.44	Between groups	.493	3	.164	.686	.561			
	6-10	117	4.56	0.44	Within-group	117.739	492	.239					
	11-15	98	4.50	0.52	Total	118.232	495						
	15+	211	4.49	0.52									
	Total	496	4.51	0.49									
Ability Approach	1-5	70	3.53	1.07	Between groups	5.290	3	1.763	1.747	.156			
	6-10	117	3.52	0.98	Within-group	496.512	492	1.009					
	11-15	98	3.81	0.95	Total	501.802	495						
	15+	211	3.66	1.02									
	Total	496	3.64	1.01									
Work Avoidance	1-5	70	2.37	0.90	Between groups	3.492	3	1.164	1.517	.209			

6-10	117	2.31	0.81	Within-group	377.571	492	.767
11-15	98	2.39	0.89	Total	381.062	495	
15+	211	2.19	0.90				
Total	496	2.28	0.88				

*p< .05, Dif: Difference

Table 6 demonstrates the findings of one-way variance analysis to evaluate whether the goal orientations of the teachers for teaching vary due to their years of work experience. According to the results of the analysis, the professional seniority of teachers does not make a statistical difference in their goal orientation for teaching. Nevertheless, when the mean scores of the teachers' answers to the questions in the sub-dimensions are roughly measured, the student relations, mastery, and ability approach increase as the professional experience increases, whereas the mean score in the sub-dimension of work avoidance declines as the professional experience increases.

Table 7. One-way variance analysis test findings to assess whether teachers' goal orientations for teaching are differentiated according to their weekly course load

Goal Orientations					ANOVA Results						Post-hoc	Dif.
	Group	N	$\bar{X}$	sd	Var. Comp.	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	P	Effect V.		
Student Relations	6-15	69	4.34	0.69	Between groups	2.034	3	.678	1.577	.194			
	15-25	104	4.19	0.68	Within-group	211.479	492	.430					
	25-30	200	4.31	0.64	Total	213.512	495						
	30+	123	4.38	0.64									
	Total	496	4.31	0.66									
Mastery	6-15	69	4.55	0.51	Between groups	.773	3	.258	1.079	.358			
	15-25	104	4.46	0.51	Within-group	117.459	492	.239					
	25-30	200	4.48	0.49	Total	118.232	495						
	30+	123	4.56	0.45									
	Total	496	4.51	0.49									
Ability Approach	6-15	69	4.01	0.92	Between groups	15.892	3	5.297	5.364	.001	.18	Games-Howell	1>2
	15-25	104	3.60	0.94	Within-group	485.911	492	.988					1>3
	25-30	200	3.48	1.11	Total	501.802	495						
	30+	123	3.73	0.88									
	Total	496	3.64	1.01									
Work Avoidance	6-15	69	2.67	1.09	Between groups	14.169	3	4.723	6.333	.000	.19	Games-Howell	1>3
	15-25	104	2.29	0.80	Within-group	366.893	492	.746					1> 4
	25-30	200	2.25	0.81	Total	381.062	495						
	30+	123	2.11	0.85									
	Total	496	2.28	0.88									

*p< .05, Dif: Difference

The results of one-way analysis of variance to assess whether the teachers' goal orientation for teaching varies according to their weekly course loads are provided in Table 7. For student relations and mastery sub-dimensions, there was no statistically significant difference in the teachers' goal orientation. In the ability approach sub-dimension, teachers' goal orientations differ in a statistically significant way based on their weekly course load (p =.001). It was observed that this significant difference was observed between the teachers who attended the lessons for 6-15 hours a week and

those who attended the lessons for 15-25 and 25-30 hours, and it was in favor of the teachers who had lessons for 6-15 hours. In other words, teachers who had lessons for 6-15 hours tend to exhibit their ability approach more compared to those who had lessons for 15-25 and 25-30 hours. However, the weekly course load has a low effect on teachers' goal orientation for teaching (d =.18). There was also a significant difference in the goal orientation of teachers in the sub-dimension of work avoidance (p =.000). Although these numbers are considered as low rates as stated at the beginning, the observed difference has been observed. The observed difference is between the teachers who had lessons for 6-15 hours and teachers who had lessons for 25-30 hours and over 30 hours. According to this result, it can be said that teachers who had 6-15 hours of lessons tend to avoid work more than teachers who attend more hours of classes when faced with professional difficulties. From another point of view, since they tend to avoid work, they have fewer course hours.

4. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, and RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, where teachers' goal orientation for teaching was examined, the sub-dimensions of mastery and student relations have the highest mean score while the work avoidance has the lowest mean score. Such findings indicate that the participant teachers feel mastered when they enhance their field expertise and abilities, sustain their professional development, and their students provide them with fresh ideas regarding the topic they are teaching. Along with this, participant teachers feel more successful when they have good relationships with their students and take care of them. When teachers are appreciated in the eyes of the school principal or their colleagues regarding sample lesson plans, the high success of students, professional awards, etc., this makes them feel successful professionally. This also points out that participant teachers do not ignore the problems they face in their professional lives and when they try to solve them, they feel successful. The results observed in other studies in the literature support current results (Han, Yin & Wang, 2015, 2016; Retelsdorf & Gunther, 2011; Saban & Yıldızlı, 2017; Yıldızlı et al., 2016).

When the relationships between the sub-dimensions of the teachers' goal orientation for teaching were examined, there was a significant positive relationship between student relations, mastery, and ability approach. It can be said that these orientations support each other. Teachers with mastery goal orientation, for example, tend to build good relationships with students, support their students more in their learning experiences, and thereby contribute to their social-emotional growth (Butler, 2012). In other researchs on the goal orientation of teachers, a weak and positively significant correlation between ability approach and work avoidance was observed (Butler, 2007, 2012; Yıldızlı et al. 2016, Saban & Yıldızlı, 2017). Butler (2007) claimed that current condition is peculiar to teachers, unlike other studies conducted with students, and it is related to the ability approach, although there is no relation between the work avoidance and teachers' positive teacher orientations such as mastery and student relations. Yıldızlı et al. (2016) reported that the work avoidance sub-dimension does not vary with other variables and is independent of these factors.

When examining the effect of gender on the teachers' goal orientation for teaching, it was noticed that female teachers in mastery sub-dimension aimed to learn and developed professional skills more than their male peers. It would appear that female teachers tend to desire respect for their teaching efforts and more than their male colleagues. Saban and Yıldızlı (2017) did not find a significant difference according to gender in the study conducted with classroom teachers. In the study conducted with classroom teachers, Tivikeli, Gonida, and Kiosseoglou (2015) stated that female teachers showed a statistically higher mastery orientation than male teachers. Similarly, Han, Yin, and Wang (2015) claimed that female teachers have higher mastery goals and ability approach goal orientations than male teachers.

While comparing the goal orientation of the teachers taking part in the study according to their educational background, it is found that the teachers completed a postgraduate education have higher

mastery and ability approach orientations than those who have an only undergraduate degree. It can be said that the increase in education level positively contributes to teachers' goal orientation for teaching.

No difference was reported in teachers' goal orientation according to their branches and years of work experience. When the mean scores were analyzed, it was observed that the mean scores of the branches are very close to each other, and while for the mean score of the professional seniority, as the years of work experience increases, the mean scores in student relations, mastery and ability approach increases, and however, mean score decreases in work avoidance. Based on the results obtained, it can be said that the professional experience contributed positively to the goal orientation. The reason for the lack of difference is thought to be due to teachers' efforts to demonstrate their pedagogical competencies and to develop these competencies rather than the branch education they receive. Saban and Yıldızlı (2017) reported that there is a difference in ability approach favoring the beginner teachers who have (1-5) years of experience compared to the experienced (6-10, 11-15 years) teachers, and in students relations dimension, it is in favor of beginner teachers who have 1-5 years of experience compared to the experienced (6-10, 11-15 years) teachers and when we look at teachers who worked for 6-10, 11-15 years and highly experienced teachers (working 16 years and more), the difference is in favor of the highly experienced (16 years and more) teachers. In their research, Han, Yin, and Wang (2015) stated that there was a difference in favor of less experienced teachers in terms of ability approach and work avoidance when teachers with less than 5 years of experience and teachers working over 15 years compared.

When the effect of teachers' weekly course load on their goal orientation for teaching was examined, it was observed that the teachers who have 6-15 hours of lessons showed higher ability approach goal orientation than those who have lessons between 15-25 and 25-30 hours. Similarly, it was noted that those who have 6 -15 hours of lessons had higher goal orientation of work avoidance than the groups who have 25 hours or more. This situation can be interpreted as teachers who have work avoidance goal orientation prefer having fewer lessons. The reason why there is no difference in mastery and student relations goal orientation in terms of course load can be explained by the fact that teachers' pedagogical perspective is not related to the course load.

As a conclusion drawn from a holistic point of view, it can be proposed that the pedagogical views of teachers are the key factor influencing the goal orientation of teachers. The willingness of instructors to build strong relations with students, to improve and show teaching skills reinforce each other particularly. The inclination to work avoidance adversely influences the drive of teachers to teach. The postgraduate school is generally preferred by teachers who would like to develop their academic and professional qualifications. Teachers pursue their postgraduate degree are educated to improve their competence and would like to demonstrate the knowledge and skills learned. This tendency is a result of the pedagogic perception of teachers. Having an intense or too free course load affects their teaching enthusiasm. Relying upon it, to improve their professional competence, teachers should be encouraged. There should be support for postgraduate education for teachers. The course hours of teachers must not be too less or too intense, and the permissible limit (15-21 lesson hours) decided may be recommended to be applied. For the improvement of effective communication skills, in-service training should be offered to improve the communication of teachers with their students.

For future studies, a more thorough understanding can be gathered on the goal orientation of teachers by utilizing qualitative methods. Especially, the examination of the relationship between the ability approach and work avoidance orientations is thought to be meaningful to contribute to the literature. In the school context, teachers can emerge as decisive social agents in managing their students' orientations by creating a certain motivational climate (Senko, Hulleman & Harackiewicz, 2011). Thus, the effects of teachers' goal orientations on students' motivation can be especially investigated. The correlations between the teaching goal orientations and learning-teaching

understanding, epistemological belief, and orientations in educational philosophy can also be explored by creating several models.

Acknowledgement

The data used in this study was confirmed by the researchers that it belongs to the years before 2020.

5. REFERENCES

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84,* 261-271.

Butler, R. (2007). Teachers' achievement goal orientations and associations with teachers' help seeking: Examination of a novel approach to teacher motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(2), 241-252. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.99.2.241

Butler, R. (2012). Striving to connect: Extending an achievement goal approach to teacher motivation to include relational goals for teaching. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(3), 726-742.

Butler, R., & Shibaz, L. (2008). Achievement goals for teaching as predictors of students' perceptions of instructional practices and students' help seeking and cheating. *Learning and Instruction, 18*(5), 453-467.

Butler, R., & Shibaz, L. (2014). Striving to connect and striving to learn: Influences of relational and mastery goals for teaching on teacher behaviors and student interest and help seeking. *International Journal of Educational Research, 65,* 41-53.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2006). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. [Manual of data analysis for social sciences]. Ankara: Pegem Yayınları. [Ankara: Pegem Publishing].

Catalán, Á. A., Serrano, J. S., Lucas, J. M. A., Clemente, J. A. J., & García-González, L. (2018). An integrative framework to validate the Need-Supportive Teaching Style Scale (NSTSS) in secondary teachers through exploratory structural equation modeling. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 52,* 48-60.

Cho, Y. J., & Shim, S. S. (2013). Predicting teachers' achievement goals for teaching: The role of perceived school goal structure and teachers' sense of efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 32,* 12-21.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Dresel, M., Fasching, M. S., Steuer, G., Nitsche, S., & Dickhäuser, O. (2013). Relations between teachers' goal orientations, their instructional practices and student motivation. *Psychology, 4*(7), 572-584.

Dweck, C. S. (1992). The study of goals in psychology. *Psychological Science, 3*(3), 165-167.

Elliot, A. J. (2005). A conceptual history of the achievement goal construct. In A. J. Elliot, & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 52-73). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2×2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80,* 501-519.

Fasching, M. S., Dresel, M., Dickhäuser, O., & Nitsche, S. (2010). Goal orientations of teacher trainees: Longitudinal analysis of magnitude, change and relevance. *Journal for Educational Research Online, 2,* 9-33.

Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(4), 331-362.

George, S. V., & Richardson, P. W. (2019). Teachers' goal orientations as predictors of their self-reported classroom behaviours: An achievement goal theoretical perspective. *International Journal of Educational Research, 98,* 345-355.

Han, J., Yin, H., & Wang, W. (2015). Exploring the relationship between goal orientations for teaching of tertiary teachers and their teaching approaches in china. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *16*(4), 537-547.

Han, J., Yin, H., & Wang, W. (2016). The effect of tertiary teachers' goal orientations for teaching on their commitment: The mediating role of teacher engagement. *Educational Psychology*, *36*(3), 526-547.doi: 10.1080/01443410.2015.1044943

Jesus, S. N., & Lens, W. (2005). An integrated model for the study of teacher motivation. *Applied Psychology*, *54*(1), 119-134.

Karasar, N. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. [Scientific research method]. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım. [Ankara: Nobel Publishing House].

Kayri, M. (2009). Araştırmalarda gruplar arası farkın belirlenmesine yönelik çoklu karşılaştırma (post-hoc) teknikleri [The multiple comparison (post-hoc) techniques to determine the difference between groups in researches]. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* [Fırat University Journal of Social Science], *19*(1), 51-64.

Kucsera, J. V., Roberts, R., Walls, S., Walker, J., & Svinicki, M. (2011). Goal orientation towards teaching (GOTT) scale. *Teachers and Teaching*, *17*(5), 597-610.

Maehr, M. L., & Zusho, A. (2009). *Achievement goal theory: The past, present, and future*. New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor US.

Malmberg, L.-E. (2008). Student teachers' achievement goal orientations during teacher studies: Antecedents, correlates and outcomes. *Learning and Instruction, 18,* 438-452. doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2008.06.003.

Mansfield, C. F., & Beltman, S. (2014). Teacher motivation from a goal content perspective: Beginning teachers' goals for teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *65*, 54-64.

Mascret, N., Elliot, A. J., & Cury, F. (2017). The 3× 2 achievement goal questionnaire for teachers. *Educational Psychology*, *37*(3), 346-361.

Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychological Review*, *91*(3), 328-346. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.91.3.328.

Nitsche, S., Dickhäuser, O., Fasching, M. S., & Dresel, M. (2011). Rethinking teachers' goal orientations: Conceptual and methodological enhancements. *Learning and Instruction*, *21*(4), 574-586.

Pintrich, P. R. (2000). An achievement goal theory perspective on issues in motivation terminology, theory, and research. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *25*(1), 92-104.

Retelsdorf, J., & Gunther, C. (2011). Achievement goals for teaching and teachers' reference norms: Relations with instructional practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*, 1111-1119.

Richardson, P. W., & Watt, H. M. (2010). Current and future directions in teacher motivation research. In S. Karabenick & T. C. Urdan (Eds.*), The decade ahead: Applications and contexts of motivation and achievement* (pp. 139-173). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Saban, A., & Yıldızlı, H. (2017). Turkish primary school teachers' goal orientations for teaching. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *9*(2), 348-355.

Sawilowsky, S (2009). New effect size rules of thumb". *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods*, *8*(2), 467-474.

Schutz, P. A., Crowder, K. C., & White, V. E. (2001). The development of a goal to become a teacher. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *93*(2), 299-308.

Schieb, L. J., & Karabenick, S. A. (2011). Teacher motivation and professional development: a guide to resources. math and science partnership – motivation assessment program, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Schiefele, U. (2017). Classroom management and mastery-oriented instruction as mediators of the effects of teacher motivation on student motivation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 64,* 115-126.

Schiefele, U., & Schaffner, E. (2015). Teacher interests, mastery goals, and self-efficacy as predictors of instructional practices and student motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *42*, 159-171.

Senko, C., Hulleman, C. S., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2011). Achievement goal theory at the crossroads: Old controversies, current challenges, and new directions. *Educational Psychologist*, *46*(1), 26-47.

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

Tivikeli, A., Gonida, E. N., & Kiosseoglou, G. (2015). Achievement goals for teaching and teacher efficacy: Their association with instructional practices. *Scientific Annals-School of Psychology AUTh*, *11*, 148-174.

Urdan, T. C., & Maehr, M. L. (1995). Beyond a two-goal theory of motivation and achievement: A case for social goals. *Review of Educational Research*, *65*(3), 213-243.

Watt, H. M., & Richardson, P. W. (2007). Motivational factors influencing teaching as a career choice: Development and validation of the FIT-Choice scale. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *75*(3), 167-202.

Wolters, C. A., & Daugherty, S. G. (2007). Goal structures and teachers' sense of efficacy: Their relation and association to teaching experience and academic level. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *99*(1), 181-193. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.99.1.181

Yıldızlı, H., Saban, A., & Baştuğ, M. (2016). Öğretmeye yönelik hedef yönelimi ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması [Adaptation of goal orientations for teaching Scale into Turkish]. *Elementary Education Online*, *15*(4), 1254-1267