

A Study on the Motivation Factors Affecting the Teaching Profession as a Career Choice

Oktaý Cem Adiguzel and Ibrahim Karagol

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the motivation factors of teacher candidates in choosing the teaching profession. The study employed a survey model which was carried out with 543 teacher candidates. The data were collected through the “Factors Influencing Teaching Choice Scale” and were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. As a result of the study, it was concluded that the highest rated motivation factors of teacher candidates for teaching were "shape the future of children/adolescents”, “make a social contribution”, and “enhance social equity”. Teacher candidates were least affected by “job transferability”, “social influences”, and “fallback career”. Female teacher candidates attached more importance to social utility values, and they were more influenced by their environment to become a teacher than males. While the teacher candidates from the department of elementary education had the highest scores in the factors of “shape the future of children/adolescents”, “enhance social equity”, “make a social contribution”, “work with children/adolescents”, and “intrinsic career values”, the teacher candidates from the department of education science had the lowest scores in these areas.

Keywords: Motivation factors, teacher candidates, teaching career

Oktaý Cem Adiguzel, Ph.D., is a Professor in the Department of Educational Sciences, Anadolu University, Eskisehir-Turkey. He can be reached at ocadiguzel@anadolu.edu.tr

Ibrahim Karagol, Ph.D., is a Research Assistant in the Department of Educational Sciences, Ordu University, Ordu-Turkey. He can be reached at karagolibrahim@gmail.com

Teachers are one of the most significant factors in achieving the purpose of educational activities and increasing student performance. They play a significant role in shaping society and raising the qualified workforce that society needs. Teachers also have important roles in the transfer of cultural values to young generations, ensuring peace and tranquility in the society, and the development of the country.

The goal of a modern education system is to raise individuals with creative qualifications who are open to change and produce and use knowledge. The way to achieve this goal is to train effective qualified teachers. "A qualified teacher is one who has knowledge and skills in every field, can put it into practice and can pass it on to others." (Akgun, 2013). Within the scope of the general competencies for the teaching profession determined by the Turkish Ministry of Education, three characteristics that qualified and effective teachers should have are emphasized. These are "professional knowledge", "professional skills", and "attitudes and values". Professional knowledge covers pedagogical content knowledge, teachers' competencies of content knowledge, and knowledge on legislation about the teaching profession. Professional skills cover the planning of education and teaching, managing the teaching and learning process, creating learning environments, and assessment and evaluation. Attitudes and values cover national, moral, and universal values, personal and professional development, communication and cooperation, and the teacher's approach to students.

An effective teacher is defined as one who is tolerant, considerate, has good social interaction, understands students' emotional states, and has sensitive personality traits (Capel et al., 2005). Affective characteristics stand out in an effective teacher (Yilmaz et al., 2016; Fajet et al., 2005) and these characteristics comprise various concepts that include the individual's emotions, such as attitude, value, and motivation (Appova & Arbaugh, 2018; Batt, 2015;

Heystek & Terhoven, 2015; Oppong, 2014; Martin, 1989), and constitute an important part of teacher education. Teachers with a high affective commitment create a positive lesson atmosphere in the classroom as a role model for respectful and appropriate communication by encouraging cooperation between students, strengthening students' intrinsic motivation, and designing their lessons in line with the students' abilities (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009). They try to make students love the subjects by making the lessons more enjoyable and play an important role in students developing positive attitudes towards the lessons and adopting cultural and national values. In this context, affective characteristics have a significant place in the teaching profession that requires dedication, patience, and affection (UNESCO, 1992).

Motivation constitutes a crucial factor related to affective characteristics. Motivation, defined as an internal condition that guides and maintains behavior (Woolfolk, 2016) or a force that drives an individual towards a specific goal (Eren, 2000), is one of the most essential factors that shape human behavior, and is a basic concept that psychology frequently emphasizes and tries to explain. Therefore, many studies and theories have been developed on this subject. For the last 30 years, social cognitive theories have dominated this area and have been quite effective in explaining motivation concepts (Wentzel & Wigfield, 2009). Social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1977), achievement motivation theory (Atkinson, 1957), attribution theory (Weiner, 1985), self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2015), and expectancy-value theory (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000) are some of the critical motivation theories that shed light on the examination and understanding of these elements that motivate individuals.

When considered in terms of choosing the teaching profession, it is significant to determine the motivation factors of teacher candidates enrolled in education faculties to understand why they made the choice to become teachers and to explain these factors. Literature

shows that teaching profession choices and motivation factors may depend on a variety of factors (König & Rothland, 2012; Watt & Richardson, 2007). In the literature, the reasons for choosing the teaching profession are discussed in three broad categories. These are altruistic reasons (reasons for a desire to help society improve, a desire to help children succeed), intrinsic reasons (reasons including the specific features of the profession), and extrinsic reasons (status, long holidays, level of pay) (Kyriacou et al., 1999). However, in later studies, these three categories were found not to be sufficient, and the reasons for choosing teaching as a profession were discussed further within the scope of existing motivation theories (Erten, 2014). Watt and Richardson (2007) stated that these three categories do not adequately explain the factors in career choice due to shortcomings in the theoretical framework. The authors identified 12 motivation factors effective in choosing the teaching profession based on the expectancy-value theory and developed the “Factors Influencing Teaching Choice Scale” (FIT-Choice scale). The theoretical model guiding the development of FIT-Choice factors consists of social utility values (shape the future of children/adolescents, make a social contribution, enhance social equity, work with children/adolescents), personal utility values (job transferability, job security, time for family), and five additional motivations (ability, fallback career, intrinsic career value, social influences, prior teaching and learning experiences). Ability construct items explore the perceptions of the participants’ own teaching skills. Intrinsic career value construct items focus on the interests and wishes of the participants towards their teaching career. Fallback career construct items explore whether participants chose a teaching career for reasons relating to being unsure what career they wanted, or not being accepted into a university of choice. Job security construct items ask about choosing a teaching career on the basis of it providing a reliable income and being a secure job. Time for family construct items focus on whether participants

chose the profession because it allows more family time and vacations, and that teaching hours allow for family commitments. Job transferability construct items explore whether teaching is useful for overseas employment. Shape the future of children/adolescents construct items address whether participants chose teaching in order to influence and shape future generations. Enhance social equity construct items look at the extent to which participants want to benefit the socially disadvantaged. Make a social contribution construct items investigate the desire of participants to serve and make a valuable contribution to society. Work with children/adolescents items are concerned with how much participants would like a career working with young people. Prior teaching and learning experiences construct items are connected with the past experiences of the participants related to teaching. Social influences construct items focus on how much participants are affected by those around them in their decision to become a teacher. Watt and Richardson (2007) applied this scale to the students in three different universities in Australia and concluded that intrinsic value, perceived teaching ability, and social utility motivations were the most influential when choosing the teaching profession as a career.

One of the significant factors affecting the choice of the teaching profession is gender. Some studies conducted in this context (Cermik et al., 2010; Manuel & Hughes, 2006; Acat & Yenilmez, 2004) deduced that female students chose the teaching profession more consciously, they saw the teaching profession as an assurance, and they were more idealistic than male students in terms of profession preferences. Johnston et al. (1999), in their study in England, concluded that men were affected by external factors, and women by internal factors when choosing the teaching profession, and there was a significant difference between men and women in terms of salary and working with children. In other words, while men cared more about the salary factor, women attached more importance to working with children. Some other

studies have indicated that "wanting to work with children" (Sinclair, 2008; Kyriacou et al., 1999; Yong, 1995; Brown, 1992), "enjoying the subject" (Kyriacou et al., 1999), "contributing to society" (Brown, 1992), "helping students gain a sense of personal achievement and self-esteem" (Book & Freeman, 1986), "high chance of finding a job", and "income status" (Chivore, 1988) are among the most significant factors in choosing the teaching profession as a career. Knowing how motivated teacher candidates are and by which motivations they are driven into the teaching profession is important in terms of developing better policies for the programs. Furthermore, it can be said that the motivation factors that are influential in a teacher candidate's choice of a profession have a strong effect on their willingness to participate in the lessons and what kind of teacher they will be in the future (Sinclair et al., 2006). Many studies have focused on the factors that affect teacher candidates' profession preferences (Yildirim et al., 2019; Suryani et al., 2016; König & Rothland, 2012; Cermik et al., 2010; Yazici, 2009; Boz & Boz, 2008; Watt & Richardson, 2007; Johnston et al., 1999). However, there are a limited number of studies examining the reasons for the choice of profession based on different departments (Kilinc et al., 2012; Boz & Boz, 2008), and therefore, this is the aim of our study. The study is important in terms of determining the factors that are effective in the choice of the teaching profession as a career. The study shows whether there has been a change in the factors of choosing the profession over the years and allows comparison between departments. Moreover, it is thought that determining the factors affecting the choice, and what motivates female and male teacher candidates in profession choices can contribute to the development of better policies regarding the selection of teacher candidates and their education processes (Ekinici, 2017). Accordingly, the aim of this study is to answer the following questions:

1. What are the motivation factors for teacher candidates choosing the teaching profession?
2. Do the motivation levels of teacher candidates differ according to department and gender variables?
3. What is the correlation among motivation factors?

Methodology

Research Model

This study used a survey model to determine the relationship between the motivation factors of first-year teacher candidates for choosing the teaching profession.

Population and Sample

The population of the study consisted of first-year students studying at the education faculty of a large higher education institution located in the Eastern Marmara region of Turkey which had a total of 790 students. The aim was to reach the whole population, so the study did not employ a sampling method and, of 790 teacher candidates included in the population, 582 volunteered to participate in the study. When a preliminary examination was made on the answers given by the participants, 39 teacher candidates were excluded as there were more than 15% missing data in their answers. As a result, the analyses were carried out on the answers provided by 543 students. The distribution of the study group according to department and gender is shown in Table 1.

Table 1*The Distribution of the Study Group According to Department and Gender*

Department	N	%	Gender	N	%
Foreign Language Education (FLE)	179	33.0	Female	369	68.8
Elementary Education (EE)	123	22.7	Male	173	31.9
Special Education (SE)	72	13.3			
Mathematics and Science Education (MSE)	70	12.9			
Education Science (ES)	57	10.5			
Turkish and Social Sciences (TSS)	42	7.7			
Total	543	100.0		543	100.0

As can be seen in Table 1, 369 of the participants were women (68.8%) and 173 were men (31.9%), 179 of the participants were from the Department of Foreign Language Education (33.0%), 123 from the Department of Elementary Education (22.7%), 72 from the Department of Special Education (13.3%), 70 from the Department of Mathematics and Science Education (12.9%), 57 from the Department of Education Science (10.5%), and 42 from the Department of Turkish and Social Sciences Education (7.7%).

Instruments

The scale developed by Watt and Richardson (2007) consists of 56 items, 18 factors, and two subscales: perception and motivation. The motivation subscale consists of 12 factors: (job security, job transferability, time for family, work with children/adolescents, enhance social equity, shape the future of children/adolescents, intrinsic career value, make a social contribution, ability, prior teaching and learning experiences, fallback career, and social influences. The perception subscale consists of six factors (satisfaction with choice, social status, salary, expert career, high demand, and social dissuasion). Cronbach's alpha reliability of the motivation factors varies between .53 and .93 and between .61 and .89 for the perception factors. In this study, only the motivation subscale was used.

The scale was adapted into Turkish by Kilinc et al. (2012). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to certify the construct validity in the Turkish adaptation and yielded acceptable global fit indices: $\chi^2/df=7.302$, RMSEA=.066, CFI=.979, NFI=.976, NNFI/TLI=.974, SRMR=.062. In this study, the motivation subscale ($\chi^2=404.41$, N=512, p=0.00, $\chi^2/df= 2.47$, RMSEA=.054, GFI=.92, AGFI=.90, CFI=.95, NFI=.92, NNFI=.94, RFI=.91, IFI=.95, SRMR=.05, PGFI=.72, and PNFI=.80) had good fit indices and showed that the structure of the scale is acceptable (Buyukozturk et al., 2010). The items of the scale and Cronbach's alpha reliabilities in the current study are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Scale items and Cronbach's Alpha Reliabilities

Factors	Cronbach's Alpha
Motivation	
Ability	.84
Intrinsic career value	.87
Fallback career	.64
Job security	.83
Time for family	.78
Job transferability	.69
Shape the future of children/adolescents	.86
Enhance social equity	.83
Make a social contribution	.75
Work with children/adolescents	.95
Prior teaching and learning experiences	.75
Social influences	.84

As can be seen in Table 2, Cronbach's alpha reliability of the motivation factors ranges from .64 to .95 which indicates that all the factors of the scale are reliable.

Analysis of Data

The data were analyzed using a statistical analysis program and descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data. When the motivation scores of teacher candidates were examined according to gender and department independent variables, it was determined that they did not

show normal distribution. Since normal distribution could not be achieved after clearing the extreme values, and transformations were not preferred, analyses on the original data were performed with nonparametric tests. Accordingly, the analyses were performed using Mann-Whitney U tests for the gender variable and Kruskal Wallis tests for the department variable. The relationships between the factors of the motivation subscale were analyzed using the Spearman Correlation analysis.

Findings

Findings Regarding the Research Question:

What are the motivation factors for teacher candidates choosing the teaching profession?

Descriptive statistics of motivation factors in teaching choice are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Motivation Factors in Teaching Choice

Motivation	M	SD
Shape the future of children/adolescents	6.07	1.16
Make a social contribution	5.86	1.16
Enhance social equity	5.75	1.29
Prior teaching and learning experiences	5.09	1.48
Work with children/adolescents	5.05	1.79
Ability	4.97	1.29
Job security	4.95	1.53
Intrinsic career value	4.62	1.66
Time for family	4.33	1.59
Job transferability	4.27	1.62
Social influences	3.44	1.80
Fallback career	2.89	1.61

As can be seen in Table 3, teacher candidates attached more importance to the social dimensions of the profession, "shape the future of children/adolescents, "make a social contribution", "enhance social equity", "prior teaching and learning experiences", "work with

children/adolescents”, and the factors “job transferability”, “social influences”, “fallback career” affected teacher candidates the least.’

Findings Regarding the Research Question:

Do the motivation levels of teacher candidates differ according to gender and department variables?

The Mann-Whitney U test was used to examine the difference between motivation scores of teacher candidates according to the gender variable. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4.

Table 4*Mann Whitney U Test Results of Motivation Scores According to Gender Variable*

	Gender	N	Mean of Ranks	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Shape future of children/ adolescents	Female	369	286.58	105749.50	26352.50	.001
	Male	173	239.33	41403.50		
Make social contribution	Female	369	284.37	104934.00	27168.00	.005
	Male	173	244.04	42219.00		
Enhance social equity	Female	369	295.86	109172.00	22930.00	.000
	Male	173	219.54	37981.00		
Prior teaching and learning experiences	Female	369	273.59	100953.50	31148.50	.649
	Male	173	267.05	46199.50		
Work with children/ adolescents	Female	369	292.17	107810.50	24291.50	.000
	Male	173	227.41	39342.50		
Ability	Female	369	280.10	103358.00	28744.00	.061
	Male	173	253.15	43795.00		
Job security	Female	369	275.75	101724.50	30377.50	.363
	Male	173	262.59	45428.50		
Intrinsic career value	Female	369	292.98	108109.00	23993.00	.000
	Male	173	225.15	43795.00		
Time for family	Female	369	272.47	100541.00	31561.00	.833
	Male	173	269.43	46612.00		
Job transferability	Female	369	272.72	100632.50	31469.50	.791
	Male	173	268.90	46520.50		
Social influences	Female	369	282.12	104104.00	27998.00	.021
	Male	173	248.84	43049.00		
Fallback career	Female	369	262.75	96956.50	28691.50	.056
	Male	173	290.15	50196.50		

The motivation scores of the teacher candidates differ significantly according to the gender variable in the factors of “shape the future of children/adolescents” (U=26352.50, p<.05), “make a social contribution” (U=27168.00, p<.05), “enhance social equity” (U=22930.00, p<.05), “work with children/adolescents” (U=24291.50, p<.05), “intrinsic career value”

($U=23993.00$, $p<.05$), and “social influences” ($U=27998.00$, $p<.05$) in favor of females, as shown in Table 4. Effect sizes were calculated respectively as $d=.14$, $.12$, $.23$, $.19$, $.20$, $.10$ which is considered a small effect according to Cohen (1988). There is no significant difference according to the gender variable in the factors of “prior teaching and learning experiences” ($U=31148.50$, $p>.05$), “ability” ($U=28744.00$, $p>.05$), “job security” ($U=30377.50$, $p>.05$), “time for family” ($U=31561.00$, $p>.05$), “job transferability” ($U=31469.50$, $p>.05$), and “fallback career” ($U=96956.50$, $p>.05$).

The Kruskal Wallis test was used to examine the difference between the motivation scores of teacher candidates according to the department variable. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 5.

Table 5*Kruskal Wallis Test Results of Motivation Scores According to Department Variable*

Factors	Departments	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X ²	p	Significant Difference
Shape future of children/adolescent	1. Foreign Lang. E.	179	255.81	5	36.781	.000	1-2, 1-4, 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 2-6, 4-5
	2. Education Science	57	182.54				
	3. Special Education	72	283.87				
	4. Elementary Education	123	323.18				
	5. Math. & Science E.	70	270.88				
	6. Turkish & Social Sci.	42	294.04				
Make social contribution	1. Foreign Lang. E.	179	244.60	5	42.774	.000	1-2, 1-3, 1-4-, 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 2-6, 4-5
	2. Education Science	57	181.68				
	3. Special Education	72	298.85				
	4. Elementary Education	123	325.78				
	5. Math. & Science E.	70	280.83				
	6. Turkish & Social Sci.	42	293.11				
Enhance social equity	1. Foreign Lang. E.	179	251.47	5	46.742	.000	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 2-6
	2. Education Science	57	165.61				
	3. Special Education	72	298.50				
	4. Elementary Education	123	323.41				
	5. Math. & Science E.	70	282.34				
	6. Turkish & Social Sci.	42	290.64				

Table 5 (Continued)

Factors	Departments	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X ²	p	Significant Difference
Prior teaching & learning experiences	1. Foreign Lang. E.	179	287.61	5	20.484	.001	1-2, 1-3, 2-4, 2-5, 2-6, 3-4, 3-5, 3-6
	2. Education Science	57	220.14				
	3. Special Education	72	218.26				
	4. Elementary Education	123	283.75				
	5. Math. & Science E.	70	284.86				
	6. Turkish & Social Sci.	42	312.12				
Work with children/adolescents	1. Foreign Lang. E.	179	234.07	5	37.866	.000	1-3, 1-4, 1-6, 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 2-6, 4-5
	2. Education Science	57	212.69				
	3. Special Education	72	301.85				
	4. Elementary Education	123	325.93				
	5. Math. & Science E.	70	274.16				
	6. Turkish & Social Sci.	42	301.44				
Ability	1. Foreign Lang. E.	179	244.29	5	26.964	.000	1-3, 1-4, 1-6, 2-3, 2-4, 2-6, 4-5
	2. Education Science	57	218.25				
	3. Special Education	72	300.17				
	4. Elementary Education	123	317.01				
	5. Math. & Science E.	70	259.86				
	6. Turkish & Social Sci.	42	303.17				
Job security	1. Foreign Lang. E.	179	250.54	5	15.336	.009	1-4, 1-6, 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 2-6
	2. Education Science	57	227.35				
	3. Special Education	72	281.69				

Table 5 (Continued)

Factors	Departments	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X ²	p	Significant Difference
Intrinsic career value	4. Elementary Education	123	293.56				
	5. Math. & Science E.	70	285.79				
	6. Turkish & Social Sci.	42	321.30				
	1. Foreign Lang. E.	179	262.90	5	60.146	.000	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 2-6, 3-5, 4-5, 5-6
	2. Education Science	57	144.72				
	3. Special Education	72	305.58				
Time for family	4. Elementary Education	123	323.20				
	5. Math. & Science E.	70	246.99				
	6. Turkish & Social Sci.	42	317.71				
	1. Foreign Lang. E.	179	227.79	5	32.562	.000	1-2, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6, 2-3, 3-4, 3-5
	2. Education Science	57	298.89				
	3. Special Education	72	244.74				
Job transferability	4. Elementary Education	123	295.80				
	5. Math. & Science E.	70	331.29				
	6. Turkish & Social Sci.	42	302.13				
	1. Foreign Lang. E.	179	331.83	5	52.177	.000	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6, 2-3, 2-4
	2. Education Science	57	183.89				
	3. Special Education	72	271.06				
	4. Elementary Education	123	262.96				
	5. Math. & Science E.	70	226.98				
	6. Turkish & Social Sci.	42	239.69				

Table 5 (Continued)

Factors	Departments	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X ²	p	Significant Difference
Social influences	1. Foreign Lang. E.	179	243.89	5	22.236	.000	1-4, 1-5, 1-6, 2-4, 2-6, 3-4, 3-6
	2. Education Science	57	242.21				
	3. Special Education	72	255.97				
	4. Elementary Education	123	303.95				
	5. Math. & Science E.	70	288.16				
	6. Turkish & Social Sci.	42	339.19				
Fallback career	1. Foreign Lang. E.	179	252.53	5	14.067	.015	1-2, 1-5, 1-6, 2-4, 4-5, 4-6
	2. Education Science	57	310.44				
	3. Special Education	72	267.88				
	4. Elementary Education	123	253.00				
	5. Math. & Science E.	70	301.03				
	6. Turkish & Social Sci.	42	317.15				

As shown in Table 5, there is a statistically significant difference between motivation scores of teacher candidates according to the department variable in the factor of “shape the future of children/adolescents” [$X^2_{(5)}=36.781$, $p<.05$]. The effect size (eta-square) was calculated as $\eta^2=.06$ which is moderate according to Cohen's (1988) criterion. As a result of multiple comparisons made with the Mann-Whitney U test, this difference was found between FLE and ES in favor of FLE; between EE and FLE in favor of EE; between EE and MSE in favor of EE; and between ES and SE, EE, MSE, and TSS against ES.

A statistically significant difference was also found between the motivation scores of teacher candidates in the factor of “make a social contribution” [$X^2_{(5)}=42.774$, $p<.05$]. The effect

size (eta-square) was calculated as $\eta^2=.08$ which is moderate according to Cohen's (1988) criterion. The multiple comparisons made with the Mann-Whitney U test found this difference between FLE and ES in favor of FLE; between FLE and SE and EE against FLE; between ES and SE, EE, MSE, and TSS against ES; and between EE and MSE in favor of EE.

There is a statistically significant difference between the motivation scores of teacher candidates according to department in the factor of “enhance social equity” [$X^2_{(5)}=46.742$, $p<.05$]. The effect size (eta-square) was calculated as $\eta^2=.08$ which is moderate according to Cohen's (1988) criterion. As a result of multiple comparisons made with the Mann-Whitney U test, this difference was found between FLE and ES in favor of FLE; between FLE and SE and EE against FLE; and between ES and SE, EE, MSE, and TSS against ES.

A statistically significant difference was also seen between the motivation scores of teacher candidates according to the department variable in the factor of “prior teaching and learning experiences” [$X^2_{(5)}=20.484$, $p<.05$]. The effect size (eta-square) was calculated as $\eta^2=.03$ which is small according to Cohen's (1988) criterion. The Mann-Whitney U tests found this difference between FLE and ES and SE in favor of FLE; between ES and EE, MSE, and TSS against ES; and between SE and EE, MSE, and TSS against SE.

Another statistically significant difference between the motivation scores of teacher candidates according to their department was found in the factor of “work with children/adolescents” [$X^2_{(5)}=37.866$, $p<.05$]. The effect size (eta-square) was calculated as $\eta^2=.07$ which is moderate according to Cohen's (1988) criterion. As a result of multiple comparisons made with the Mann-Whitney U test, this difference was found between FLE and ES, EE, and TSS against FLE; between ES and SE, EE, MSE, and TSS against ES; and between EE and MSE in favor of EE.

The factor of “ability” was another where a statistically significant difference was identified between the motivation scores of teacher candidates according to department [$X^2_{(5)}=26.964, p<.05$]. The effect size (eta-square) was calculated as $\eta^2=.05$ which is small according to Cohen's (1988) criterion. The multiple comparisons made with the Mann-Whitney U test found this difference between FLE and SE, EE, and TSS against FLE; between ES and SE, EE, and TSS against ES; and between EE and MSE in favor of EE.

A further statistically significant difference between the motivation scores of teacher candidates according to the department variable was found in the factor of “job security” [$X^2_{(5)}=15.336, p<.05$]. The effect size (eta-square) was calculated as $\eta^2=.02$ which is small according to Cohen's (1988) criterion. As a result of multiple comparisons made with the Mann-Whitney U test, this difference was found between FLE and EE, and TSS against FLE; and between ES and SE, EE, MSE, and TSS against ES.

A statistically significant difference between the motivation scores of teacher candidates according to their department was identified in the factor of “intrinsic career value” [$X^2_{(5)}=60.146, p<.05$]. The effect size (eta-square) was calculated as $\eta^2=.11$ which is moderate according to Cohen's (1988) criterion. The Mann-Whitney U test multiple comparisons found this difference between FLE and ES in favor of FLE; between FLE and SE and EE against FLE; between ES and SE, EE, MSE and TSS against ES; and between MSE and SE, EE, and TSS against MSE.

For the factor of “time for family” another statistically significant difference between the motivation scores of teacher candidates was found according to the department variable [$X^2_{(5)}=32.562, p<.05$]. The effect size (eta-square) was calculated as $\eta^2=.06$ which is moderate according to Cohen's (1988) criterion. As a result of multiple comparisons made with the Mann-

Whitney U test, this difference was found between FLE and ES, EE, MSE, and TSS against FLE; and between SE and ES, EE, and MSE against SE.

A statistically significant difference was also identified between the motivation scores of teacher candidates according to their department in the factor of “job transferability” [$X^2_{(5)}=52.177$, $p<.05$]. The effect size (eta-square) was calculated as $\eta^2=.09$ which is moderate according to Cohen's (1988) criterion. Multiple comparisons made with the Mann-Whitney U test found this difference between FLE and ES, SE, EE, MSE, and TSS in favor of FLE; and between ES and SE, and EE against ES.

A further statistically significant difference between the motivation scores of teacher candidates and their department was in the factor of “social influences” [$X^2_{(5)}=22.236$, $p<.05$]. The effect size (eta-square) was calculated as $\eta^2=.04$ which is small according to Cohen's (1988) criterion. As a result of multiple comparisons made with the Mann-Whitney U test, this difference was found between FLE and EE, MSE, and TSS against FLE; between ES and EE, and TSS against ES; and between SE and EE, and TSS against SE.

The final statistically significant difference identified between the motivation scores of teacher candidates according to the department variable was in the factor of “fallback career” [$X^2_{(5)}=14.067$, $p<.05$]. The effect size (eta-square) was calculated as $\eta^2=.02$ which is small according to Cohen's (1988) criterion. The multiple comparisons from the Mann-Whitney U test found this difference between FLE and ES, MSE, and TSS against FLE; and between EE and ES, MSE, and TSS against EE.

Findings Regarding the Research Question:

What is the correlation among motivation factors?

The Spearman correlation test was used to analyze the correlation among motivation factors. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 6.

Table 6

Correlations Among Motivation Factors

Factors	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.
1. Ability	-											
2. Intrinsic career value	.55*	-										
3. Fallback career	-	-	-									
4. Job security	.32*	.56*		-								
5. Time for family	.34*	.34*	-.03		-							
6. Job transferability	.16*	.01	.21*	.54*	-							
7. Shape the future of children/adolescents	.23*	.07	.02	.30*	.14*	-						
8. Enhance social equity	.47*	.46*	-.28*	.31*	.03	.16*	-					
9. Make a social contribution	.47*	.46*	-.30*	.29*	.03	.15*	.37*	-				
10. Work with children/adolescents	.51*	.51*	-.22*	.39*	.08*	.12*	.66*	.66*	-			
11. Prior teaching & learning experiences	.50*	.67*	-.39*	.37*	.10	.04	.59*	.56*	.54*	-		
12. Social influences	.45*	.37*	-.20*	.27*	.05	.17*	.37*	.36*	.45*	.31*	-	
	.37*	.38*	-.01	.40*	.22*	.14*	.26*	.25*	.31*	.40*	.21*	-

*p<.01

As can be seen in Table 6, there is a positive moderate correlation between “make a social contribution” and “enhance social equity” ($r=.66$), “make a social contribution” and “shape the future of children/adolescents” ($r=.66$), “shape the future of children/adolescents” and “intrinsic career value” ($r=.55$). There is a negative moderate correlation between “fallback career” and “ability” ($r=-.32$), “fallback career” and “intrinsic career value” ($r=-.56$), fallback career” and “enhance social equity” ($r=-.30$), “fallback career” and “work with children/adolescents” ($r=-.39$).

There is a positive weak correlation between “time for family” and “ability” ($r=.16$), “make a social contribution” and “job transferability” ($r=.12$), “social influences” and “job transferability” ($r=.14$).

There is no significant correlation between “time for family” and “intrinsic career value” ($r=.01$), “social influences” and “fallback career” ($r=-.01$), “job transferability” and “fallback career” ($r=.02$), “shape the future of children/adolescents” and “time for family” ($r=.03$), “work with children/adolescents” and “job transferability” ($r=.04$), “prior teaching” and “learning experiences” and “time for family” ($r=.05$).

Discussion, Conclusions, and Suggestions

In this study, the motivation factors of teacher candidates for choosing the teaching profession were examined. Within the scope of the first research question of the study, it was observed that the highest rated motivation factors were "shape the future of children/adolescents, “make a social contribution”, and “enhance social equity”. Teacher candidates were least affected by “job transferability”, “social influences”, and “fallback career”. In other words, it can be said that teacher candidates attach more importance to the social utility values and they are little influenced by their environment when choosing the teaching profession. It has been reported in many studies that while altruistic reasons, such as “contributing to society”, “working with children” (Krecic & Grmek, 2005; Saban, 2003; Johnston et al., 1999), “shaping the future of children/adolescents”, and “enhancing social equity” are the most influential factors; “job transferability”, “social influences”, and “fallback career” are the least influential factors of choosing the teaching profession (Akpochafo, 2020; Salifu et al., 2017; Jukovic et al., 2012; Kilinc et al., 2012; Lin et al., 2012; Watt & Richardson, 2007; Richardson & Watt, 2006). In this context, the findings of this study support those found in the literature.

In our Turkish sample, social utility values were found to be the most important factors for choosing teaching as a career. Social utility values may arise from the collectivist culture of Turkish society in which instead of “I”, “we” is important, and therefore belonging to a group is of significant value (Eren, 2019). In contrast to the Australian (Watt & Richardson, 2007; Richardson & Watt, 2006) and Korean context (Lee & Kim, 2018), intrinsic value motivations were not among the most prominent factors in our study. In those contexts, teaching may be highly regarded as a valuable profession, in contrast to economically developing countries in which issues such as low teacher salaries, insufficiency of personal rights, negative statements of politicians towards teaching, inability to achieve success in education, and a lack of merit-based teacher recruitment are less easy to be taken for granted (Bozbayındır, 2019; Ozdemir & Orhan, 2019; Cum & Dogan, 2016). Despite these problems that the teaching profession faces (Moss, 2020; Layton, 2015), it is encouraging that the students in Turkey choose teaching for altruistic reasons and want to help contribute to society by being a part of young peoples’ growth and development.

Within the scope of the second research question, the motivation factors of teacher candidates for choosing the teaching profession were examined in terms of gender and department variables. The results showed that there were statistically significant differences in the motivation factors of “shape the future of children/adolescents”, “make a social contribution”, “enhance social equity”, “work with children/adolescents”, “intrinsic career value”, and “social influences” in favor of females. Other studies reached similar results (Cermik et al., 20010; Saban, 2003). It was concluded by Saban (2003), that “shape the future of children/adolescents”, “make a social contribution”, “work with children/adolescents”, “intrinsic career value”, and “social influences” are more effective in a female teacher candidate’s choice

of the teaching profession; and thus, intrinsic and altruistic reasons for becoming teachers motivate women more than men. Accordingly, it can be stated that female teacher candidates attach more importance to the social utility values and they are more influenced by their environment about being a teacher than males. Considering that the teaching profession is seen as a female profession in society (Dogan & Coban, 2009), it attracts females more than males (Erten, 2014) and women dominate the teaching profession (Barshay, 2015), the motivation level of female teacher candidates for choosing the teaching profession is higher than males. It is important to note that, although significant, these differences have small effect sizes ($d=.12$ to $.23$).

There are significant differences in all motivation factors of teacher candidates for choosing the teaching profession according to the department variable. The differences have moderate effect sizes ($\eta^2=.06$ to $.11$) in the factors of “shape the future of children/adolescents”, “make a social contribution”, “enhance social equity”, “work with children/adolescents”, “intrinsic career value”, “time for family”, and “job transferability”. It was observed that while the teacher candidates from the department of elementary education had the highest scores, the teacher candidates from the department of education science had the lowest scores in the factors of “shape the future of children/adolescents”, “make a social contribution”, “enhance social equity”, “work with children/adolescents”, and “intrinsic career value”. Elementary education teachers have an important place in the education life of the students. Since children see their teachers as role models from an early age, they tend to behave like them. Teachers' attitudes and behaviors affect students' attitudes towards school, teachers, and lessons, and leave a great impression on their present and future lives. Considering the importance of elementary teachers for the students, it can be said that the strongest motivation factors of the teacher candidates from

the department of elementary education show that they come to the profession with high motivation and passion.

It was observed that while the teacher candidates from the department of foreign language education had the highest scores, the teacher candidates from the department of education science had the lowest scores in the factor of “job transferability”. Students from the department of foreign language education may have the opportunity to give private lessons, translate, go abroad, and work in different fields besides teaching. At this point, they may have more opportunities to work in alternative language-related jobs compared to the students who do not know a second language. Therefore, it can be said that the “job transferability” factor in their choice of the teaching profession is high and they come to the teaching profession with high motivation in terms of “job transferability”. Although there are significant differences in the factors of “prior teaching and learning experiences”, “ability”, “job security”, “social influences”, and “fallback career” of teacher candidates for choosing the teaching profession according to the department variable, these differences had small effect sizes ($\eta^2=.02$ to $.05$).

Within the scope of the third research question, the correlations among motivation factors were examined. Among the 66 possible correlations between motivation factors, 56 of them were found to be statistically significant. There was a positive moderate correlation between “make a social contribution” and “enhance social equity” ($r=.66$), “make a social contribution” and “shape the future of children/adolescents” ($r=.66$), and “shape the future of children/adolescents” and “intrinsic career value” ($r=.55$). There was a positive weak correlation between “time for family” and “ability” ($r=.16$), “make a social contribution” and “job transferability” ($r=.12$), and “social influences” and “job transferability” ($r=.14$). Other studies reached similar results

(Glutsch & König, 2019; Akar, 2012; Kilinc et al., 2012; König & Rothland, 2012; Lin et al., 2012; Jugovic et al., 2012; Watt & Richardson, 2007).

It is important if a teacher candidate's motivations for choosing teaching affect the amount of motivation for learning during their education (Butler, 2017). Therefore, to increase the motivation of teacher candidates, the importance of the teaching profession for society can be emphasized, and teacher candidates can be provided with motivational experiences about teaching in teacher education programs.

This study was carried out using a quantitative method. Studies on this subject can be supported by different variables and qualitative studies, and more detailed results can be obtained for motivation factors. Similar studies can be carried out on different universities and the results of the studies can be compared. In the literature, there are many studies on the factors that affect the choice of teaching as a profession. Hence, the effects of different variables that affect this can be examined by combining the results of different studies on this subject with a meta-analysis study.

References

- Acat, M. B., & Yenilmez, K. (2004). Egitim fakultesi ogrencilerinin ogretmenlik meslegine iliskin motivasyon düzeyleri. *Manas Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(12), 125-139.
- Akar, E. O. (2012). Motivations of Turkish pre-service teachers to choose teaching as a career. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(10), 67-84.
- Akgün, F. (2013). Preservice teachers' web pedagogical content knowledge and relationship between teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy. *Trakya University Journal of Education*, 3(1), 48-58.
- Akpochafo, G. O. (2020). Factors influencing undergraduates' choice of teaching as a career (fit-choice) in Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(1), 121-133.
- Appova, A., & Arbaugh, F. (2018). Teachers' motivation to learn: Implications for supporting professional growth. *Professional development in education*, 44(1), 5-21.
- Atkinson, J. W. (1957). Motivational determinants of risk-taking behavior. *Psychological Review*, 64(61), 359-372.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Barshay, J. (2015). Could it be that the teaching profession isn't pink enough? In the Hechinger Report. Retrieved from <https://hechingerreport.org/teaching-profession-isnt-pink-enough/>.
- Batt, A. (2015). Teaching and evaluating the affective domain in Paramedic education. *Canadian Paramedicine*, 31(1), 1-5.
- Book, C. L., & Freeman, D. J. (1986). Differences in entry characteristics of elementary and secondary teacher candidates. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(2), 47-51.

- Boz, Y., & Boz, N. (2008). Prospective chemistry and mathematics teachers' reasons for choosing teaching as a profession. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 16(1), 137-144.
- Bozbayındır, F. (2019). Investigation of teachers' views in the basis of the factors affecting the status of teaching profession. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 18(72), 2076-2104.
- Brown, M. M. (1992). Caribbean first-year teachers' reasons for choosing teaching as a career. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 18(2), 185-195.
- Butler, R. (2017). Why choose teaching, and does it matter? H. M. G. Watt, P. W. Richardson, and K. Smith (Eds.), In *Global Perspectives on Teacher Motivation* (pp. 377–388). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Buyukozturk, S., Sekercioglu, G., & Cokluk, Ö. (2010). *Sosyal bilimler icin cok degiskenli istatistik: SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Capel, S., Leask, M., & Tourner, T. (2005). *Learning to teach in the secondary school: A companion to school experience*. London: Routledge.
- Chivore, B. S. R. (1988). A review of factors that determine the attractiveness of teaching profession in Zimbabwe. *International Review of Education*, 34(1), 59–77.
- Cermik, H., Dogan, B., & Sahin, A. (2010). Prospective elementary classroom teachers' motives for selecting teaching profession. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education*, 28(2), 201-212.
- Cum, S., & Dogan, N. (2016). Determining the importance order of factors which are increasing the motivation level of teachers in their professional life. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 24(1), 119-132.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2015). Self-determination theory. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 486-491.

- Dogan, T., & Coban, A. E. (2009). The investigation of the relations between students' attitude toward teaching profession and anxiety level in faculty of education. *Education and Science, 34*(153), 157-168.
- Ekinci, N. (2017). Pre-service teachers' motivational factors affecting their teaching profession and field choices. *Elementary Education Online, 16*(2), 394-405.
- Eren, S. (2019). Cultural problems of Turkey, by Ekrem Akrugul. *Corvinus Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 10*(2), 201-206.
- Erten, İ. H. (2014). Understanding the reasons behind choosing to teach English as a foreign language. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 8*(1), 30-44.
- Fajet, W., Bello, M., Ahwee, L. S., Mesler, J. L., & Shaver, A. N. (2005). Pre-service teachers' perceptions in beginning education classes. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 717-727.
- Glutsch, N., & König, J. (2019) Pre-service teachers' motivations for choosing teaching as a career: does subject interest matter? *Journal of Education for Teaching, 45*(5), 494-510.
- Heystek, J., & Terhoven, R. (2015). Motivation as critical factor for teacher development in contextually challenging underperforming schools in South Africa. *Professional development in education, 41*(4), 624-639.
- Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of educational research, 79*(1), 491-525.
- Johnston, J., McKeown, E., & McEwen, A. (1999). Choosing primary teaching as a career: The perspectives of males and females in training. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 25*(1), 55-64.

- Jugovic, I., Marusic, I., Ivanec, T. P., & Vidovic, V. V. (2012). Motivation and personality of preservice teachers in Croatia. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(3), 271-287.
- Kilinc, A., Watt, H. M., & Richardson, P. W. (2012). Factors influencing teaching choice in Turkey. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(3), 199-226.
- König, J., & Rothland, M. (2012). Motivations for choosing teaching as a career: Effects on general pedagogical knowledge during initial teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(3), 289-315.
- Krecic, M. J., & Grmek, M. I. (2005). The reasons students choose teaching professions. *Educational Studies, 31*(3), 265-274.
- Kyriacou, C., Hultgren, A., & Stephens, P. (1999). Student teachers' motivation to become a secondary school teacher in England and Norway. *Teacher Development, 3*(3), 373-381.
- Layton, L. (2015). Chris Christie to teachers union: You deserve a punch in the face. The Washington Post. Retrieved from www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/chris-christie-to-teachers-union-you-deserve-a-punch-in-the-face/2015/08/03/86358c2c-39de-11e5-8e98-115a3cf7d7ae_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.59063c931dbb.
- Lee, B., & Kim, H. (2018). What factors affect pre-service teachers in choosing teaching science as career? Teaching motivations of pre-service science teachers in Korea. *Journal of The Korean Association for Science Education, 38*(2), 123-133.
- Lin, E., Shi, Q., Wang, J., Zhang, S., & Hui, L. (2012). Initial motivations for teaching: comparison between preservice teachers in the United States and China. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(3), 227-248.
- Manuel, J., & Hughes, J. (2006). It has always been my dream: Exploring pre-service teachers' motivations for choosing to teach. *Teacher Development, 10*(1), 5-24.

- Martin, B. L. (1989). A checklist for designing instruction in the affective domain. *Educational Technology, 29*, 7-15.
- Moss, J. D. (2020). "I was told to find what broke my heart and fix it:" College students explain why they want to become teachers. *Cogent Education, 7*(1), 1734284.
- Opong, C. A. (2014). Cognitive and affective characteristics of history students of the university of cape coast. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publication, 4*(10), 1-7.
- Ozdemir, T. Y., & Orhan, M. (2019). The opinions of the teachers on "the image of the teaching profession. *Trakya Journal of Education, 9*(4), 824-846.
- Richardson, P. W., & Watt, H. M. G. (2006). Who chooses teaching and why? Profiling characteristics and motivations across three Australian universities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(1), 27-56.
- Salifu, I., Alagbela, A. A., & Ofori, C.G. (2017). Factors influencing teaching as a career choice (FIT-Choice) in Ghana. *Teaching Education, 29*(2), 111-134.
- Sinclair, C. (2008). Initial and changing student teacher motivation and commitment to teaching. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(2), 79-104.
- Sinclair, C., Dowson, M., & McInerney, D. M. (2006). Motivations to teach: Psychometric perspectives across the first semester of teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 108*(6), 1132-1154.
- Suryani, A., Watt, H. M., & Richardson, P. W. (2016). Students' motivations to become teachers: FIT-Choice findings from Indonesia. *International Journal of Quantitative Research in Education, 3*(3), 179-203.
- Saban, A. (2003). A Turkish profile of prospective elementary school teachers and their views of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 829-846.

- UNESCO (1992). *Education for affective development: A guidebook on programmes and practices*. Bangkok, Thailand: UNESCO Principal Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific.
- 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.
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review, 92*, 548–573.
- Wentzel, R. K., & Wigfield, A. (2009). Introduction. In K. R. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (p. 1-9). New York: Routledge.
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy–value theory of achievement motivation. *Contemporary educational psychology, 25*(1), 68-81.
- Woolfolk, A. E. (2016). *Educational psychology*. Boston: Pearson.
- Yazici, H. (2009). Teaching profession sources of motivation and basic attitudes: A theoretical overview. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 17*(1), 33-46.
- Yildirim, K., Alpaslan, M. M., & Ulubey, Ö. (2019). Exploring teaching motivation of preservice teachers studying at pedagogic formation program. *Abant Izzet Baysal Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi, 19*(1), 428-439.
- Yilmaz, M., Ozdemir, B. G., & Aklar, S. (2016). The standards for becoming a teacher. *The Journal of Limitless Education and Research, 1*(1), 65-79.