



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Profiling Pre-service Teachers' Reasons of Teaching In Turkey

Zehra Nur Ersozlu

Curriculum and Instruction, Gaziosmanpasa University, Turkey.

Manuscript Info**Abstract****Manuscript History:**

Received: 12 August 2013

Final Accepted: 25 August 2013

Published Online: September 2013

Key words:

Pre-service Teachers
Characteristics,
Teaching Motivations,
Teacher Training Type,
Individual reasons for Teaching.

This study examines four factors that predict the level of teaching motivation for prospective teachers (PTs): program types, gender, age, and personal reasons for choosing teaching as a career. The discriminant analysis was used to test whether statistically significant differences exist between PTs' teaching motivation level and the four predicting factors of teaching motivation. The result of this study suggests that PTs with a low level of teaching motivation can be reliably distinguished from PTs with a high level of teaching motivation by the type of program, the gender, age and grouped personal reasons for choosing teaching as career.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2013.. All rights reserved.

Introduction

In recent years, teaching motivation has received much attention and intensive research has been conducted on examining the reasons why both PTs and in-service teachers choose teaching as a career (Papanastasiou & Papanastasiou 1997; Kyriacou & Kobori, 1998; Kyriacou, Hultgren, & Stephens, 1999; Saban, 2003; Jarvis & Woodrow, 2005; Watt & Richardson, 2008, Pop & Turner, 2009; Kızıltepe, 2008; Rots & Aelterman, 2008a; Kitching, Morgan & O'Leary, 2009; Thomson, Turner & Nietfeld, 2011). Even though, many researchers examined the reasons for choosing teaching as a career, few studies were conducted to examine the relationship between teacher training program types and teaching motivation level (Rots et al., 2007; Rots & Aelterman, 2008b). Thus the purpose of this study is to examine the predicting factors as program types, gender, age, and personal reasons that may distinguish PTs with high level of teaching motivation from the low level of teaching motivation. To have a better understanding of why this research examined the predicting factor or program types that distinguish the PTs motivation levels in the Turkish teachers sample, the following section will give a snapshot of the teacher education system in Turkey. Then, in this context, related literature on PTs' reasons for choosing teaching as a profession and teaching motivation will be discussed.

Teacher Education System in Turkey

During the 1800s there were various teacher-training programs in Turkey. In 1848, only one institution "Darulmuallimin-i Ruşdi" was responsible for educating and training teachers but the effort of those institutions were not enough to meet the need for teachers in every school level in Turkey. The limitations of one teacher training institution created the development of various institutions that began to train and educate prospective teachers-most of whom were soldiers (Akyuz, 1997). Near the 1900s a new era for training and educating teachers began. In those years new legislations combined all teacher-training programs into one sect at the universities. Four-year Faculty of Education (FE) programs were responsible for training specialized teachers and Higher Schools Pre-Licentiate (HSPL) program (two years non-university higher education) was responsible for training elementary school teachers (YOK, 2007). HSPL trained elementary school teachers until 1989 and in 1992 new legislation integrated this program into four-year FE programs (YOK, 2007).

Many on-going revisions and refinements have been made to the teacher training system in Turkey at the university level since 1992. Currently in Turkey FE is the institution primarily responsible for teacher training programs. Since the teacher training programs in FE cannot meet the demand for teachers, the Ministry of National Education allows

Faculty of Art and Science (FAS) graduates to obtain teacher certificates if they attend a postgraduate pedagogical formation program. In these programs the teacher candidates receive several education courses within a limited time (YOK, 2007). The comparison of these two programs will highlight both faculties' PTs profile as they study in their undergraduate degrees. FAS students took pure science courses while FE students took mainly pedagogical-didactical courses in relation to specific subject areas. In addition, the aim of each program differs. FE aims to train and educate elementary to high school level PTs while FAS aims to train and educate scientists. If FAS graduates decide to be teachers, they are expected to complete the required pedagogical formation courses to be a teacher within one and a half years.

Revisions on current legislations were made in 2007, 2009 and 2010 on but still only two institutions are currently responsible for educating and training teachers: the Faculty of Education and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In this study participants were selected from both faculties.

In the Turkish Educational System, there are two university entrance policy requirements. Prospective students must first take a university entrance examination. Second, based on their scores on this examination, students are given a list of universities that meet their minimum score requirements. They then rank their choices of universities and are accepted to a university of their choice. Last, students need to meet the minimum score requirements in order to attend the department in which they would like to pursue their education.

Motivation of Teaching or Reasons for Teaching

The current demand for teaching as a profession is typically declining in world countries (Preston, 2000; Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; Lokan, Ford, & Greenwood, 1996). This decrease requires examination for possible causes and leads to the search for possible solutions in order to increase the demand for teaching (OECD, 2005). Due to difficulties confronted by teachers and current decrease in demand for teaching as a profession, (OECD) Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2005) reported some recommendations for subject oriented policy revisions and refinements in teaching profession. This study included 25 countries (U.K, Australia, USA and many Asian and European countries' around the world. The report indicated the increasing difficulties in the ageing teacher workforce and also in raising the interest in teaching (OECD, 2005). There are many possible reasons for these increasing difficulties some of which are; the value that society

attached to teaching as a profession, and income (Ramsay, 2000). Kyriacou and Kunc, (2006) documented in their studies in U.K. that 40% of the teachers quit their teaching jobs and move into different a profession in the first five years of their teaching.

Another important focus of the OECD (2005) report was teacher quality. According to the report teacher quality has considerable influence on students' learning. This issue was emphasized in the report as: "The third broad conclusion from the research, which is somewhat more contentious, concerns the indicators or correlates of teacher quality. Most of the research has examined the relationship between measures of student performance, most commonly standardised test scores, and readily measurable teacher characteristics such as qualifications, teaching experience, and indicators of academic ability or subject-matter knowledge. Such research generally indicates that there is a positive relationship between these measured teacher characteristics and student performance, but perhaps to a lesser extent than may have been expected".

This statement indicates that attitudes towards teaching and teaching motivation have a great impact on the outcome of learning. As a result, many researchers have examined the effects of cultural and individual difference measures that may influence the teaching motivation of individuals.

Teacher quality is believed to be influenced by the teachers' motivation level as they make the decision to go into teaching as a career. Previous studies indicated that many different motivations exist among individuals who chose teaching as a career. These studies indicated that teachers are more likely motivated by three factors which are; Intrinsic, extrinsic and altruistic (Chuene, Lubben & Newson 1999, Kyriacou, Hultgren, & Stephens, 1999; Papanastasiou & Papanastasiou 1998; Saban 2003; Yong 1995; Zounhia et al., 2006). The conducted studies on these factors typically focused on possible determinants of individuals' decision on teaching as a career, their values and beliefs about teaching (Watt & Richardson, 2008; Saban, 2003; Papanastasiou & Papanastasiou 1997; Kyriacou, Hultgren, & Stephens, 1999; Jarvis & Woodrow, 2005, Juklová, 2011; Özgan, 2011). In addition to these factors, some studies brought and examined other factors. For instance, Thomson, Turner and Nietfeld (2011) examined intrinsic value, job benefits, meaningful relationships, altruistic views, and ability and opportunities factors. In addition, Brookhart and Freeman (1992) examined altruistic purposes, service purposes and intrinsic purposes factors. Covington and Mueller (2001), proposed a model that integrated altruistic and intrinsic factors. The teaching

motivation research focused on student teachers' reasons for teaching and reasons for choosing a career for teachers and student teachers (Papanastasiou & Papanastasiou 1997; Kyriacou, Hultgren, & Stephens, 1999; Kyriacou & Coulthart, 2000; Jarvis & Woodrow, 2005; Watt & Richardson, 2008; Saban, 2003; Yong, 1995; Richardson and Watt, 2006; Zounhia et al., 2006; Roness, 2011). In addition to this, some research assessed influence of the teaching motivation and commitment of PTs when they are at the beginning of teacher education programs or practicum experiences (Sinclair, 2008) and the others (Rots et al., 2007; Rots & Aelterman, 2008b, Rots, Aelterman, 2009) examined the teacher graduation types factor influence on teaching motivation and commitment. Furthermore, the research investigated gender effect on teaching motivation; they reported female PTs have higher teaching motivation than male PTs (Sinclair, 2008; Manuel & Hughes, 2006; Richardson & Watt, 2006; Gao & Trent, 2009). Manuel and Hughes (2006) stated younger PTs are more likely to be motivated than older PTs.

Although much research examines the factors that will likely affect teacher's motivation level, few studies have been conducted on examining relations between PTs' teaching motivation level and teacher training programs that obtain their teaching certificates (Rots & Aelterman, 2008b). Thus, there is a need for examining the influence of the measures - teacher training program types and individual's personal reasons and motivations for becoming a teacher- on PTs' teaching motivation level. These examinations are also important for designing teacher education programs that will more likely increase PTs' teaching motivation level. As a result, the purpose of this study is to examine whether a difference exists between PTs' teaching motivation level based on the previously stated three factors. Identifying two profiles of PTs' with low teaching motivations (LTM) and high teaching motivations (HTM) may help us to understand the differences in teacher motivations and may contribute greatly to the body of knowledge in this field.

Research Questions

In this study, the quantitative method approach was used in two-phases. In the first phase, discriminant analysis was used to test whether the types of PT graduates with low and high teaching motivations is clearly distinguished from each other. The factors that predict the PTs' teaching motivation levels is also investigated in this phase. During the second phase the grouped personal views about choosing teaching as a profession were collected through participants' responses to a particular question, i.e.

What was your reason to prefer the teaching as a profession? This question provided us with a deeper understanding of PT's reported motivations for teaching and personal reasons to prefer teaching as a profession. Then, the following three research questions were addressed:

- (1) Can the PTs from different types of teacher education programs with high or low teaching motivation be clearly distinguished from each other?
- (2) What are the factors that predict PTs' motivation levels?
- (3) How much of original grouped cases correctly classified with RTS?

Methods

Participants

322 student teachers from both FE and FAS programs participated in this study from a public university in Turkey. Approximately 39.9% of the students were male, 60.1% were female. 224 (69.3%) of student teachers were from FE, 99 (30.7%) of student teachers were from FAS. We used descriptive discriminant analysis to assess whether or not a set of variables discriminates between two groups (low and high teaching motivations) in this research. Demographic information (Gender, Age, Grade and Type of Faculty) of each PTs were obtained through the questions in initial parts of the scale. The goals and expected impacts of this study were clarified to all participants. Due to the absence of an Ethics Committee Process, an Ethical agreement wasn't required for this study. Rather, the following stages were utilized to meet the participants' names and their institutional information was held; the participants had no obligation to answer the survey; and the participants were given the opportunity to see and discuss the results.

Materials and Measures

Reasons for Teaching Scale

Kyriacou, Hultgren and Stephens (1999) developed Reasons For Teaching Questionnaire (RTQ). Ersozlu, Arslan and Lari (2012) adapted this questionnaire in the Turkish language and then developed a Turkish version of Reasons for teaching scales (RTS). The scale consists of 20 items with five likert-type items as "Not Important" and "Very Important" and all items are positive. The reliability and validity of this scale was tested. The scale was applied to a total of 247, of which 157 were female and 90 were male PTs, selected randomly from different majors at a state university in Turkey. Cronbach Alpha

coefficient for the reliability of RTS was found to be .85.

The Language adaptation process of the RTS was done in three steps. First, five education experts translated each item of the original questionnaire into Turkish independent from one another. Then, researchers examined each translation, determined common points across translations and drafted the final version the scale. After that, the same experts checked the final version and agreed on the meaning of each item. Second, two Turkish Literature faculty members and a Turkish language teacher checked the Turkish grammar of the scale and the Turkish meaning of each item. Based on their feedback more revisions were made on the scale. Third, an expert who is fluent in both Turkish and English translated the final version of the Turkish scale into English. Then, two English teachers checked both the English version and the Turkish version of the scale and decided that both versions of the scale were acceptable.

Construct-validity of the Turkish-version scale was examined through exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. The results of the exploratory factor analysis showed the Turkish-version scale included a four-factor structure. Based on the concepts in relevant literature and items' properties, these factors have been entitled, respectively, as "Altruistic Reasons", "Intrinsic Reasons", "Extrinsic Reasons" and "Job's Benefit". In addition, these four factors total variance explained was 55.345% and structures of the factors were identified as valid. The (communalities) variances of the four factors defined regarding the items ranged between 0.401 and 0.708. It was found that the item-total correlations range was between 0.261 and 0.623, and the factor loads range was between 0.433 and 0.823. The internal reliability coefficient of the Turkish version of the scale was calculated at $\alpha=0.85$. Furthermore, the internal reliability of four factors were calculated, respectively, as for factor 1 was $\alpha=0.82$, factor 2 was $\alpha=0.66$, factor 3 was $\alpha=0.60$ and factor 4 was $\alpha=0.68$. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis established that the Turkish-version form included a four-factor structure. As a result of the first confirmatory factor analysis applied, the coherence index was found to be $\chi^2=423.96$ ($N=247$, $p=0.00$) ($\chi^2/sd=2.58$, $RMSEA=0.082$, $\text{standardized RMR}=0.084$, $GFI=0.85$ and $AGFI=0.81$). Those values indicated an acceptable fit between the model and the observed data. It was found that the factor loads range between 0.34 and 0.75.

Grouped Personal Reasons

A question - What was your reason to choose teaching as a profession? - was created to elicit each

participant's personal reason for choosing teaching as a career. Each PT was presented with this question before they filled out the questionnaire. One of the content analysis method (Krippendorff, 2004) technique open analysis was used to identify patterns, dominant messages and subject matter (McKeone, 1995) across PTs' responses and the categories of PTs' personal reasons to choose the teaching as a profession. Based on the content analysis of two education experts, PTs' personal reasons were grouped into five categories. The inter-coder reliability used to determine the degree of agreement among two experts. The categories were;

- #1: Unwilling, involuntary reasons (e.g., "I don't want to be a teacher but my score was just enough to enter this college", "I don't want to be a teacher but my parents forced me to do this", "I don't like teaching but it's easy to get a job in teaching").
- #2: The financial reasons (e.g., "because the salary is good", "because of financial reasons", "you can get more money if you want").
- #3: The job benefit reasons (e.g., "It has a job guarantee and long vacation", "Teaching is a suitable job for women", "I can spare time for my family").
- #4: The societal reasons (e.g., "I want to be useful in society", "I can educate the new generation", "I want to get my students ready for the future").
- #5: Willing, voluntary reasons (e.g., "Because this job is my ideal job", "I love teaching", "I always wanted to be a teacher").

Results

In this section we first reported on the data analysis methods that were used in the study. Then, we reported findings for the three main research questions of the study. In order to provide a comprehensive understanding of the results of the first and second questions' findings reported together. In this study, linear discriminant analysis was used to determine the factors that highly influenced teaching motivation levels of PTs. Chi-square tests results used to determine which of the variables discriminated between low and high levels of teaching motivation.

Can the Pts who were educated in different types of teacher education programs with high or low teaching motivation be clearly distinguished from each other? And what are the factors that predict student teachers' motivation?

The chi-square test enabled us to see how well the function separates the groups. Initially, six variables were included in the analysis model. We found no significant statistical differences between PTs' teaching motivation levels with respect to variables of PTs' departments and grade levels. Thus these two variables were not included in the discriminant

analysis. The differences between the LTM and HTM of PTs with regard to the predicting variables (Type of faculty, Gender, Age, Personal reasons for choosing teaching as a career) found statistically significant at the 1% level. Table 1 shows the results of the Chi-square tests.

Table 1: PTs' teaching motivation according to the type of teacher training, gender, age and grouped personal reasons

Predicting Variable	LTM f (%)	HTM f (%)	Total f (%)	Chi-Square (X ²)
Type of Teacher Training				
• Faculty of Education	78(51.3)	146(85.4)	224 (69.3)	
• Faculty of Arts and Science	74(48.7)	25(14.6)	99 (30.7)	43.930**
Total	152(100.0)	171 (100.0)	323 (100.0)	
Gender				
• Female	68(44.7)	126 (73.7)	194 (60.1)	
• Male	84(55.3)	45 (26.3)	129 (39.9)	28.111**
Total	152 (100.0)	171(100.0)	323 (100.0)	
Age				
• Between 18-22	66(43.4)	124(72.5)	190(58.8)	
• Between 23-27	72(47.4)	28(16.4)	100(31.0)	36.833**
• Between 28-32	14(9.2)	19(11.1)	33(10.2)	
Total	152(100.0)	171(100.0)	323(100.0)	
Grouped Personal Reasons				
• #1	32(21.1)	4(2.3)	36(11.1)	
• #2	16(10.5)	10(5.8)	26(8.0)	
• #3	28(18.4)	17(9.9)	45(13.9)	51.536**
• #4	18(11.8)	61(35.7)	79(24.5)	
• #5	58(38.2)	79(46.2)	137(42.4)	
Total	152(100.0)	171(100.0)	323(100.0)	

** $p < .001$

Results of Table 1 indicate that while 85.4% of PTs who are currently enrolled FE have HTM, only 14.6 % of PTs who are currently enrolled in FAS have HTM. Results of Table 1 indicates that while 85.4% of PTs who are currently enrolled FE have HTM, only 14.6 % of PTs who are currently enrolled in FAS have HTM. This implies that there is significant statistical difference in HTM and LTM among PTs from FE and FAS ($X^2=43.930$, $p<.00$). The results related to gender indicate that while 73.7% of PTs are female with HTM, only 26.3% of PTs are males with HTM ($X^2=28.111$, $p<.001$). This result indicates that female PTs have higher teaching motivation level

than the male PTs. The age related findings show that 72.5% of PTs, (18-22 ages) have HTM, 16.4% of PTs (23-27 ages) and 11.1% of PTs (28-32 ages) have HTM. These results indicate younger PTs (18-22 ages) have the highest teaching motivation level among all age ranges of PTs. There is a meaningful statistical difference in teaching motivation levels among different age groups ($X^2=36.833$, $p<.001$). The results related to Grouped personal reasons show 46.2% of PTs have HTM with personal reasons #5 , 35.7% with #4, 9.9% with #3, 5.8% with #2 and 2.3% with #1. This result indicates that PTs' HTM levels in #5 and #4 are higher than #1, #2 and #3.

Table 2 Discriminant analysis of student teacher's teaching motivations

Predictor	Canonical discriminant function coefficient	Wilks' Lambda
Type of Education	.895	.535
Gender	.161	.913
Grouped Personal Reasons	.353	.909
Age	.045	.893

The results for the canonical discriminant function were:

Eigenvalue = 1.024; Wilks' lambda = 0.494; chi-square = 224.993; df = 4; $p < .0001$.

Results of discriminant analysis discriminant function coefficients were found for each predicting factor. This provides information on each of the discriminate functions produced. The canonical correlation results showed the correlation between the canonical variables formed by applying the weights from the discriminant function to the four predictors, and levels of teaching motivations. Table 2 shows that the factor with the largest effect on teaching motivation is faculty type (0.895), followed by grouped personal reasons (0.353), gender (0.161) and age (.045). The eigenvalue is a value that can be interpreted for evaluating the magnitude of its respective discriminant function. In current study, the discriminant function provided an eigenvalue above 1 (1.024). This shows that the differences between-groups are higher than the differences within groups. Therefore, we can conclude that the discriminant function has suitably distinguished between the two groups: the differences between the groups are greater than the differences within the groups. Wilks' lambda indicates how good the discriminating power of the model is. The lower the value of Wilks' lambda, the higher the proportion of explained variance of the dependent variable, since the

percentage of explained variance is calculated as $[1 - (\text{Wilks' lambda})]100$. In our analysis, the overall test of the discriminant function yielded Wilks' lambda of 0.494 (chi-square = 224.993; df = 4; $p < 0.0001$), which implies that the discriminant function (or composite predicting variables) accounts for 50.6% of the variance in teaching motivation. So, we have 49.4% unexplained. Therefore, we can conclude that the discriminating power of the model is good.

How does Discriminant analysis "discriminate" between LTM and HTM Pts?

Table 3 shows the results of discriminant analysis for determining correctness of classifications of Low and High teaching motivations of PTs.

Classification Results' is a simple summary of the number and percentage of subjects classified correctly and incorrectly. According to classification results, 152 out of 152 PTs (100%) have low teaching motivation, 111 out of 171 PTs (64.9%) have HTM predicted correctly and classification power of model found as 81.4 %.

Table 3 Classification Results of Low and High Teaching Motivations

		Predicted Group Membership		
		LTM	HTM	Total
Original Group Membership	LTM	152	0	152
	HTM	60	111	171
%	LTM	100.0	.0	100.0
	HTM	35.1	64.9	100.0

81.4% of original grouped cases correctly classified

Discussion

Findings of this study indicated that the factors, different teacher training program types, teachers' personal reasons for choosing teaching as a career, genders and ages- distinguished PTs with HTM and LTM. PTs different grade levels from FE and FAS were included in the study without changing the normal distribution of the sample size. Before running discriminant analysis first through chi square analysis the effect of grade level were tested and no statistical significance was found. As a result, grade level factor was not included in the study. Furthermore, we determined whether teaching motivation scale correctly classified PTs in the Turkish Sample. At last, the implications of the findings for PTs from FE and FAS, were reported as well as the connections of the findings with the extant literature. These were discussed in terms of the initial research questions posed.

The results of the current study revealed that factors- teacher education program type, personal reasons for choosing teaching as a career, gender and age- discriminate between high motivated PTs and low motivated PTs. The first outcome of the study indicates that PTs with HTM - mostly from faculty of education programs and others with LTM - were mainly from faculty of Sciences and Arts programs. As expected, outcome of this study indicates that PTs from faculty of education were more likely motivated toward the goal of becoming a teacher. Since those PTs already made their career selections to teach before they were admitted to the faculty of education program (Gurbuz & Kisoglu, 2007). One possible explanation of the LTM of PTs from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences is that their initial reason for attending the program indicates that they are not willing to become a teacher (Ozturk, Dogan & Koc, 2005, Karamustafaoglu, Ozmen, 2004). In addition to this, in Turkey students sometimes have to select other programs that they do not want to pursue as their career if they perform poorly on the University Entrance Examination and if their scores on this

examination do not meet the entrance requirements for the program they would prefer to pursue.

Students' motivation to get a university degree may differ. Some of the students choose to attend the university without thinking about the type of program in which their interest lies since they are concerned about finding a job without a degree. But this situation is usually is irrelevant in the choosing of certain programs- education, engineering and medicine- because their acceptance requirements are higher than the other programs. As a result a student who chooses to attend the faculty of education with a high score on the university examination has a strong motivation for being a teacher rather than attending university just to find a job after graduation. Many students, who chose the faculty of education programs as their undergraduate study, selected those programs within their first top five choices of universities after they obtained their university entrance examination scores (Karamustafaoglu & Ozmen, 2004). The research supported the notion that those students had a higher motivation for being a teacher when they chose teaching as a career.

Students, who chose the Faculty of Science and Art programs, do not prefer teaching as a first career option. If they cannot find a profession they lean on teaching as a second career option (Ozturk, Dogan & Koc, 2005). The reason for that change is that the job market is more competitive in the science and arts fields rather than in education field. Thus, the faculty of science and arts graduates lean to teaching as a profession since they get a job easier than in their fields (Can, 2010). Moreover, Saracalioglu et al. (2001) stated that FAS graduates hold relatively less positive attitudes toward teaching than FE graduates. All these factors are possible explanations for why PTs from faculty of science and arts have a lower level of motivation toward teaching.

The second finding of this study suggests that the gender factor has an important influence on the teaching motivations of PTs. The finding of this research supports the findings from previous

researchers which suggest female PTs are more likely to be motivated to become a teacher than male PTS (Sinclair, 2008; Manuel & Hughes, 2006; Richardson & Watt, 2006; Gao & Trent, 2009).

The third finding of this study indicates that the age factor also has considerable influence on the PTs' motivation level. Manuel and Hughes (2006) reported PTs from ages 18-22 have a higher level of teaching motivation. In line with this finding we also found that young PTs aged 18-22 have HTM than older PTs.

The most remarkable finding of this study is related to the effect of PTs personal reasons for choosing teaching as a career on their motivation level. Findings of this study indicated that PTs with HTM stated their personal reasons as: “#4: The societal reasons” (e.g., “I want to be useful to society”, “I can educate the new generation”, “I want to get my students ready for the future”) and “#5: Willing, voluntary reasons” (e.g., “Because this job is my ideal job”, “I love teaching”, “I always wanted to be a teacher”). Many researchers (Brookhart & Freeman, 1992; Ozder, Konedrali & Zeki, 2010; Kyrcaiou & Coulthard, 2000; Richardson & Watt, 2006) also supported the notion that PTs have high teaching motivation because of their societal and voluntarily reasons for being a teacher. In other words higher teaching motivation is strongly related to societal and willing reasons. The social structure of Turkish society may explain why societal reasons distinguish PTs with HTM from PTs with LTM. Turkish society has a collectivist structure. Social relations with people and nurturing social atmosphere are the two important components of this structure. When we consider this structure of society it is expected that PTs who have societal reasons also have higher teaching motivation. These societal reasons may also be related to the altruistic values of PTs. The cause for which willing reasons dominantly appeared as a personal reason for PTs with HTM can be explained by the fact that teaching itself is also an emotional experience. (Bullough & Young, 2002; Hayes, 2003).

The overall findings of this study implies that PTs' with HTM and LTM can be reliably distinguished through predicting factors: 1) teacher training program types 2) personal reasons for becoming a teacher 3) age and 4) gender. In order to have a deeper understanding of the factors that influence teacher motivation cross-cultural studies should be considered as future studies. In those studies, we believe, researchers should examine economical, social and psychological factors and effects on both PTs' and teachers' motivation.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Zuhul Yilmaz and Jo Ann Kosobucki for her help about English editing to this paper.

References

- Akyüz, Y. (1997). *Türk eğitim tarihi: başlangıçtan 1997'ye*. Istanbul: Istanbul Kültür Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Brookhart, S. M. & Freeman, D. J. (1992). Characteristics of entering teacher candidates. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(1): 37-60.
- Bullough, R.V. Jr. & Young J. (2002). Learning to teach as an intern: the emotions and the self. *Teacher Development*, 6: 417-431.
- Can, S. (2010). Attitudes of the students who attend the non-thesis graduated education program towards the teaching profession. *Mugla Institute of Social Sciences Journal*, 24: 13-28.
- Chuene, K., Lubben, F. & Newson, G. (1999). The views of pre- service and novice teachers on mathematics teaching in South Africa related to their educational experience. *Educational Research*, 41(1): 23-34.
- Covington, M. V. & Mueller, K. J. (2001). Intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation: An approach/avoidance reformulation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13:157-176.
- Ersozlu, Z. N., Arslan, M. & Lari, P. (2013). Validity and reliability study of reasons for teaching questionnaire in Turkish. *Energy Education Science and Technology Part B: Social and Educational Studies, Special Issue*: 245-249.
- Gao, X. & Trent, J. (2009). Understanding mainland Chinese students' motivations for choosing teacher education programmes in Hong Kong. *Journal of Education for Teaching*. 35(2): 145-159.
- Gürbüz, H. & Kışoğlu, M. (2007). Attitudes of the science and art faculty students and education faculty students attend the non-thesis graduated education program toward teaching profession (Atatürk University Sample). *Journal of Erzurum Education Faculty*, 9(2): 71-83.
- Hayes, D. (2003). Emotional preparation for teaching: a case study about trainee teachers in England. *Teacher Development*, 7: 153-171.

Jarvis, J. & Woodrow, D. (2005). Reasons for choosing a teacher training course' in. *Research in Education*, 73: 29-35.

Juklová, K. (2011). Significant Aspects of Professional Orientation of Beginning Teachers, 25(3): 81-95.

Karamustafaoğlu, O. & Üzmen, H. (2004). A research about the value given to the teaching profession among the prospective teachers and in our country. *Journal of Values Education* 2 (6): 35-49.

Kızıltepe, Z. (2008). Motivation and demotivation of university teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 14(5-6): 515-530.
DOI:10.1080/13540600802571361

Kitching, K., Morgan, M. & O'Leary, M. (2009). It's the little things: exploring the importance of commonplace events for early-career teachers' motivation. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 15(1): 43-58. DOI: 10.1080/13540600802661311

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. 2nd edition, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kyriacou, C. & Kobori, M. (1998). Motivation to Learn and Teach English in Slovenia *Educational Studies* 24(3): 345-351.

Kyriacou, C., Hultgren, A. & Stephens, P. (1999). Student Teacher Motivation to become a secondary school teacher in England and Norway. *Teacher Development*, 3: 373-381.

Kyriacou, C. & Coulthard, M. (2000). Undergraduates' views of teaching as a career choice. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 26: 117-126.

Kyriacou, C. & Kunc, R. (2006). Beginning teachers' expectations of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23: 1246-1257.

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.

McKeone, D. (1995). *Measuring Your Media Profile*. Gower Press: England.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development-OECD. (2005). *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Özder, H., Konedralı, G. & Zeki, C. P. (2010). Examining the Attitudes towards the Teaching Profession and Academic Achievements of Prospective Teachers. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 16(2): 253-275.

Özgan, H. (2011). Organizational Transparency in Schools: Effects and Obstacles, 25(3): 116-127.

Öztürk, B., Dogan, O. & Koc, G. (2005). Comparing the perceptions of the students of faculty of education and arts and sciences concerning the teaching profession. *Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, 3: 1-22.

Papanastasiou, C. & Papanastasiou, E. (1998). What influences students to choose the elementary education major: The case of Cyprus. *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies* 3: 35-45.

Preston, B. (2000). *Teacher supply and demand to 2005: projections and context*. Canberra: Australian Council of Deans.

Pop, M. M. & Turner, J.E. (2009). To be or not to be ... a teacher? Exploring levels of commitment related to perceptions of teaching among students enrolled in a teacher education program. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 15(6): 683-700.

Ramsay, G. (2000). *Quality matters. Revitalising teaching: Critical times, critical choices. Report of the review of teacher education*. Sydney, Australia: NSW Department of Education and Training.

Richardson, W. & Watt, H. (2006). Who chooses teaching and why? Profiling characteristics and motivations across three Australian universities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 34 (1): 27-56.

Roness, D. (2011). Still motivated? The motivation for teaching during the second year in the profession. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(3): 628-638.

Rots, I. & Aelterman, A. (2008a). Teacher training for secondary education and graduates' entrance into the teaching profession. *Educational Studies* 34(5): 399-417.

- Rots, I. & Aelterman, A. (2008b). Two Profiles of Teacher Education Graduates: a discriminant analysis of teaching commitment. *European Educational Research Journal*, 7(4): 523-534.
- Rots, I., Aelterman, A., Devos, G. & Vlerick, P. (2010). Teacher education and the choice to enter the teaching profession: A prospective study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(8): 1619-1629.
- Rots, I. & Aelterman, A. (2009). Teacher education graduates' entrance into the teaching profession: Development and test of a model. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 24(4): 453-471.
- Saban, A. (2003). A Turkish profile of prospective elementary school teachers and their views of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19: 829-846.
- Saracaloğlu, A. S., Kesercioğlu, T., Gökler, I., Serin, O. & Serin, U. (2001). Primary School Teachers' Attitudes Towards Teaching Profession Investigation of Some Variables. *National Conference on Educational Sciences*. Bolu: 7-9 June, Volume 1, 88-99 / 322-333.
- Sinclair, C. (2008). Initial and changing student teacher motivation and commitment to teaching. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(2): 79-104.
- Thomson, M. M., Turner, J. E. & Nietfeld, J. L. (2011). A typological approach to investigate the teaching career decision: Motivations and beliefs about teaching of prospective teacher candidates. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(3): 324-335.
- Watt, Helen M.G. & Richardson, Paul. W. (2008). Motivations, perceptions, and aspirations concerning teaching as a career for different types of beginning teachers. *Learning and Instruction*, 18: 408-428.
- Watt, Helen M.G. & Richardson, Paul 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.
- Yong, B.C. (1995). Teachers' motives for entering into a teaching career in Brunei Darussalam. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(3): 275-280.
- YOK (2007). *Oğretmen yetistirme ve eğitim fakulteleri (1982-2007)*. Ankara: Yükseköğretim Kurulu.
- Zounhia, K., Chatoupis, C., Amoutzas, K. & Hatziharistos, D. (2006). Greek physical education student teachers' reasons for choosing teaching as a career. *Studies In Physical Culture And Tourism*, 13 (2): 99-108.