

**Investigation of the Motivation Level of Teachers Working at State Schools in Relation to Some Variables****Süleyman Can\***

Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University

**Abstract**

In order to give the best and accurate orientation to teachers working in school organizations, it seems to be necessary to determine their motivation level. Thus, the purpose of the current study is to determine the motivation level of teachers working in state elementary and secondary schools. Moreover, the study also looks at the relationships between motivation level of teachers and type of the school, the number students in the class, length of service and job satisfaction. The universe of the present study conducted according to descriptive survey model consists of 1310 teachers working in 76 elementary and secondary schools in Menteşe district of the city of Muğla and the sampling is comprised of 398 teachers randomly selected from among the universe. The data collection instrument of the study has two parts, personal information form and teacher motivation scale. In order to determine the factors motivating teachers, "Teacher Motivation Scale" was developed on the basis of "Workers' Job Satisfaction Evaluation Scale" developed by Gülten İncir (1990), a literature review and expert opinions. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.834. The findings of the study revealed that the motivation level of the teachers working at state schools is high in general. It was also found that the teachers' motivation levels do not vary significantly depending on type of the school, the number of students in the class and length of service but vary significantly according to job satisfaction.

**Keywords:** teacher, motivation, school, state school

\* Süleyman Can is an associate professor at the department of Primary Education in Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Turkey.

**Correspondence:** scan0767@gmail.com

### Introduction

Today, one of the important prerequisites of being a developed society is effective execution of educational and instructional activities. The most influential factor determining the efficiency of these educational and instructional activities is the teacher. The teacher is the person who holds a great potential in the determination of the future of a society. It is known that the teacher's power to influence the student and educational programs is greater than that of the other elements involved in education (Erdem, 1998). Thus, teacher education and their qualifications are of great importance. Therefore, teachers should strive for personal development and gain the identity of a professional teacher (Azar and Çepni, 1999; Güzel, 2011).

Today, success of any organization is closely associated with the motivation of its workers (Yiğenoğlu, 2007; Sonmezer & Eryaman, 2008). Educational organizations are not an exception and there is much research focusing on the motivation of teachers (Can, 2015; Mansfield and Beltman, 2014; Özen, 2014; Güçlü, Receptoğlu and Kılınç, 2014; Lourmpas and Dakopoulou, 2014; Receptoğlu, 2014; Satman, 2013; Öztürk and Uzunkol, 2013; Yalçın and Korkmaz, 2013; Ada et al., 2013; Sharabyan, 2011; Güzel, 2011). The word of motivation comes from the Latin word "Moti" meaning "to move". Motivation is an affective factor directing and reinforcing human behaviors to reduce a drive or to achieve a goal (Wright and Wiediger, 2007; Yılmaz and Huyugüzel Çavaş, 2007). In the field of psychology, conscious and unconscious elements initiating a behavior, making it understandable, explaining, sustaining and directing it are called motives. The process of the formation of a behavior as a result of motives is called "motivation" (Köknel, 1983). Similar definition is offered by Türk Dil Kurumu Sözlüğü (2000) as "motivation is making eager, encouraging and getting into action" (Açıksöz, 2008).

Motivation is a state of reinforcement having physiological, cognitive and affective dimensions and putting an individual into action for a specific purpose, making the individual more willing to perform a task and increasing the will of working, giving energy and direction and directly affecting the performance of workers (Jonett, 2009; Özdemir and Muradova, 2008; Ofoegbu, 2004; Başaran, 1991). Motivation involves all internal and external stimuli, desires and wishes promoting people to move, giving directions to their behaviors, affecting, checking, reinforcing human behaviors by means of their thoughts, hopes, beliefs, needs and fears (Örücü and Kambur, 2008; Güzel, 2011).

Depending on the data collected from various organizations, two types of motivational sources were determined for educational organizations as intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation comes from the desire of feeling adequate and independent and meeting higher level needs (Onaran, 1981). Intrinsic motivation is shaped parallel to an individual's own interest, curiosity about a task and satisfaction derived from accomplishing the task. Enthusiasm, pleasure and desire are important intrinsic motivators for an individual to perform a task. When the teacher puts the greatest emphasis on the job satisfaction while performing an activity within the educational organization, it means he/she is intrinsically motivated (Güçlü, Receptoğlu and Kılınç, 2014; Millette and Gagne, 2008; Lin, 2007). On the other hand, extrinsic motivation comes into being as a result of external stimuli and task itself is not the focus of attention (Akbaba, 2006). Here, the stimulus arousing the motivation of an individual is imposed by external sources. Reward, punishment and physical conditions of the individual are all examples of the sources of extrinsic motivation (Littlejohn, 2008). School organizations need teachers to accomplish their objectives and they employ material motives for their teachers to achieve organizational objectives. For an individual to be intrinsically motivated, some of his/her basic needs must have already been met (Yıldırım, 2007).

Success of an organization is closely associated with the motivation of the workers of this organization (Yiğenoğlu, 2007). Thus, great deal of research has focused on how to motivate teachers at schools that are the smallest unit of educational organizations. Improved motivation will increase the efficiency of the teacher and accordingly the efficiency of the student. Thus, it will be easier for educational organizations to achieve their goals.

There are many factors affecting the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of teachers working in school organizations included within the education system. Factors such as physical conditions of the school, job satisfaction, type of control imposed, wages, interpersonal relations, pleasure taken from the job determine whether the motivation will be low or high (Ada et al., 2013; Yalçın and Korkmaz, 2013; Güzel, 2011; Dereli and Acat, 2010). Thus, the purpose of the current study was set to be to determine the motivation level of elementary and secondary school teachers. In this regard, the current study seeks answers to the following questions.

- 1) What is the motivation level of elementary and secondary school teachers?
- 2) Does the motivation level of the elementary and secondary school teachers' motivation level vary significantly depending on type of the school, the number of students in the class, length of service and job satisfaction?

### **Method**

The present study employed the survey method. Survey studies are used to determine the existing situation. As there are comparisons made in relation to type of the school, the number of students in the class, length of service and job satisfaction, sectioning approach is adopted and as it is intended to determine the relationships between the continuous variables, relational screening approach is adopted (Çepni, 2010).

### **Universe and Sampling**

The universe of the present study consists of 1310 teachers working in 76 elementary and secondary schools in Menteşe district of the city of Muğla and the sampling is comprised of 398 teachers randomly selected from among the universe. Demographic characteristics of the teachers in the sampling are as follows: 47.7% (n=190) of the teachers are males, 52.3% (n=208) are females; 5.5% (n=22) are in the age group of 21-30, 38.2% (n=152) are in the age group of 31-40, 39.7% (n=158) are in the age group of 41-50, 16.6% (n=66) are in the age group of 51 and over; 89.7% (n=357) are married, 10.3% (n=41) are single; 10.1% (n=40) hold an associate degree, 80.2% (n=319) hold a bachelor's degree, 9.8% (n=39) hold a post-graduate degree.

### **Data Collection Instrument**

In the study, "The Questionnaire of Factors Motivating Teachers" was employed to collect data. The questionnaire is comprised of two parts. First part aims to elicit demographic features of the teachers and the second part is the teacher motivation scale. In the first part of the questionnaire, there are some items to elicit some demographic features of the teachers (type of the school worked, the number of students in the class, length of service and job satisfaction).

In the second part of the questionnaire, there is "The Teacher Motivation Scale" to determine the factors motivating the teachers. This scale was developed on the basis of "Workers' Job Satisfaction Evaluation Scale" developed by İncir (1990), a literature review and expert opinions. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be .834. This value shows that the scale has a reliable structure.

### **Findings**

In order to find an answer to the first research question, means and standard deviations related to the teachers' motivation levels are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** *Distribution of the Teachers' Motivation Levels*

Teachers' motivation levels	N	The lowest score	The highest score	Mean	S
		55	149	124.14	11.16
	398	<b>Low</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Very high</b>
		2	17	360	19

The teachers' mean score for the attitudes towards motivational factors is 124.14, standard deviation is 11.16. These values reveal that the teachers' attitudes towards motivational factors are high. This finding shows that in general the teachers are affected from motivational factors.

In order to find an answer to the second research question of the study, the results of the one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) conducted to elicit the relationships between the motivation level and type of the school worked, the number of students in the class, length of service and job satisfaction are presented in Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5.

**Table 2.** *The Results of One-way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) Conducted to Determine whether the Teachers' Motivation Level Varies Significantly depending on Type of the School Worked*

Variable		N	Mean	Sd			
Type of School	(1) Elementary	125	123.56	11.85			
	(2) Secondary	110	125.86	8.81			
	(3) High school	162	123.43	11.94			
	Variance Source	MS	df	SS	F	p	Difference Scheffe
	Between Groups	448.85	2	224.42	1.80	.16	
	Intra Groups	48877.38	394	124.05			-
	Total	49326.23	396				

As can be seen in Table 2, one-way variance analysis conducted to determine whether the teachers' motivation level varies significantly depending on type of the school revealed that the difference between the arithmetic means of the groups is not significant ( $F=1.80$ ;  $p>.05$ ).

**Table 3.** *The Results of One-way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) Conducted to Determine whether the Teachers' Motivation Level Varies Significantly depending on the Number of Students in the Class*

Variable		N	Mean	Sd			
The number of students in the class	(1)	34	124.35	8.24			
	(2)	163	123.64	12.88			
	(3)	174	124.02	9.93			
	(4)	26	127.88	10.43			
	Variance Source	MS	df	SS	F	p	Difference Scheffe
	Between Groups	408.54	3	136.18	1.09	.35	
	Intra Groups	48917.68	393	124.47			-
Total	49326.23	396					

As can be seen in Table 3, one-way variance analysis conducted to determine whether the teachers' motivation level varies significantly depending on the number of students in the class

revealed that the difference between the arithmetic means of the groups is not significant ( $F=1.09;p>.05$ ).

**Table 4.** *The Results of One-way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) Conducted to Determine whether the Teachers' Motivation Level Varies Significantly depending on Length of Service*

Variable			<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sd</i>		
<i>Length of Service</i>	(1)		17	127.11	8.60		
	(2)		51	126.72	10.21		
	(3)		100	122.95	12.18		
	(4)		229	123.87	10.99		
	Variance Source	<i>MS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Difference Scheffe
	Between Groups	648.98	3	216.32	1.74	.15	
	Intra Groups	48677.24	393	123.86			-
	Total	49326.23	396				

As can be seen in Table 4, one-way variance analysis conducted to determine whether the teachers' motivation level varies significantly depending on the length of service revealed that the difference between the arithmetic means of the groups is not significant ( $F=1.74;p>.05$ ).

**Table 5.** *The Results of One-way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) Conducted to Determine whether the Teachers' Motivation Level Varies Significantly depending on Job Satisfaction*

Variable			<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Sd</i>		
<i>Job satisfaction</i>	(1) Satisfied		300	123.46	11.76		
	(2) Dissatisfied		48	125.54	9.03		
	(3) Undecided		49	126.97	8.52		
	Variance Source	<i>MS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Difference Scheffe
	Between Groups	626.73	2	313.36	2.53	<b>.04</b>	
	Intra Groups	48699.49	394	123.60			<b>3&gt;1</b>
	Total	49326.23	396				

As can be seen in Table 4, one-way variance analysis conducted to determine whether the teachers' motivation level varies significantly depending on job satisfaction revealed that the difference between the arithmetic means of the groups is significant ( $F=2.53;p<.05$ ). Following this finding, complementary analyses (posthoc) were conducted to determine the source of the difference. First, the homogeneity of the variance was checked and it was decided that the variances are homogenous ( $L_f= 3.98;p>.05$ ); thus, Scheffe test was preferred. The reason for selecting Scheffe analysis is that this analysis is sensitive towards  $\alpha$  type error. The results of Scheffe analysis conducted to determine the source of the difference revealed that the difference is between the mean scores of the undecided group and the satisfied group in favor of the satisfied group ( $p<.05$ ). The difference between the arithmetic means of the other groups was not found to be significant ( $p>.05$ ).

### Discussion

The mean score for the teachers' attitudes towards motivational factors was calculated to be 124.14. The teachers' motivation level was found to be high in general. This shows that the teachers are affected from motivational factors to a great extent while working at school to fulfill educational

objectives. In order to improve the motivation of teachers working at elementary and secondary education organizations, the factors increasing the motivation of teachers should be supported and the factors decreasing their motivation need to be reduced. In this regard, the factors intrinsically motivating teachers should be given the highest priority. As a result of improved intrinsic motivation, teachers will be more willing, successful and active to participate in the process. Enhancing the intrinsic motivation of teachers is the responsibility of school administration to a great extent. Therefore, school directors need to be sensitive towards the needs of teachers, fulfill their desires, put emphasis on factors positively affecting teachers' motivation and support them. The findings of the current study concur with the findings reported by Can (2015), Erdem and Gözel (2014) and Ada et al. (2013).

It was found that type of the school worked does not have a significant effect on the teachers' attitudes towards motivational factors [ $p > .05$ ]. Thus, it can be claimed that the factors motivating teachers are not affected from type of the school. While this finding is supported by the finding reported by Güzel, Özdöl and Oral (2010), it is contrary to the finding of Gökay and Özdemir (2010).

It was also found that the teachers' attitudes towards motivational factors do not significantly vary depending on the number of students in the class [ $p > .05$ ]. Thus, it can be argued that the motivation level of the teachers is not significantly related to the number of students in the class. This finding is also supported by the finding reported by Gökay and Özdemir (2010). Moreover, it was found that the teachers' attitudes towards motivational factors do not vary significantly depending on length of service [ $p > .05$ ]. Thus, it can be claimed that the teachers' length of service does not significantly affect their attitudes towards motivational factors. This finding is parallel to the finding reported by Güzel (2011) and Çermik (2001).

Finally, it was found that the teachers' attitudes towards motivational factors vary significantly depending on their job satisfaction [ $p < .05$ ]. In this regard, length of service can be claimed to be influential on the teachers' attitudes towards motivational factors and this difference is between the undecided group and the satisfied group in favor of the satisfied group.

### **Results and Suggestions**

In light of the findings of the study, it can be claimed that the teachers' attitudes towards motivational factors are high. It was also concluded that type of the school, the number of students in the class and length of service are not influential on the teachers' attitudes towards motivational factors. It was also found that the teachers who are in the undecided group are affected more from motivational factors. Thus, the following suggestions are made:

- More emphasis should be put on factors intrinsically motivating teachers.
- School directors should pay greater attention to teachers whose motivation level is undecided.

### References

- Ada, Ş., Akan, D., Ayık, A., Yıldırım, İ. & Yalçın, S. (2013). Öğretmenlerin motivasyon etkenleri. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17(3), 151-166.
- Açıksöz, A., (2008). Fen ve teknoloji öğretmen adaylarının fen eğitimine yönelik motivasyonları belirlemek için örnek bir ölçek geliştirilmesi, VII. Ulusal Sınıf Öğretmenliği Sempozyumu, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, 2-3-4 Mayıs.
- Akbaba, S. (2006). Eğitimde motivasyon. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13, 343-361.
- Azar, A. & Çepni, S. (1999). Yeni öğretmenlerin iş başında gelişimini destekleyen modelleri. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11, 39-45.
- Basaran, E. (1991). Örgütsel davranış. Ankara: Gül Yayınları.
- Can, S. (2015). Factors motivating teachers working at elementary and secondary schools. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174, 3087-3093.
- Çermik, E. (2001). *Ortaöğretim fizik öğretmenlerinin profili, motivasyonu, iş tatmini*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Çepni, S. (2010). *Araştırma ve proje çalışmalarına giriş*. Trabzon: Üç Yol Kültür Merkezi.
- Dereli, E. & Acat, M.B. (2010). Okul öncesi eğitim öğretmenliği bölümü öğrencilerinin motivasyon kaynakları ve sorunları. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 24, 173-187.
- Erdem, M. (1998). *Öğretmenlik mesleğine giriş*. Ankara: Alkım Yayınları.
- Erdem, A.R. & Gözel, E. (2014). Motivational levels of prospective primary school teachers concerning teaching profession. *The Journal of Academic Social Science*, 2(1), 49-60.
- Sonmezer, M. G. & Eryaman, M. Y. (2008). A comparative analysis of job satisfaction levels of public and private school teachers. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 4(2), 20-33.
- Gökay, M. & Özdemir, Ş.S. (2010). Görsel sanatlar (Resim-İş) öğretmenlerinin motivasyonlarını etkileyen faktörler: Konya örneği. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 26, 237-251.
- Güçlü, N., Receptoğlu, E. & Kılınç, A.Ç. (2014). The relationship between organizational health of the primary schools and teachers' motivation [in Turkish]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi [Hacettepe University Journal of Education]*, 29(1), 140-156.
- Güzel, H., Özdöl, M.F. & Oral, İ. (2010). Öğretmen profillerinin öğrenci motivasyonuna etkisi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 24, 241-253.
- Güzel, H. (2011). Fizik öğretmenlerinin demografik özellikleri ve motivasyon faktörlerinin araştırılması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 11(2), 1031-1054.
- İncir, G. (1990). *Çalışanların iş doyumu üzerine bir inceleme*, Ankara: Milli Prodüktivite Merkezi Yayınları.

- Jonett, J. L. F. (2009). *The motivation of teachers to assume the role of cooperating teacher*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cardinal Stritch University.
- Köknel, Ö. (1983). *Kişilik*. 4. Baskı, İstanbul: Altın Kitap.
- Lin, H. F. (2007). Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intentions. *Journal of Information Science*, 33(2), 135-149.
- Littlejohn, A. (2008). The tip of the iceberg: Factors affecting learner motivation. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, 39(2), 214-225.
- Lourmpas, S. & Dakopoulou, A. (2014). Educational leaders and teachers' motivation for engagement in innovative programmes. The case of Greece. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 3359-3364.
- Mansfield, C.F. & Beltman, S. (2014). Teacher motivation from a goal content perspective: Beginning teacher' goals for teaching. *International Journal of Education Research*, 65, 54-64.
- Millette, V. & Gagne, M. (2008). Designing volunteers' tasks to maximize motivation, satisfaction and performance: the impact of job characteristics on volunteer engagement. *Motivation and Emotion*, 32(1), 11-22.
- Ofoegbu, F. I. (2004). Teacher motivation as an essential factor for classroom effectiveness and school improvement. *College Student Journal*, 3 (1), 54-69.
- Onaran, O. (1981). *Çalışma yaşamında güdülenme kuramları*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, No: 470, Sevinç Matbaası.
- Örücü, E. & Kambur, A. (2008). Örgütsel-yönetimsel motivasyon faktörlerinin çalışanların performans ve verimliliğine etkilerini incelemeye yönelik ampirik bir çalışma: hizmet ve endüstri işletmesi örneği. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi*, 15(1), 85-97.
- Özdemir, S. & Muradova, T. (2008). Örgütlerde motivasyon ve verimlilik ilişkisi. *Journal of Qafqaz University*, 24, 146-153.
- Özen, H. (2014). Motivasyonel dil teorisi ışığında okul müdürlerinin kullandığı motivasyonel dilin öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına olan etkisi. *Turkish Studies*. 9(5). 1731-1746.
- Öztürk, E. & Uzunkol, E. (2013). İlkokul öğretmeni motivasyon ölçeğinin psikometrik özellikleri. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 9(4), 421-435.
- Recepoğlu, E. (2014). Analyzing job motivation level of high school teachers in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 2220-2225.
- Satman, C. (2013). Devlet okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin ekip çalışması konusundaki yaklaşımları, ekip çalışmasına ilişkin motivasyon ve doyum düzeylerinin incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Sharabyan, S. K. (2011). An investigation into Iranian language teachers' motivation with respect to their job satisfaction and second language pedagogy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30, 1071-1075.



- Wright, J., & Wiediger, R. (2007). Motivated behaviours: The interaction of attention, habituation and memory. In L. Brown (Ed.), *Psychology of motivation* (pp. 5-28). New York, USA: Nova Science Publishers Inc.
- Yalçın, H. & Korkmaz, M.E. (2013). Preschool teachers' conditions of motivation. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 6(26), 602-609.
- Yıldırım, F. (2007). İş doyumu ile örgütsel adalet ilişkisi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 62(1), 253-278.
- Yılmaz, H. & Huyugüzel Çavaş, P. (2007). Fen Öğrenimine Yönelik Motivasyon Ölçeğinin Geçerlik ve Güvenirlilik Çalışması. *İlköğretim Online*, 6 (3), 430-440. [Online]: <http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr> adresinden 17 Mayıs 2015 tarihinde indirilmiştir.
- Yiğenoğlu, E. (2007). *Ortaöğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin algılarına göre, mesleki etkinliklerindeki güdülenmişliklerini sağlayan etmenler*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.