International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies

An Exploration of the Interplay Between Teachers' Goal Orientation Towards Teaching and Teacher Motivation: A Quantitative Study

Özgür Murat ÇOLAKOĞLU[1]

[1] *Faculty of Education, Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University, Zonguldak, Türkiye*   0000-0001-7258-4007

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore the relationship between teachers' goal orientation towards teaching and teacher motivation, employing a correlational survey model as part of quantitative research methods. The participant pool consists of public school teachers across various educational levels in the Ereğli district of Zonguldak province during the spring semester of the 2020-2021 academic year. The "Goal Orientation Scale for Teaching" and the "Teacher Motivation Scale" were utilized to collect data, with appropriate validity and reliability analyses conducted. Given the non-normal distribution of the data, nonparametric statistical tests such as Mann-Whitney U, Kruskal-Wallis, and Spearman correlation analysis were applied. The findings indicate a high level of both goal orientation and teacher motivation, with significant differences observed according to teaching level and education level. Conversely, no significant differences were identified concerning gender, length of service, or school location. The study concludes with the revelation of significant correlations between teachers' goal orientations and motivations towards teaching, underscoring the complex interplay of these key educational constructs.

Keywords:
Goal orientation, motivation, and teacher

1. Introduction

The transformative role of education in individual and societal development is a point of consensus among scholars and policymakers (Coleman, 1966; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). It serves as the cornerstone for social, economic, and intellectual advancement, shaping the trajectories of both communities and nations. Within this complex framework, the role of teachers is undeniably crucial (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Teachers serve as the architects of the learning environment, impacting students' social, emotional, and intellectual growth (Hattie, 2008).

As the global educational landscape undergoes profound shifts influenced by technological innovations and evolving socio-cultural dynamics (Fullan, 1999; Prensky, 2001), the necessity of understanding the key determinants of effective teaching has become increasingly urgent. Among these determinants, teachers' goal orientation and motivation towards teaching emerge as particularly salient variables (Dweck, 2000; Eccles & Wigfield, 2002).

Goal orientation, conceptualized as the cognitive framework directing individuals in their pursuit of objectives, has been shown to shape teachers' pedagogical choices and interactions with students (Pintrich, 2003; Urdan & Schoenfelder, 2006). This can manifest in several forms, such as mastery orientation, which is intrinsically focused on skill and knowledge acquisition (Ames & Archer, 1988), or performance orientation, where the emphasis is on external validations such as grades or commendations (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996).

Citation: Çolakoğlu, Ö. M. (2023). An exploration of the ınterplay between teachers' goal orientation towards teaching and teacher motivation: A quantitative *study. International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, *10*(4), 954-965. https://dx.doi.org/10.52380/ijpes.2023.10.4.1288

1.1. Conceptual Definitions of Variables

Similarly, motivation towards teaching represents a complex interplay of internal and external factors that propel teaching-related activities (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Bandura, 1997). Intrinsic motivators include the satisfaction derived from impacting students' lives positively (Lortie, 1975), whereas extrinsic motivators may encompass financial incentives and job security (Vroom, 1964). An array of studies substantiates the direct correlation between teachers' motivation and classroom effectiveness and, by extension, student achievement (Pianta, Hamre, & Allen, 2012; Skinner & Belmont, 1993).An array of studies substantiates the direct correlation between teachers' motivation and classroom effectiveness, and by extension, student achievement (Pianta, Hamre, & Allen, 2012; Skinner & Belmont, 1993).

Despite the extensive scrutiny of these constructs, there remains a conspicuous gap in the literature concerning their interactive dynamics and their influence on teaching effectiveness (Brownell & Tanner, 2012; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The current research aims to fill this void by employing a comprehensive approach to explore these intertwined variables and their collective effects on educational outcomes (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone, 2006).

1.2. Empirical Findings and Theoretical Relationships Between Variables

The exploration of goal orientation and teacher motivation as separate constructs is well documented, albeit as isolated phenomena. However, the synergy between these constructs is relatively underexplored in the existing literature. Notwithstanding this lacuna, a handful of studies offer initial insights into this complex interplay.

Previous research has found evidence suggesting a positive relationship between mastery orientation and intrinsic motivation in teachers. For instance, studies by Ames and Archer (1988) suggest that teachers with a mastery orientation are more likely to be intrinsically motivated, thereby impacting student engagement positively. Conversely, performance orientation has been linked to extrinsic motivation, often manifesting in teaching practices geared toward test results and administrative evaluations (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996).

From a theoretical perspective, the Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) can offer a framework for understanding the connection between goal orientation and motivation. The theory suggests that mastery orientation aligns well with intrinsic motivation, as both are geared toward autonomy and competence. Meanwhile, the Expectancy-Value Theory (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002) posits that performance orientation, driven by expected outcomes and associated values, is likely to be influenced by extrinsic motivators such as rewards and recognition.

Although scant, existing literature that examines the intersection of these variables often hinges on the mediating role of the school environment. For example, a conducive environment may amplify the positive effects of a mastery orientation coupled with intrinsic motivation on teaching effectiveness (Urdan & Schoenfelder, 2006). On the contrary, a high-stakes, test-centric environment may compel even intrinsically motivated teachers with a mastery orientation to adopt performance-oriented practices (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

In light of the existing academic landscape, elucidating the complexities of teacher motivation and goal orientation takes on a critical role. This understanding is vital not merely for scholarly discussions but also for tangible applications in the realms of teacher education, curriculum development, and educational policy (Darling-Hammond, 2017; Shulman, 1987).

1.3. Significance and Originality of the Study

The significance of this research is threefold, delineating its rationale, importance, and originality within the broader academic and pedagogical landscape. Firstly, the study is grounded in the recognition of rapidly shifting educational paradigms, influenced by technological innovations and evolving pedagogical methodologies. Given this dynamism, a nuanced understanding of the intricate relationship between teachers' goal orientation and their motivation to teach emerges as a subject of critical scholarly inquiry. This rationale underscores the research's timeliness and relevance, serving as an urgent call to delve into an area that can shape future educational landscapes. Secondly, the importance of this inquiry lies in its potential to inform and reshape existing structures. The anticipated findings could serve as a pivotal reference point for key

educational stakeholders, informing the development of more robust teacher education programs, reimagining curriculum structures, and shaping policy frameworks to positively impact student outcomes. Lastly, the originality of this study resides in its focus on the synergistic interplay between goal orientation and teacher motivation—a facet largely overlooked in existing literature. By bridging this gap, the research not only contributes to scholarly discourse but also provides actionable insights that could lead to transformative changes in educational practices and policies.

From this perspective, the aim of this research is to reveal the relationship between goal orientation towards teaching and teacher motivation. In this context, the problem statement and sub-problems of the study focus on understanding how teachers' goal orientation towards teaching and levels of motivation affect each other and what the results of this interaction may be.

Therefore, the present study is designed to address the following research questions:

- What are the levels of teachers' goal orientation and motivation towards teaching?
- Do the levels of teachers' goal orientation and motivation towards teaching show significant differences based on:
  - Gender
  - Teaching level
  - Educational attainment
  - Location of the school
- Is there a significant relationship between teachers' goal orientation towards teaching and their levels of motivation towards teaching?

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Model

This study aims to determine whether there is a significant relationship between teachers' goal orientation towards teaching and teacher motivation. In this context, it can be stated that the research model belongs to the correlational survey model, a type of descriptive research among quantitative research methods. Correlational survey models are research methods that aim to reveal the existence and/or degree of the relationship between two or more variables (Karasar, 2014, p. 81).

2.2. Research Sample

During the second semester of the 2020-2021 academic year, a study was conducted in the Ereğli district of Zonguldak province with the participation of 275 teachers from public schools. The study covers various demographic characteristics, and the participants were selected using the convenience sampling method. Of the teachers, 68% are female, while 32% are male. In terms of educational background, 80.4% hold a bachelor's degree, and the highest proportion of teaching levels is at 41.1% with primary school teachers. Regarding years of service in teaching, the highest proportion, 22.9%, is found among those with 16-20 years of experience. A vast majority of schools (85.1%) are located in the central region. Due to the pandemic process, data were collected online, leading to difficulties in reaching the entire population.

2.3. Data Collection Tools and Procedure

The study utilized the Goal Orientation Scale and the Teacher Motivation Scale.

Goal Orientation Scale: The 'Goal Orientation Scale' used in the research was developed by Butler (2007) and adapted into Turkish by Yıldızlı, Saban, and Baştuğ (2016). The scale is of a 5-point Likert type and consists of 15 items, encompassing five different dimensions: Approach to Skill, Mastery, Avoidance of Skill, Avoidance of Effort, and Student Relations. The scale does not include any reverse-scored items, and the scoring system is based on a minimum of 21 and a maximum of 105 points. The original reliability values for the scale are as follows: $\alpha=0.86$ for Approach to Skill, $\alpha=0.70$ for Mastery, $\alpha=0.84$ for Avoidance of Effort, and $\alpha=0.66$ for Student Relations. Within the scope of this study, the obtained values are: 0.78 for Approach to Skill, 0.70 for Mastery, 0.76 for Avoidance of Effort, and 0.64 for Student Relations. The results demonstrate that the 'Goal Orientation Scale' is a reliable and valid tool, and it could be an effective instrument for understanding the relationship between teachers' goal orientations and motivations.

Motivation Scale for Teachers: "The 'Motivation Scale for Teachers,' used in the study, was developed by Akdemir and Arslan (2013) and tested on 150 teachers serving in various fields in the province of Zonguldak. The scale consists of 26 items and is evaluated using a 5-point rating system. The ratings are as follows: 'None' = 1, 'A Little' = 2, 'Moderate' = 3, 'Much' = 4, and 'Completely' = 5. The scale is composed of four main dimensions: Communication (1-7), Professional Advancement (8-11), Institutional Alignment (12-19), and Personal Expectation (20-26). An Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) resulted in a 4-factor structure that explained 60.9% of the total variance, with factor loadings ranging from 0.811 to 0.904. In the original study, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the subdimensions of the scale were calculated as follows: 0.873 for Communication, 0.811 for Professional Advancement, 0.870 for Institutional Affiliation, 0.904 for Personal Expectation. In the context of this study, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for each subdimension were found to be: 0.88 for Communication, 0.86 for Professional Advancement, 0.88 for Institutional Affiliation, 0.92 for Personal Expectation, and 0.95 for the entire scale. These details indicate that the 'Motivation Scale for Teachers' is a reliable and valid measuring tool for determining the sources of teachers' motivation.

2.4. Data Collection Procedures

The research process was initiated with authorizations from the Zonguldak Provincial Directorate of National Education and, owing to the COVID-19 pandemic that emerged within the country in March 2020, was conducted in an online modality. In this framework, the instruments to be employed in the study were digitally prepared through the medium of Google Forms. The investigator engaged in both the introductory phase and the elucidation of the research objectives via the same online platform. Consultations were undertaken with the administrative personnel of preschools, primary schools, middle schools, and high schools in the Karadeniz Ereğli district to coordinate the distribution of the Google Form link within teacher-associated networks. During this phase, supplementary clarifications were judiciously provided. In the application phase of the instruments, both the "Goal Orientation Scale towards Teaching" and the "Teacher Motivation Scale" were made available to the teaching staff by school administration for completion at suitable intervals. Comprehensive information regarding the procedures for completing the survey was conveyed to participants through an online medium, and emphasis was placed on the confidentiality of the responses, ensuring their utilization solely for the purpose of scientific inquiry.

2.5. Data Analysis

Initially, the normality of the data distribution was carefully examined, with particular attention given to the skewness and kurtosis values, to ensure they were confined within the range of -1.5 to +1.5. To assess a normal distribution, both Kolmogorov-Smirnov The findings suggested that while the subdimensions of the research scales largely adhered to a normal distribution, p-values less than 0.05 in certain instances pointed to a deviation from the normal distribution. Consequently, non-parametric statistical techniques were implemented (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Hair, Anderson, & Tatham, 1987).

In the subsequent section, the level of significance was set at 0.05, and an array of statistical tests was utilized to address diverse subproblems, including the Mann-Whitney U test, the Kruskal-Wallis H test, and Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient. Variables affecting teachers' orientation towards teaching goals and levels of motivation were explored through Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U analyses. The correlation between teachers' goal orientation and motivation was discerned using correlation analysis. The categorization of the correlation coefficient's absolute value was as follows: a value within the range of 0.70-1.00 denoted a strong correlation, 0.70-0.30 a moderate correlation, and 0.30-0.00 a weak correlation, as stipulated by Büyüköztürk (2019, p. 32).

During the analysis process, the primary reasons for not including the Spearman correlation coefficients in the regression analysis were that the coefficients revealed monotonic relationships and the observed weak relationships between variables. Monotonic relationships may not be suitable for regression analysis, which is built upon linear relationships. Weak relationships, in turn, could limit the potential of the analysis to produce meaningful and reliable results. Therefore, linear regression analysis was not applied in this study.

2.6. Ethical

Ethical approval was obtained from the Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Board at Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University (date and document number: 07/01/2020 and 688).

3. Findings

Descriptive statistics for teachers' goal orientation and motivation levels towards teaching, within the scope of the first sub-problem of the research, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics for the Variables of the Teacher Motivation Scale and Goal Orientation towards Teaching*

Scales	Sub-dimensions	N	Mean	Std.	Assessment
Teacher Motivation	Communication	275	3,91	,63	Agree
	Professional Advancement		3,25	,91	Neutral
	Institutional Alignment		3,46	,75	Agree
	Expectatation		3,45	,87	Agree
Goal Orientation	Skill Orientation	275	3,43	,86	Agree
	Mastery		4,30	,43	Completely Agree
	Avoidance		2,43	,79	Disagree
	Student Relations		4,22	,61	Completely Agree

Upon examining Table 1, it is evident that the Teacher Motivation Scale encompasses four distinct sub-dimensions: "Communication," "Professional Advancement," "Institutional Affiliation," and "Personal Expectation." The scores obtained in these dimensions generally indicate high levels of motivation among teachers, although there appears to be more ambiguity in the "Professional Advancement" dimension. In the scale of Goal Orientation Toward Teaching, there are four sub-dimensions, namely: "Skill Approach," "Mastery," "Avoidance," and "Student Relations." The scores within these sub-dimensions reveal that teachers' goals towards teaching are generally high, but a lower score in the "Avoidance" dimension is notable.

Within the purview of the research's secondary sub-problem, the results of the Mann-Whitney U analysis conducted to ascertain whether there exists a statistically significant disparity in teachers' goal orientations and motivation levels relative to gender can be found delineated in Table 2.

Table 2. *Comparison of Sub-dimensions of Teacher Goal Orientation and Motivation Scale by Gender*

Scales	Sub-dimensions	Gender	N	Mean Rank	U	p
Goal Orientation	Skill Orientation	Female	187	137.77	8185.50	.95
		Male	88	138.48		
	Mastery	Female	187	139.50	7947.50	.65
		Male	88	134.81		
	Avoidance	Female	187	134.98	7663.50	.36
		Male	88	144.41		
	Student Relations	Female	187	140.78	7708.50	.39
		Male	88	132.10		
Teacher Motivation	Communication	Female	187	136.73	7990.50	.70
		Male	88	140.70		
	Professional Advancement	Female	187	138.64	8108.00	.85
		Male	88	136.64		
	Institutional Alignment	Female	187	138.40	8153.00	.91
		Male	88	137.15		
	Expectatation	Female	187	136.26	7902.00	.60
		Male	88	141.70		

The table encompasses an evaluation according to gender for the sub-dimensions of the 'Goal Orientation towards Teaching Scale' and the 'Teacher Motivation Scale'. According to the statistical analysis results, no

significant difference was found between genders in dimensions such as skill approach, mastery, avoidance of work, and student relations, as well as in the sub-dimensions of the motivation scale (p > .05).

The comparisons of teachers' responses to the sub-dimensions of teacher goal orientation and motivation scales according to the school levels they work at are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. *Comparison of Sub-dimensions of Teacher Goal Orientation and Motivation Scale by School Level Conclusion and Discussion*

Scales	Sub-dimensions	Teaching Level	N	Mean Rank	Chi-square	df	p	Difference
Goal Orientation	Skill Orientation	Preschool	5	88,30	4,519	3	,22	-
		Primary School	113	144,50				
		Middle School	90	128,12				
		High School	67	144,01				
	Mastery	Preschool	5	168,90	1,032	3	,80	-
		Primary School	113	137,83				
		Middle School	90	134,65				
		High School	67	140,49				
	Avoidance	Preschool	5	71,80	9,855	3	,03*	4>1 4>2
		Primary School	113	125,92				
		Middle School	90	144,02				
		High School	67	155,22				
	Student Relations	Preschool	5	187,90	9,848	3	,03*	2>3
		Primary School	113	149,77				
		Middle School	90	119,24				
		High School	67	139,62				
Teacher Motivation	Communication	Preschool	5	117,10	3,968	3	,27	-
		Primary School	113	137,47				
		Middle School	90	149,35				
		High School	67	125,20				
	Professional Advancement	Preschool	5	128,80	2,485	3	,48	-
		Primary School	113	130,15				
		Middle School	90	147,49				
		High School	67	139,17				
	Institutional Alignment	Preschool	5	135,40	1,884	3	,60	-
		Primary School	113	131,73				
		Middle School	90	146,99				
		High School	67	136,69				
	Expectatation	Preschool	5	125,10	3,531	3	,32	-
		Primary School	113	127,77				
		Middle School	90	146,48				
		High School	67	144,81				

* p<,05

The data presented in the table reveals that in the 'Goal Orientation towards Teaching' scale, no significant differences were found based on the educational level in the dimensions of 'Skill Approach' and 'Mastery' (p > 0.05), while significant differences were detected between different educational stages in the 'Avoidance of Work' dimension (p < 0.05). Averages in the 'Avoidance of Work' dimension were observed to be highest at the high school level, with the preschool level being the lowest. Significant statistical differences were also observed in the 'Student Relations' dimension (p < 0.05), indicating that student relationships were higher at the primary school level compared to the middle school level.

In the 'Teacher Motivation' scale, no significant differences were found based on the educational level in the dimensions of 'Communication,' 'Professional Advancement,' 'Institutional Affiliation,' and 'Personal Expectation' (p > 0.05). These results may suggest that teachers working at different educational stages possess similar attitudes and expectations in these dimensions.

The comparisons of teachers' responses to the sub-dimensions of teachers' goal orientation and motivation scales according to the school location variable are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *Comparison of Sub-dimensions of Teacher Goal Orientation and Motivation Scale by Education Level*

Scales	Sub-dimensions	Education Level	N	Mean Rank	U	p
Goal Orientation	Skill Orientation	Undergraduate	225	135,03	4956,0	,19
		Graduate	50	151,38		
	Mastery	Undergraduate	225	134,62	4864,0	,13
		Graduate	50	153,22		
	Avoidance	Undergraduate	225	134,26	4783,5	,10
		Graduate	50	154,83		
	Student Relations	Undergraduate	225	132,52	4392,5	,01*
		Graduate	50	162,65		
Teacher Motivation	Communication	Undergraduate	225	137,36	5480,5	,78
		Graduate	50	140,89		
	Professional Advancement	Undergraduate	225	135,01	4953,5	,19
		Graduate	50	151,44		
	Institutional Alignment	Undergraduate	225	137,74	5566,5	,91
		Graduate	50	139,17		
	Expectatation	Undergraduate	225	138,55	5500,5	,81
		Graduate	50	135,51		

* p<,05

In scrutinizing the table, it is observed that within the Goal Orientation Toward Teaching scale, there is no significant difference between teachers who have received an associate or undergraduate degree and those with a postgraduate degree in the dimensions of 'Skill Approach,' 'Mastery,' and 'Avoidance' (p > 0.05). However, a different pattern emerges in the 'Student Relations' dimension. Teachers with a postgraduate degree have been found to have a higher mean rank compared to those at the associate or undergraduate level. This difference is statistically significant (p < 0.05).

In the Teacher Motivation scale, no significant difference has been detected based on the level of education in the dimensions of "Communication," "Professional Advancement," "Institutional Affiliation," and "Personal Expectation" (p > 0.05). These results indicate that teachers with different levels of education demonstrate similar attitudes in dimensions such as motivation and institutional affiliation. Table 5 shows how teachers' responses to goal orientations towards teaching and motivation to teach vary by school location across different sub-dimensions.

Table 5. *Comparison of Goal Orientation and Teacher Motivation Subscales by Urban and Rural Locations*

Scales	Sub-dimensions	Cinsiyet	N	Sıra Ortalaması	U	p
Goal Orientation	Skill Orientation	Urban	234	138,56	4667,0	,79
		Rural	41	134,83		
	Mastery	Urban	234	138,12	4770,0	,96
		Rural	41	137,34		
	Avoidance	Urban	234	139,51	4444,0	,45
		Rural	41	129,39		
	Student Relations	Urban	234	138,58	4662,0	,78
		Rural	41	134,71		
Teacher Motivation	Communication	Urban	234	138,84	4600,0	,68
		Rural	41	133,20		
	Professional Advancement	Urban	234	137,46	4671,0	,79
		Rural	41	141,07		
	Institutional Alignment	Urban	234	138,04	4787,5	,99
		Rural	41	137,77		
	Expectatation	Urban	234	139,90	4352,5	,35
		Rural	41	127,16		

In the table, the data delineates the comparison between various sub-dimensions of the "Goal Orientation Towards Teaching" and "Teacher Motivation" scales, classified according to the type of settlement (central or rural). The analysis reveals no statistically significant differences in the dimensions of "Skill Approach," "Mastery," "Work Avoidance," and "Student Relations" within the "Goal Orientation Toward Teaching" scale (p > 0.05), nor in the dimensions of "Communication," "Professional Advancement," "Organizational Belonging," and "Personal Expectation" (p > 0.05). These findings collectively indicate that teachers employed across different residential areas manifest analogous perceptions and attitudes concerning these dimensions.

3.6. The relationship between teachers' goal orientation towards teaching and their motivation levels

The Spearmann correlation coefficients between teachers' responses to the sub-dimensions of goal orientations towards teaching and motivation to teach are given in Table 6.

Table 6. *The Correlation Between Teachers' Goal Orientations Towards Teaching and Teaching Motivation Variables*

Sub-dimensions	Communication	Professional Advancement	Institutional Alignment	Expectatation
Skill Orientation	,13*	,10	,03	,10
Mastery	,23*	,03	,04	,03
Avoidance	-,13*	,16*	,06	,03
Student Relations	,13*	,06	,05	,03

* p<,05

Another key finding is the significant negative relationship between "Avoidance" and "Communication" (r = -0.13; p < 0.05), suggesting that as work avoidance increases, communication expectations may decrease. A significant positive relationship was also found between "Work Avoidance" and "Professional Advancement" (r = 0.16; p < 0.05). Other correlation coefficients show no statistically significant relationship among the variables examined (p > 0.05). These results highlight that teachers' attitudes and perceptions towards teaching can have varied effects on their motivations. In particular, skill approach and mastery appear to have a positive influence on teachers' communication expectations, while work avoidance might have the opposite effect.

4. Conclusion and Discussion

The findings help us understand the kinds of goals and motivations that educators have in their professional lives. Within the framework of the Teacher Motivation Scale, it was observed that the participants generally showed positive tendencies in the "Communication," "Institutional Belonging," and "Personal Expectations" sub-dimensions, which is in line with similar findings by authors such as Ertürk (2016) and Butler (2007). However, a more ambiguous stance was found in the "Professional Advancement" sub-dimension, which points to the complex motivations of teachers in this area, as shown by Cingiloğlu (2020) and Demir, Demir, and Bolat (2017). In the context of the Goal Orientation Towards Teaching scale, moderate agreement was found in the Skill Approach sub-dimension, high agreement in the Mastery and Student Relations sub-dimensions, and low agreement in the Work Avoidance dimension. These results are consistent with the findings of studies such as Aydın (2007) and Saban and Yıldızlı (2017). In general, the findings of this study are consistent with the results of similar studies in the literature on the level of teachers' motivation and goal orientation towards teaching.

The findings related to the second sub-problem of the study show that gender does not have a determining effect on teachers' motivation and goal orientations. This finding is partially consistent with the studies in the literature, which found different results. For example, in the study conducted by Genç and Göksu (2019), it was observed that the gender variable did not create a significant difference in motivation and goal orientations. Ertürk (2016) found that although there was a significant difference in intrinsic motivation, gender had no effect on extrinsic motivation. On the other hand, studies such as Ertem (2006), Yılmaz and Huyugüzel Çavaş (2007), and Çekim and Aydın (2018) found that the gender variable created a significant difference in motivation. According to these studies, women have higher intrinsic motivation than men. In addition, studies such as Yıldız (2010) and Sarıgül (2019) state that gender is effective on goal orientation, and male teachers have different scores compared to female teachers.

In the context of the "Goal Orientation Toward Teaching" scale, no meaningful differences were discerned based on educational stages within the dimensions of "Skill Approach", "Mastery", "Professional Advancement", "Institutional Affiliation", and "Personal Expectation". These findings are in harmony with the

research conducted by Cingiloğlu (2020) and Butler (2007), affirming that the goal orientation toward teaching does not constitute statistically significant variations concerning educational stages. Therefore, this may infer that teachers' attitudes towards these dimensions are not contingent upon the educational level. Nevertheless, significant disparities were identified within the "Work Avoidance" and "Student Relations" sub-dimensions among teachers in different educational stages. Specifically, it was observed that high school teachers scored higher in the "Work Avoidance" dimension compared to preschool and primary school teachers. Similarly, primary school teachers were found to outscore middle school teachers in the "Student Relations" dimension. These findings intimate that teachers' attitudes toward their work and relationships with students may vary across different educational levels, a conclusion that resonates with the study by Sarıgül (2019), where middle school teachers were found to have higher goal orientations compared to those in high schools.

On the "Teacher Motivation" scale, no significant differences were found in any of the sub-dimensions according to educational level. This result underlines that factors related to motivation are not endemic to certain educational levels but rather have a similar structure across different levels. Consequently, these findings not only contribute to our understanding of the underlying dynamics but are also in line with the broader scholarly discourse, reflecting a sophisticated analysis of the complexities inherent in teachers' motivation and goal orientations.

In an evaluation of the "Goal Orientation Towards Teaching" scale, the dimensions of "Skill Approach," "Mastery," and "Work Avoidance" revealed no statistically significant differences between teachers at undergraduate, graduate, and graduate levels. Conversely, within the "Student Relationships" dimension, graduate-level teachers were found to have scored significantly higher than those at the undergraduate or graduate level. These findings echo the study conducted by Sarıgül (2019), which discerned marked differences in the "Job Avoidance" and "Student Relationships" dimensions according to the level of education.

In assessing the "Teacher Motivation" scale, the examination of the dimensions "Communication," "Professional Advancement," "Institutional Belonging," and "Personal Expectation" resulted in no statistically meaningful divergence between the two educational strata. Consequently, the data affirm a substantial congruence in motivation and goal orientations across different educational levels of teachers. It is only within the "Student Relationships" dimension that graduate-level teachers attained higher scores. This particularity may be attributed to the enhanced educational exposure that postgraduate teachers experience. Their advantage in receiving more nuanced and comprehensive instruction, having a deeper understanding of teaching methodologies and pedagogical frameworks, being at a further advanced stage in their professional trajectory, and embracing a research- and practice-oriented approach might explain this difference.

In an exploration of the "Goal Orientation towards Teaching" scale, the dimensions of "Skill Approach," "Mastery," and "Job Avoidance" disclosed no statistically significant disparities between teachers operating in central and rural areas. This pattern of congruence persists in the "Teacher Motivation" scale, wherein the dimensions of "Communication," "Professional Advancement," "Institutional Belonging," and "Personal Expectation" also revealed no appreciable distinctions between the two regions. Consequently, this data suggests that teachers in both central and rural locales exhibit parallelism in their motivation, goal orientation, and related dimensions. Intriguingly, a review of extant literature fails to uncover any studies that examine teachers' goal orientation and motivation in teaching according to the geographical location of the school.

Lastly, the investigation into the seventh sub-problem of the study, focusing on the interrelations between teachers' "Goal Orientation towards Teaching" and "Teacher Motivation," has yielded intriguing findings. The results reveal a modest positive correlation between the sub-dimensions of "Skill Approach" and "Communication," "Mastery" and "Communication," "Job Avoidance" and "Professional Advancement," and "Student Relationships" and "Communication." Contrarily, a negative correlation has been identified between "Job Avoidance" and "Communication." However, relationships between other sub-dimensions were not found to be significant. In a study conducted by Cingiloğlu (2020), strong positive correlations were detected amongst the sub-dimensions of goal orientation, a result mirrored in the works of Saban and Yıldızlı (2017). Butler (2007) also identified a significant relationship between the avoidance of work and skill approach goals, thereby lending further credence to the findings of the current research.

In conclusion, discernible and meaningful correlations were found among the analyzed sub-dimensions. An increase in student relationships is indicative of a rise in skill approach and mastery goals, pointing to teachers'

augmented enthusiasm and proficiency in teaching. Furthermore, a potent positive effect has been detected between job avoidance and skill approach goals. These insights offer essential understanding directed towards enhancing teachers' competence and motivation within the educational field.

In terms of limitations, it's important to note that during the analysis process, the Spearman correlation coefficients were not included in the regression analysis. This exclusion was due to the coefficients revealing monotonic relationships and the observed weak relationships between variables. Monotonic relationships may not be suitable for regression analysis, which is built upon linear relationships. Weak relationships, in turn, could limit the potential of the analysis to produce meaningful and reliable results. Therefore, linear regression analysis was not applied in this study. This limitation may impact the breadth of the findings and should be considered when interpreting the results.

5. Recommendations

The findings of this study suggest the need for several strategic interventions in the field of education. First, teacher training and professional development programs need to be comprehensively re-evaluated to improve their impact on teachers' skill approaches, mastery, and student relationships. Secondly, adopting customized strategies by school administrations to increase teacher motivation and reduce job avoidance behaviors can help improve educational productivity. The complex dimensions of institutional belonging and personal expectations also highlight the need to strengthen school culture and build specific supports to better understand teachers' needs. There is also a need for more extensive research on whether the needs and motivations of teachers in different regions are similar. Improving student-teacher relationships should be supported by programs and activities to increase achievements in this area. If education policymakers and school leaders adopt an approach that focuses on teacher motivation, skill development, and student-teacher relationships, overall educational achievement can improve. Finally, future research examining similar issues in different contexts and levels of education can make important contributions to the development of educational practice and policy.

6. References

Akdemir, E., & Arslan, A. (2013). Development of motivation scale for teachers. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 106*, 860-864.

Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(3), 260-267.

Aydın, B. (2007). *Fen bilgisi dersinde içsel ve dışsal motivasyonun önemi* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Sage.

Brownell, S.E., & Tanner, K.D. (2012). Barriers to faculty pedagogical change: lack of training, time, ıncentives and tensions with professional ıdentity? *CBE-Life Sciences Education, 11*(4), 339-346.

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

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2019). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Pegem.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*(6), 473-490.

Cingiloğlu, H. (2020). *In-servıce english language teachers' goal orientations for teaching: a mixed methods study* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi.

Coleman, J. S. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Çekim, Z., & Aydın, S. (2018). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin fen öğrenmeye yönelik motivasyonları ve kullandıkları öğrenme stratejileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *8* (2), 451-468.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8*, 1. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n1.2000

Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? *European Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(3), 291-309. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1315399

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum.

Demir, C., Demir, E., & Bolat, Y. (2017). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin motivasyonları ile kişilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişki. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *14*(37), 73-87.

Dweck, C. S. (2000). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Psychology press.

Eccles, J., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(1), 109-132.

Elliot, A. J., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1996). Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 461-475.

Ertem, H. (2006). *Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin kimya derslerine yönelik güdülenme tür (içsel ve dışsal) ve düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Balıkesir Üniversitesi.

Ertürk, R. (2016). Öğretmenlerin iş motivasyonları. *Eğitim Kuram ve Uygulama Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *2*(3), 01-15.

Fındıkoğlu, F. (2019). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin akademik hedef yönelimi ve iş alanında hedef yönelimi düzeylerinin belirlenmesi ve bu düzeyler arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Fullan, M. (1999). *Change forces: The sequel*. Falmer Press/Taylor & Francis, Inc.

Genç, G. A. & Göksu, V. (2019). Lise öğrencilerinin başarı hedef yönelimleri ile fizik öğrenmeye yönelik akademik motivasyonlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 16* (44), 307-331.

Hair, J. F, Jr., Anderson, R. E, & Tatham, R. L. (1987). *Multivariate data analysis with readings* (2nd ed.). Macmillan.

Hattie, J. (2008). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.

Hee, O. C., Ping, L. L., Rizal, A. M., Kowang, T. O., & Fei, G. C. (2019). Exploring lifelong learning outcomes among adult learners via goal orientation and information literacy self-efficacy. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *8*(4), 616-623.

Karasar, N. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Nobel.

Lin, C.-A. & Chen, M.-C. (2009). Factors effecting teachers' knowledge sharing behaviours and motivation: System functions that work. [Online]: http://120.107.180.177/1832/9802/98-214pa.pdf. adresinden 10 Mayıs 2023'de alınmıştır.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. University of Chicago Press.

Meece, J. L., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Hoyle, R. H. (1988). Students' goal orientations and cognitive engagement in classroom activities. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*, 514-523.

Pianta, R.C., Hamre, B.K., Allen, J.P. (2012). Teacher-student relationships and engagement: Conceptualizing, measuring, and ımproving the capacity of classroom ınteractions. In S. Christenson, A. Reschly and C. Wylie (Eds), *Handbook of research on student engagement*. Springe. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_17

Pintrich, P. R. (2003). A motivational science perspective on the role of student motivation in learning and teaching contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *95*(4), 667–686.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital ımmigrants, Part 1. *On The Horizon, 9*, 3-6. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424816

Rasheed, M.I., Aslam, H., & Sarwar, S. (2010). Motivational ıssues for teachers in higher education: A critical case of ıub. *Journal of Management Research*, *2*(2), 1-23.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2009). Promoting self-determined school engagement: Motivation, learning and well-being. In K. R. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 171-196). Routledge.

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

Sarıgül. V. (2019). *Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmenlerinin öğretmeye yönelik hedef yönelimleriyle öğretim yaklaşımları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 1-22.

Skinner, E. A., & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*(4), 571-581.

Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L.(2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5 th ed.). Boston.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct*. Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783-805.

Urdan, T., & Schoenfelder, E. (2006). Classroom effects on student motivation: Goal structures, social relationships, and competence beliefs*. Journal of School Psychology, 44*(5), 331-349.

Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.

Yıldız, B. (2010). *Herzberg'in çift faktör kuramı açısından ilköğretim ı. kademe öğretmenlerinin motivasyon düzeylerinin değerlendirilmesi* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Beykent Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Yıldızlı, H., Saban, A. ve Baştuğ, M. (2016). Öğretmeye yönelik hedef yönelimi ölçeği'nin türkçe'ye uyarlanması. *İlköğretim Online, 15* (4), 1254-1267.

Yılmaz, H., & Huyugüzel Çavaş, P. (2007). Reliability and validity study of the students' motivation toward science learning (smtsl) questionnaire. *İlköğretim Online*, *6*(3), 430-440.