EFL Teachers' Work Tasks Motivation towards Class Preparation, Teaching, and Evaluation of Students

*Ali Erarslan - Mehmet Asmalı**

Received: September 20, 2020; received in revised form: January 10, 2021;
accepted: January 12, 2021

Abstract:

Introduction: Motivation plays a central role in teachers' instructional practices. Teaching quality and teacher effectiveness contribute positively to student achievement. In line with this, teachers face several tasks in their profession, and they exhibit various motivational levels consisting of different motivational constructs, such as intrinsic, introjected, identified, external motivation, and amotivation. Therefore, this study aims at revealing Turkish EFL teachers' motivations towards the work tasks of class preparation, teaching, and evaluation of students, which all teachers have to conduct in their profession.

Methods: To collect data, Work Tasks Motivation Scale for Teachers was used. The sample consisted of 1786 EFL teachers teaching throughout Turkey in all types of schools and locations across seven geographical regions.

Results: The quantitative data revealed that motivational constructs vary according to the work tasks of class preparation, teaching, and evaluation of students indicating that teacher motivation has a multifaceted nature and is a non-uniform construct.

Discussion: The results indicated that Turkish EFL teachers did not value the task of classroom preparation, while the task of evaluation of students seemed to be valued. Gender-based differences also indicated that female teachers had higher amotivation and external regulation levels towards classroom preparation and teaching despite their higher levels of intrinsic motivation towards evaluation of students. In addition, considering age variable, the younger group of EFL teachers were found to be more intrinsically motivated towards teaching and evaluation of students compared to the older groups while being more amotivated towards the task of classroom preparation.

* Ali Erarslan, Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University, Faculty of Education, Alanya-Antalya, Turkey; ali.erarslan@alanya.edu.tr
Mehmet Asmalı, Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University, School of Foreign Languages, Alanya-Antalya, Turkey; asmalimehmet@gmail.com

Limitations: Despite the high number of the participants, the findings of the study are limited to the analyses of quantitative data as the main source.

Conclusions: The findings of the study indicated that EFL teachers working in all regions and cities of Turkey demonstrated high levels of a) amotivation towards classroom preparation, b) introjected regulation towards teaching, and c) intrinsic motivation towards evaluation of students. Moreover, EFL teachers' work task motivations displayed variations based on their gender, their age, the location and the type of their school. Further research could investigate potential reasons for the differences in EFL teachers' motivation levels while further increasing the reliability of the results by integrating qualitative data through interviews, observations, or teacher diaries.

Key words: EFL teachers, self-determination theory, teacher motivation, teaching profession, work tasks motivation.

Introduction

Teaching has always been and is likely to be one of the most important professions for the future of humanity (Bishay, 1996). Therefore, literature has welcomed a rekindling of interest in drawing the portrait of an effective teacher (Baytur & Razi, 2015; Miller, 1987; Orgoványi-Gajdos & Kovács, 2020; Prodromou, 1991; Shishavan & Sadeghi, 2009; Werbinska, 2009). Among the multiple variables playing role, motivation is of central importance in teachers' efficiency and success (Jesus & Lens, 2005; Receptoğlu, 2013). Since teacher motivation is related to several significant aspects, such as students' achievement (Bishay, 1996), implementation of educational reforms, or teachers' own satisfaction and fulfillment (Jesus & Lens, 2005), it is crucial to delve into teacher motivation.

Despite teacher motivation's significance, their dissatisfaction with their jobs (Bishay, 1996) and a lack of work motivation (Jesus & Lens, 2005) are not desired states. A brief overview of the existing research offers insights into how various approaches and models have been employed to demonstrate teacher motivation. Factors playing role in choosing teaching as a career (Özsoy, Özsoy, Özkara, & Memiş, 2010; Topkaya Zehir & Üztosun, 2012; Watt & Richardson, 2007), motivating or demotivating factors in different school types (Öztürk Ölmezer, 2015; Seebaluck & Seegum, 2013; Sugino, 2010), and assessment of teacher motivation (Feyyat, 2010; Receptoğlu, 2014) were among the popular topics addressing the issue of teacher motivation.

One aspect of teacher motivation that has been overlooked is the question why and how teachers are involved in their work tasks and to what extent they integrate with various tasks (Fernet, Senecal, Guay, Dowson, & Marsh, 2005).

One framework to conceptualize teacher motivation is Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985).

1 Self-Determination Theory

Human nature is inclined to learn, internalize knowledge, and assimilate values (Niemic & Ryan, 2009). However, idealizing people as always curious, inspired, and responsibly striving to learn may be too optimistic since, despite most people's considerable effort and commitment, apathy, irresponsibility, and alienation are abundant regardless of gender, maturity, culture, and social strata (Ryan & Deci, 2000). What matters in people's being active or passive is the social contexts catalyzing differences in motivation rather than biological endowments (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Teachers seem to be the best actors in these social contexts to facilitate, cultivate, and harness internal tendencies of students to be curious and interested through guiding learning and development (Niemic & Ryan, 2009). However, what exactly optimizes teachers' engagement in this process and motivates them opens up new gates for researchers. Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) is one of the pathfinders as a theoretical framework in understanding teachers' motivation.

Motivation is placed along a self-determination continuum representing the reasons for action in SDT. In this continuum, intrinsic motivation is hypothesized to deal with the task for itself with the ultimate aim of enjoying satisfaction (Vallerand, 1997). No restrictions take place in the performance that is done with volition (Fernet et al., 2008). The type of motivation that stands in the middle of the spectrum encapsulating 'identified', 'introjected', and 'external' regulations, ordered from higher to lower levels of self-determination, is extrinsic motivation. This type of motivation is commonly perceived as non-autonomous (Ryan & Deci, 2000). However, despite instrumentalism and non-autonomy in its nature (Fernet, Senécal, Guay, Marsh, & Dowson, 2008), SDT posits that relative autonomy may considerably vary across various behaviors in extrinsic motivation (Ryan & Connell, 1989). At the leftmost side of the continuum with highest level of self-determination is identified regulation. Rather than feeling the pressure, people with identified regulation perform the activities with higher freedom due to the match between the task and their values and personal goals (Gagne & Deci, 2005). Introjected regulation, on the other hand, occurs when people feel the pressure stemming from anxiety, shame, or guilt in order to assure that a certain behavior is performed (Fernet et al., 2008). The least self-determined extrinsically motivated behaviors are called externally regulated (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Externally regulated people perform tasks to obtain a reward or avoid an undesired consequence (Gagne & Deci, 2005). The behavior of a student studying for an examination just in order not to let his/her parents down might be an example for externally regulated behavior (Vallerand, 1997). Finally, at the rightmost side of the continuum with the lowest level of

self-determination stands amotivation. Amotivated people are not aware of the reasons why they are performing tasks, and they do not have intentions for them (Fernet et al., 2008). Lack of intention stems from a sense of incompetency (Bandura, 1986), lack of feeling hopeful to achieve the desired outcomes (Seligman, 1975), and not valuing the activity (Ryan, 1995).

One advantage of this theory is its focus on quality rather than quantity of motivation (Fernet et al., 2008). Studies have shown that external pressure arises as the reason of low or lack of self-determination in teachers' actions in the classroom (Ryan & Brown, 2005). With regard to pressure, Niemiec and Ryan (2009) indicate a negative correlation between pressure on teachers to achieve specified outcomes and teachers' effective, interesting, and inspiring practices as well as their enthusiasm and creative energy. Considering the likely impacts of motivation types ordered along a self-determination continuum, the more self-determined the teachers become (with intrinsic motivation and identified regulation), the more positive outcomes appear. On the other hand, the decrease in self-determination (introjected regulation, external regulation, and amotivation) leads to negative outcomes (Fernet et al., 2008). The related literature supports the claim that intrinsic motivation is associated with higher job satisfaction (Shah, Rehman, Akhtar, Zafar, & Riaz, 2012), student engagement and attentiveness (Demir, 2011; Fernet, Trepanier, Austin, & Levesque-Cote, 2016), lower burnout (Fernet, Chanal, & Guay, 2017), commitment (Fernet et al., 2016), and positive school environment (Fernet et al., 2016). However, controlled motivation in teachers generated negative school environment, emotional exhaustion (Fernet et al., 2016), work stress and ill-being (Nie, Chua, Yeung, Ryan, & Chan, 2015). Thus, unless policy makers and school administrators take teachers' motivation into account, it is highly likely that both teachers and students will suffer from motivational and learning problems (Deci & Ryan, 2002).

2 Teacher motivation

Teacher motivation has attracted researchers across various socio-cultural contexts over the past decades (Han, Yin, & Boylan, 2016). Research on teacher motivation has predominantly underscored the significance of competence beliefs in this respect (Fernet et al., 2008). Nevertheless, regardless of their competence, teachers may perform some tasks due to internalizing the values of them, whereas some may undertake a task just because of external pressure or benefits (Fernet et al., 2008).

Teacher motivation-related research has also proliferated in the field of language teacher education recently (Fen Ng & Kiat Ng, 2015; Hiver, Kim, & Kim, 2018). This growth of interest has also been observed in Turkey, where 65000 English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers in different levels of state schools are employed (TÜİK, 2019). Despite the high number of teachers, Turkish students have continuously faced English proficiency problems

(Savaşkan, 2016). The recent English proficiency index has also concurred this issue by placing Turkey in the 79th position among 100 countries in total and penultimate order in 33 European countries (Education First, 2019). However, the studies conducted in language teacher motivation in Turkey have mostly been concerned with too general issues, such as motivating (Erkaya, 2013; İpek & Kanatlar, 2018) and demotivating factors (Aydin, 2012), and choosing language teaching as a career motivation (Özsoy et al., 2010; Topkaya Zehir & Uztosun, 2012). Furthermore, this general focus on teacher motivation is centered on higher education (Erkaya, 2013; İpek & Kanatlar, 2018; Öztürk Ölmezer, 2015), leaving other levels of educational contexts overlooked.

Considering these facts, employing the Work Tasks Motivation Scale for Teachers (henceforth WTMST) designed by Fernet et al. (2008) based on SDT, we direct our focus on potential differences among EFL teachers working in different levels of public schools all around Turkey. While performing their profession, teachers undertake different tasks, and while fulfilling these responsibilities, they may have different levels of motivation, such as lesson preparation, active teaching, and assessment of students. They may undervalue some tasks because of external pressure, whereas some teachers might enjoy conducting certain tasks. In this respect, the present nationwide comprehensive research aims to explore how controlled or self-determined motivation Turkish EFL teachers demonstrate in their class preparations, active teachings, and evaluations of students' performances. The following research questions are sought in the study:

1. What are the participating EFL teachers' motivation levels towards the work tasks of class preparation, teaching, and evaluation of students?
2. Are there significant differences in teachers' motivations towards class preparation, teaching, and evaluation of students based on their demographic characteristics, such as their age, gender, the type and the location of their school?

3 Methodology

Intended to explore the EFL teachers' work tasks motivations in Turkey, the study is designed following survey research methodology to have an-in-depth data from a large population regarding individuals' characteristics, opinions, attitudes, and behaviors (Dornyei & Csizér, 2012). For the collection and analyses of the data, quantitative research is adopted to find out teachers' motivational aspects regarding class preparation, teaching, and evaluation of students among the specific tasks they need to perform to teach the language in schools. As Ushioda (2001) highlighted, many motivational studies in the field of language learning and teaching benefitted from quantitative research paradigm due to the effectiveness of quantitative research in collecting data regarding a multifaceted construct of motivation. Thus, the work tasks

motivations of the EFL teachers were investigated making use of ‘WTMST’ in this study.

3.1 Setting and participants

For data collection, seven geographical regions and all school types from primary to high schools across Turkey were targeted in the study. English language teaching starts with the second grades in primary school and all students receive at least two hours of English instruction until the end of high school. In order to have an in-depth understanding revealing the general picture of EFL teachers’ work-task motivational constructs in Turkey, all location types involving villages, counties, and cities were involved in the study. The reason for this is that students receive English courses in primary schools located not only in cities but also in small villages. While all school types exist in cities, only primary schools are found in towns and villages. Counties with a population of 5.000+ people may also have all school types (primary to high school).

In terms of geographical regions in Turkey, the Marmara Region is the most densely populated one due to industrialization. Istanbul, which is located in this region, is the biggest city with most EFL teachers working in state schools. On the other hand, Eastern Anatolian Region and South-Eastern Anatolian Region are the ones with the least densely populated cities and other location types (counties and villages). Another reason for the inclusion of all location types is that if this study focused only on cities, teachers’ work-tasks motivations working in these two regions would not be reflected since most EFL teachers work in cities or counties in Eastern Anatolian Region and South-Eastern Anatolian Region rather than cities. Thus, we believe that this study will be able to draw a general picture of state school EFL teachers’ motivations towards various work tasks in Turkey.

A total of 1786 EFL teachers participated in the study. The participants worked in Turkish state schools throughout the country. In order to have a detailed analysis of the teachers regarding their work tasks motivation, various aspects of teacher demographics, i.e., gender, age, graduation, teaching experience, school type, school location and region, were identified as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Distributions of demographic variables

<i>Variable</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Gender</i>		
Female	1208	67.6
Male	578	32.4
<i>Age</i>		
21-25	160	9.0

Acta Educationis Generalis
Volume 12, 2022, Issue 1

26-30	415	23.2
31-35	417	23.3
36-40	363	20.3
41-45	235	13.2
46-50	106	5.9
51-55	64	3.6
56+	26	1.5
<i>Graduation</i>		
English Language Teaching	1316	73.7
English Language & Literature	318	17.8
American Language & Literature	45	2.5
Linguistics	28	1.6
Translation Studies	24	1.3
Non-language related depts. (classroom teaching, etc)	55	3.1
<i>Teaching Experience</i>		
0-2 yrs	231	12.8
3-5 yrs	393	22.0
6-8 yrs	256	14.3
9-11 yrs	151	8.4
12-14 yrs	189	10.5
15-17 yrs	174	9.7
18-20 yrs	183	10.2
21-23 yrs	99	5.5
24+yrs	110	6.1
<i>School Type</i>		
Primary	233	13.0
Secondary	835	46.8
High School	690	38.6
Public Education Center	10	.6
Other	18	1.0
<i>Region</i>		
Marmara	464	26.0
Central Anatolia	332	18.6
South-Eastern Anatolia	229	12.8
Eastern Anatolia	208	11.6
Mediterranean	185	10.4
Aegean	202	11.3
Black Sea	166	9.3
<i>School Location Type</i>		
Village/Town	251	14.1
County	731	40.9
City	804	44.0

The analysis of the demographic variables in the study showed that among 1786 participants, the majority of them were female teachers of English (n=1208), and nearly three quarters of the participants were between the ages of 21-40 (75.8%).

Regarding the participant teachers' university graduation, English language teaching graduates ranked the first with a percentage of 73.7% (n=1316). Regarding the teaching experience of the participants, the highest rank belonged to the teachers with a teaching experience of 3-5 years (n=393). In terms of the school type, nearly half of the participants (n=835, 46.8%) worked in secondary schools (grades 5-8). Across seven geographical regions in Turkey, 26% of the teachers (n=464) worked in the Marmara Region, which is followed by Central Anatolia Region (n=332, 18.6%), where Ankara, the capital of Turkey, is located. Regarding location, nearly 85% of the participant teachers worked in cities and sub-provinces.

3.2 Data collection procedure

To reveal EFL teachers' motivations regarding specific work tasks, the data of this study were collected via WTMST (Work Tasks Motivation Scale for Teachers), developed and validated by Fernet et al. (2008). WTMST was specifically constructed to assess six different work tasks. These work tasks were 'class preparation', 'teaching', 'evaluation of students', 'classroom management', 'administrative tasks', and 'complementary tasks.' In the work task of class preparation, teachers' motivations regarding their selection of the topics to teach, materials to use, drawing the teaching practices, and any other preparation tasks prior to teaching are targeted. In the teaching task, teachers' motivational aspects in terms of applying teaching practices, managing question-answer sessions, or addressing to students' needs in the classroom are dealt with. In the evaluation of students as a work task type, on the other hand, teachers' giving feedback, conducting assessments and examinations as well as evaluating and entering grades are handled in the scale. Additionally, in the last three work tasks, namely, classroom management, administrative and complementary tasks, management, and administration related tasks, such as classroom organization, meetings, disciplinary cases, and extracurricular activities or committee works are addressed (Fernet et al., 2008).

In this study only the first three work tasks motivations (class preparation, teaching, and evaluation of students) for the teachers were included since other tasks, such as administrative and complementary tasks were not experienced by all teachers. However, all teachers have the tasks of class preparation, teaching, and evaluation of students. In WTMST, under these six work tasks, teacher motivations were investigated under five motivation types labeled as intrinsic motivation, identified regulation, introjected regulation, external regulation, and amotivation. The scale had 15 items for each work task to assess six motivational constructs. A total of 45 items were utilized in this study to assess teachers' motivational constructs. The items in WTMST were based on a 7-point frequency response scale and the item responses varied from 'does not correspond at all' to 'corresponds completely.' Fernet et al. (2008) explain that the WTMST statistically had good fit indices ($\chi^2=5658.93$; $df=3255$; CFI

(Comparative Fit Index)=.94; NNFI (Non-formed Fit Index)=.93; RMSEA=.04) indicating that the WTMST is a validated data collection tool to gather motivational data from teachers regarding various work tasks they performed in their professional life. For the scale was a comprehensive data collection tool for various work tasks involving five motivation types, it was used as a survey tool to collect data from teachers in this study.

The data collection process for the study was initiated by creating an online survey form that was composed of two major parts where the participants' demographic information regarding their personal variables, such as age and gender, and professional information in terms of their university graduation, teaching experience, school type, school region and area, were included. Apart from the demographic part, the second part included 45 items regarding 'class preparation', 'teaching,' and 'evaluation of students' aspects for EFL teachers' motivations. The constructed online survey tool was distributed to every EFL teacher working in state schools across Turkey through the Ministry of National Education (MoNE). The data collection process was completed in the fall term of 2019-2020 teaching year at the end of 2019. Accordingly, 1786 teachers took part in the study as the participants.

3.3 Data analysis

Since this study was designed as a quantitative research, quantitative statistical analyses were run to analyze EFL teachers' motivational contracts regarding three different work tasks. In the analyses of the data, SPSS was utilized for various tests. Initially, the reliability was tested, and Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated as .84 indicating the reliability of the WTMST, which was followed by checking the normality of distribution for the gathered data. Making use of Skewness and Kurtosis coefficients, it was seen that the data were distributed normally which allowed to run parametric tests for further analyses. In analyzing the participants' demographic variables, frequencies and percentages were utilized. To check the teachers' motivational differences based on the demographic variables, such as age, school type, region and area, one-way ANOVA, was used. In other to have a detailed analysis to see the variances among groups, Tukey, as a post-hoc test, was run. Finally, for the gender variable, independent samples t-test was utilized.

4 Findings

RQ1. What are the participating EFL teachers' motivation levels towards the work tasks of class preparation, teaching and evaluation of students?

The first research question aimed at finding out the participants' motivations towards the work tasks of class preparation, teaching, and evaluation of the students. Following the analysis of the data, the teachers' work tasks motivations were computed separately considering five different motivational constructs as seen in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics regarding the EFL teachers' motivations towards class preparation, teaching, and evaluation of students

<u>Motivation</u> <u>types/work tasks</u>	<u>Class preparation</u>		<u>Teaching</u>		<u>Evaluation of</u> <u>students</u>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Intrinsic Motivation	4.01	.99	5.06	.95	5.68	.98
Identified Regulation	4.48	.77	5.14	.72	5.21	.97
Introjected Regulation	5.48	.95	6.00	.82	4.71	.83
External Regulation	5.22	.74	5.14	.65	4.34	1.03
Amotivation	5.73	.94	4.42	.77	4.82	.76

When the teachers' motivational levels for the motivational constructs in the class preparation are analyzed, the findings show that their amotivation levels were comparatively higher than the other motivational constructs with a mean score of 5.73, which shows that the teachers see no value of making preparation for the class. The amotivational aspects of the teachers in conducting the preparation for the class indicate no level of self-determination. Amotivation generally occurs when individuals see no value in conducting the action or expecting no concrete outcome of the action performed. Introjected regulation was the second motivational construct among others with a mean score of 5.48 indicating that class preparation was rather not internalized but performed as a necessity. The findings show that apart from these, the participants were externally motivated for class preparation, which received the third highest mean score as 5.22. This means that the participants conducted class preparation due to external factors, such as receiving reward or avoiding punishment. These findings indicate that class preparation is not an activity type for teachers to be performed by their own desires but rather conducted for external contingencies. The findings for identified regulation as a motivational construct assessed for class preparation indicate that the participant teachers internalized class preparation not for external contingencies but with a feeling of necessity which otherwise would cause feeling of guilt. Ranking the fourth with a mean score of 4.48, identified regulation was a motivational construct, which received one of the lowest scores together with intrinsic motivation as the lowest one ($M=4.01$). Intrinsic motivation is the construct, which is a sign of the self-determination yielding autonomous behaviors conducted by teachers' own interests with no expectation from external factors. In general, based on the findings, it is seen

that amotivation was the most apparent motivational construct while intrinsic motivation was the last one for teachers in terms of class preparation.

Teachers' motivations were investigated with respect to the work task of teaching, which involved activities, such as giving instruction in the classroom, managing classroom activities, dealing with students' needs. The results regarding the teachers' motivational levels based on motivational constructs revealed that introjected regulation was the most evident motivational construct with the highest mean score ($M=6.00$) among other constructs. This shows that the act of teaching was partially internalized due to an inner pressure on the part of the teachers. At the same time, findings show that both identified regulation and external regulation received equal mean scores of 5.14, indicating that while for some teachers teaching motivation came from external factors, for others teaching was valued since in identified regulation they regarded this work task as valuable and important. The mean score for intrinsic motivation was 5.06. This shows that for some teachers the act of teaching was self-directed, autonomous, and fully internalized. The lowest mean score among these motivational constructs belonged to amotivation ($M=4.42$), which indicates that unlike class preparation as a work task, teachers comparatively favor the work task of teaching since it received the lowest mean score, while amotivation was the highest in work task of class preparation.

The teachers' motivational levels regarding evaluation of students, which included work tasks of preparing assessment and exams, reading, checking, and evaluating students' progress, as well as giving feedback to students for their exam scores, were analyzed based on five different motivation constructs. It was found that their intrinsic motivation had the highest mean score ($M=5.68$), which shows that they internally and autonomously conduct this task. Apart from this, the teachers' identified regulation levels were also high for evaluation of students. The mean score for identified regulation was 5.21. This illustrates that they internally value the task of evaluation, but not as autonomous and self-directed as in the intrinsic motivation. On the other hand, while some teachers valued and internalized the task of evaluation of students, amotivation was still apparent ($M=4.82$) for some who had no motivation towards the task of student evaluation.

In terms of introjected regulation as a motivational construct, the mean score was 4.71, which was in the third rank showing that some teachers' conduct this task by external locus of causalities, which is not self-driven. The final motivational construct, which ranked the last, was external motivation with the mean score of 4.34, indicating that the work task of student evaluation was conducted based on external contingencies for some of the teachers.

RQ2. Are there significant differences in teachers' motivations towards class preparation, teaching, and evaluation of students based on their demographic

characteristics, such as their age, gender, the type and the location of their school?

The impact of various demographic variables on the EFL teachers' motivation on different tasks was examined to answer the second research question. First, descriptive statistics and independent samples t-test were performed to check any gender-based differences among the EFL teachers concerning their work tasks motivation. As Table 3 indicates, the female EFL teachers had higher mean scores for all motivation constructs for all work tasks except intrinsic motivation in class preparation.

Table 3

T-test results comparing male and female EFL teachers' motivation on work tasks

<u>Motivation constructs</u>	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>Cohen's d</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>			
CPINTMOT	3.04	.99	2.99	.99	.928	.353	0.001
CPIDTREG	3.44	.76	3.51	.77	1.677	.094	0.002
CPINTROJCTDREG	4.34	.97	4.55	.94	4.276	.000	0.005
CPEXTREG	4.13	.77	4.26	.72	3.731	.000	0.004
CPAMOT	4.59	.98	4.80	.92	4.492	.000	0.005
TINTMOT	4.03	.94	4.08	.96	1.101	.271	0.001
TIDTREG	4.14	.75	4.15	.71	-.211	.833	0.001
TINTROJCTDREG	4.93	.85	5.04	.80	2.740	.006	0.003
TEXTREG	4.06	.64	4.18	.64	3.902	.000	0.004
TAMOT	3.41	.76	3.43	.77	-.668	.504	0.001
ESINTMOT	4.60	.99	4.72	.97	2.407	.016	0.003
ESIDTREG	4.21	1.00	4.22	.96	-.146	.884	0.001
ESINTROJCTDREG	3.68	.85	3.74	.82	1.490	.136	0.002
ESEXTREG	3.31	1.02	3.35	1.04	-.731	.465	0.001
ESAMOT	3.78	.77	3.84	.75	1.755	.079	0.002

Note. The first letters of each construct refer to one specific work task, i.e. 'CP' refers to 'classroom preparation,' 'T' refers to 'teaching,' and 'ES' refers to 'evaluation of students'. The following parts of the constructs are abbreviated forms of motivation types (INTMOT = intrinsic motivation, IDTREG = identified regulation, INTROJCTDREG = introjected regulation, EXTREG = external regulation, AMOT = amotivation).

Male and female distributions were sufficiently normal for the purposes of conducting a t-test with skewness of -.75 (SE=.058) and kurtosis of -1.43 (SE = .116). Moreover, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was tested and satisfied via Levene's F test for all motivational constructs. The results indicated significant differences for CPINTROJCTDREG (male: M=4.34, SD=.97, female: M=4.55, SD=.94, $t(1784)=4.276$, $p=0.00$), CPEXTREG (male: M=4.13, SD=.77, female: M=4.26, SD=.72, $t(1784)=3.731$, $p=0.00$), and CPAMOT

(male: $M=4.59$, $SD=.98$, female: $M=4.80$, $SD=.92$, $t(1784)=4.492$, $p=0.00$) in classroom preparation work task category; TINTROJCTDREG (male: $M=4.93$, $SD=.85$, female: $M=5.04$, $SD=.80$, $t(1784)=2.740$, $p=0.006$) and TEXTREG (male: $M=4.05$, $SD=.64$, female: $M=4.18$, $SD=.64$, $t(1784)=3.902$, $p=0.00$) in teaching work task category; and ESINTMOT (male: $M=4.60$, $SD=.99$, female: $M=4.72$, $SD=.97$, $t(1784)=2.407$, $p=0.016$), in evaluation work task category.

The second demographic variable was the age. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the work tasks motivation of the EFL teachers from eight different age groups. As the assumptions of normal distribution and homogeneity of variance need to be met in order to calculate ANOVA, Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was employed to decide whether samples were normally distributed across the groups and the motivation type scores. Moreover, Levene's test of equality of error variances showed that variances across the groups were homogeneously distributed. A significant difference among the groups was found at the $p<.05$ level for CPINTMOT, $F(7, 1778)=2.136$, $p=0.037$. Post hoc comparisons using Tukey test showed that the mean score for the EFL teachers between the ages 41–45 ($M=3.15$, $SD=0.95$) was significantly higher than that of ones between 31 and 35 ($M=2.89$, $SD=1.00$).

Another significant difference was found among the groups in CPIDTREG, $F(7, 1778)=2.652$, $p=0.010$. Tukey post hoc results indicated that 21–25-year-old EFL teachers ($M=3.34$, $SD=0.78$) had significantly lower mean scores than EFL teachers over 55 ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.87$). Introjected regulation in class preparation task (CPINTROJCTDREG) showed significant differences among the groups as well, $F(7, 1778)=4.533$, $p=0.000$. The youngest group of EFL teachers (aged 21–25) ($M=4.81$, $SD=0.90$) had significantly higher mean scores compared to all other age groups except over 55. The last category in class preparation that showed significant differences among the groups was amotivation (CPAMOT), $F(7, 1778)=4.500$, $p=0.000$. The youngest group of EFL teachers (aged 21–25) ($M=5.06$, $SD=0.89$) reported significantly higher amotivation in class preparation than other age groups except the ones over 55.

In the task of teaching, the only motivation type that showed significant difference among different age groups was intrinsic motivation (TINTMOT), $F(7, 1778)=5.441$, $p=0.000$. As in the case of some other motivation types, the EFL teachers aged 21–25 had the highest intrinsic motivation ($M=4.30$, $SD=1.02$) according to Tukey post hoc test results.

Two motivation types showed significant differences among the age groups in the work task of evaluation of students. Intrinsic motivation was the first one in which the EFL teachers aged 21–25 ($M=4.94$, $SD=.95$) reported higher level of motivation compared to the ones aged 31–45, $F(7, 1778)=3.529$, $p=0.001$. The second motivation type was regulation, $F(7, 1778)=4.065$, $p=0.000$. The identified regulation of EFL teachers aged 21–25 ($M=4.41$, $SD=1.03$) and 26–30

($M=4.35$, $SD=.97$) was significantly higher than the ones aged 31-35 ($M=4.06$, $SD=.95$).

The impact of school area on the work task motivation of EFL teachers was also investigated using one-way ANOVA test. A significant effect of school area was found at the $p<.05$ level for three school areas (village/town, county, city) for identified regulation in classroom preparation task, $F(2, 1783)=5.97$, $p=0.003$. Post hoc comparisons using Tukey test showed that the mean score for the EFL teachers working in cities ($M=3.54$, $SD=0.77$) was significantly higher than those of working in villages ($M=3.35$, $SD=0.74$). Additionally, in the task of teaching, the EFL teachers' motivation was significantly different from one another for intrinsic motivation, $F(2, 1783)=4.573$, $p=0.010$. Tukey post hoc test results indicated that the EFL teachers working in counties ($M=4.12$, $SD=0.94$) reported significantly higher intrinsic motivation than the ones working in cities ($M=3.99$, $SD=0.97$).

The next demographic variable was seven geographical regions the EFL teachers were working in. The effect of these geographical regions on the work tasks motivation of EFL teachers showed significant differences in two tasks, i.e. classroom preparation and evaluation of students. First, significant differences were found among the EFL teachers' intrinsic motivation in classroom preparation task, $F(6, 1779)=2.906$, $p=0.008$. The intrinsic motivation of EFL teachers working in Central Anatolia Region ($M=3.18$, $SD=1.04$) was significantly higher than the ones working in the Marmara Region ($M=2.96$, $SD=0.98$) and Black Sea Region ($M=2.83$, $SD=0.91$). EFL teachers' introjected regulation, $F(6, 1779)=3.756$, $p=0.00$, and external regulation, $F(6, 1779)=2.369$, $p=0.028$, were also reported to be significantly different among the participants working in different regions for the task of evaluation of students. In terms of introjected regulation, Tukey post hoc test results indicated that the EFL teachers working in South-Eastern Anatolia ($M=3.85$, $SD=0.83$) and Mediterranean Region ($M=3.85$, $SD=0.79$) had significantly higher introjected regulation than the ones living in Black Sea Region ($M=3.54$, $SD=0.87$). The EFL teachers working in Black Sea Region ($M=3.14$, $SD=.97$) also had significantly lower external regulation than the ones working in Central Anatolia Region ($M=3.47$, $SD=1.08$).

The last demographic variable investigated was school type. An analysis of variance indicated that the impact of school type was significant in evaluation of student task for intrinsic motivation, $F(4,1781)=3.755$, $p=.005$ and amotivation, $F(4,1781)=3.621$, $p=.006$. Post hoc analyses using Tukey post hoc criterion showed that the EFL teachers working in primary ($M=4.75$, $SD=.95$), secondary ($M=4.70$, $SD=.96$), and high schools ($M=4.66$, $SD=.99$) had significantly higher intrinsic motivation than the ones working in other school types like science and art centers ($M=3.85$, $SD=1.11$). Moreover, the EFL teachers working in public education centers ($M=4.43$, $SD=.59$) had higher amotivation compared to the ones working in science and art centers ($M=3.44$, $SD=.82$).

5 Discussion

It is widely acknowledged that motivation plays a crucial role not only on the part of the learning processes of students but also for teachers in language teaching to conduct a number of work tasks for effective teaching. Teachers' motivation is principally represented by their enthusiasm and commitment towards teaching (Fen Ng & Kiat Ng, 2015). As it is the case for all human beings, teachers' motivation demonstrates both stability and variability (Hiver et al., 2018). Although motivation as a construct has been investigated in many studies, review of the literature indicates a gap regarding work tasks motivations of EFL teachers. Thus, this study aimed at exploring EFL teachers' motivations towards the work tasks of class preparation, teaching, and evaluation of students. A number of significant findings were revealed with the analysis of the data that were collected from a large sample of participants working in state schools across Turkey.

The research questions posed for the study aimed at understanding EFL teachers' multitask motivations at school. The findings for the first research question showed that teachers' motivations varied significantly across different work tasks. It is evident from the findings that teacher motivation is a multifaceted and a non-uniform construct since their motivations change depending on the work task to be conducted, which is also supported by Fernet et al. (2008). In terms of the specific work tasks, the teachers' motivations for each task of class preparation, teaching, and evaluation of students changed considerably. In detail, it was found that amotivation had the highest mean score in class preparation, while intrinsic motivation was the lowest among other motivational constructs. It is acknowledged that class preparation plays a critical role for an effective teaching since teachers address, plan, and organize teaching content, activities, and materials based on the course objectives before actual teaching (Auster & Wylie, 2006; Manasia, Ianos, & Chicioareanu, 2020). Class preparation underlies the learning outcomes for students (Gross, Pietri, Anderson, Moyano-Camihort, & Graham, 2015) and for teachers. It is the pathway for increasing the quality of teaching in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. However, the findings in this study suggest that EFL teachers were amotivated for class preparation with the highest mean score compared to other motivational constructs. As Ryan and Deci (2000) state, amotivation may be the result of not valuing the activity or not believing in getting the desired outcomes of doing the activity. In line with this, it has been found that for most EFL teachers in Turkey, class preparation is not valued. or they do not believe in its yielding the intended outcomes. The reasons why EFL teachers in Turkey do not value class preparation may be varied and complex. Several studies highlighted that reforms initiations to increase the quality of English language teaching in Turkey failed to yield the intended outcomes due to the top-down processes applied in decision making, extra work on teachers', their following the course-book rather than the teaching program, failures in teacher education,

grammar based language teaching, and other common reasons. It is also seen that introjected regulation is the major drive for teachers in the task of teaching. This might stem from the value given to students by teachers. Although introjected regulation is characterized to come out due to the pressure or feeling of guilt, it also has aspects stemming from internalized, self-controlled actions to preserve self-worth (Deci & Ryan, 2008). In this respect, Turkish EFL teachers value the task of teaching and evaluation of students compared to class preparation where they are not actually controlled by external sources. Since Turkey has an exam-oriented education system (Sagun, Ateskan, & Onur, 2016) through which the students are placed into secondary schools, high-schools, and universities, teachers pay special attention to student evaluation as they are the actual indicators for teacher success in schools by both all parties within the education system. Thus, intrinsic motivations of teachers significantly surpassed other motivational constructs.

EFL teachers' age is a rather neglected variable in terms of its impact on their motivation. The findings in this study indicated that the younger the EFL teachers, the more extrinsically motivated or amotivated they are for classroom preparation. Considering the average age of teachers in Turkey (36 years old), which is lower compared to other OECD countries (44 years old) (OECD, 2019), and almost over 63% of the total Turkish teachers aged below 40 (Ministry of National Education, 2020), it becomes apparent that the majority of the EFL teachers may be at risk of losing spontaneous curiosity, tendency, or interest toward classroom preparation before their classes due to the lack of intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2019). The case being so in classroom preparation task notwithstanding, the results indicated younger (especially 21-25-year-olds) EFL teachers were significantly more intrinsically motivated for the tasks of teaching and evaluation of students. Therefore, despite lacking intentionality in classroom preparation by indicating high amotivation that may stem from lack of competence, value, or interest to perform; younger EFL teachers consider teaching and evaluation of students as curiosity spawned activities which are not dependent on external incentives by showing high intrinsic motivation towards these tasks (Ryan & Deci, 2020).

Moreover, teachers' salary has also been reported as a factor affecting EFL teachers' motivation (İpek & Kanatlar, 2018). The starting annual salary of Turkish teachers for all levels of education was 29407 USD (in equivalent USD converted using purchasing power parity for private consumption) in 2019, which changes according to levels of education in OECD average (OECD, 2020). However, the teachers' starting salary in OECD average was 8% (pre-primary) to 25% (upper-secondary) higher than that of Turkish teachers. What is more, although Turkish teachers' salary increase is limited to 12% from start to top of the scale, it ranges from 64% to 68% in OECD average depending on the level of education (OECD, 2020). Therefore, considering these data, both low income in the beginning of their career and lack of opportunity to increase it

later in their career may be a demotivating factor for young Turkish EFL teachers.

Regarding gender, the female EFL teachers seemed to perform classroom preparation and teaching tasks for several reasons, such as avoiding the feelings of anxiety or guilt (introjected regulation), being appraised, receiving a reward, or avoiding negative consequences like reprimand (external regulation) (Fernet et al., 2017). However, they seemed to have higher inherent pleasure and satisfaction (intrinsic motivation) towards evaluation of students (Fernet et al., 2016). In contrast to the findings of the present research, no differences based on gender variable was found in the study by Wanakacha, Aloka, and Nyaswa (2018) investigating Kenyan secondary school teachers or the research conducted by Wahab, Idha, and Halim (2020) investigating Malaysian teachers' motivation based on gender differences. However, the study by Triyanto (2016), examining motivations of Indonesian junior high school teachers, showed that male teachers had considerably higher motivation for teaching. The interviews indicated the fact that female teachers' motivation to work as a teacher was lower since they considered teaching career as a way to help their husbands in their families to have better economic conditions. Therefore, more in-depth data is needed for the present study to identify potential reasons of both genders' high and low levels of motivations for different work tasks.

Turkish EFL teachers' motivation across different work tasks also varied according to the area of the school located. For classroom preparation, the teachers working in city centers showed higher identified regulation indicating that they get prepared for their classes because it was congruent with their own values and goals. In general, the more modern the area of the school, the higher motivation the teachers reported for classroom preparation. On the other hand, for the tasks of teaching and evaluation of students, the EFL teachers working in rural areas seemed to be more intrinsically motivated than the ones working in city centers. Besides, the teachers working in city centers showed higher amotivation, which may possibly play the role of a negative predictor for wellness, engagement, and learning (Ryan & Deci, 2020).

The participant EFL teachers' motivation showed variations across seven geographical regions in Turkey as well. Initially, it should be stated that Turkey is a geographically large country exhibiting various landscapes and human characteristics in its seven regions. The results indicated that teachers working in Black Sea Region were found to be the teachers with the lowest intrinsic motivation, while the ones in Central Anatolia Region reported higher intrinsic motivation for classroom preparation and teaching. Moreover, the EFL teachers working in Eastern Anatolia Region showed a high level of amotivation for classroom preparation task. The regions in which EFL teachers reported higher amotivation and the lowest intrinsic motivation have low (Eastern Anatolia) and middle-low (Black Sea Region) income levels and high illiteracy and schooling rates (Ministry of Development, 2014). In addition, these two regions were

among the lowest scoring three regions in Turkey in English proficiency index (Education First, 2019). The low intrinsic motivation and the high amotivation scores of the EFL teachers in these regions may be a reflection of several different negatively associated data gathered from these two regions.

The last variable to be discussed is school type. The immediately apparent finding indicating relatively higher amotivation towards classroom preparation of the EFL teachers working in primary, secondary, and high schools compared to public education centers and other school types showed that putting an extra effort for the task of classroom preparation does not seem plausible for these teachers since the curriculum is offered in a top-down manner and materials (course-books) are provided by the MoNE. On the other hand, intrinsic motivation of the EFL teachers working in public education centers, where the teachers design their own materials and do not follow a certain course-book, which is also possible on demand though, was significantly higher. Therefore, EFL teachers working in public schools become less autonomous and demonstrate higher amotivation on classroom preparation task since a certain course-book and a syllabus to be followed are imposed.

In contrast to this finding, the EFL teachers working in primary schools demonstrated higher intrinsic motivation in the task of teaching, whereas they showed higher amotivation towards the task of evaluation of students. This may be due to the lack of evaluation process in primary school English classes.

Conclusion

The present study attempted to investigate Turkish EFL teachers' motivation for different work tasks with regard to various demographic data. In general, the results indicated significant changes in EFL teachers' motivations in three different work tasks, i.e. classroom preparation, teaching, and evaluation of students.

First, the findings showed that the EFL teachers demonstrated high amotivation towards classroom preparation, high-introjected regulation towards teaching, and high intrinsic motivation towards evaluation of students. Second, the findings regarding gender-based differences between the EFL teachers showed that the female teachers had higher amotivation or external regulation towards classroom preparation and teaching, whereas they demonstrated higher intrinsic motivation towards evaluation of students.

Another major conclusion is that the younger the EFL teachers, the more amotivated they were for classroom preparation. Nevertheless, the younger group of EFL teachers were found to be more intrinsically motivated towards teaching and evaluation of students compared to older groups.

The findings regarding school area showed that EFL teachers' motivation was more self-regulated for classroom preparation in city centers, whereas it is vice versa for teaching task. Moreover, in terms of evaluation of students, EFL teachers working in primary, secondary, and high schools where all the decisions

are taken by the MoNE, demonstrated higher intrinsic motivation. The findings concerning geographical regions showed that the EFL teachers working in Black Sea Region showed the lowest intrinsic motivation towards classroom preparation and evaluation of students.

Lastly, although the number of participants is quite high, quantitative data as the main source of findings stands as the major limitation of this study. Since interviews and diaries may provide richer data in terms of teachers' reasons for different work tasks, further research may conduct more in-depth investigations of potential reasons indicating why EFL teachers' motivation varies according to different work tasks.

References

- Auster, E. R., & Wylie, K. K. (2006). Creating active learning in the classroom: A systematic approach. *Journal of Management Education*, 30(2), 333-353. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562905283346>
- Aydin, S. (2012). Factors causing demotivation in EFL teaching process: A case study. *The Qualitative Report*, 17(51), 1-13.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Baytur, B., & Razi, S. (2015). Characteristics of effective EFL teachers from the perspective of Turkish EFL learners. *International Journal of Human and Behavioral Science*, 1(2), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.19148/ijhbs.105749>
- Bishay, A. (1996). Teacher motivation and job satisfaction: A study employing the experience sampling method. *Journal of Undergraduate Science*, 3, 147-154.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*. New York: Platinum Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2002). The paradox of achievement: The harder you push, the worse it gets. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving Academic Achievement: Contributions of Social Psychology* (pp. 59-85). New York: Academic Press.
- Demir, K. (2011). Teachers' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as predictors of student engagement. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 6(2), 1397-1409.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2012). How to design and analyze surveys in second language acquisition research. In L. Wei, A. Mackey, & S. M. Gass (Eds), *Research Methods in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 74-95). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Education First (EF). (2019). *EF English proficiency index*. Retrieved from https://www.ef.com.tr/_/~/media/centralefcom/epi/downloads/full-reports/v9/ef-epi-2019-english.pdf
- Erkaya, O. R. (2013). Factors that motivate Turkish EFL teachers. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 2(2), 49-61. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2012.135>
- Fen Ng, C., & Kiat Ng, P. (2015). The motivation of English language teachers in a language centre. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 1(2), 87-92.
- Fernet, C., Senécal, C., Guay, F., Dowson, M., & Marsh, H. W. (2005). *Motivation toward specific work tasks among elementary and high school teachers: The work tasks motivation scale for teachers (WTMST)*. Presented at Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference, Parramatta, 2005. Parramatta, Australia: Australian Association for Research.

- Fernet, C., Senécal, C., Guay, F., Marsh, H. W., & Dowson, M. (2008). The work tasks motivation scale for teachers (WTMST). *Journal of Career Assessment*, 16, 256-279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072707305764>
- Fernet, C., Trepanier, S. G., Austin, S., & Levesque-Cote, J. (2016). Committed, inspiring, and healthy teachers: How do school environment and motivational factors facilitate optimal functioning at career start? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59, 481-491. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.07.019>
- Fernet, C., Chanal, J., & Guay, F. (2017). What fuels the fire: Job- or task-specific motivation (or both)? On the hierarchical and multidimensional nature of teacher motivation in relation to job burnout. *Work & Stress*, 31(2), 145-163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2017.1303758>
- Feyyat, G. (2010). Assessment of teacher motivation. *School Leadership & Management*, 30(5), 487-499. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2010.525228>
- Gagne, M., & Deci, E. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 331-362.
- Gross, D., Pietri, E. S., Anderson, G., Moyano-Camihort, K., & Graham, M. J. (2015). Increased preclass preparation underlies student outcome improvement in the flipped classroom. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, 14(4), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.15-02-0040>
- Han, J., & Yin, H., & Boylan, M. (2016). Teacher motivation: Definition, research development and implications for teachers. *Cogent Education*, 3(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1217819>
- Hiver, P., Kim, T.-Y., & Kim, Y. (2018). Language teacher motivation. In S. Mercer, & A. Kostoulas (Eds.), *Language Teacher Psychology* (pp. 18-33). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- İpek, H., & Kanatlar, M. (2018). Factors affecting EFL teacher motivation. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 6(2), 25-41.
- Jesus, S. N., & Lens, W. (2005). An integrated model for the study of teacher motivation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(1), 119-134.
- Manasia, L., Ianos, M. G., & Chicioreanu, T. D. (2020). Pre-service teacher preparedness for fostering education for sustainable development: An empirical analysis of central dimensions of teaching readiness. *Sustainability*, 12(1), 4-6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU12010166>
- Miller, P. (1987). Ten characteristics of a good teacher. *English Teaching Forum*, 25(1), 40-41.
- Ministry of Development (2014). *National strategy of regional development 2014-2023*. <https://abdigm.meb.gov.tr/projeler/ois/003.pdf>
- Ministry of National Education (2020). *2019 Annual activity report*. Retrieved from http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2020_03/12144540_28191618_Milli_EYitim_BakanlYYY_2019_YYIY_Ydare_Faaliyet_Raporu_28.02.2020.pdf
- Niemiec, C. P., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). Autonomy, competence, and relatedness in the classroom: Applying self-determination theory to educational practice. *Theory and Research in Education*, 7(2), 133-144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878509104318>
- Nie, Y., Chua, B. L., Yeung, A. S., Ryan, R. M., & Chan, W. Y. (2015). The importance of autonomy support and the mediating role of work motivation for well-being: Testing self-determination theory in a Chinese work organization. *International Journal of Psychology*, 50(4), 245-255. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.07.019>
- OECD (2019). *Country note: Results from TALIS 2018*. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/education/talis/TALIS2018_CN_TUR.pdf
- OECD (2020). *Education at a Glance 2020: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en>
- Orgoványi-Gajdos, J., & Kovács, E. (2020). Teachers' views about the characteristics of pedagogical talents. *Acta Educationis Generalis*, 10(2), 78-94. <https://doi.org/10.2478/atd-2020-0011>

- Özsoy, G., Özsoy, S., Özkara, Y., & Memiş, A. D. (2010). Factors affecting pre-service teachers' choice of teaching as a profession. *Elementary Education Online*, 9(3), 910-921.
- Öztürk Ölmezer, E. (2015). A qualitative study on the motivation of Turkish EFL teachers working at state universities. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 11(4), 1436-1453.
- Prodromou, L. (1991). The good language teacher. *English Teaching Forum*, 29(2), 2-7.
- Recepoglu, E. (2013). A study of teachers' job motivation in the high schools of the Ministry of National Education in Turkey (Karabük and Sinop Sample). *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 13(4), 532-537.
- Recepoglu, E. (2014). Analyzing job motivation level of high school teachers in Turkey. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 2220-2225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.547>
- Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 749-761.
- Ryan, R. M. (1995). Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative processes. *Journal of Personality*, 63, 397-427.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- Ryan, R. M., & Brown, K. W. (2005). Legislating competence: High-stakes testing policies and their relations with psychological theories and research. In A. J. Elliot, & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 354-72). New York: Guilford Publications
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2019). Brick by brick: The origins, development, and future of self-determination theory. In A. J. Elliot (Ed.), *Advances in motivation science* (pp. 111-156). Cambridge, MA: Elsevier Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.adms.2019.01.001>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- Sagun, S., Ateskan, A., & Onur, J. (2016). Developing students for university through an international high school program in Turkey. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri*, 16(2), 439-458. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2016.2.0313>
- Savaşkan, İ. (2016). Turkey's place in the rankings of the English proficiency index. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, 5(2), 192-208.
- Seebaluck, A. K., & Seegum, T. D. (2013). Motivation among public primary school teachers in Mauritius. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(4), 446-464. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09513541311316359>
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). *Helplessness*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Shah, M. J., Rehman, M. U., Akhtar, G., Zafar, H., & Riaz, A. (2012). Job satisfaction and motivation of teachers of public educational institutions. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(8), 271-281.
- Shishavan, H. B., & Sadeghi, K. (2009). Characteristics of an effective English language teacher as perceived by Iranian teachers and learners of English. *English Language Teaching*, 2(4), 131-143.
- Sugino, T. (2010). Teacher demotivational factors in the Japanese language teaching context. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 216-226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.036>
- Topkaya Zehir, E., & Uztosun, M. S. (2012). Choosing teaching as a career: Motivations of pre-service English teachers in Turkey. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1), 126-134. <http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/jltr/vol03/01/15.pdf>
- Triyanto, T., & Handayani, R.D. (2016). Teacher motivation based on gender, tenure and level of education. *New Educational Review*, 45, 199-209.

- Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (TÜİK). (2018). *Net schooling ratio, number of schools, teachers, students and classrooms, students per division and teacher at primary education by types of educational year, 1997-2018*. Retrieved from http://tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1018
- Ushioda, E. (2001). Language learning at university: Exploring the role of motivational thinking. In Z. Dörnyei, & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (Tech. Rep. No. 23, pp. 93–125). Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Vallerand, R. J. (1997). Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 29, 271-360. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60019-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60019-2)
- Wahab, R., Idha, S. N., & Halim, A. (2020). The type of motivation on work task among special education teachers. *American Research Journal of Humanities & Social Science*, 3(6), 162-168. <https://www.arjhss.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/R36162168.pdf>
- Wanakacha, C. K., Aloka, P. J. O., & Nyaswa, P. (2018). Gender differences in motivation and teacher performance in core functions in Kenyan secondary schools. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 7(1), 89-95.
- Watt, H. M. G., & Richardson, P. W. (2007). Motivational factors influencing teaching as a career choice: Development and validation of the FIT-Choice scale. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 75(3), 167-202. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JEXE.75.3.167-202>
- Werbinska, D. (2009). A profile of an effective teacher of English: A qualitative study from Poland. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 36, 306-315.