Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education) 30(1): 77-89 [Ocak 2015]

Social Desirability Bias in Altruistic Motivation for Choosing Teaching as a Career*

Öğretmenliği Kariyer Olarak Seçmede Özgeci Güdülenmeye Dair Toplumsal Cazibe Yanlılığı Sorunu

İsmail Hakkı ERTEN**

ABSTRACT: Using different tools of data collection often leads to controversial results as to what constitutes the best attractor to teaching as a profession. Quantitative survey studies report altruistic reasons as the prevailing factors whereas qualitative studies highlight intrinsic and extrinsic reasons with a possible link to a social desirability bias posed by scales/questionnaires. This paper reports on findings of a study that explored whether/how different tools of data collection yield different entry motivations. 248 student teachers of English at a state university in Ankara completed three different instruments: a qualitative self-report survey form; FIT-Choice Scale (Watt & Richardson, 2007); and a ranking task where participants ranked five most important reasons from the FIT-Choice Scale. The analysis of the data revealed that the qualitative instrument and the ranking task yielded that intrinsic reasons were the best motivators, followed by ability, extrinsic, and altruistic reasons. However, in the FIT-Choice Scale data, the altruistic reasons were the best attractors. This study concludes that the altruistic reasons in the FIT-Choice Scale may have enjoyed an inflated popularity due to their socially desirable properties and that research studies into entry motivations need to take precautions to deal with such a response bias.

Keywords: teacher entry motivations, intrinsic reasons, extrinsic reasons, altruistic reasons, social desirability bias

ÖZ: Öğretmen olma nedenleri üzerine yapılan çalışmalarda farklı veri toplama tekniklerinin kullanılması, sıklıkla çelişkili sonuçların ortaya çıkmasına neden olabilmektedir. Nicel tarama çalışmaları özgeci sebepleri baskın nedenler arasında gösterirken nitel çalışmalar daha çok içsel ve dışsal nedenlerin önemli olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Farklı yöntemler arasında ortaya çıkan böylesi bir fark, anket ve ölçeklerde gözlemlenebilen toplumsal cazibe yanlılığı ile ilişkili olabilir. Bu makale, farklı veri toplama araçlarının öğretmen olma nedenleriyle ilgili olarak çelişkili sonuçlar verip vermediğini inceleyen bir çalışmanın sonuçlarını sunmaktadır. Ankara'daki bir devlet üniversitesinde İngiliz dili eğitimi öğrenimi gören 248 aday öğretmene üç farklı araç uygulanmıştır. Bunlar, öğrencilerin öğretmen olma nedenlerini betimledikleri nitel bir tarama formu; FIT-Choice ölçeği (Watt and Richardson, 2007) ve katılımcıların FIT-Choice ölçeğinden kendileri için en önemli 5 nedeni seçip bunları da kendi içinde önem sırasına koyacakları bir sıralama formundan oluşmaktadır. Nitel veri ve sıralama formu verilerinin analizi içsel nedenlerin en çok öneme sahip olduğunu, daha sonra yetenek, dışsal ve özgeci nedenlerin geldiğini; FIT-Choice ölçeğinden gelen nicel verinin analiziyse özgeci değerlere en yüksek önemin atfedildiğini göstermiştir. Bu çalışmada, FIT-Choice ölçeğinde sunulan özgeci değerlerin toplumsal cazibeleri nedeniyle katılımcılar tarafından abartılmış olabileceği; bu sebeple çalışmalarda bu toplumsal cazibe yanlılığı sorununa dair önlem alınması gerektiği sonucuna varılmıştır.

Anahtar sözcükler: öğretmen olma nedenleri, içsel nedenler, dışsal nedenler, özgeci nedenler, toplumsal yanlılık sorunu

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Rationale Behind The Study of Teacher Motivations

There has recently been an influx of interest in understanding reasons for deciding to become a teacher. This interest is simply due to an undeniable role that teachers play in the creation and enrichment of a given society. Such an interest in understanding who would like to become teachers and why they want to do so carries importance and "has implications for teacher

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 4th International Symposium of Policies and Issues on Teacher Education-ISPITE 2014, 15-16 May, 2014, Hacettepe University, Ankara/Turkey.

** Associate Professor, Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, Ankara-Turkey, e-mail: iherten@gmail.com; iherten@hacettepe.edu.tr

education planning and curriculum design, teacher recruitment authorities, and government and intergovernmental planning and policy decisions" (Watt & Richardson, 2007, 167).

Given the significant number of people who wish to become teachers, the question of why people decide to become teachers gains salience. Socio-economic factors behind attractions offered by the teaching profession are likely to differ from one nation to another. For example many industrialized countries experience a shortage of teacher supply (Taylor, 2006) and difficulty in maintaining teachers within the profession (Watt & Richardson, 2007). The situation is different in Turkey where a surplus of 300 000 candidate teachers was reported by Türk Eğitim Sen (Turkish Education Union) (2011).

The excess supply of teachers reported in Turkey may inflate with a recent decision by Turkish Higher Education Council (YÖK, 2014), which dictates that all undergraduate students, enrolled in departments that are regarded as potential sources of teachers, are to be able to receive training towards a teaching certification as opposed to the previous practice that adopted a process of a more competitive selection of only graduate students. Moreover, the new decision authorizes even distance education programmes to be able to offer so-called theoretical teacher training courses. Such practice, undoubtedly, will create even more university graduates who are officially qualified to apply for a teaching position and is also likely to complicate the whole phenomenon of teachers' entry motivations into the profession in Turkey. Therefore, a more careful examination of entry motivations can contribute to our understanding of the phenomenon. This is what this study aims to achieve by investigating varying effects of different research tools on participants' manifestation of their initial reasons to become a teacher of English as a foreign language.

1.2 Motives for Choosing Teaching as A Career

Research into why people choose teaching as a profession has, so far, has identified three main groups of reasons. These can broadly be categorized as intrinsic reasons; extrinsic reasons; and altruistic reasons (e.g. Brookhart & Freeman, 1992; Kyriacou, Hultgren & Stephens, 1999). Intrinsic reasons are those that involve joy and satisfaction received from teaching while extrinsic reasons are the ones that involve expectations to gain a better position both socially and financially. Altruism, on the other hand, involves serving and giving back to the society and making a contribution, and helping to shape the future of next generations.

An alternative system of categorising reasons to become a teacher was offered by Watt and Richardson (2007). The authors state that studies do not always adhere to the same or broadly recognized scheme of classification of reasons, making it difficult to compare research findings. Therefore, a more comprehensible and theory-based classification of reasons is required. They developed and validated an instrument called FIT-Choice Scale (Factors Influencing Teaching as a Career Choice), a well-established, theory-driven instrument that was based on expectancy value theory (e.g. Eccles, Adler, Futterman, Goff, Kaczala & Meece, 1983) and organized into seven groups of reasons. These are ability; intrinsic career value; fallback career, personal utility (job security, time for family, job transferability, and bludging[1]); social utility value (shape future of children/adolescents, enhance social equity, make social contribution, and work with children/adolescent); prior teaching and learning experience; and social influences. Although different terms are employed in the FIT-Choice Scale, they broadly denote the concepts of intrinsic, extrinsic and altruistic reasons as described by Watt and Richardson (2007, 171-176). For example, ability and intrinsic value resonate with satisfaction received from the joy of teaching. Reasons in the social utility value category echo altruism as they highlight making a

1 Easy work

contribution and helping others improve. Similarly, reasons in the personal utility value are in keeping with extrinsic reasons. New additions in the scheme are prior learning and teaching experience, social influence, and fallback career. The prior learning and teaching experience refer to influential teachers or education environment while the social influence involves encouragement from environment (e.g. family and friends) to become a teacher. The fallback career describes not having better choice or failing in other fields of study or professions.

1.3 Methodological Bias on Teacher Motivations

Research findings as to what reasons best attract people to the profession, however, are not always unanimous. Although researchers tend to agree that most new teachers are intrinsically motivated with some significant extrinsic expectations, there seems to be a considerable level of disagreement regarding whether student teachers are altruistically motivated, which is the main concern for this study.

The discrepancy regarding how altruistically motivated student teachers are often appears to be related to research methodologies employed to collect data. Erten (2014) summarized that, concerning altruistic reasons manifested by student teachers, studies that employ quantitative tools (i.e. scales and questionnaires) (e.g. Eren & Tezel, 2010; Kılınç, Watt & Richardson, 2012; Kyriacou & Coulthart, 2000; Özsoy et al., 2010; Saban, 2003; Şahin, 2010; Topkaya & Uztosun, 2012; Watt & Richardson, 2007) tend to yield considerably different results from those studies where mainly qualitative self-report tools were used (e.g. Boz & Boz, 2008; Erten, 2014; Ubuz & Sarı, 2008).

Quantitative studies almost unanimously report altruistic reasons or social utility values as one of the strongest attractors of the teaching profession, with of course due optimism for the future of the profession. In support of all these, Brookhart and Freeman (1992) reviewed 44 studies that explored teachers' entry motivations. They state that most studies they reviewed employed a survey methodology and prevailing reasons for choosing to teach were altruistic and service oriented reasons. This seems to hold true across nations and fields of study as well as survey instruments employed. Survey studies, for example from Norway (Kyriacou & Coulthart, 2000), Australia (Watt & Johnson, 2007), USA and China (Lin, Shi, Wang, Zhang & Hui, 2012), and Turkey (Kılınç et al., 2012; Özsoy et al, 2010; Saban, 2003) highlighted altruistic reasons as one of the main motives to choose teaching as a profession. Student teachers from various fields of study reported, when asked to fill in questionnaires/scales, that they wanted to become teachers dominantly for altruistic reasons (Kılınç et al., 2012; Kyriacou & Coulthart, 2000; Özsoy et al., 2010; Saban, 2003; Topkaya & Uztosun, 2012).

Prevalence of altruistic reasons remains constant even when different questionnaires or scales are employed. Kyriacou and Coulthart (2000) found that those candidate teachers who seriously consider teaching as a future career decided to do so because they wanted to help and contribute to the society. Such a finding resonates with findings from studies that employed different questionnaires of data collection. For example, Özsoy et al. (2010) and Saban (2003), who used their own instruments, both reported that altruism was one of the strongest motivators. Similarly, studies that employed the FIT-Choice scale (Eren & Ezel, 2010; Topkaya & Uztosun, 2012; Watt & Richardson, 2007; also see Watt & Richardson, 2012 for a summary of studies) also showed student teachers choose to teach primarily to serve and make a contribution to their societies. Altruistic reasons, however, are not always reported in quantitative studies. For example, Aksu et al. (2010), a large scale study with 18,226 student teachers, interestingly, did not report any altruistic reasons. This was probably because they were either not included in the list of reasons from which students were to choose or perhaps students did not report any items as such. No information is available on this matter.

Dominance of altruistic reasons over other types of reasons appears to diminish when a qualitative tool of data collection is employed (e.g. Boz & Boz, 2008; Ubuz & Sarı, 2008; Kılınç & Mahiroğlu, 2009; Erten, 2014), where student teachers are asked to report (oral or written) their entry motivations. For example, Boz and Boz (2008) describe their candidate teachers of mathematics and chemistry as being more intrinsically and extrinsically motivated than altruistically motivated. Similarly, Ubuz and Sarı (2008), with student primary school teachers, identified extrinsic employability factor as one of the main attractors of teaching. Only 14% of participants manifested choosing teaching for an initial altruistic reason. Kılınç and Mahiroğlu's (2009) findings show that the top three attractors of teaching for future biology teachers were mainly intrinsic and extrinsic reasons (e.g. love of biology and light workload) value. In a recent qualitative study, Erten (2014) identified proportionally very few altruistic reasons reported by 84 student teachers of English while intrinsic reasons were dominant.

It has been argued that varying frequency and salience of altruistic reasons in teachers' entry motivation across studies with different tools of data collection can be linked to a social desirability bias inherent in the use of scales and questionnaires (Porter & Freeman, 1987; Brookhart & Freeman, 1992; Porter, 2011). It is, therefore, not superfluous to question whether the differences observed can be an artefact of employing questionnaires/scales or qualitative self-report protocols and thus whether they are biased by socially desirable responding (Erten, 2014). Socially desirable responding refers to participants' tendency to respond to survey items, consciously or subconsciously, untruthfully but in a manner that they think will look socially more desirable (Paulhus, 2002). Survey participants, for example, may feel inclined to underreport socially taboo behaviours (e.g. drug use or sexual behaviours) but overreport behaviours that are perceived to be socially more desirable (e.g. number of hours spent for courses or number of books read within a term). Such a tendency is so pervasive that it may even jeopardize survey validity (Mick, 1996; Porter, 2011).

Studies into teacher motivations predominantly employ surveys (Brookhart & Freeman, 1992). Questionnaires/scales can be effective tools of data collection. However, they are vulnerable to a possible social desirability bias as well as other types of response bias (Dörnyei, 2010). It is possible that, when responding to a questionnaire or a scale on reasons for choosing teaching as a career, participants may be expressing their opinion concerning some motives that they have not even thought before. Erten (2014), thus, argues that questionnaires that seek to explore teachers' entry motivations may impose on students the need to state higher level of agreement with altruistic items. He claims;

> *... participants may be allured to agree with items presenting altruistic/patriotic reasons although they were not quintessentially so motivated. Who can easily disagree with a patriotic item such as "I wanted to become a teacher because I wanted to contribute to the education of future generations."? (Erten, 2014, p. 40)*

Conversely, qualitative studies where students report either orally or in writing why they choose to teach as a career are not without limitations. In addition to generalizability issues inherent in qualitative studies, verbalization effect can be a factor (Ericsson & Simon, 1993). Participants may forget to report their altruistic reasons, possibly resulting in underrepresentation of such motives. However, Erten (2014) argues that such a case is less likely as, in self-report and introspective tools of data collection, participants tend to verbalise their vivid and personally salient thought processes and memories (Ericsson & Simon, 1993). Hence, Brookhart and Freeman (1992) call for more qualitative studies for a deeper understanding of the phenomenon. More research is needed to clarify the controversy.

This study, then, seeks to explore whether different tools of data collection yield contradicting results regarding entry motivations of student teachers and whether altruistic reasons hold constant across different instruments.

2. METHOD

2.1 Setting and Participants

This study was conducted at the English Language Teaching (ELT) department of a state university, located in Ankara, Turkey, where a four-year teacher education programme with an additional one-year compulsory language preparatory programme is offered to all enrolled students. Those students who succeed in the preparatory programme exemption exam given at the beginning of each academic year or achievement tests given at the end of the term and/or academic year can join the mainstream teacher education programme.

Entry to the programme is through a centrally administered competitive university placement exam. Students are assessed and placed according to a composite score that consists of students' high school achievement score, test performance in the English language test as well other tests (for details see, OSYM, 2014). Students who qualify to enrol in the ELT teacher training programme usually fall within top 1000 students (approximately equalling to 97th percentile and above). Therefore, it is not unwarranted to assume that student teachers have a reasonably homogeneous entry levels of qualifications.

Employability of the graduates of a programme can influence students' entry motivations. Teachers of English, despite the large surplus of teacher supply, are still demanded (Eren & Tezel, 2010) both by the government and the private sector educational enterprises. Therefore, students enrolled in ELT programmes do not experience as severe an employment concern as students in other teacher education programmes.

Participants in this study, then, were 248 student teachers of English as a foreign language. Students were from different years of the study, representing a satisfactory 49% of all students in the programme. Of participants, 131 were female while 57 were male, representing a characteristic gender distribution in many ELT programmes in Turkey (Erten, 2014). 60 students did not report their gender as this was an optional question. Students had a fairly successful grade point average (GPA) (*M = 3.18/4.00, SD = .34).*

2.2 Instruments

A composite survey form was employed to collect data. The instrument consisted of four sections. The first section elicited some demographic information from the participants. Remaining three sections sought participants' entry motivations. In each section, the participants had a different task to do. The first section asked students to self-report verbally in writing why they chose to become a teacher of English. They were not given any reasons to choose from but report their own reasons in order of their personal salience. This verbal self-report task was given as the first task to avoid and the learning effect bias from the succeeding tasks.

The second section required students to respond to FIT-Choice Scale (Watt and Richardson, 2005; 2007). The scale was based on a robust expectancy-value theory (Eccles et al., 1983) and has been used and verified across different countries. For example, it has been used by Jugović, Marušić, Ivanec, and Vidović (2012) in Croatia; König and Rothland (2012) in Germany; Lin, et al. (2012) in China; and Topkaya and Uztosun (2012) and Kılınç and Watt (2012) in Turkey. The scale consists of two sections. In the first part encompasses motives to become while the second part includes items regarding perceptions of teaching. For research purposes only the first part of the scale was used for this study. The scale used here consists of 37 items and employs a 7-point Likert scale and organized into motivational factors such as *ability*, *intrinsic career value*, *fallback career* [undesired, secondary preference], *personal utility value* (job security; time for family; job transferability; bludging [undemanding easy job]), *social utility value* (shaping the future of children/adolescents; enhancing social equity; making a social

contribution; working with children/adolescents), *prior teaching and learning experience*, and *social influences*. The scale was always reported to have acceptable Cronbach alpha estimates (∞ > .7). Watt and Richardson (2012, p. 191) report internal consistency coefficients from 8 different studies. Only fallback career subscale had lower coefficients in two studies (∞ varying between .57 and .67). Overall, the scale represents a robust, theory-driven instrument to investigate teacher motivations.

The third section required students to select 5 reasons of the highest personal salience from the 37 reasons presented in the FIT Choice Scale and rank them in order of personal significance. Different from the verbal self-report task, participants in this task were instructed to select from an existing list of reasons and rank them in order of significance to explore comparative importance of main motivators.

2.3 Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis

The data were collected online in the spring term of 2013-2014 academic year. An online version of the composite survey form was uploaded onto Google Documents. All students enrolled in the ELT teacher training programme were invited to visit the html address and fill in the online form. A satisfactory 49% return rate was observed.

The data were analysed to descriptively seek whether different tools of data collection yield different results as to the best attractors of an ELT programme. To do this, an order of significance had to be drawn in all three sets of data (i.e. verbal self-report; FIT-Choice Scale; and rank order task).

Due to different natures of the data in the emergent data some preliminary analysis had to be done. Firstly, qualitative self-report data were analysed through a constant comparative method within a Grounded Theory framework (Glaser and Straus, 1967) whereby the data were firstly tallied for recurring themes. In order to make the comparison between different sets of data in this study, labels derived from the FIT-Choice scale were employed, as well as setting the data free to generate non-overlapping themes and categories. A further inter-coder reliability analysis revealed that two independent coders were satisfactorily consistent (Holsti coefficient = .85; Holsti, 1969).

After labelling of the qualitative data, order of significance was tabulated following the same procedures both in the self-report data and the rank order data. All reasons given in the 1st rank through the 5th rank were assigned different values from 7 to 1 to denote their level of importance for the participants, 7 being the most important and 1 being the least important. Two extra points were given to the reason reported in the 1st order to put emphasis on being reported so. The resulting value assignments of the reasons were then 7 for the 1st; 4 for the 2nd; 3 for the 3rd; 2 for the 4th; and finally 1 for the 5th. Due to disproportionate number of items in the subscales of the FIT-Choice scale and to allow comparison between different sets of data, mean values were calculated for each subscale. The quantitative data from the FIT-Choice scale were also analysed to calculate mean values for each subscale.

3. FINDINGS

3.2 Order of Reasons in Different Sets of Data

3.2.1 Reasons From The Qualitative Self-Report Data

The analysis of the qualitative data revealed that participants in the self-report data reported to have chosen to become a teacher mainly for intrinsic reasons. Mean significance values of the

items in different subscales indicated that intrinsic values prevailed by a large margin, achieving a mean significance value of 268, followed by ability (M = 53), personal utility (M = 36), social utility (M = 34), fallback career (M = 31), and social influence (M = 29). These can be further examined in Table 1.

Table 1: Reasons in the Qualitative Self-Report Data

Reasons	F	Mean
Intrinsic Career Value	155	268
Ability	32	53
Personal Utility	84	36
Social Utility	131	34
Fallback Career	17	31
Social Influence	32	29

The analysis of the data also revealed some reasons that were not included and incompatible with the classification offered in the first part of the FIT-Choice scale. These were, in order of significance, love of English, self-actualization, suitable to one's personality, university placement system, suitability to my sex (female), teacher parents as role models, social status, and social job. These are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Non-FIT Choice Reasons in the Qualitative Self-Report Data

Reasons	F	Total
Love of English	47	305
Self-actualisation	24	138
Appropriate to my personality	21	123
University placement system	19	120
Appropriate to my sex (Female)	12	66
Teacher parents as role models	10	60
Social status	11	60
Social job	6	33

Of these, although, love of English could be included in the intrinsic value of teaching, it was regarded as a distinct reason. This was mainly partly because love of English does not necessarily entail *teaching of English* and partly because it was not always clear in responses whether participants implied teaching of English. Another reason that deserves attention is teacher parents as role models. This appears to be compatible with the social influence category. However, it can be culture specific and presents a different concept than usual influence received from the environment. It, to some extent, involves following footsteps of parents in real life. Finally *social status* and teaching being a *social profession* resonate with perceptions of teaching presented in the second part of the FIT-Choice scale. These reasons are presented here as this study made use of only the first part of the FIT-Choice scale.

3.2.2 Reasons in the FIT-Choice Scale

Analysis of the quantitative data from the FIT-Choice scale showed that, different from the case in the qualitative self-report data, participants reported choosing teaching as a career mainly for altruistic reasons as represented in the FIT-Choice scale by social utility items. They achieved the highest mean values and the smallest standard deviation (M = 5.17, SD = 1.07), which was much lower in the qualitative self-report. Except for the upward move of the reasons given in the set of social utility value, the order of significance attributed to other sets of reasons was similar in the FIT-Choice scale data. Intrinsic career value (M = 4.83, SD = 1.77) had the second highest mean value followed by ability reasons (M = 4.78, SD = 1.33); personal utility reasons (M = 4.14, SD = 1.18) and social influence reasons (M = 4.06, SD = 1.09) with lesser significance. Participants reported the lowest mean value for a fallback career (M = 2.58, SD = 1.40). These can be seen Table 3.

Table 3: Order of Reasons in FIT-Choice Scale

Reasons	N	Mean	SD
Social utility	248	5.17	1.07
Intrinsic career value	248	4.83	1.77
Ability	248	4.78	1.33
Personal utility	248	4.14	1.18
Social Influence	248	4.06	1.09
Fallback career	248	2.58	1.40

3.2.3 Reasons in the Ranking Task

The analysis of the data from the ranking task revealed a rank of significance almost identical to that found in the qualitative self-report data, with a switch of the 5th and the 6th places between social influence (M= 77) and fallback career (M = 43). Similar to the rank order in the qualitative self-report data, the top attractors to the teaching profession emerged to be intrinsic values attributed to the teaching profession (M = 278) and perceived ability about the teaching (M = 140). Personal utility reasons achieved a third place (M = 106) followed by social utility reasons (M = 94) in the fourth place. Table 4 presents results varying levels of significance found in the ranking task.

Table 4: Order of Reasons in the Ranking Task

Reasons	F	Mean
Intrinsic career value	201	278
Ability	116	140
Personal utility	356	106
Social utility	264	94
Social influence	139	77
Fallback career	34	43

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study sought to explore whether different tools of data collection yields conflicting results in investigating motives for choosing a teaching career. Therefore, the findings will be discussed within this limited framework. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss in detail why people actually choose teaching as a career.

The analysis of the data that emerged from the three sets of data showed that reasons for choosing teaching as a career were attributed similar levels of personal salience across different sets. Social utility value reasons (altruism), however, were exceptions to this observation. They were attributed the highest significance in the FIT-Choice Scale data. However, this prevailing significance appears to disappear in both the qualitative self-report data and the rank order task data where altruistic reasons were credited with lesser importance and downgraded from the most important to the fourth most important sets of reasons. It was particularly interesting to note that social utility value reasons appear to have lost some of their attributed significance in the rank order task and similarly were not reported as frequently in the self-report data or reported as less significant than other reasons when so done.

The findings from the FIT-Choice Scale were in keeping with the findings from the studies that used both the FIT Choice Scale (e.g. Watt & Richardson, 2007; Lin et al. 2012; Topkaya & Uztosun, 2012, Kılınç et al., 2012) and other independent questionnaires (Kyriacou & Coulthart, 2000; Saban, 2003; Özsoy et al., 2010; also see Brookhart & Freeman, 1992 for a review of papers) in that altruistic reasons prevail over other reasons.

The picture gets complicated when considered the fact that altruistic reasons were given much less significance in the self-report qualitative task, falling behind intrinsic reasons, ability reasons and personal utility reasons. These findings, too, are consistent with those found in studies with compatible research tools (e.g. Erten, 2014; Boz & Boz, 2008; Kılınç & Mahiroğlu, 2008), where mainly intrinsic and extrinsic reasons were documented to have a critical impact on choosing teaching as a career.

It was particularly interesting to note that altruistic reasons have lost some ground in significance in the rank order task. Altruistic reasons that were rated as the most important reasons for choosing teaching as a career in the FIT-Choice Scale were relegated to the fourth place in personal salience when participants were instructed to rank the 5 personally most important reasons presented in the FIT-Choice. Moreover, it was especially important to observe that the order of significance was almost identical in both the qualitative self-report data and the rank order data. It can be speculated that when asked to compare to other reasons, participants probably had more personally appealing reasons than altruism.

The inconsistency documented in this study is striking as the data collected over the three sections employed should not be constrained by any possible variations across different samples and contextual variables. All participants studied English language teaching and were students at the same university. They all joined with similar qualifications. Further, they all filled in the same instruments. Thus the question arises: what makes people respond variably in different instruments that seek to explore the same construct.

One explanation of this controversy can be given with reference to a widely known response bias inherent in survey studies: socially desirable responding (Brick, 1996; Paulhus, 2002; Dörnyei, 2010; Porter, 2011). Porter (2011), for example, provides examples from how diary/memory tasks and surveys can yield controversial results with inflated or deflated results in the surveys reflecting how socially desirable the responses are perceived by participants. Altruism that is under scrutiny in this study is no exception to social desirability bias. Given the fact that serving and giving back to society and helping the betterment of individuals and the communities alike are socially desirable behaviours expected of many in the modern world. Survey items

tapping onto such virtues are, therefore, likely to lead to higher levels of agreement on such items as it should be difficult to disagree on altruistic items (Erten, 2014). This could explain why altruistic reasons prevail almost all quantitative studies into teachers' entry motivations.

Use of self-report tasks can also raise concerns whether students are able to report possible reasons. They may simply forget to verbalize service oriented reasons. However, this should be regarded less likely. Firstly, the qualitative self-report data in this study identified more reasons than those included in the FIT-Choice scale. It appears that participants actually had a wider repertoire of reasons than presented in the survey scale. Secondly, when introspecting, self-reporting, and on memory tasks participants tend to report vivid and personally salient memories (Brookhart and Freeman, 1992; Ericsson & Simon, 1993; Porter, 2011). Choosing a profession for a particular reason should qualify to be vivid and personal salient enough to be remembered in such tasks. Thirdly, the orders of significance identified in the qualitative self-report task and the rank order task are almost identical, especially with reference to top attractors of teaching as a profession, implying that participants did verbalize their personally significant reasons just as efficiently as they did in the ranking task.

All considered, it is not unwarranted to conclude that tools of data collection, expectedly, yield controversial results and that the significance attributed to altruistic reasons in the quantitative survey tool in this study may have been inflated by the participants due to their socially desirable properties. Therefore, we need to be cautious when interpreting survey findings concerning altruism.

Implications of this study are two-fold. Firstly, it may be beneficial to triangulate data on issues that are likely to attract socially desirable responding, with data from complementary tools employing a single instrument research methodology as the findings may be constrained by response biases. To this end, Porter (2011) questions the validity of surveys with college students and recommends using, where possible, alternative tools. Similarly, Brookhart and Freeman (1992) warn against overreliance on surveys and calls for more frequent use of qualitative tools of data collection for a deeper understanding of student teachers' motivations.

Secondly, measures may have to be taken to cope with possible social desirability bias in research data. This issue is taken seriously in marketing research but rarely thought about in the field educational research especially at the tertiary level (Porter, 2011). Several instruments are readily available to test socially desirable responding. The most frequently used ones are Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) and Paulhus Deception Scales (Paulhus, 1998). Such tests can be used with the main tool of data collection and can at least indicate whether any social desirability bias is likely in the data. Further studies are necessary to clarify this issue.

5. REFERENCES

Aksu, M., Demir, C.E., Daloğlu, A., Yıldırım, S., & Kiraz, E. (2010). Who are the future teachers in Turkey? Characteristics of entering student teachers. *Journal of Educational Development, 30*, 91-101.

Boz, Y., & Boz, N. (2008). Kimya ve matematik öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen olma nedenleri. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, *16*(1), 137-144.

Brookhart, S.M., & Freeman, D.J. (1992). Characteristics of entering teacher candidates. *Review of Educational Research, 62*, 37–60.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*, 349-354.

Dörnyei, Z. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Eccles (Parsons), J.S., Adler, T.F., Futterman, R., Goff, S.B., Kaczala, C.M., Meece, J.L., et al. (1983). Expectancies, values, and academic behaviors. In J.T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motivation* (pp. 75–146). San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Eren, A., & Tezel, K. V (2010). Factors influencing teaching choice, professional plans about teaching, and future time perspective: A mediational analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*, 1416-1428.

Ericsson, K., & Simon, H. (1993). *Protocol analysis: verbal reports as data* (2nd ed.). Boston: MIT Press.

Erten, I. H. (2014). Understanding the reasons behind choosing to teach English as a foreign language. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, *8*(1), 30-44.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine.

Holsti, O. R., (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Jugović, I., Marušić, I., Pavin Ivanec, T., & Vizek Vidović, V. (2012). Motivation and personality of preservice teachers in Croatia. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *40*(3), 271-287.

Kılınç, A., & Mahiroğlu, A. (2009). The attractors of teaching biology: A perspective from a Turkish context. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *34*(5), 15-39.

Kılınç, A., Watt, H.M.G., & Richardson, P.W., (2012). Factors influencing teaching choice in Turkey. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *40*(3), 199-226.

König, J., & Rothland, M. (2012). Motivations for choosing teaching as a career: effects on general pedagogical knowledge during initial teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *40*(3), 289-315.

Kyriacou, C., & Coulthart, M. (2000). Undergraduates' views of teaching as a career choice. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy*, *26*(2), 117-126.

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

Lin, E., Shi, Q., Wang, J., Zhang, S., & Hui, L. (2012). Initial motivations for teaching: comparison between preservice teachers in the United States and China. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *40*(3), 227-248.

Mick, D. G. (1996). Are studies of dark side variables confounded by socially desirable responding? The case of materialism. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 106-119.

OSYM (2014) *Selection and placement of students in higher education institutions in Turkey*. Ankara: OSYM. http://dokuman.osym.gov.tr/pdfdokuman/2014/YGS/2014_OSYS_KILAVUZU_02_01_2014.pdf, retrieved on 21.06.2014.

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.

Paulhus, D. L. (1998). *Paulhus deception scales (PDS): the balanced inventory of desirable responding-7: user's manual*. North Tanawanda NY: Multi-Health Systems.

Paulhus, D. L. (2002). Socially desirable responding: The evolution of a construct. In Braun, H. I., Jackson, D. N., & Wiley, D. E. (Eds.). *The role of constructs in psychological and educational measurement*, (49-69). Mahwah NJ: Earlbaum.

Porter, A. C., & Freeman, D. J. (1986). Professional orientations: an essential domain for teacher testing. *Journal of Negro Education*, 284-292.

Porter, S. R. (2011). Do college student surveys have any validity? *The Review of Higher Education*, *35*(1), 45-76.

Saban, A. (2003). A Turkish profile of prospective elementary school teachers and their views of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *19*(8), 829-846.

Şahin, A. E. (2010). Professional status of elementary teaching in Turkey: a Delphi study. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *16*, 437–459.

Taylor, A. (2006). Perceptions of prospective entrants to teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*, 451-464.

Topkaya, E. Z., & Uztosun, M. S. (2012). Choosing *teaching as a career: motivations of preservice English teachers in Turkey. Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *3*(1), 126-134.

Türk Eğitim Sen. (2011). Ataması yapılmayan öğretmenler Ankara'yı inletti. [Unappointed teachers roared in Ankara]. Retrieved from http://www.turkegitimsen.org.tr/haber_gosterphp?haber_id=13992 on 18.02.2013

Ubuz, B., & Sarı, S. (2008). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğini seçme nedenleri [Reasons of student teachers of primary education for choosing the profession]. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *24*, 113-119.

Watt, H. M., & Richardson, P.W. (2007). Motivational factors influencing teaching as a career choice: development and validation of the FIT-Choice scale. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *75*(3), 167-202.

Watt, H. M., & Richardson, P. W. (2012). An introduction to teaching motivations in different countries: comparisons using the FIT-Choice scale. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *40*(3), 185-197.

YÖK (2014). *Decision number 9, 22 February 2014*. http://yok.gov.tr/web/guest/icerik/-/journal_content/56_INSTANCE_rEHF8BIsfYRx/10279/7817301, retrieved on 21.06.2014.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Son yıllarda öğretmen adaylarının neden bu mesleği seçtiklerini betimlemeye yönelik bir ilgi artışı gözlemlenmektedir. Öğretmenlerin mesleğe giriş nedenlerinin anlaşılmasının, öğretmen yetiştirme programları ve öğretmen istihdam politikaları gibi birçok konuda önemli faydaları bulunmaktadır.

Öğretmenlerin mesleğe giriş motivasyonları ile ilgili olarak yapılan araştırmalar; alternatif adlandırmalar kullanılsa da öğretmenlik mesleğini kariyer olarak seçme nedenlerini içsel sebepler, dışsal sebepler ve özgeci sebepler olmak üzere üç farklı neden kategorisinde toplamaktadır. Bununla birlikte bu konuda yapılan araştırmalar, kişilerin en çok hangi nedenlerle bu mesleğe yöneldiklerine dair çelişkili sonuçlar ortaya koymaktadır. Çalışmalar, öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelmede içsel (intrinsic) ve dışsal (extrinsic) faktörlerin önemi konusunda benzer bulgular ortaya koysa da özgeci (altruistic) nedenlerin ne derece önemli olduğu yönünde çelişkili sonuçlar gözlemlenebilmektedir. Bu konudaki farklı sonuçların temelinde, çalışmalarda kullanılan veri toplama yöntemlerinin olabileceği yönünde gözlemler de bulunmaktadır (Brookhart ve Freeman, 1992; Porter, 2011; Erten, 2014). Yapılan nicel çalışmalar (örn. Kılınç, Watt ve Richardson, 2012) özgeci değerleri çoğunlukla en önemli değerler arasında göstermektedir. Bununla birlikte nitel araştırmalarda (örn. Ubuz ve Sarı, 2008) bu nedenlerden ya çok az bahsedilmekte ya da bunlara çok daha az önem atfedilmektedir. Erten (2014) bu çelişkili sonuçların anket ve ölçek çalışmalarının doğası gereği sıklıkla görülebilen toplumsal cazibe yanlılığına (social desirability bias) bağlanabileceğini savunmuştur. Katılımcılar, toplumsal olarak ulvî kabul edilen özgeci değerler anket veya ölçeklerde sorulduğunda daha önce adı geçen sebebi hiç düşünmemiş olsalar bile bu değerler, verilen neden cümlesinin ulvî özelliklerinden ötürü toplumsal olarak cazip görünüp katılımcılardan olumlu yönde hemfikirlik çekebilmektedir (Porter, 2011; Dörnyei, 2010). Kaldı ki anket ve ölçeklerde özgeci değerleri ölçmek için kullanılan "gelecek nesillerin eğitimine katkıda bulunmak istediğim için öğretmen olmak istedim" şeklindeki bir ifadeye katılmıyorum demek zor olsa gerekir. Bu yüzden bu çalışma, bu konuda kullanılan farklı veri toplama yöntemlerinin sonuçları etkileyip çelişkili sonuçların ortaya çıkmasına neden olup olmadığını araştırmayı hedeflemektedir.

Bu çalışma, Ankara'da bulunan bir devlet üniversitesinin İngilizce öğretmenliği programında yürütülmüştür. Ortam ve örneklem etkisini en aza indirebilmek için aynı programın öğrencileri çevrimiçi bir tarama formunu cevaplamaya davet edilmiştir. Yüzde ellilik bir katılım oranıyla, toplam 248 katılımcı üç bölümden oluşan formu cevaplamıştır. İlk bölümde katılımcılardan nitel olarak kendilerini öğretmen olmaya yönelten nedenleri önem sırasıyla yazmalarını istemiştir. İkinci bölümde ise Watt ve Richadson (2007) tarafından geliştirilen Öğretmenlik Mesleğini Seçmeyi Etkileyen Faktörler Ölçeği (FIT-Choice) uygulanmıştır. Bu ölçek birçok çalışmada kullanılmış olup hakkında tatminkâr güvenilirlik değerleri rapor edilmiştir (bkz. Watt ve Richarson, 2012). Son olarak katılımcılardan sıralama bölümünde, FIT-Choice ölçeğinden seçecekleri kendileri için önemli beş nedeni kendi içlerinde önem sırasına koymaları istenmiştir.

Ortaya çıkan nitel veriler, öncelikle yinelenen temalar açısından kodlanmıştır. Bu kodlamada öncelikli olarak FIT-Choice ölçeğindeki neden isimleri kullanılmıştır. Tespit edilen temalara FIT-Choice ölçeğinde karşılık bulunamadığı durumlarda da yeni kategori isimleri üretilmiştir. Kodlamanın güvenilirliği test etmek için ikinci bir araştırmacı ile yapılan mukayese iki araştırmacının tutarlı olduğunu ortaya koymuştur (Holsti güvenilirlik katsayısı .85). Bu işlemden sonra girilen nedenler önem sırasına göre

rakamsal bir değer verilmiştir. Birinci sırada verilen nedene 7 puan, 2. nedene 4, 3. neden 3, 4. nedene 2, 5. nedene de 1 puan verilmiştir. Böylece, birinci neden olarak belirtilmenin önemini vurgulamak için ilk sırada verilen nedene iki ek puan verilmiştir. Aynı puanlama sıralama bölümündeki nedenler için de kullanılmıştır. FIT-Choice ölçeğinden elde edilen nicel veriler ise betimsel olarak analiz edilmiş, madde ve altölçek ortalama puanları üzerinden bir değerlendirme yapılmıştır.

Farklı bölümlerden elde edilen sonuçların karşılaştırması, özgeci değerlerin öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelmedeki önemleri açısında kolaylıkla gözlemlenebilen bir tutarsızlığı ortaya çıkartmaktadır. Nitel veriler ve sıralama bölümü sonuçları ile FIT-Choice ölçeğinden elde edilen sonuçlar farklılık göstermektedir. Nitel ve sıralama bölümünden elde edilen verilerin analizi, öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelten en önemli nedenlerin içsel sebepler, yetenek sebepleri ve kişisel yarar sebepleri (personal utility reasons) olduğunu; özgeci (altruistic) sebeplerin ancak dördüncü sırada ifade edildiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Bununla birlikte özgeci nedenler, FIT-Choice ölçeğinde en önemli nedenler olarak birinci sırada ifade edilmiştir.

Burada tespit edilen farklı sonuçlar kullanılan veri toplama araçlarının doğası ile açıklanabilir. Kuramsal temelli nedenlerin bir araya getirilmesi ile oluşturulan anket ve ölçekler, katılımcılara önceden hazırlanmış bir nedenler listesi olarak sunulduğu için ilk olarak katılımcılardan daha önce belki de üzerinde hiç düşünmedikleri öğretmenliği seçme nedenlerin kendilerine ne kadar uyduğunu sorgulamaktadır. İkincisi, bu formlarda sunulan toplumsal cazibesi yüksek maddelere olumsuz cevap vermek zor olabilir bu da toplumsal cazibe yanlılığına neden olabilir. Öğretmen olma nedenleri içinde özgeci nedenler, toplumsal cazibesi yüksek olan ve modern toplumlarda ulvî kabul edilen değerlerdir. Bu nedenle bu değerlerin özellikle FIT-Choice ölçeğinde yüksek çıkması, bu değerlerin katılımcılar adına bir yanlılık sorunu yaşatmış olabileceğine işarettir. Nitel verilerde bu nedenlerin çok daha az önem derecesine sahip olması ve özellikle öğretmen olma nedenlerinin FIT-Choice ölçeğinden seçilerek önem sıralaması yapılan sıralama bölümünde çok daha alt sıralarda öneme sahip olmaları, özgeci değerlere bu çalışmanın özelikle nicel kısmında toplumsal cazibe yanlılığı ile şişirilmiş bir önem derecesi verildiğine en ciddi kanıt olarak kabul edilebilir.

Bulgular ve tartışma ışığında bu çalışma, sadece anket ve ölçek yardımıyla öğretmenliğe yönelme nedenlerinin yansız olarak incelemenin zor olacağı, bu tür çalışmalarda alternatif nitel veri toplama araçları ile verilerin desteklenmesi gerektiği sonucuna varmaktadır. Bu tür çalışmalarda toplumsal cazibe yanlılığı sorununu gidermek için ek önlem alınması uygun olacaktır. Araştırmacılar, Marlowe-Crowne Cazibe Ölçeği (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) veya Paulhus Aldatma Ölçeği (Paulhus, 1998) gibi ölçeklerle çalışmalarındaki toplumsal cazibe yanlılığını denetleyebilirler.

Citation Information

Erten, İ. H. (2015). Social Desirability Bias in Altruistic Motivation for Choosing Teaching as a Career. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi [Hacettepe University Journal of Education], 30*(1), 77-89.