

THE OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION AND THE CURRICULUM
SATISFACTION OF THE TEACHERS
AT THE SECOND CYCLE OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

EDA TÜZEMEN GENÇER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

AUGUST 2004

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer AYATA
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Hasan ŞİMŞEK
Chair of the Educational Sciences Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Educational Sciences.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ahmet OK
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Sadettin KİRAZCI (METU) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ahmet OK (METU) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ercan KİRAZ (METU) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Eda TÜZEMEN GENÇER

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION AND THE CURRICULUM SATISFACTION OF THE TEACHERS AT THE SECOND CYCLE OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Tüzemen Gençer, Eda

MSc, Department of Educational Sciences

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Ahmet OK

August 2004, 84 pages

The purpose of this study was to assess the overall job satisfaction and the curriculum satisfaction of the teachers teaching Mathematics, Turkish, Social Studies, Natural Sciences, and Foreign Language at 6-8 grades of public elementary schools. A questionnaire developed by the researcher was used as the data collection instrument of this study. All the teachers working at the 6-8 grades of the public elementary schools in Turkey and teaching Mathematics, Turkish, Social Studies, Natural Sciences, and Foreign Language constituted the population of the study. The total number of the teachers who constituted the sample was 720. The data gathered was analyzed by SPSS program; descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test, and one-way ANOVA. The results showed that the teachers were satisfied in terms of overall job satisfaction, however, quite undecided in terms of curriculum satisfaction. According to the results of the study, there was a significant difference between the teachers' overall job satisfaction in terms of age, marital status, educational background, work experience, lesson load, and motive for choosing teaching profession, but no difference in terms of their gender, number of courses taught, and teaching subject. The results also showed that there was a significant difference between the teachers' curriculum satisfaction in terms of teaching subject. When the teachers' choice for a new career was considered, there was a significant difference

between the teachers' overall job satisfaction and between their curriculum satisfaction.

Keywords: Teachers' Job Satisfaction, Overall Job Satisfaction, Curriculum Satisfaction

ÖZ

İLKÖĞRETİM İKİNCİ KADEME ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN GENEL İŞ DOYUMU VE DERS PROGRAMLARINDAN SAĞLADIKLARI DOYUM

Tüzemen Gençer, Eda

Yüksek Lisans, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ahmet OK

Ağustos 2004, 84 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı devlet ilköğretim okullarının ikinci kademesinde görev yapan Matematik, Türkçe, Sosyal Bilgiler, Fen Bilgisi, ve Yabancı Dil öğretmenlerinin genel iş doyumunun ve ders programından sağladıkları doyumun incelenmesidir. Çalışmada veri toplama aracı olarak araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan anket kullanılmıştır. Devlet ilköğretim okullarının ikinci kademesinde görev yapan tüm Matematik, Türkçe, Sosyal Bilgiler, Fen Bilgisi, ve Yabancı Dil öğretmenleri çalışmanın evrenini oluşturmuştur. Örneklemi oluşturan öğretmen sayısı ise 720'dir. Elde edilen veriler SPSS Paket Programı'ndan yararlanılarak, betimsel istatistikler, t-test, tek yönlü varyans analizi kullanılarak çözümlenmiştir. Çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre öğretmenler genel iş doyumunu açısından doyumlu görünmekte, ancak ders programı doyumunu açısından kararsız görünmektedir. Ayrıca, yaş, medeni durum, eğitim düzeyi, iş tecrübesi, ders yükü, ve öğretmenlik mesleğini seçme gerekçesi söz konusu olduğunda öğretmenlerin genel iş doyumları arasında anlamlı farklar ortaya çıkmıştır; ancak, cinsiyet, verilen farklı ders sayısı, ve branş söz konusu olduğunda öğretmenlerin genel iş doyumları arasında anlamlı bir fark olmadığı görülmüştür. Bunun yanı sıra, farklı branş öğretmenlerinin ders programı doyumları arasında anlamlı farklar ortaya çıkmıştır. Öğretmenlerin öğretmenlik mesleğine yaklaşımı söz konusu olduğunda ise, öğretmenlerin hem genel iş doyumlarında hem de ders programı doyumlarında anlamlı farklar bulunmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğretmenlerin İş Doyumu, Genel İş Doyumu, Ders Programından Sağlanan Doyum

To My Family, especially My Father

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my thesis advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Ok for all the time, support and guidance he provided generously at every single stage of the realization of this study.

I would like to express my appreciation to my whole family, especially my aunt and my husband, for their unconditional and invaluable support and suggestions.

Thanks are also due to many friends who have helped me with ideas, encouragement and practical help.

I wish to thank the proposal committee who shared their knowledge and suggestions with me during the shaping of the study.

I would also like to thank the Examining Committee Members for their suggestions before the submission of this thesis to the Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to all nameless teachers for their contribution to the results of this study.

This study was supported by the Educational Research and Development Department (EARGED) of the Ministry of National Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Purpose and Problem of the Study.....	3
1.3 Significance of the Study.....	4
1.4 Definitions of Terms.....	4
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
2.1 What is Job Satisfaction?.....	6
2.2 The Importance of Job Satisfaction.....	8
2.3 The Theories and Determinants of Job Satisfaction.....	9
2.4 The Assessment of Job Satisfaction.....	14
2.5 What is Curriculum?.....	15
2.6 The Importance of Curriculum.....	17
2.7 The Issues to be Considered in Developing a Curriculum.....	18

2.8 Studies Conducted Abroad on Job Satisfaction.....	19
2.9 Studies Conducted in Turkey on Job Satisfaction.....	24
2.10 Studies on Curriculum Satisfaction.....	25
2.11 The Summary of the Correlates of Overall Job Satisfaction.....	26
3. METHOD.....	28
3.1 Overall Design of the Study.....	28
3.2 Population and Sample.....	29
3.3 Data Collection Instruments.....	33
3.4 Data Collection Procedures.....	35
3.5 Data Analysis Procedures.....	35
3.6 Assumptions.....	36
3.7 Delimitations	36
4. RESULTS.....	37
4.1 Characteristics of the Participants.....	37
4.2 Results of the Study.....	40
4.2.1 Overall Job Satisfaction.....	40
4.2.2 Overall Job Satisfaction and Independent Variables.....	41
4.2.3 Curriculum Satisfaction.....	48
4.2.4 Curriculum Satisfaction and Teaching Subject.....	49
4.2.5 Overall Job Satisfaction and Job Preference.....	50
4.2.6 Curriculum Satisfaction and Job Preference.....	51
5. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	53
5.1 Discussion.....	53
5.2 Implications for Practice.....	60

5.3 Implications for Further Research.....	64
REFERENCES.....	65
APPENDICES.....	69
A. THE LIST OF THE SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO THE CENTRAL DISTRICTS AND CITIES.....	69
B. OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION AND CURRICULUM SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH VERSION).....	72
C. GENEL İŞ DOYUMU VE DERS PROGRAMI DOYUMU ANKETİ (TURKISH VERSION)	76
D. FACTOR LOADS OF OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION AND CURRICULUM SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE.....	80
E. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR EACH ITEM OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	81

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

1. The Cities Representing the Geographical Regions and Their Populations.....	30
2. Number of Subject Teachers in Turkey.....	30
3. Number of Teachers Invited to the Study.....	31
4. Number of Central Districts and Schools.....	32
5. Number of Valid Questionnaires (Cities).....	35
6. The Distribution of Teachers by Age.....	37
7. The Distribution of Teachers by Work Experience.....	38
8. The Distribution of Teachers by City.....	39
9. The Distribution of Teachers by Teaching Subject.....	40
10. Intervals for the Level of Satisfaction (OJS).....	41
11. ANOVA according to Age.....	42
12. Overall Job Satisfaction and Age.....	42
13. Independent Sample t-test for Male and Female Teachers.....	43
14. Independent Sample t-test for Marital Status.....	43
15. ANOVA according to Educational Background.....	44
16. ANOVA according to Work Experience.....	45
17. Overall Job Satisfaction and Work Experience.....	45
18. Independent Sample t-test for the Number of Courses Taught.....	46
19. ANOVA according to Teaching Subject (OJS).....	46
20. Independent Sample t-test for Lesson Load.....	47
21. Independent Sample t-test for the Motive for Teaching Profession.....	48

22. Intervals for the Level of Satisfaction (CS).....	48
23. ANOVA according to Teaching Subject (CS).....	49
24. Curriculum Satisfaction and Teaching Subject.....	50
25. ANOVA according to Teachers' Job Preference (OJS).....	50
26. Overall Job Satisfaction and Teachers' Job Preference	51
27. ANOVA according to Teachers' Job Preference (CS).....	51
28. Curriculum Satisfaction and Teachers' Job Preference	52

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

In every sector, threat had been used for years as a motivator for performance and productivity, however, it was understood that it was a temporary motivator, which decreased when the threat was removed (Brown, 1996). In the search of a more permanent and effective motivator, many organizational researchers found that there was a strong correlation between motivation and productivity, that is to say, the ‘satisfaction’ of employees was a determinant of their motivation which had great impact on their productivity and efficacy, and therefore, the organizational success (Avi-Itzhak, 1988). When the sectors which were directly in the service of the society are considered, such as marketing and banking, the importance of the employee satisfaction became more significant. As a result, after 1980s, people were accepted to be one of the ‘resources’ that was necessary not only for production but also for quality. Such an understanding caused some crucial modifications in the organizations inevitably. ‘Human Resources’ became an important unit of Personnel Management departments, which made use of various studies and theories in the field in order to increase the satisfaction of their employees (Mathis & Jackson, 1997).

When teaching profession is considered, teachers are among the most important ‘resources’ in education. They serve as the bridge between the theory and the practice. In educational organizations, which are among service organizations, the students, who can be accepted as the clients, are vastly dependent on the teacher’s professional attitude (Avi-Itzhak, 1988).

Taking the relation between job satisfaction and productivity into consideration, and considering the role of teachers in educational organizations, their level of satisfaction, how they feel about their work, gain an utmost importance because a group of reasonably satisfied teachers constitute an important component for school improvement (Watson, Hatton, Squires & Soliman, 1991).

Job satisfaction is not a one-dimensional but a complex and elusive concept which involves many internal and external variables in itself (Watson, et.al., 1991). There has been various research conducted to define those variables and their impact on the overall job satisfaction. These variables can also be defined as antecedents which are grouped under two major categories from the employee's standing point; internal and external antecedents.

Internal antecedents are mainly associated with personality and prior experience. As Kottkamp (1990) mentions in one of his works, studies have provided enough evidence that both of them are definitely two factors having great impact on job satisfaction.

External variables include two basic components, which are the environment itself and the factors associated with the job. Together they involve how people are treated, relations with others in the workplace, nature of job tasks, and rewards (Spector, 1997). The results of many research assert that satisfaction with the content of the work is the dominant job satisfaction factor (Abu-Saad & Hendrix, 1995). A study conducted by Prick (1989) showed that the overall job satisfaction of the teachers working at Dutch secondary schools was mainly determined by job content: teaching and other activities which involved direct contact with students.

When teaching profession is considered, curriculum stands as one of the most important issues in 'factors associated with the job', because, for teaching staff, what constitutes the content of the job is mainly the curriculum. If tasks associated with the job play a significant role in the overall job satisfaction in order to be efficient,

teachers need to be happy and satisfied with the curriculum they use as it constitutes the majority of the tasks and responsibilities in that particular profession.

Therefore, if (1) job satisfaction has an impact on productivity, (2) job content is a determinant of job satisfaction, and (3) curriculum constitutes a great part of job content for teaching profession, then curriculum can be accepted as one of the factors affecting the overall job satisfaction of teachers. This study intends to assess the overall job satisfaction of the teachers, accepting curriculum as one of the facets of this concept. It also assesses the curriculum satisfaction of the teachers, which can be accepted as the evaluation of curricula from a satisfaction perspective.

1.2 Purpose and Problem of the Study

The main purpose of this study is to assess the overall job satisfaction and the curriculum satisfaction of the teachers teaching Mathematics, Turkish, Social Studies, Natural Sciences, and Foreign Language at 6-8 grades of public elementary schools in relation to various variables. Therefore, this study focuses on the following research questions:

1. What is the overall job satisfaction of teachers?
2. Are there any differences among teachers' overall job satisfaction in terms of age, gender, marital status, educational background, work experience, number of courses taught, teaching subject, lesson load, and motive for choosing teaching profession?
3. Are the teachers satisfied with the curricula they use?
4. Are there any differences among different subject area teachers in terms of their curriculum satisfaction?
5. Are there any differences among teachers' overall job satisfaction in terms of their job preference?
6. Are there any differences among teachers' curriculum satisfaction in terms of their job preference?

1.3 Significance of the Study

There is great number of research on job satisfaction and curriculum evaluation in the literature. These studies create a comprehensive spectrum in terms of their sampling, procedure, and results. However, there is lack of research in the available literature combining these two issues; curriculum and job satisfaction. The studies either examine or evaluate the curriculum in detail, not focusing on the perceptions of the teachers from a satisfaction perspective, or examine the job satisfaction of teachers, not using curriculum with its various aspects as an environmental factor. That is to say, they have always been examined separately and with different purposes.

In this study, the researcher attempts to direct the attention towards curriculum by integrating it as a new component of overall job satisfaction of teachers. Therefore, the results of this study present the overall satisfaction of the teachers from a rather different understanding. With this new understanding of job satisfaction, the results of this study are expected to serve as a new ring in the chain of the literature and provide a set of data for further research on the importance and evaluation of curriculum from the stand point of job satisfaction.

This study also provides data regarding different subject teachers' satisfaction with the curricula they use, which can be accepted as the evaluation of different curricula used in Turkey from a satisfaction perspective.

1.4 Definitions of Terms

Overall Job Satisfaction: a state of mind determined by the extent to which the individual feels content with the current working conditions and the coherence between the profession and personal traits.

Curriculum: a plan designed and directed by the school and the official authorities, and implemented by teachers to enhance all of the learning of students.

Curriculum Satisfaction: a state of mind determined by the extent to which the individual feels content with the curriculum he / she uses.

Second Cycle: the sixth, seventh, and the eighth grades of elementary education.

Subject Teachers: the teachers who are specialized at a certain subject area and who teach the lessons of that subject area or an officially equivalent one (Turkish, English, Social Studies, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics).

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter consists of literature review on job satisfaction, curriculum, and studies conducted in both areas. First, the definition and the importance of job satisfaction are mentioned. Second, the theories and determinants of job satisfaction are introduced. Third, the assessment of job satisfaction and three instruments developed for this purpose are clarified. After the literature review on job satisfaction, definition and the importance of curriculum follow. The issues to be considered in developing a curriculum are mentioned before the literature review on studies conducted abroad and in Turkey in relation to job satisfaction and satisfaction with curriculum. Lastly, the summary of the correlates of overall job satisfaction is presented.

2.1 What is Job Satisfaction?

Job satisfaction has been defined in various ways by various researchers. From an overall perspective, Benson defines job satisfaction as “the willingness to remain within the current organization despite inducements to leave” (1983, p. 140). However, it would be misleading to associate job satisfaction with remaining in the organization. The employee may feel dissatisfaction but there may exist other factors which force him to stay in the organization, such as the risk of unemployment, social pressure, or limited choices.

In her study, Avi-Itzhak (1988) defines job satisfaction as “the willingness of the teachers to choose the same profession if it were feasible to reconsider a career choice” (p. 356). Nevertheless, ‘choosing the same profession’ may show the enthusiasm in the profession, but may not reflect the satisfaction obtained in a

particular organization. A teacher can be enthusiastic about the profession but may not be satisfied in his/her current job.

Evans (1997) defines job satisfaction from a more need-oriented perspective. According to her, job satisfaction is “a state of mind determined by the extent to which the individual perceives his/her job-related needs to be being met” (p. 833). From this definition it is possible to claim that job satisfaction is the degree to which a person perceives his/her job as a means for self-actualization in professional context. Yet, studies conducted in educational settings strongly suggest that “teachers are generally motivated by higher needs such as esteem or self-actualization rather than by lower basic needs such as security and personal comfort” (Avi-Itzhak, 1988, p. 355). The results of a study of the same researcher showed that the needs for self-actualization, esteem, and teaching experience had a strong discriminating power than the need of autonomy, age, and organizational complexity. From this perspective, it can be claimed that a satisfied person perceives his/her job not only as a source of income but also as an important part of his/her life, which stands as a distinct component of his/her journey towards self-actualization.

When the definitions above are synthesized, it is possible to reach a more comprehensive definition of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is ‘a state of mind determined by the extent to which the individual feels content with the current working conditions and the coherence between the profession and personal traits’. This definition of job satisfaction includes the attitude of a person in terms of both the profession and the present job.

Job commitment, job fulfillment, job comfort, motivation, and adjustment are important terms with are somehow related to job satisfaction and with each other.

Mowday, Porter, and Steers present job commitment to be a more general concept than job satisfaction, in the sense that, “it is the global evaluation of the linkage between the individual employee and the organization” (cited in Reyes, 1990, p. 143). This linkage leads to believing and accepting the goals and the values of the

organization, putting effort on behalf of the organization, and a willingness to remain in the organization.

Job fulfillment and job comfort are the two components of job satisfaction (Bogler, 2002). Job fulfillment is the degree to which the job is performed, and its relation with job satisfaction is that, the more fulfillment the worker experience, the more satisfied he will be in terms of job-related and achievement-related satisfaction. Job comfort refers to the satisfaction of the worker in terms of working conditions, regardless of personal characteristics.

Satisfaction stands as the source of motivation (Watson, et al., 1991). Motivation sustains performance which is needed for routine but necessary tasks that are required. When teaching profession is considered, commitment and motivation creates the difference between good teaching and poor teaching.

Adjustment is a phenomenon which affects the degree of satisfaction a worker gets with the present working place. It is more overt and more easily manipulated compared to job satisfaction. This concept is also related to job commitment in that, teachers who are highly committed to teaching profession are better adjusted than teachers with a low degree of job commitment (Watson, et al., 1991).

2.2 The Importance of Job Satisfaction

Motivating the employees for the benefits of the organizations is one of the main concerns of any organization. The traditional understanding of motivation is based on authority and economic reward. Therefore, in organizations with such an understanding, employees are constantly supervised and if they do not put forward the expected effort, the economic reward is withdrawn. This approach paid off in past, especially during the first years of industrial revolution, when people even had difficulty in supplying their physical needs. However, in recent decades, people began to expect more from their jobs since the physical needs are better satisfied (Strauss & Sayles, 1972).

The term 'job satisfaction' has gained a significant importance in industrial-organizational psychology and organizational behavior since its implications were accepted to have a direct relationship with lower productivity (Strauss & Sayles, 1972). However, it should not be ignored that it is not the only determinant of productivity. There are other environmental and conditional factors which are effective on productivity. In fact, job satisfaction and productivity are in a constant interaction (Varlık, 2000). That is to say, with high job satisfaction, people may put forward more effort on what they do. Similarly, high effort leads to achievement, which may increase job satisfaction in return.

When job satisfaction in teaching profession is considered, job satisfaction is necessary for high-quality education (Birlik, 1999).

A reasonably satisfied teaching staff is a critical component in any attempt at school improvement. A school is not likely to be improved if there is a pervasive sense of dissatisfaction among the teaching staff. Although it is difficult to establish a causal link between teacher satisfaction and pupil outcomes, there is evidence that satisfied teachers tend to have a positive rather than a negative effect on classroom learning conditions (Watson, et al., 1991, p. 69).

It is possible to claim that high level of job satisfaction can affect the quality of teaching in favor of education, and even the intent to remain in the teaching profession in favor of the teacher himself (Bogler, 2002).

In order to enhance the performance and productivity of the employees, assessment of job satisfaction has started to play an important role in the definition of job satisfaction levels. Much research aiming at defining various facets of job satisfaction has been helpful in designing assessment scales, such as The Job Descriptive Index, The Job Satisfaction Survey, and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Kottkamp, 1990).

2.3 The Theories and Determinants of Job Satisfaction

In her study, Varlık (2000) states that what play a critical role in the level of job satisfaction are the needs and values of people. They both lead to expectations in

people and the extent to which these expectations are satisfied defines the level of job satisfaction.

Strauss and Sayles (1972) group needs under three categories. The first group is physical and security needs. These are associated with the satisfaction of bodily functions. The second group of needs is social needs which occur as a result of the human nature. These needs are related to recognition by the society and encouragement. The last group of needs is egoistic needs. These needs are based on independence and accomplishments.

Another categorization by Strauss and Sayles considers needs in terms of the means to satisfy them. Some needs are satisfied *off-the-job*. Spending the salary away from the job environment is an example for this type of need. The next one is directly related to the work environment, which is called satisfaction *around-the-job*. Lastly, *through-the-job* satisfaction is obtained through the process of working and it is intrinsic.

These needs have different reflections and implications in practice. If an employee only gets high level of off-the-job satisfaction, for that person, work is a punishment with its rewards to be enjoyed after work. For an employee with only high level of around-the-job satisfaction, the work environment is satisfying but he does not have motivation to work harder. Hardworking employees can be observed in organizations where through-the-job satisfaction is encouraged.

When those two sets of categories are combined, it is suggested that “physical needs are satisfied off-the-job, social needs are satisfied around-the-job, whereas egoistic needs are chiefly satisfied through the job” (Strauss and Sayles, 1972, p.7).

Theories of motivation present various approaches for the determinants of motivation and satisfaction. Lunenburg and Ornstein (1996) grouped them into two categories: content and process theories. Content theories concentrate on the definition of motivators, whereas process theories focus on how motivation occurs. The most

popular three content theories are; (a) Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory, (b) Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory, and (c) Alderfer's Existence Relatedness Growth Theory. The three major process theories are (a) Expectancy Theory, (b) Equity Theory, and (c) Goal-setting Theory.

Need Hierarchy Theory is based on the five basic human needs each of which is a prerequisite for another. When one need is satisfied, the next one emerges. Those needs are physiological, safety, social, esteem, and self-actualization, in the order of importance (Lunenburg and Ornstein, 1996).

According to Motivation-Hygiene Theory, developed by Herzberg, employees have two kinds of needs; hygiene and motivator (Furnham, Petrides, Jackson & Cotter, 2002). The motivation factors (motivators) are achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth. Company policies, interpersonal relations, working conditions, and salary constitute the hygiene factors (dissatisfiers). This theory mainly focuses on the working environment, and asserts that job satisfaction is a consequence of the aspects of job which meet the individual's need for psychological growth, whereas job dissatisfaction arises from working conditions (Galloway, Boswell, Panckhurst, Boswell & Gren, 1985). Therefore, it is possible to be both satisfied and dissatisfied at the same time.

Alderfer's Existence Relatedness Growth Theory is an expansion of the first two theories. He groups needs under three broad categories; existence needs (physiological and material needs), relatedness needs (interpersonal relations with others), and growth needs (intrinsic desire to develop and fulfill one's potential).

The Expectancy Theory is based on four assumptions. The first assumption is that people start working with their expectations, motivations, and experiences. The second assumption is that people behave according to their choices. The third assumption is that people's expectations from organizations vary. The last assumption is that people make their choices according to optimum outcomes for themselves.

The Equity Theory concentrates on equitable rewards, which contribute to the job satisfaction of the workers. The equity can be defined as the balance between the inputs and the outputs. The inputs are all the sources that are effective in performing the job (education, experience, ability, training, personality, effort, and attitude). The outputs are the things the worker gets as a result of his performance.

According to the Goal-setting Theory, difficult and specific goals result in high level of performance. Feedback and goal commitment are two important terms in this theory. Individual differences are not the determinants of goal-setting performance (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996).

Determinants of satisfaction have expanded in time by the development of various theories and research conducted to measure satisfaction. Besides, the results of much research show that many factors work in combination to affect satisfaction, and as Evans (1997) claims, from the responses of the teachers, it is clear that these combinations and the effect size of each factor differ;

The individuality of human behavior, arising out of differences in life experiences and biographical factors, and which underpins the heterogeneity of teachers, is clearly the underlying reason for diversity of responses. (p. 840)

Locke puts three independent variables forward whose interaction cause job satisfaction: one's values, one's perceptions of the job, and the environment. (Abu-Saad & Hendrix, 1995). From this approach, the interaction between these three components defines the level of job satisfaction.

Zaleznik, Christensen, and Roethlisberger (1959) summarized six areas which they accepted to be determinants of satisfaction:

1. The intrinsic characteristics of his job (the degree to which the worker felt the job provided him with the outlet for his technical-work skills).
2. The extended features of his job (his feelings about the pay, the physical working conditions, benefits, etc.).
3. The supervision (the worker's feelings toward his foreman as a boss).

4. His associates at work (his feelings in working with the particular people in the department).
5. The company (his feelings about working for this particular concern).
6. The union (his feelings in being a member of this particular union). (p. 258)

Based on the Motivation-Hygiene Theory, Herzberg came up with 14 factors promoting job satisfaction or dissatisfaction (cited in Evans & Maas, 1969):

1. Recognition
2. Achievement
3. Possibility of growth
4. Advancement
5. Salary
6. Interpersonal relations (with superiors, subordinates, peers)
7. Supervision-Technical
8. Responsibility
9. Company policy and management
10. Working conditions
11. Work itself
12. Factors in personal life
13. Status
14. Job security (p. 9)

Knoop (cited in Furnham et al., 2002) grouped factors that affect job satisfaction under five categories:

1. Intrinsic work-related values (responsibility, meaningful work)
2. Intrinsic work-outcome values (job status, recognition for good work)
3. Extrinsic job-outcome values (benefits, job security)
4. Extrinsic job-related values (working conditions)
5. Extrinsic people-related values (supervisors, coworkers, promotions)

His findings supported the Motivation-Hygiene Theory in that the two intrinsic factors represented the motivators, and the other three extrinsic factors represented the hygiene variables.

When the scope of this study is considered, the researcher tried to involve all these factors in her data collection instrument. These factors were grouped under five categories and those were defined as communication, administration, job itself, benefits, and personal traits. The researcher added one more factor, which was curriculum, as the sixth factor. The items in the questionnaire were designed in such a way that they represented those factors with their different aspects.

2.4 The Assessment of Job Satisfaction

There are two approaches towards the measurement of job satisfaction; global approach and facet approach (Spector, 1997). Each would be more functional than the other depending on the purpose. For instance, global approach could be used when the relation between productivity and the satisfaction is to be examined. The facet approach could be necessary to identify the aspects of the job to be developed in order to enhance productivity.

A great amount of scales have been designed to measure job satisfaction. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) is claimed to be the most carefully developed and validated one (Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969). It assesses five facets, and it includes 72 items. Each item is designed in the form of a question and the respondents choose among three adjectives or short phrases, which serve as the possible responses for the question. It has proved to have high reliability and validity in various research. However, the designers of the scale do not recommend calculating an overall score with that scale since it was designed mainly to measure satisfaction obtained from different aspects of a job.

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was designed to assess nine facets of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction (Spector, 1985). It includes 36 items, and for

each statement the respondents are expected to circle the numbers which reflect their opinion on a six-point Likert scale. Ten different scores can be obtained through this scale; nine for each facet, and one overall score representing the overall job satisfaction level. The scores are calculated by adding the circled numbers for each item. Therefore, the score for each facet can range between 4-24, and for overall job satisfaction between 36-216. In a study conducted with 3067 participants, the coefficient alpha for the total score was .91, which showed a high internal reliability when the widely expected minimum standard for internal consistency is considered, which is .70. In terms of validity, five of JSS subscales correlate well with JDI, which is accepted to be the most carefully validated scale of job satisfaction. The correlations ranged from .61 to .80 (Spector, 1997).

Another widely used instrument to assess job satisfaction is Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ; Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1967). The questionnaire has two versions; 100-item and 20-item. It covers 20 facets. Therefore, the facets are more detailed than JDI and JSS. The short form has been reported to have acceptable internal consistency reliability. It would be reasonable to use the long version to assess facet satisfaction, and the short version for overall job satisfaction.

There are many other scales to assess job satisfaction, such as The Job Diagnostic Survey, The Job in General Scale, and Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Subscale; however, they will not be mentioned due to the scope of this study.

2.5 What is Curriculum?

Curriculum has been defined in various ways from different perspectives. It has great number of definitions as a subject matter, as an experience, as an outcome, and as a plan (Wiles, 1999). As a subject matter, George Beauchamp claims that “it should consist entirely of knowledge that comes from the disciplines” (p. 5). Ronald Doll defines curriculum as experiences “that learners have under the auspices of the school” (p. 5). As an outcome, K. Howell, S. Fox, and K Morehead perceive

curriculum to be “a structured set of learning outcomes (objectives) resulting from instruction” (p. 6). Lastly, Ralph Taylor defines curriculum as “all of the learning of students that is planned by and directed by the school to attain its educational goals” (p. 5), which is a definition of curriculum as a plan. This approach towards curriculum has also been adopted by the researcher of this study and has been influential in the development of the questionnaire used in this study.

Goodlad defines five layers and three levels of curriculum (cited in OECD, 1998). According to him, five layers of curriculum are the ideal, formal, perceived, operational, and experiential curriculum. The ideal curriculum is the one developed by its developers. The formal curriculum is the officially approved one and is to be adopted by institutions and teachers. The perceived curriculum is the one with the teachers’ and parents’ subjective views on what should be taught. The operational curriculum and the experiential curriculum are both related with what is going on in the class, but prior deals with what is presented to the students, whereas, the latter focuses on what the students actually experience.

One more layer of curriculum that should be added is the hidden curriculum. It is unplanned and unofficial. It is the least visible type of curriculum. It functions via school experience. Apple (cited in Henson, 2001) defines it as “the tacit teaching to students of norms, values, and dispositions that goes on simply by their living in and coping with the institutional expectations and routines of schools day in and day out for a number of years” (p. 12)

Three levels of curriculum, defined by Goodlad, are all on decision-making basis. These are societal, institutional, and instructional levels. The decision makers in these levels are the society in the societal level, principals, teachers and school committees in the institutional level, and the individual teachers in the instructional level.

The content and the structure of curricula vary all over the world. That is to say, there are different views towards curriculum and these views are shaped through a

country's social and economic priorities (OECD, 1998). For instance, the Finnish curriculum encourages students to recognize the growth of knowledge, adapt it, and organize their own structure of knowledge. Similarly, Spanish curriculum is based on "concepts, mental schemata and a world view, procedures or skills, attitudes and values, and moral development" (p. 34).

2.6 The Importance of Curriculum

The power of education comes from its effect size. Education, especially the compulsory education is the means to reach almost all of the people living in a country. When curriculum is considered, it serves as the means to define the limits and characteristics of people living in a particular country. That is to say, the values that are planned to be imposed to a society are given through carefully-planned curricula. All the behaviors to be developed by the learner in any institution exist within the curriculum (Erden, 1998). Therefore, a curriculum is not only a list of topics or subjects to be taught or how they should be thought, it is also a reflection of the values and priorities of a country.

However, there is another important variable which is highly influential on the accomplishment of the goals and objectives underlying a curriculum. These are the teachers who, in practice, have more power on the students than the curriculum or the authors of the books in the curriculum (Birlik, 1999). In other words, they are the ones to decide on how to use the curriculum and the books with the curriculum. Therefore, curriculum and teachers are the two crucial components to reach the desired goals for the students.

At that point, attention must be given to maintaining a strong link between curriculum and teachers. That is, it can be claimed that teachers must have a strong belief in the curriculum they use so that the curriculum achieves its aims. A curriculum is worthless without teachers with a strong belief in what they do.

2.7 The Issues to be Considered in Developing a Curriculum

According to Ornstein and Hunkins (1988), curricularists mainly focus on two issues; first, they work on the knowledge and content, and then they deal with teaching and learning experiences. There are certain criteria which the curriculum planner should consider, irrespective of philosophical orientations and preferences:

1. Self-sufficiency (enabling the learner to attain maximum self-sufficiency in the most economical way in terms of teacher and student effort, and generalizability of the subject matter)
2. Significance (significance in terms of either contribution to meaningful experiences, or social, political, and economic issues)
3. Validity (the authenticity of the content selected and the coincidence with the goals and objectives of the curriculum)
4. Interest (the meaningfulness of the content to the learner and its degree of matching with the interests of the learner)
5. Utility (usefulness of the content)
6. Learnability (the appropriateness of the content for the intended learner group)
7. Feasibility (considering the available time, resources, expertise of teachers, nature of the political climate, existing legislation, and finance)

While considering these criteria, the curriculum planner pays attention to the five common and basic features of curriculum design (Henson, 2001, p. 199-200);

1. Scope (the breadth of the curriculum)
2. Sequence (order of the topics to be covered)
3. Continuity (the smoothness / the absence of disruptions)
4. Articulation (the smooth flow vertically and horizontally)
5. Balance (balance between two curricula)

Because these all constitute the key points of curriculum development, they have always been used in the studies aiming at curriculum evaluation. They were also

used in the development of the items designed to measure the curriculum satisfaction of teachers in this study.

2.8 Studies Conducted Abroad on Job Satisfaction

In a study conducted in New Zealand primary schools (Galloway et al., 1985), determinants of satisfaction and dissatisfaction were examined. 292 teachers completed the Satisfaction with Teaching Questionnaire, which had 42 items, in the form of a five-point Likert scale. The results showed that tendency for overall satisfaction increased with age. Male teachers had higher mean satisfaction ratings on the professional autonomy subscale compared to female teachers. Teachers with head teachers below the age 50 and who taught full-time showed more satisfaction, which may show the importance of management style in job satisfaction of the teachers. Finally, teachers working at schools with more than 75% of students of European origin were more satisfied than teachers in schools with fewer students of European origin. The study verified the Motivation-Hygiene Theory in that sources of satisfaction stemmed from intrinsic aspects of the job, whereas dissatisfaction was a consequence of working conditions.

Furnham, Petrides, Jackson, and Cotter (2002) conducted a study in New Zealand for various occupations. It involved two studies; 250 participants completed two different questionnaires in the first study (Eysenck Personality Profiler and Work Values Questionnaire), and 82 participants completed two other questionnaires (The Big Five Inventory and The Job Satisfaction Questionnaire). They found out that conscientiousness and age were the two predictors of overall job satisfaction. Younger and more conscientious employees consistently reported higher levels of job satisfaction. Personality did not show a strong or consistent effect either on what individuals perceived as important in their work environment or on their levels of job satisfaction.

In a study conducted in the U.S.A., Santangelo and Lester (1985) examined the correlation between age, locus of control, stress, and job satisfaction. The researchers

found that age showed no significant correlation with job satisfaction and subjective stress. Similarly, stress scores and belief in an external locus of control were not related to each other. However, job dissatisfaction appeared to have a high correlation with a belief in an external locus of control and subjective stress scores. This correlation varied when gender was the independent variable. For female teachers job satisfaction was related to subjective stress, while it was related to a belief in external locus of control for male teachers. Finally, psychological variables correlated more with job dissatisfaction compared to demographic variables.

Conley, Bacharach and Bauer (1989) examined the relation between working environment and teacher dissatisfaction working at elementary and secondary schools in New York. The data were gathered at school level, and 42 elementary and 45 secondary schools were involved. The instrument was in the form of a four-point Likert scale. In this study, high levels of role ambiguity and routinization were associated with high levels of career dissatisfaction. They both together proved to be significant predictors of dissatisfaction. Besides, career dissatisfaction was associated with neither authority nor influence deprivation. Communication with peers and administrators negatively associated with dissatisfaction. Positive supervisory behavior emerged as a significant negative predictor of dissatisfaction with both primary and secondary school teachers, however, negative supervisory behavior showed to be a predictor of dissatisfaction only for secondary school teachers. Certainty and rationality of the promotion process showed a high negative correlation with career dissatisfaction. When classroom environmental factors were considered, elementary school teachers with manageable class size, less student learning problems, and less student behavior problems reported a lower level of career dissatisfaction. However, for secondary school teachers, only the last two variables of the three emerged as a predictor of career dissatisfaction.

U.S. Department of Education (1997), in their study on job satisfaction levels of teachers, provided evidence to show a high correlation between job satisfaction and working conditions (administrative support and leadership, student behavior and school atmosphere, and teacher autonomy). Private school teachers and primary

school teachers tended to be more satisfied than public school teachers and secondary school teachers, respectively. The correlation between age and job satisfaction varied in terms of school type. Salary and benefits showed a weak relationship with teacher satisfaction. Parental support constituted an additional factor, which showed a high correlation with job satisfaction.

The results of Benson's (1983) study on the bureaucratic nature of schools and job satisfaction in Australian secondary schools were also striking. 255 teachers completed The School Organizational Inventory and Teacher Satisfaction Scale. Teachers with the highest level of decisional deprivation showed the lowest satisfaction levels. In parallel, teachers who perceived their school to have a bureaucratic system were more willing to leave, compared to the ones who claimed their schools to be less bureaucratic.

Watson et al. (1991) conducted a research on primary and secondary school teachers in Australia. 611 primary and 711 secondary school teachers participated in the study. The level of overall satisfaction among the teachers was found to be moderate to very high for over 80 % of the teachers. Human relations in the work place were the basic source of job satisfaction for the teachers. The results showed that the most important reasons for satisfaction were staff relations, pupil qualities, personal achievement, and school tone. Community support, geographic location, and the departmental structures and requirements played smaller roles in overall job satisfaction. In the search of a correlation between certain factors and facet job satisfaction, they found that female teachers were more satisfied than male teachers in terms of appointment. Higher commitment to teaching, effective pre-service education, having an induction program and in-service training, spending less than 60 minutes to arrive the school, and receiving helpful staff support showed a high correlation with job satisfaction. Besides, teachers finding school equipment and teaching aids helpful were more satisfied than those who did not.

Avi-Itzhak (1988) conducted a study in Israel in order to identify the professional needs of kindergarten teachers and to find out those professional needs,

organizational factors, and teachers' characteristics which constituted the determinants of job satisfaction. 93 teachers completed a questionnaire with 19 statements. It was designed as a five-point Likert scale. In this study, five categories emerged after the application of factor analysis. The need categories were found to be parallel with the needs identified by Maslow. The results showed that teachers were most satisfied on the two lower needs (security and social needs), and less satisfied on higher needs (esteem, autonomy, and self actualization). Age, teaching experience, and organizational complexity were found to have a significant role in defining satisfied and dissatisfied teachers. From the perspective of Herzberg's theory, teachers were quite satisfied with hygiene factors, and less satisfied with the motivators.

In another study conducted in Israel, Abu-Saad and Hendrix (1995) defined two job satisfaction factors and five organizational climate factors after implementing a questionnaire on 273 teachers. The questionnaire had two sections. The first section was constructed to measure the job satisfaction levels of the teachers and it had 25 items. The second section had 54 items to measure organizational climate. Both sections were designed in the form of a five-point Likert scale. The results showed that the most dominant factor affecting job satisfaction was the satisfaction with the work itself. Principal leadership was an important organizational climate factor. Satisfaction with work itself was found to be related to principal leadership and autonomy. The relation between principal leadership and teacher intimacy showed a high correlation with two job satisfaction factors, which were the work itself and social needs.

Bogler (2002) conducted a study on the determinants of job satisfaction for elementary, lower and higher secondary school teachers in Israel. A total of 745 teachers involved in the study. 51% of the teachers were elementary, 20% of the teachers were junior high, and 26% of the teachers were high school teachers. The instrument had three sections with a total of 80 items. The first section was designed as a seven-point Likert scale, and the other two were in the form of five-point Likert scale. He defined occupational perceptions, principals' leadership styles, and some

demographic characteristics to be distinguishing between satisfied and dissatisfied teachers. Most of the male teachers who worked in large schools in the city, perceived their principal as a transactional leader, and did not perceive their job as a profession showed low level of job satisfaction, whereas, mainly female, Jewish, working in large schools, perceived their principal as a transformational leader, and viewed their job as a profession constituted the ones with high level of job satisfaction. More highly satisfied teachers were among the ones teaching at 1-3 grades compared to those in higher grades.

In order to define the overall satisfaction and facet satisfaction of teachers at secondary schools and to examine the determinants of job satisfaction, Prick (1989) conducted a study in Holland. Apart from a general job satisfaction scale, he used five other scales to measure the facet satisfaction levels. Those were school management, work content, working conditions, colleagues, and opportunities for promotion. The results showed that the primary determinant of the job satisfaction was the job content. After the age of 45, the teachers became less satisfied with their profession. He also compared the satisfaction levels of teachers from different countries. Among six countries (Holland, Austria, Belgium, West Germany, Spain, and Portugal), Austrian teachers demonstrated significantly high, and Portugal and Belgium significantly low level of satisfaction.

Stempien and Loeb (2002) worked on the differences in the satisfaction levels of general education and special education teachers. 116 teachers participated in the study. The researchers used two different satisfaction scales; Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index was five-point Likert scale including 18 items, and Life Satisfaction Index-A with 20 items in the form of five-point Likert scale. The researchers added five more items for satisfaction related to teaching. Special education teachers taught students who were emotionally or behaviorally impaired. Those teachers showed lower job satisfaction compared to general education teachers.

2.9 Studies Conducted in Turkey on Job Satisfaction

Great number of studies has been conducted on teacher satisfaction and the predictors of it. Birlik (1999) conducted a study on teacher job satisfaction and their understanding of education. 300 teachers working at general high schools involved in the study. The overall job satisfaction of the teachers was found to be quite low. The major factors associated with this result were salary, reputation, problems of the education system, and interest areas. The results also showed that gender and work experience were related to job satisfaction. Teachers who were graduates of faculties of education were more likely to be more satisfied with their jobs, compared to teachers with teaching certificate obtained after the completion of a four-year-program at faculties of art and science. Working conditions, benefits, and seniority were also found to be related with job satisfaction.

Erbey's research on teachers' degree of need deficiency (1999) supported the results of Birlik's study (1999). 710 teachers completed the Need Deficiency Index, which elicits answers regarding both the current situation and the ideal. Gender, age, experience, school type, and school region were found to correlate with need deficiency. Female, young, and inexperienced teachers showed more need deficiency than male, old, and experienced teachers, respectively. Teacher working at general high schools were the most dissatisfied group, whereas, teachers at Anatolian and Science high schools were the least dissatisfied. Finally, teachers working at school in suburbs showed higher need deficiency than teachers at schools in urban areas.

Overall job satisfaction shows significant differences in different teaching levels. In Birlik's study with high school teachers, teachers showed a low level of satisfaction; however, in another study conducted by Varlık (2000), job satisfaction among primary school teachers emerged to be quite high. In her study, 320 teachers completed the short form of Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, which involves 20 items. The overall job satisfaction levels of private school teachers were slightly higher than the public school teachers. Private school teachers were more satisfied than public school teachers in all facets, except the security facet.

In a study conducted by Günbayı (1999), the determinants of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in elementary schools of Malatya were defined. The results showed that salary, physical conditions, human relations, inspection, promotion, and personal development were the destructive factors for job satisfaction. There was no significant difference between the satisfaction levels of subject and class teachers.

Özdayı (1990) conducted a study on job satisfaction and job stress, and the results showed that private school teachers had more job satisfaction than public school teachers. Teachers of both groups were the most satisfied with the variables related to the work itself. The highest level of job satisfaction was observed in the teachers between the ages 31-40 and who worked at private schools. However, teachers over 41 and working at public schools showed the least job satisfaction in terms of reputation of their job in the society. Female teachers were more satisfied than male teachers in terms of appreciation, and creativity.

2.10 Studies on Curriculum Satisfaction

Hundreds of research has been conducted on curriculum evaluation where the teachers provided feedback with their experiences. However, as mention in the ‘Significance of the Study’ section, there has been found no study in the literature, examining the satisfaction of teachers with the curriculum with its every individual aspect.

Dreyfus and Mazouz (1988) conducted a qualitative study on the teachers’ satisfaction with the curriculum in Israel. They made interviews with 16 teachers from different institutions, and they asked one single question in three different forms, which were found to be the most eliciting. This question was related to the degree they like and dislike the curriculum they used. The teachers showed nine areas of concern to this question. These were;

1. The central principle of the curriculum
2. The demands imposed by the curriculum on the teachers and the pupils

3. The requirements of the establishment (Ministry of Education) and their influence on the developers of the curriculum
4. The teaching materials of all types which had so far been produced by the curriculum developing team
5. The in-service assistance system
6. The school: environmental and organizational factors
7. The characteristics of the individual teachers
8. The characteristics of the individual pupils and of the target population of the curriculum
9. The developing team (p. 247-248)

These areas of concern and two studies conducted by Engin and Yıldırım (1998), and Balcı and Yıldırım (1998) to evaluate the curricula of philosophy and sociology courses were also used in the development of the scale for measuring the satisfaction with the curriculum.

2.11 The Summary of the Correlates of Overall Job Satisfaction

Overall job satisfaction changes from country to country. Portugal and Belgium seem to have the least satisfied employees compared to Holland, Austria, and Spain (Prick, 1989). Teachers teaching at lower grades are more satisfied than the ones working at higher grades (Birlik, 1999; Varlık, 2000; U. S. Department of Education, 1997; Bogler, 2002). Besides, teachers working at private schools seem to be more satisfied than the teachers working at public schools (Erbey, 1999; Varlık, 2000; Özdayı, 1990; U. S. Department of Education, 1997).

The results of the studies seem to be inconsistent in terms of the correlation between age and job satisfaction. While some studies showed that overall job satisfaction increased with age (Galloway et. al., 1985; Erbey, 1999), others reported younger teachers to be more satisfied than the elders (Furnham et. al., 2002). On the other hand, Santangelo and Lester (1985) found out that age had no significant correlation with job satisfaction. Another study conducted by Zeitz (1990), showed a curvilinear

relation, where the job satisfaction declined at young ages and approximately after the age of 45, and increased in middle ages.

According to the research mentioned in this study, the other factors correlating with the overall job satisfaction are gender, locus of control, supervision, promotion, career development, job content (stress, student behavior, student quality, routinization), school atmosphere (administrative support, communication, human relations, leadership), organizational structure (role ambiguity, bureaucracy, decision mechanism).

Taking into account the studies done on job satisfaction abroad and in Turkey, this study aimed to explore the overall job satisfaction and the curriculum satisfaction of the teachers. While exploring the overall job satisfaction of the teachers, the researcher accepts curriculum as one of the factors affecting overall job satisfaction. Moreover, this study focuses on the relationship of overall job satisfaction and curriculum satisfaction with other variables, such as teaching area, motive for teaching profession, and job preference. These variables may be considered as less emphasized in the studies in the field of overall job satisfaction.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This chapter includes the overall design of the study, the population and the sample, data collection instruments, procedures, data analysis techniques, the assumptions and the limitations of the study.

3.1 Overall Design of the Study

The overall design of this research study is survey. Basically, surveys intend to elicit answers to questions from a sample which is carefully elected to represent a population (Krathwohl, 1998).

What is common for the research designed in the form of survey is that the main concern is the commonality of the replies and how they vary in terms of some certain demographic information. Besides, they are target oriented in that the scope of the questions depends on what the designer wants to explore. Therefore, every detail of a survey has to be preplanned very carefully. These details can be listed as the sample, the instrument to collect data, the method used in the collection of the data, and the data analysis procedures.

This study was a quantitative survey in which the researcher defined the sample to represent the whole population carefully. All the teachers working at the second cycle of the public elementary schools in Turkey and teaching Mathematics, Turkish, Social Studies, Natural Sciences, and Foreign Language constitute the population of the study. The sample was defined via stratified random sampling method and a total of 720 teachers took part in the study. The researcher developed a five-point Likert type questionnaire as the instrument to collect data. This questionnaire was revised and reformed with the results of expert opinion and pilot study. The questionnaire

was sent and collected by Educational Research and Development Department of Ministry of National Education (EARGED). In the data analysis stage of the study, the researcher made use of SPSS, which is a statistical software program designed for Windows, and used descriptive statistics, t-tests, one-way ANOVA to analyze data.

3.2 Population and Sample

All the teachers working at the 6-8 grades of the public elementary schools in Turkey and teaching Mathematics, Turkish, Social Studies, Natural Sciences, and Foreign Language constitute the population of the study. The criterion for selecting the teachers of Mathematics, Turkish, Social Studies, Natural Sciences, and Foreign Language was the number of credit hours of the mentioned subjects per week and the appropriateness of the questionnaire to these courses. These courses are given three or more hours per week and they all have course books about which there are items in the questionnaire. All the subject teachers teaching those five courses in the selected schools were invited to the study; except for contractual teachers and school principals.

Since the population covers the whole country, all the seven geographical regions (Marmara, Central Anatolia, Aegean, Mediterranean, Southeast Anatolia, Black Sea, and East Anatolia) were planned to be involved. The city with the highest population in each geographical region was assumed to represent that particular geographical region it is located in and these cities are identified as İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Adana, Şanlıurfa, Samsun, and Erzurum (Table 1).

Table 1
The Cities Representing the Geographical Regions and Their Populations

Geographical Region	City	Population of the City
Marmara	İstanbul	10,018,735
Central Anatolia	Ankara	4,007,860
Aegean	İzmir	3,370,866
Mediterranean	Adana	1,849,478
Southeast Anatolia	Şanlıurfa	1,443,422
Black Sea	Samsun	1,209,137
East Anatolia	Erzurum	937,389
Total		22,836,887

Source: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü [State Statistics Institute] (2001)

31,256 teachers teach Mathematics, Turkish, Social Studies, Natural Sciences, and Foreign Language in those seven cities (MEB, 2003), and the total number of teachers teaching these courses in Turkey is 96,933 (Table 2).

Table 2
Number of Subject Teachers in Turkey

City	Turkish	Mathematics	Social Studies	Natural Sciences	Foreign Language	Total
Istanbul	3,074	2,621	1,708	2,218	2,279	11,990
Ankara	1,578	1,227	1,117	1,036	1,348	6,306
İzmir	1,448	1,069	848	910	1,035	5,310
Adana	759	687	705	503	583	3,237
Samsun	522	428	375	445	232	2,002
Erzurum	393	309	254	312	89	1,357
Şanlıurfa	364	229	219	265	67	1,144
Total	8,138	6,570	5,226	5,689	5,633	31,256
Turkey	26,287	21,165	17,790	19,220	12,471	96,933

Source: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [Ministry of National Education] (2003)

In determining the sample size to represent this population, the researcher made use of the method of calculating sample range for different standard errors (Çingü, 1990). According to this statistical calculation, when ± 0.05 standard error is considered for $\alpha = 0.01, p = 0.5$, the minimum sample for a population of 100,000 is 661. However, the number of teachers invited to the study was 1000. The ratio between the total number of all subject teachers in those seven cities and the total number of specified subject teachers in the same cities defined the number of the subject teachers to be involved in the study. In the same way, the ratio between the number of subject teachers in a city and in seven cities defined the number of the subject teachers from each city to participate in the study (Table 3).

Table 3
Number of Teachers Invited to the Study

City	Turkish	Mathematics	Social Studies	Natural Sciences	Foreign Language	Total
Istanbul	98	83	54	71	73	379
Ankara	50	39	36	33	42	200
İzmir	47	35	27	29	33	171
Adana	24	21	23	17	18	103
Samsun	17	14	12	14	8	65
Erzurum	12	11	8	9	3	43
Şanlıurfa	12	7	8	9	3	39
Total	260	210	168	182	180	1000

For example, there are 31,256 subject teachers of Mathematics, Turkish, Social Studies, Natural Sciences, and Foreign Language in seven cities. In those cities, the total number of Turkish teachers is 8,138. Because the sample was planned as 1000 teachers, the number of Turkish teachers invited to the study was defined as 260 with a calculation of ratio. There are 3,074 Turkish teachers in İstanbul. When the researcher calculated the ratio of this number to the total number of Turkish teachers

in those seven cities (8,138), the number of Turkish teachers to be invited from Istanbul was defined as 98.

Because the comparison of the geographical regions was not among the purposes of this study, and because central districts were considered to have more teachers, teachers working at schools in central districts were invited to the study. The schools are selected from different central districts as much as possible (Table 4).

Table 4
Number of Central Districts and Schools

Geographical Region	City	Total Number of Central Districts	Central Districts involved in the study	Number of schools
Marmara	İstanbul	27	27	35
Central Anatolia	Ankara	8	8	18
Aegean	İzmir	9	9	14
Mediterranean	Adana	2	2	8
Black Sea	Samsun	1	1	7
East Anatolia	Erzurum	1	1	6
Southeast Anatolia	Şanlıurfa	1	1	6
Total		49	49	94

Source: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü [State Statistics Institute] (2001).

In the definition of the schools to be involved in the study, random sampling method was used. (The list of the schools involved in the study is presented in Appendix A). In order to check the number of subject teachers from each school, the researcher got into contact with most of the schools and gathered information about the number of subject teachers. The name of the schools and the central district they are located in are given in Appendix A. In the cities where the number of central districts was less than the number of schools to be selected (İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Adana), the number of schools were defined in ratio with the population of the central districts. For example, in Adana there are two central districts; Seyhan and Yüreğir. Parallel to

their population, six schools were chosen from Seyhan while only two schools were chosen from Yüreğir. In the cities with only one central district (Erzurum, Samsun, Şanlıurfa), the schools were directly selected from these central districts.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

A questionnaire was developed as the data collection instrument of this study (See Appendix B). This questionnaire consists of two sections. The first section includes 11 questions and the first ten questions were designed to get the demographic information about the teachers (age, gender, marital status, educational background, work experience, name of the city and the school, courses taught, teaching subject, lesson load and motive for choosing teaching profession). The last question of this section is an attitude question which was stated as; 'Would you choose teaching profession again if it were feasible to reconsider a career choice?' The second section was designed in the form of a five-point Likert scale. There are 40 items, which reflect different aspects of teaching profession (communication, administration, job itself, benefits, personal traits, curriculum) and the teachers are expected to rate each item in the questionnaire on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (highly dissatisfied) to 5 (highly satisfied). The scoring was calculated by taking the mean of the responses of the teachers; therefore, the scores ranged from 1 to 5.

In the construction of the questionnaire, the researcher examined Turkish and foreign literature, and made use of various theories and research, most of which are provided in this thesis. In the light of these theories and research, a pool of topics and subtopics related to job satisfaction and curriculum was created. The first draft questionnaire was developed in accordance with those topics and subtopics. This questionnaire was subject to expert opinion. The experts provided feedback concerning both the content and the structure of the questionnaire. In terms of content, the items were reworded so that they became clearer and more direct. In addition, some items were added to the questionnaire which were thought to be missing when the content of job satisfaction and curriculum were considered. The items which were added after expert opinion were items 33, 34, 35, 37 and 40. The

format of the questionnaire was also reshaped in the light of feedback. Necessary changes were made in the order and the appearance of the items. Then, the reliability of the second draft of the questionnaire was tested in a pilot study conducted in four schools in Ankara, which represented the target sample. 48 teachers who were teaching Mathematics, Turkish, Social Studies, Natural Sciences, and Foreign Language answered the questionnaire, and the reliability (Cronbach Alpha) was found as .92. Yet, the reliability of the questionnaire was verified with the application of the questionnaires to 720 subjects. The Cronbach Alpha was .94.

Factor analysis was conducted to explore the dimensionality of the questionnaire. The first rotated component matrix solution indicated eight factors with eigenvalues greater than one. In the second step, factor analysis was run with two factors. Rotated component matrix solution indicated that two factors accounted for 39% of variation, but the scree plot was not indicating a strong two dimensionality. Items 26-40 were mainly loaded on curriculum dimension with factor loads greater than .40. Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 14 were loaded on the second factor. The remaining items were mainly shared on both factors with factor load less than .40. Taking these analysis results, the researcher conceptually accepted the last 15 items as a sub-scale and calculated curriculum satisfaction scores of participants (See Appendix D).

For the first 25 items of the questionnaire (out of 40), the researcher made use of the available literature on job satisfaction. The theories and pre-defined determinants of job satisfaction were considered in the construction of these items. For the remaining 15 items, the researcher made use of the issues to be considered during the process of curriculum planning and implementation, and some other research with the purpose of curriculum evaluation (Engin & Yıldırım, 1998; Balcı & Yıldırım, 1998). The scoring for curriculum satisfaction was calculated by taking the means of the responses of the teachers to the last 15 items.

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

As this study was supported by the Educational Research and Development Unit of the Ministry of National Education (EARGED), taking the necessary permissions, duplication of the questionnaire (1000 copies), and administering the questionnaires were among the responsibilities of this unit. The questionnaires were sent to the schools at the beginning of March, 2004 and delivered back to the researcher at the end of the same month. The number of the valid questionnaires is given in Table 5.

Table 5
Number of Valid Questionnaires (Cities)

Cities	Number of Valid Questionnaires	Return %	%
İstanbul	250	65.96	34.72
Ankara	147	73.5	20.42
İzmir	120	70.18	16.67
Adana	92	89.32	12.78
Samsun	58	89.23	8.05
Şanlıurfa	30	76.92	4.17
Erzurum	23	53.49	3.19
Total	720		100

The return rate was 76.8 with a total of 768 questionnaires. However, the number of valid questionnaires was 720 due to the fact that some teachers were found to complete more than one questionnaire or teachers of other courses answered the questionnaires. Therefore, these questionnaires were omitted.

3.5 Data Analysis Procedures

In this study, data analysis was carried out through descriptive statistics, independent samples t-test, and one-way ANOVA.

The data analysis of the descriptive statistics was used to describe the variables in the study. Frequency, mean and percentages were calculated to define the subjects of the study in terms of their age, gender, marital status, educational background, work experience, city, number of courses taught, teaching subject, lesson load, and motive for choosing teaching profession. They were also used in answering the first and the third research questions, which were concerned with the overall job satisfaction and curriculum satisfaction of the teachers.

T-test and one-way ANOVA were used in order to compare the means of groups in relation to variables of age, gender, marital status, educational background, work experience, number of courses taught, teaching subject, lesson load, and motive for choosing teaching profession. These procedures were mainly used in answering the second, fourth, fifth, and sixth research questions. Because the Levene's test was not significant in the whole study, Dunnett's C test was run as multiple comparison test.

3.6 Assumptions

In the study, it was assumed that;

1. the subjects responded the questionnaire sincerely and under no organizational / institutional pressure,
2. the subjects reflected their satisfaction or dissatisfaction rather than the present situation or social desirability while filling in the questionnaire.

3.7 Delimitations

This study is limited with the teachers working at the second cycle of public elementary schools and teaching Mathematics, Turkish, Social Studies, Natural Sciences, and Foreign Language.

Although factor analysis did not indicate a clear two dimensional scale, the researcher preferred to use scores of items 26-40 as part of a sub-scale.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter includes the results of the study. At the beginning of the chapter, the overview of information about the participants is provided. The following comprehensive part provides answers to the research questions on statistical basis. Findings will be presented in the same sequence with the research questions.

4.1 Characteristics of the Participants

In this study, the total number of the teachers who constituted the sample is 720. The demographic information about the subjects was obtained through 10 questions in the first section of the data collection instrument. These questions were about age, gender, marital status, educational background, work experience, city, number of courses taught, teaching subject, lesson load, and motive for choosing teaching profession.

The age range of the subjects was 21-61. The researcher grouped them with an interval size of 7 (Table 6).

Table 6
The Distribution of Teachers by Age

Age	<i>n</i>	%
27 and below	164	22.90
28-34	184	25.70
35-41	126	17.60
42-48	181	25.28
49 and above	61	8.52
Total	716	100

The teachers between 28 and 34 constituted the most crowded group and the teachers who were 49 and above constituted the least crowded group, with 184 and 61 teachers respectively.

Of the 720 subjects participated in the study, 59.03 % ($n = 425$) of them were female, and 40.97 % ($n = 295$) of them were male. In terms of marital status, 74.57 % ($n = 519$) of the subjects were married whereas 25.43 % ($n = 177$) of them were single, widow/widower or divorced.

Regarding the subjects' educational background, 41.53 % ($n = 299$) of the teachers graduated from the education faculties of universities. 30.83 % ($n = 222$) of them graduated from other faculties of universities but obtained a certificate to be authorized to teach. The rest of the subjects ($n = 199$, 27.64 %) were graduates of educational institutes, teachers' training colleges (Yüksek Öğretmen Okulları), and schools of foreign languages.

The subjects' work experience varied from 1 year to 35 years. The researcher grouped the subjects with an interval size of 7 (Table 7). The most crowded group was composed of the least experienced teachers ($n = 273$), and the least crowded group was composed of teachers with 15-21 years of work experience.

Table 7
The Distribution of Teachers by Work Experience

Work Experience	<i>n</i>	%
7 years and below	273	38.08
8-14 years	179	24.96
15-21 years	73	10.18
22 and above	192	26.78
Total	717	100

The distribution of the subjects in terms of city seemed to represent the population of the cities. Istanbul, with its highest population among the pre-defined cities, had the highest number of subjects with 34.72 % ($n = 250$), and Erzurum had the lowest number of subjects with 3.19 % ($n = 23$). The distribution is provided in Table 8.

Table 8
The Distribution of Teachers by City

City	n	%
İstanbul	250	34.72
Ankara	147	20.42
İzmir	120	16.67
Adana	92	12.78
Samsun	58	8.05
Şanlıurfa	30	4.17
Erzurum	23	3.19
Total	720	100

The researcher divided the subjects into two categories in terms of number of courses taught in 2003-2004 academic year. The first group who taught only one course constituted the majority with 75.83 % ($n = 546$). The second group who taught more than one course constituted 24.17 % ($n = 174$) of the subjects.

The distribution of the teachers in terms of teaching subject was quite closed to each other. The distribution is presented in Table 9.

Table 9
The Distribution of Teachers by Teaching Subject

Course	<i>n</i>	%
Turkish	181	25.14
Foreign Language	147	20.42
Mathematics	139	19.30
Social Studies	130	18.06
Natural Sciences	123	17.08
Total	720	100

The lesson load of the subjects varied from 4 to 30 hours per week. 5.92 % ($n = 42$) of the teachers had 15 teaching hours or less per week. The percentage of the teachers who had 16 teaching hours and more was 94.08 ($n = 667$).

79.33 % ($n = 568$) of the subjects reported that they had chosen teaching profession with their own will whereas 20.67 % ($n = 148$) of the subjects reported that it had been only the conditions which had led them into teaching profession.

4.2 Results of the Study

In this study, the data collected were analyzed according to six research questions asked regarding the teachers' overall job satisfaction (OJS) and their satisfaction with the curricula (CS) they used. The results will be presented in the same order with the research questions posed for the study.

4.2.1 Overall Job Satisfaction

The first research question was stated as: 'What is the overall job satisfaction level of teachers?' The data gathered via the questionnaire designed by the researcher was

subject to descriptive analyses. Descriptive statistics was used to calculate the mean, range, and standard deviation. The mean of their scores ranged from 1.58 to 4.75 with an overall mean of 3.41 over 5.00 ($SD = .51$). When Table 10 is considered (intervals for the levels of satisfaction), they are found to be satisfied on average. However, it is difficult to claim that they are satisfied since the average is too closed to the upper limit of ‘undecided’ level.

Table 10
Intervals for the Level of Satisfaction (OJS)

Interval	Level of Satisfaction	<i>n</i>	%
1.00-1.80	Highly Dissatisfied	2	.3
1.81-2.60	Dissatisfied	38	5.3
2.61-3.40	Undecided	313	43.5
3.41-4.20	Satisfied	333	46.2
4.21-5.00	Highly Satisfied	34	4.7

The satisfied and the undecided teachers constituted the great majority (89.6 %). When the items are examined (see Appendix E), it is understood that teachers were mostly satisfied with the communication in the institution and the coherence between their personal traits and their job. On the other hand, what seemed to lower the satisfaction of the teachers were mainly their responses to the items related to the benefits of the profession and the items related to curriculum.

4.2.2 Overall Job Satisfaction and Independent Variables

The second research question was stated as ‘Are there any differences among teachers’ overall job satisfaction in terms of age, gender, marital status, educational background, work experience, number of courses taught, teaching subject, lesson load, and motive for choosing teaching profession?’ This question was examined

under nine sub-questions and the results are reported taking each sub-question one by one.

For the first sub-question, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out to find out whether there was any difference in the teachers' overall job satisfaction in relation to their age, which was transformed into five categories. The overall ANOVA test revealed a significant difference, $F(4,711) = 4.95, p = .00$ (Table 11).

Table 11
ANOVA according to Age

	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	5.04	4	1.26	4.95	.00
Within Groups	181.09	711	.26		
Total	186.13	715			

Because the ANOVA was significant, the multiple comparison Dunnett's C test was run. The multiple comparison test indicated that the overall job satisfaction of the teachers over 42 was significantly higher than the teachers between the ages 21-27. The teachers between the ages 42-48 had significantly higher overall job satisfaction compared to the teachers between the ages 28-34 (Table 12).

Table 12
Overall Job Satisfaction and Age

Age Range	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> (OJS)	<i>SD</i>
21-27	164	3.31	.50
28-34	184	3.36	.57
35-41	126	3.42	.49
42-48	181	3.52	.46
49-61	61	3.52	.49

The teachers over 42 were the most satisfied group while teachers between 21 and 27 were the least satisfied group.

For the second sub-question, an independent sample t-test was conducted to evaluate whether there were any differences between male and female teachers' overall job satisfaction. The test was not significant, $t(718) = -.62, p \geq .05$ (Table 13). The overall job satisfaction of male teachers ($M = 3.43, SD = .51$) was almost same with the female teachers' ($M = 3.40, SD = .51$).

Table 13
Independent Sample t-test for Male and Female Teachers

		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean of OJS	Equal variances assumed	-.62	718	.54
	Equal variances assumed	-.620	631.75	.54

For the third sub-question, an independent sample t-test was conducted to find out whether there were any statistical differences between teachers' overall job satisfaction and their marital status. The test was significant, $t(694) = 2.30, p = .02$ (Table 14).

Table 14
Independent Sample t-test for Marital Status

		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean of OJS	Equal variances assumed	2.30	694	.02
	Equal variances assumed	2.11	266.24	.04

The overall job satisfaction of married teachers ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .49$) was significantly higher than the overall job satisfaction of single, widow/widower and divorced teachers ($M = 3.33$, $SD = .58$), with a mean difference of .11.

For the fourth sub-question, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to find out whether there was any difference in the teachers' overall job satisfaction in accordance with their educational background. The overall ANOVA test revealed a significant difference, $F(2,717) = 3.20$, $p = .04$ (Table 15).

Table 15
ANOVA according to Educational Background

	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	1.65	2	.83	3.20	.04
Within Groups	185.10	717	.26		
Total	186.76	719			

Because the ANOVA was significant, the multiple comparison Dunnett's C test was run. The multiple comparison test indicated that the overall job satisfaction of teachers who graduated from educational institutes teachers' training colleges, and schools of foreign languages ($M = 3.49$, $SD = .46$) was significantly higher than the satisfaction of the teachers who graduated from the faculties of universities other than education but obtained a certificate to be authorized to teach ($M = 3.36$, $SD = .51$), and the satisfaction of the teachers who had a 4-year university education in faculties of education ($M = 3.40$, $SD = .54$) didn't show any significant difference from the other two groups of teachers.

For the fifth sub-question, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out to find out whether there was any difference in the teachers' overall job satisfaction in accordance with their work experience. The overall ANOVA test was significant, $F(3,713) = 4.91$, $p = .00$ (Table 16).

Table 16
ANOVA according to Work Experience

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.74	3	1.25	4.91	.00
Within Groups	181.15	713	.25		
Total	184.89	716			

Because the ANOVA was significant, the multiple comparison Dunnett's C test was run. The multiple comparison test indicated that the overall job satisfaction of teachers who had more than 22 and more years of work experience ($M = 3.51$, $SD = .47$), which constituted the highest scoring group, was significantly higher than the satisfaction of the teachers with 1-7 years of work experience, which constituted the lowest scoring group ($M = 3.33$, $SD = .53$). The distribution of the subjects in terms of work experience is provided in Table 17. The mean scores also show that as years of work experience increase, teachers' overall job satisfaction increases, too.

Table 17
Overall Job Satisfaction and Work Experience

Work Experience	n	M (OJS)	SD
7 and below	273	3.33	.53
8-14	179	3.42	.51
15-21	73	3.42	.49
22 and above	192	3.51	.47

For the sixth sub-question, an independent sample t-test was conducted to find out whether there were any statistical differences between teachers' overall job satisfaction and the number of courses they taught in 2003-2004 academic year. The

test was not significant, $t(718) = -.24, p \geq .05$ (Table 18). The overall job satisfaction of teachers who taught one course ($M = 3.41, SD = .51$) and more than one course ($M = 3.42, SD = .52$) were almost the same.

Table 18
Independent Sample t-test for the Number of Courses Taught

		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean of OJS	Equal variances assumed	-.24	718	.81
	Equal variances assumed	-.23	287.05	.82

For the seventh sub-question, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out to find out whether there was any difference in the teachers' overall job satisfaction in accordance with their teaching subject. The overall ANOVA test did not reveal a significant difference, $F(4,715) = 2.26, p \geq .05$ (Table 19). The overall job satisfaction of teachers teaching Mathematics, Turkish, Social Studies, Natural Sciences, and Foreign Language were almost equal to each other with a mean difference (between the highest and the lowest mean) of 0.13.

Table 19
ANOVA according to Teaching Subject (OJS)

	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	2.33	4	.58	2.26	.06
Within Groups	184.42	715	.26		
Total	186.76	719			

For the eighth sub-question, an independent sample t-test was conducted to find out whether there were any statistical differences between teachers' overall job satisfaction and their lesson load. The test was significant, $t(707) = 3.68$, $p = .00$ (Table 20).

Table 20
Independent Sample t-test for Lesson Load

		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean of OJS	Equal variances assumed	3.68	707	.00
	Equal variances not assumed	3.95	47.28	.00

The overall job satisfaction of teachers who had 15 and less teaching hours per week ($M = 3.69$, $SD = .47$) was significantly higher than the overall job satisfaction of teachers who had 16 and more teaching hours per week ($M = 3.39$, $SD = .51$), with a mean difference of .30. However, it is necessary to mention that this result may be due to the difference in the sub-sample size.

For the ninth sub-question, an independent sample t-test was conducted to see whether there were any statistical differences between teachers' overall job satisfaction and their motive for choosing teaching profession. The test was significant, $t(714) = 5.49$, $p = .00$ (Table 21). The difference was in favor of teachers who claimed that teaching had been their personal choice ($M = 3.46$, $SD = .49$). The mean of the overall job satisfaction of the teachers who claimed that it had been the conditions what had led them to teaching profession was 3.21 ($SD = .52$).

Table 21
Independent Sample t-test for the Motive for Teaching Profession

		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean of OJS	Equal variances assumed	5.49	714	.00
	Equal variances assumed	5.31	220.24	.00

4.2.3 Curriculum Satisfaction

The third research question was stated as: ‘Are the teachers satisfied with the curricula they use?’ The data obtained from the last 15 items of the questionnaire designed by the researcher was subject to descriptive analyses. The mean of 720 teachers’ scores ranged from 1.00 to 5.00 with a mean of 2.95 ($SD = .73$). When Table 22 is considered (intervals for the levels of satisfaction), they are found to be undecided on average.

Table 22
Intervals for the Level of Satisfaction (CS)

Interval	Level of Satisfaction	<i>n</i>	%
1.00-1.80	Highly Dissatisfied	43	6
1.81-2.60	Dissatisfied	185	25.7
2.61-3.40	Undecided	307	42.6
3.41-4.20	Satisfied	164	22.8
4.21-5.00	Highly Satisfied	21	2.9

The dissatisfied and the undecided teachers constituted the majority (68.3 %). When the items are examined (see Appendix E), it is understood that teachers were mostly dissatisfied with the items regarding the coherence between the curriculum and the

students, the modernity of the curricula they used, and the variety of the main course books (items 27, 28, 29, 30, 35, 38. Only for the items 32 and 33, which were about the integrity of different curricula and the freedom they gave to the teachers respectively, the teachers showed their satisfaction. Though the teachers expressed their satisfaction in item 33, which questions the freedom given to the teachers by the curriculum, this freedom was formerly discussed by Engin and Yıldırım (1998). The freedom occurring as a result of the lack of assistance or guidance can not be defined as freedom. What is needed is a curriculum which guides teachers and gives them freedom of choice at the same time.

4.2.4 Curriculum Satisfaction and Teaching Subject

The fourth research question was stated as ‘Are there any differences among different subject area teachers in terms of their curriculum satisfaction?’ The data gathered was subject to one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The overall ANOVA test was significant, $F(4,715) = 6.65, p = .00$ (Table 23). It would be necessary to mention that there was no significant difference among the teachers’ overall job satisfaction in terms of teaching subject.

Table 23
ANOVA according to Teaching Subject (CS)

	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	13.72	4	3.43	6.65	.00
Within Groups	368.58	715	.52		
Total	382.30	719			

Because the ANOVA was significant, the multiple comparison Dunnett’s C test was run. The multiple comparison test indicated that the curriculum satisfaction of

teachers teaching Foreign Language was significantly lower than the curriculum satisfaction of the teachers teaching Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Turkish, with a mean difference of -.31, -.29, and -.37, respectively. The means and the standard deviations are given in Table 24.

Table 24
Curriculum Satisfaction and Teaching Subject

Course	<i>M</i> (CS)	<i>SD</i>
Turkish	3.09	.75
Foreign Language	2.72	.69
Mathematics	3.01	.72
Social Studies	2.86	.73
Natural Sciences	3.04	.67

4.2.5 Overall Job Satisfaction and Job Preference

The fifth research question was stated as ‘Are there any differences among teachers’ overall job satisfaction in terms of their job preference?’ A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out to find out whether there was any difference in the teachers’ overall job satisfaction in accordance with their job preference. The overall ANOVA test was significant, $F(2,710) = 42.13, p = .00$ (Table 25).

Table 25
ANOVA according to Teachers’ Job Preference (OJS)

	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	19.55	2	9.77	42.13	.00
Within Groups	164.71	710	.23		
Total	184.26	712			

Because the ANOVA was significant, the multiple comparison Dunnett's C test was run. The multiple comparison test indicated that the overall job satisfaction of the teachers who would choose the same profession again ($M = 3.53$, $SD = .48$) was significantly higher than those teachers' who wouldn't ($M = 3.12$, $SD = .51$) and who were undecided ($M = 3.26$, $SD = .45$). The means and standard deviations are given in Table 26.

Table 26
Overall Job Satisfaction and Teachers' Job Preference

Preference	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> (OJS)	<i>SD</i>
I would	464	3.53	.48
Undecided	139	3.26	.45
I wouldn't	110	3.12	.51

4.2.6 Curriculum Satisfaction and Job Preference

The sixth research question was stated as 'Are there any significant differences among teachers' curriculum satisfaction in terms of their job preference?' A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out to find out whether there was any difference in the teachers' curriculum satisfaction in accordance with their job preference. The overall ANOVA test was significant, $F(2,710) = 18.20$, $p = .00$ (Table 27).

Table 27
ANOVA according to Teachers' Job Preference (CS)

	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	18.38	2	9.19	18.20	.00
Within Groups	358.51	710	.51		
Total	376.89	712			

Because the ANOVA was significant, the multiple comparison Dunnett's C test was run. The multiple comparison test indicated that the curriculum satisfaction of the teachers who would choose the same profession again ($M = 3.06$, $SD = .73$) was higher than those teachers' who wouldn't ($M = 2.65$, $SD = .71$) and who were undecided ($M = 2.82$, $SD = .65$). The means and standard deviations are given in Table 28.

Table 28
Curriculum Satisfaction and Teachers' Job Preference

Preference	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> (CS)	<i>SD</i>
I would	464	3.06	.73
Undecided	139	2.82	.65
I wouldn't	110	2.65	.71

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter is devoted to the discussion of the study, implications for practice and implications for further research.

5.1 Discussion

This study aimed to define the overall job satisfaction and the curriculum satisfaction of the teachers who work at the second cycle of elementary education. It also examined the overall job satisfaction and curriculum satisfaction in relation to some variables. In the following part, the inferences that can be drawn from the results of the study are presented.

It would be necessary to discuss overall job satisfaction and curriculum satisfaction of the teachers together since some explanations will be common for them. When the teachers' overall job satisfaction level is considered, they are found to be satisfied on average ($M = 3.41$, $SD = .51$). The items for which the teachers claimed to be satisfied were the items regarding communication and the coherence between the job and personal traits. This can be interpreted in a way that the teachers had a strong chain of communication within and out of the schools and they feel they are at the appropriate place when their personal traits are considered. That the average is too closed to the upper limit of 'undecided' level can lead to the idea that they have doubts about certain aspects of the work they do as well. Their doubts can be seen in their responses to some specific group of items. The responses to the items related to benefits and curriculum satisfaction were remarkably lower than the responses to the other items. Especially the item related to the salary of the teachers (item 16) revealed as the lowest scored item in the whole questionnaire. Yet the responses of

13 teachers to the open-ended question at the end of the questionnaire supported their dissatisfaction with the salary they got.

When the teachers' satisfaction with the curricula they used is considered, they can be regarded as undecided on average ($M = 2.95$, $SD = .73$). From an optimistic perspective, the teachers are not dissatisfied with the curricula they use, at least. However, when the importance of curriculum is considered as a probable major component of the job content of teaching profession, this result is not satisfying at all. From the responses of the teachers to the items related to curriculum, it can be found out that they were mostly dissatisfied with the content and the appropriateness of the curriculum, and the aids and support provided by the authorities. The dissatisfaction with the content may be largely a result of the mismatch between the aims-goals-objectives of the courses and the conditions and opportunities to actualize these objectives. In fact, this issue was the most frequently emphasized issue in the open-ended question. 72 teachers claimed that the programs were really overloaded and they wanted them to have a moderate level of load or they recommended a raise in the number of lessons per week. They also complained about the fact that they had to rush so much that the courses encouraged memorization (18 teachers) because they had no time for practice, experiments, and observations. The teachers also expressed their dissatisfaction with the aids and support provided by the authorities (items 36-40). Yet, they expressed their reflections more specifically in the open-ended question. They mainly emphasized the lack of computers and laboratories (32 teachers). The teachers were also dissatisfied with the variety of course books and they mention the inefficiency of the course books in their reflections (14 teachers).

According to the results of this study, there was a significant difference between the teachers' overall job satisfaction in terms of age, marital status, educational background, work experience, lesson load, and motive for choosing teaching profession. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction of the teachers in terms of their gender, number of courses, and teaching subject.

The results showing a significant difference in the teachers' overall job satisfaction in terms of age are consistent with the results of some other studies (Galloway et al., 1985; Erbey, 1999) whereas inconsistent with some others (Furnham et al., 2002; Santangelo & Lester, 1985; Zeitz, 1990). Younger teachers, especially the teachers between the ages 21-27 ($M = 3.31$) were significantly less satisfied than the teachers over 42 ($M = 3.52$). This may be explained by the expectations of the teachers. In the first years of teaching, when the teachers find the working conditions lower than their expectations, they may be experiencing some kind of disappointment. However, the teachers over 42 seem to adapt well to the working conditions, probably by lowering their expectations or just by getting used to those conditions. As Watson et al. (1991) claims adjustment affects the degree of job satisfaction. The number of teachers also seems to support this idea since the number of teachers between 35-41 ($n = 126$) is far less than the teachers between 21-27 ($n = 164$) and 42-48 ($n = 181$). This may be due to resignation after a certain years of teaching, and the ones who accept the conditions remain in the job. Another possible explanation for this result can be related to the competence in the profession. Feeling competent may reduce the stress (Watson et al., 1991) and the time investment on the work one does. However, novice teachers have a lot to learn and have a lot to do at the beginning of teaching profession.

There was a significant difference between the teachers' overall job satisfaction in terms of their marital status. Married teachers ($M = 3.44$) were found to be more satisfied than single, widow/widower and divorced teachers ($M = 3.33$). The most plausible explanation for this result is that physiological and safety needs may be more important than other needs for married teachers when Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory is considered (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996). That is to say, as Strauss and Sayles (1972) define it, *off-the-job* needs may have more priority for married teachers whereas *around-the-job* and *through-the-job* needs may have more priority for single, widow/widower and divorced teachers. When working at public schools is accepted to provide more future and security guarantee in Turkey and when the responsibilities of married teachers out of school are considered, this explanation seems plausible.

There was a significant difference in the teachers' overall job satisfaction in terms of educational background. The teachers who graduated from faculties of universities other than education but certified to teach ($M = 3.36$) were less satisfied than the teachers who graduated from educational institutes, teachers' training colleges, and schools of foreign languages ($M = 3.49$). This mean difference can be a consequence of a number of reasons. The first possibility is that the teachers who graduated from educational institutes, teachers' training colleges, and schools of foreign languages are quite older than the other group of teachers, and when the overall job satisfaction of teachers over 42 is considered, this explanation seems plausible. The second possibility is related to 'doing your own job' issue. For example, for a person who enters university with the purpose of becoming a scientist, teaching mathematics can be far from his plans that he made before entering the university. For such teachers, teaching may only be an alternative that they would use only if they had to. That is to say, teaching is only an alternative for them via accomplishing necessary requirements; however, the institutions that the other group of teachers attends are established with the purpose of training teachers. Though the teachers who graduated from faculties of education did not show significant difference from the other two groups of teachers in terms of overall job satisfaction, they were also more satisfied than the teachers who graduated from the faculties of universities other than education, which is in line with the results of Birlik's study (1999). Another explanation can be attributed to the results of Watson's study (1991), which reports that the teachers who feel well-prepared during teacher education are more satisfied than those who feel poorly-prepared during teacher education. When the teacher education that these groups of teachers get is considered, this may stand as a plausible explanation.

The results revealed a significant difference in the teachers' overall job satisfaction in terms of work experience. Teachers with seven and less than seven years of experience ($M = 3.33$) displayed less overall job satisfaction than teachers with 22 and more years of work experience ($M = 3.51$). This significant difference may be a result of expectations, mentioned in the explanation of the difference in the overall job satisfaction of the teachers in terms of age. It seems that the more time teachers

spend on adapting to the working conditions and lowering their expectations, the more satisfied they become. Here, it would be necessary to bear in mind that in his study, Avi-Itzhak (1988) reports that teaching experience plays a significant role in defining the satisfaction level of teachers and the satisfied teachers are more likely to be older with longer teaching experience.

The teachers' overall job satisfaction showed significant difference in terms of lesson load in that teacher who had 15 and less teaching hours per week ($M = 3.69$) were more satisfied than the teachers who had 16 and more teaching hours per week ($M = 3.39$). At first glance, this result is quite striking because subject teachers get additional payment for each lesson over 15 lessons per week, however, it should be remembered that "teaching profession does not attract people who are motivated by monetary compensation, but rather from intrinsic or psychological rewards" (Avi-Itzhak, 1988, p. 360). One of the most plausible explanation for this result is that, teaching over 15 hours is so exhausting that or the work load (including teaching-time and non-teaching time activities) is so deterrent that nothing can compensate it. In their reflections, 11 teachers complained about their class size, which made it impossible for them to be effective in their classes. Another explanation is that teachers may be experiencing classroom management problems in crowded classes. This can be interpreted in a way that they may be facing some kind of discipline problems. Yet, in their comments, eight teachers mentioned that the regulations regarding the discipline issues and passing policies had to be revised urgently as they caused a loss in their reputation and sanction in their classes. Under such circumstances, teachers may be finding their efforts wasted and far from accomplishing educational goals. Yet, according to Knoop (cited in Furnham et al., 2002), meaningful work, as an intrinsic work-related value, stands as one of the factors affecting job satisfaction.

Motive for choosing teaching profession was found to be a factor creating significant difference in teachers' overall job satisfaction. The teachers who claimed that teaching had been their personal choice ($M = 3.46$) had significantly higher overall job satisfaction than the teachers who claimed that it had been only the conditions

which had directed them to teaching ($M = 3.21$). This difference may be a consequence of the reasons mentioned during the explanation of the importance of educational background. That is, the individuals who once dreamt of some other career plan may prefer teaching due to the conditions. However, the individuals for whom teaching is a personal choice can be accepted as having more internal motivation and therefore more decisive and committed. This explanation is in line with the results of a study conducted by Watson et al. (1991). In his study, it is reported that higher commitment to teaching showed a high correlation with job satisfaction.

There was a significant difference between the teachers' curriculum satisfaction in terms of teaching subject. Foreign Language teachers ($M = 2.72$) were significantly less satisfied with the curriculum they used than the teachers of Natural Sciences ($M = 3.04$), Mathematics ($M = 3.01$), and Turkish ($M = 3.09$). This means different aspects of curriculum meet the needs of Foreign Language teachers less than they meet the needs of other subject teachers in relation to the curriculum they use. The reason can be attributed to hours allocated for foreign language courses per week. Since learning a foreign language requires the development of various skills, the number of the lessons may not be enough for these teachers. Besides, Foreign Language is different from other courses in that it is impossible for the teachers to have natural settings for practice. That is to say, since it is almost impossible for those teachers to make use of daily life, they always need more aids to create an authentic-like learning environment. When the problem of class size is added to this contextual difficulty, it may become highly difficult for teachers to achieve their objectives and this may be leading to a lack of satisfaction towards curriculum. The last and the most plausible reason can be that other subject teachers have to teach foreign language due to the shortage of foreign language teachers in Turkey, and when the incompetence in teaching a foreign language comes together with the inadequate guidance and inadequate in-service training, the teachers may be feeling hopeless with the curricula.

When the relation between job preference and overall job satisfaction is considered, the teachers who claimed that they would choose the teaching profession again if it were feasible to consider a career choice ($M = 3.53$) had significantly higher overall job satisfaction than the ones who were undecided ($M = 3.26$) and wouldn't ($M = 3.12$). The relation between this attitude towards teaching profession and curriculum satisfaction is significant as well. The teachers who would reconsider teaching as a career choice ($M = 3.06$) were more satisfied with the curricula they used than the teachers who were undecided ($M = 2.82$) and wouldn't ($M = 2.64$). Choosing a profession for a second time can be a consequence of (1) desirable working conditions that the job provides or (2) commitment and decisiveness regardless of the current working conditions or any other factor. The first reasoning is easier to clarify because it can be claimed that when you fulfill your needs or expectations, you feel satisfied with the work you do (Galloway, Boswell, Panckhurst, Boswell & Gren, 1985). In fact, this explanation is not valid for this study because the teachers do not show a very high level of overall job satisfaction or curriculum satisfaction. The second reasoning is more complex because the reasons are more internal and the distinguishing features stand as commitment and decisiveness. As a result, it can be claimed that more decisive and committed teachers tend to be more satisfied with their current working conditions, the coherence between their job and personality, and the curricula they use. Similarly, the teachers who are less committed to their profession and who lack this inner motivation are less satisfied with their job and curriculum. Yet, studies have provided evidence that internal factors definitely have impact on job satisfaction (Kottkamp, 1990).

What is also striking is that 110 out of 713 teachers claimed that they wouldn't choose teaching profession again. They may be remaining in teaching profession for some other reason, probably due to financial reasons or unemployment problem in Turkey, but it is clear that they are dissatisfied with the profession they chose and the work they are doing.

5.2 Implications for Practice

According to the findings of the study, it was found that the teachers were satisfied in terms of overall job satisfaction, however, quite undecided in terms of curriculum satisfaction. In addition, there was a significant difference between the teachers' overall job satisfaction in terms of age, marital status, educational background, work experience, lesson load, and motive for choosing teaching profession, but no difference in terms of their gender, number of courses, and teaching subject. The results also showed that there occurred a significant difference between the teachers' curriculum satisfaction in terms of teaching subject. When the teachers' attitude towards teaching profession was examined, there was a significant difference between the teachers' overall job satisfaction, so did for the curriculum satisfaction. In the lights of the findings some implications can be drawn.

With respect to the overall job satisfaction and the curriculum satisfaction of the teachers, the benefits of teaching profession should be revised so that teaching regains its encouraging reputation back. In terms of curriculum, it seems as if the Ministry of National Education needs to revise the content of the curricula they developed and supply the necessary aids to the schools and teachers if it wants to achieve its educational goals and to have more satisfied and effective teachers. Probably, the Ministry should follow every single basic principle of curriculum planning. For instance, they should have teachers join the planning process and consider the feedback from the schools more seriously since teachers are the ones who directly see the effect of curriculum during the implementation.

From the significant difference between the teachers' overall job satisfaction in terms of age and in terms of work experience, it can be stated that novice or young teachers have difficulty in adapting to the working conditions and they can not fulfill their expectations. It would be too demanding to suggest better conditions for teachers, and to be realistic, probably, a comprehensive teacher training, including more educational setting applications, and a more intensive in-service training would be helpful for the teachers to get used to and realize the conditions and the implications

in practice. In fact, in 1997 the Ministry of National Education added school experience courses in teacher training programs to enhance more hands-on experiences for the candidates, and the teachers getting this additional practical courses has recently been teaching in real settings. In addition, better orientation programs and more effective mentoring strategies, and moderate level of workload would be helpful for the novice teachers. This would also give them enough time to get ready, experience more and feel more competent in teaching.

The results of the study showed that married teachers, for whom physiological and safety needs seemed to be more important, were more satisfied than single, widow, widower, and divorced teachers. Therefore, the Ministry of National Education should conduct comprehensive studies to define higher level of needs of the teachers in detail and find ways to address those needs in order to increase the overall job satisfaction of single, widow, widower, and divorced teachers.

It was apparent from the result that educational background was a factor creating a difference in the overall job satisfaction of the teachers. The teachers graduating from faculties of universities other than education showed the lowest level of satisfaction, and this result seems to be an answer to the regulation of the unavoidable system due to the shortage of teachers in Turkey. In the short run, those teachers who still work at schools have no choice other than gaining competence at their working place if they are to remain in teaching profession. Therefore, adequate and effective in-service training should be conducted and encouraged within schools. In the middle run, the duration of teaching formation education should be lengthened and the content of these programs should be revised so that the teacher candidates gain more competence in teaching. This is also crucial for the quality of education itself as training of teachers stands as an important factor in maintaining quality standards in education (Amelsvoort & Scheerens, 1989). In the long run, (1) ways to educate more and qualified teachers and (2) ways to raise the reputation of teaching profession in the society should be sought via starting effective reforms in teacher education institutions and legislation of new policies so that more teachers in number and in quality can be trained.

The results of the study showed that teachers teaching 15 and fewer hours were more satisfied than the teachers teaching 16 and more hours. Presumably, the teachers' work load (all the duties and responsibilities as regards teaching and non-teaching) is very deterrent and it can be suggested that the work load of the teachers be reduced to a moderate level. In relation to this issue, the discipline and passing policies should be revised despite all political or social pressure, because it is understood from the reflections of the teachers that teachers are discontent with the present situation in favor of themselves, students, and the quality of education as a whole.

When the present context of this study is considered, it can be stated that if a person chooses teaching as a result of personal choice, this person is likely to be more satisfied than a person who chooses teaching due to some other environmental reasons. This result verifies the importance of decisiveness and commitment on the satisfaction obtained from a job. Therefore, an effective guidance before choosing a profession and better working conditions for teachers would help teacher candidates most who have to make their professional choices during their high school education. An effective guidance, consideration of the coherence between personal traits and the requirements of teaching profession and better benefits and working conditions are necessary for students to make their personal choices towards teaching profession. At that point, it is the government's responsibility to provide guidance in favor of teaching profession and to undertake better standards of living for those who are qualified to teach.

It can be inferred from the results of this study that Foreign Language teachers are the least satisfied group of teachers in terms of the curriculum they use. However, this does not mean that other subject area teachers are very satisfied with the curricula they use. It is clear that the curricula do not match with the expectations of all groups of teachers. Especially the overloaded curricula, which constitute a big problem for all subject teachers, should be reconsidered and reduced to a moderate level. Besides, the necessary aids should be supplied to all schools and teachers if the objectives of courses are expected to be achieved and the teachers to be more willing to teach. Although the results provide the areas which need to be handled, the extent

and the details of these issues should be investigated. Such an investigation can be both helpful in terms of both teacher satisfaction and the curriculum itself, and inevitably the quality of education and probably, more attention should be given to the reflections of the teachers since they are the ones who take place in every stage of curriculum.

The results of the study also showed that there was a difference between teachers' overall job satisfaction and curriculum satisfaction in terms of their job preference. The teachers who would choose teaching profession again had more overall job satisfaction and curriculum satisfaction than the teachers who were undecided and wouldn't. It is clear that there are some teachers who remain in the job although they wouldn't choose teaching profession if it were feasible to reconsider a career choice. This can be interpreted as that they find some features of teaching profession unsatisfying, but there are other factors leading them to stay in the teaching profession. The Ministry of National Education should probably conduct other studies in order to gather deeper information related to the reasons of the dissatisfaction with the job and the curriculum, and take some precautions to motivate these teachers and increase their job satisfaction for the sake of the quality of education in Turkey before these teachers consider other professions.

To sum up, this research was a survey which explored the overall job satisfaction and curriculum satisfaction of the teachers working at the second cycle of elementary education. It also examined overall job satisfaction and curriculum satisfaction in relation to some other variables. It is hoped that the results of this study are taken into consideration by school administrations, the Ministry of National Education, and the departments of universities responsible for teacher education.

5.3 Implications for Further Research

In this part, recommendations for further research are presented.

1. This study tries to draw attention to the 'curriculum satisfaction' concept and therefore the relation between curriculum satisfaction and overall job satisfaction can be examined to define the impact of curriculum on overall job satisfaction.
2. This study examines whether the teachers are satisfied or not with their job and curriculum. Further study can exploit the reasons for the satisfaction or the dissatisfaction of the teachers in detail.
3. For some items of the questionnaire, a considerable amount of teachers preferred 'undecided' option. Therefore, further qualitative study can exploit the reasons for such an inclination of the teachers.
4. A further qualitative study in search for any undefined facet is required to conduct more reliable job satisfaction assessments in the future.
5. Further studies can be conducted for teachers working at different levels of education and different types of schools, enhancing comparative studies in the field.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Saad, I. & Hendrix, V. L. (1995). Organizational climate and teachers' job satisfaction in a multi-cultural milieu: The case of the Bedouin Arab schools in Israel. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 15(2), 141-153.
- Amelsvoort, G. V. & Scheerens, J. International comparative indicators on teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13(4), 267-277.
- Avi-Itzhak, T. E. (1988). The effects of needs, organizational factors, and teachers' characteristics on job satisfaction in kindergarten teachers. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 26(3), 353-363.
- Balcı, A. & Yıldırım, A. (1998). Liselerde sosyoloji dersinin öğretimi üzerine bir çalışma. *Ç. Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(17), 80-94.
- Benson, J. (1983). The bureaucratic nature of schools and teacher job satisfaction. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 21(2), 137-148.
- Birlik, M. A. (1999). *Öğretmenlerin Mesleki Doyumu ve Eğitim Anlayışları*. İzmir: Author.
- Bogler, R. (2002). Two profiles of schoolteachers: A discriminant analysis of job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 665-673.
- Brown, M. G. (1996). *Keeping Score-Using the Right Metrics to Drive World-Class Performance*. New York: Quality Resources.
- Conley, S. C., Bacharach, S. B., & Bauer, S. (1989). The school work environment and teacher career dissatisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 25(1), 58-81.
- Çingı, H. (1990). *Örnekleme Kuramı*. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü. (2001). *2000 Genel Nüfus Sayımı Kesin Sonuçları*. Available URL: http://www.die.gov.tr/nufus_sayimi/2000Nufus_Kesin1.htm
- Dreyfus, A. & Mazouz, Y. (1988). Probing teachers' (dis-) satisfaction with a curriculum by means of unstructured interviews. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 14, 245-259.
- Engin, C & Yıldırım, A. (1998). Liselerdeki felsefe dersi öğretiminin değerlendirilmesi. *Ç. Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(17), 102-117.

- Erbey, H. (1999). *İzmir Liselerinde Çalışan Öğretmenlerin Gereksinim Karşılanma Yetersizliği Dereceleri*. İzmir: Author.
- Erden, M. (1998). *Eğitimde Program Değerlendirme*. (3. Baskı). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Evans, G. A. & Maas, J. M. (1969). *Job Satisfaction and Teacher Militancy: Some Teacher Attitudes*. Illinois: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.
- Evans, L. (1997). Understanding teacher morale and job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(8), 831-845.
- Furnham, A, Petrides, K. V., Jackson, C. J., & Cotter, T. (2002). Do personality factors predict job satisfaction? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33, 1325-1342.
- Galloway, D., Boswell, K., Panckhurst, F., Boswell, C. & Gren, K. (1985). Sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction for New Zealand primary school teachers. *Educational Research*, 27(1), 44-51.
- Günbayı, İ. (1999). *İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin İş Doyumu (Malatya İli Örneği)*. (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Henson, K. T. (2001). *Curriculum Planning: Integrating Multiculturalism, Constructivism, and Education Reform*. (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies , Inc.
- Kottkamp, R. B. (1990). Teacher Attitudes about Work. In P. Reyes (Ed.), *Teachers and Their Workplace (84-114)*. California: Sage Publication.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (1998). *Methods of Educational and Social Science Research: an Integrated Approach* (2nd ed.). N. Y.: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Lunenburg, F. C. & Ornstein, A. C. (1996). *Educational Administration-Concepts and Practices* (2nd ed.). California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Mathis, R. L. & Jackson, H. L. (1997). *Human Resources Management* (8th ed.). Minneapolis: West Publishing Company.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2003). *Milli Eğitim Sayısal Veriler 2002-2003*. Ankara: MEB.
- OECD. (1998). *Making the Curriculum Work*. M.A.: OECD.
- Ornstein, A. C. & Hunkins, F. P. (1988). *Curriculum: Foundations, Principles, and Issues*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Özdayı, N. (1990). *Resmi ve Özel Liselerde Çalışan Öğretmenlerin İş Tatmini ve İş Stresinin Karşılaştırılmalı Analizi*. (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi). İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi.
- Prick, L. G. M. (1989). Satisfaction and stress among teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13(4), 363-377.
- Reyes, P. (1990). Organizational Commitment of Teachers. P. In Reyes (Ed.), *Teachers and Their Workplace (143-162)*. California: Sage Publication.
- Santangelo, S. & Lester, D. (1985). Correlates of job satisfaction of public school teachers: moonlighting, locus of control, and stress. *Psychological Reports*, 56, 130.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M. & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction*. California: Sage Publications.
- Stempien, L. R. & Loeb, R. C. (2002). Differences in job satisfaction between general education and special education teachers. *Remedial and Special Education*, 23(5), 258-268.
- Strauss, G. & Sayles, L. R. (1972). *Personnel: The Human Problems of Management* (3rd ed.). N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Varlık, T. (2000). *Devlet ve Özel İlköğretim Okullarında Çalışan Öğretmenlerin İş Doyumu (Ankara İli Örneği)*. Ankara: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Educational Statistics. (1997). *Job Satisfaction among America's Teachers: Effects of Workplace Conditions, Background Characteristics, and Teacher Compensation*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Watson, A. J., Hatton, N. G., Squires, D. S., & Soliman, I. K. (1991). School staffing and the quality of education: Teacher adjustment and satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7(1), 63-77.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W. & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Wiles, J. (1999). *Curriculum Essentials: A Source for Educators*. M.A.: Allyn & Bacon.

Zaleznik, A., Christensen, C. R., & Roethlisberger, F. J. (1959). *The Motivation, Productivity, and Satisfaction of Workers*. Massachusetts: The Plimpton Press.

Zeitz, G. (1990). Age and work satisfaction in a government agency: A situational perspective. *Human Relations*, 43, 419-438.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE LIST OF THE SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO THE CENTRAL DISTRICTS AND CITIES

CITY	CENTRAL DISTRICT	SCHOOL	
İSTANBUL	Adalar	Heybeliada E.S.	
	Avcılar	Cihangir E.S.	
	Bağcılar	Evren E.S.	
			Ziya Gökalp E.S.
		Bahçelievler	Dr. Refik Saydam E.S.
			Kocasinan E.S.
		Bakırköy	Aybars Ak E.S.
		Bayrampaşa	Tuna E.S.
		Beşiktaş	Tabiiyeci Mehmet Emin Ergün E.S.
		Beykoz	60. Yıl E.S.
		Beyoğlu	Ahmet Emin Yalman E.S.
		Eminönü	Beyazıt E.S.
		Esenler	Öz-de-bir E.S.
		Eyüp	Silahtarağa E.S.
		Fatih	Vedidi Baha Pars E.S.
		Gaziosmanpaşa	Ahmet Yesevi E.S.
			Yenimahalle E.S.
		Güngören	Mehmetçik E.S.
		Kadıköy	Şener Birsöz E.S.
			Yahya Kemal Beyatlı E.S.
		Kağıthane	İmece E.S.
		Kartal	Ege Sanayi E.S.
			Hasanpaşa E.S.
		Küçükçekmece	Akşemsettin E.S.
			Malkoçoğlu E.S.
		Maltepe	Nezahat-Aslan Ekşioğlu E.S.
		Pendik	75. Yıl Mesut Yılmaz E.S.
		Sarıyer	Fatih E.S.
		Şişli	Talatpaşa E.S.
		Tuzla	Lale-Barış Manço E.S.
		Ümraniye	Mehmet Ali Yılmaz E.S.
		Saadet Yılmaz E.S.	
	Üsküdar	Ata E.S.	

Continued

CITY	CENTRAL DISTRICT	SCHOOL
		Belma Güde E.S.
	Zeytinburnu	Çiftlik E.S.
ANKARA	Altındağ	Ayşe Numan Konakçı E.S. Hüseyin Güllü Ceylan E.S.
	Çankaya	Dedeman E.S. Köy Hizmetleri E.S. Metin Oktay Mah. E.S.
	Etimesgut	Eryaman Bahar E.S. Güneşevler E.S.
	Gölbaşı	Bayrak E.S.
	Keçiören	Halit Fahri Ozansoy E.S. İbrahim Akoğlu E.S.
		Kocatepe E.S.
	Mamak	19 Mayıs E.S. Köstence E.S.
	Sincan	Atıf Benderli E.S. Plevne E.S.
	Yenimahalle	Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar E.S. Batıkent E.S.
		Hazar E.S.
İZMİR	Balçova	Ertuğrul Gazi E.S.
	Bornova	Okutan E.S. Şehitler E.S.
	Buca	Betontaş E.S. Kozağaç E.S.
	Çigli	Selim Diniz E.S.
	Gaziemir	Dokuz Eylül E.S.
	Güzelbahçe	Güzelbahçe Vali Kazım Paşa E.S.
	Karşıyaka	Fevzipaşa E.S. Osman Faruk Verimer E.S.
	Konak	Gürçeşme Leman Alptekin E.S. Necatibey E.S. Vasıf Çınar E.S.
	Narlidere	Kılıçaslan E.S.
ADANA	Seyhan	Celalettin Sayhan E.S. Hoca Ahmet Yesevi E.S. Necdet Karhama E.S. Öğ. Zeynep Erdoğan E.S.
		Seyhan E.S. Yunus Emre E.S.
	Yüreğir	Anadolu E.S. İsmail Sefa Özler E.S.
SAMSUN	Merkez	100. Yıl E.S. Abdullahpaşa E.S.

Continued

CITY	CENTRAL DISTRICT	SCHOOL
		Alparslan E.S.
		Bayındır E.S.
		İlkadım E.S.
		Kubilay E.S.
		Taflan Yalı E.S.
ERZURUM	Merkez	23 Temmuz E.S.
		Aliravi E.S.
		Altınbulak Köyü E.S.
		Dadaş E.S.
		Evliya Çelebi E.S.
		Mehmetçik E.S.
ŞANLIURFA	Merkez	Bağlarbaşı E.S.
		Cengiztopel E.S.
		Kavakbaşı E.S.
		Koç E.S.
		Ortahameden E.S.
		Profilo E.S.
TOTAL		94

APPENDIX B

OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION AND CURRICULUM SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH VERSION)

Dear Colleague,

I am conducting a study to define the overall job satisfaction of teachers working at the second cycle of elementary schools and their satisfaction with the curricula they use. This data collection instrument, which consists of two sections, is given to you to serve this purpose. In Section I, you are expected to provide demographic information (11 questions). In Section II, some phrases reflecting communication, administration, the nature of the job, the benefits of the job, personal traits, and curriculum are presented. For this 40-item section, you are expected to go over each item and on the 5-item scale tick the appropriate parenthesis which fits you best. There is no right or wrong answer to the questions. Answering all the questions is important for the study to be carried out in good order. Your sincere responses to the questions are highly appreciated.

You do not have to write your name and surname. Your responses to the questions will not be used for any other purpose other than this study. Thank you for your cooperation.

Regards,
Eda TÜZEMEN GENÇER
METU Department of Educational Sciences MSc. Student
Hacettepe University SFL Instructor
e-mail: edatuzemen@superonline.com

SECTION I

Please answer the following questions by putting a cross (X) in the appropriate parenthesis or by directly writing the answer.

1. Please write your age: _____
2. Gender:
() Female () Male
3. Marital Status (Please Write): _____
4. Educational level/levels completed:
() Educational Institute
() Teachers' Training College
() University (Faculty of Education)
() University (Other Faculties)
() Other (Please Write.): _____

5. How long have you been teaching? (Please Write): _____
6. The name of the school you work at and the city it is located in (Please Write):

7. Tick the courses that you taught in your school in the 2003-2004 academic year.
 Natural Sciences
 Mathematics
 Turkish
 Social Studies
 Foreign Language (Please write the foreign language): _____
 Other (Please Write): _____
8. If you have ticked more than one option in the previous question, please write the course you will consider (among the first five) while answering the questions related to the curriculum (26-40). _____
9. Lesson load per week (Please Write): _____
10. Was teaching profession your personal choice?
 Yes, it was. No, it wasn't.
 Other (Please Write): _____
11. Would you choose teaching profession again if it were feasible to reconsider a career choice?
 Yes Undecided No

SECTION II

You will find some phrases related to various aspects of your job. After reading each phrase carefully, state your satisfaction for each item by putting a cross (X) in the scale provided.

	HIGHLY DISSATISFIED	DISSATISFIED	UNDECIDED	SATISFIED	HIGHLY SATISFIED
1. The degree of peace in the working place	()	()	()	()	()
2. My communication with my colleagues	()	()	()	()	()
3. My communication with the supervisor	()	()	()	()	()
4. My communication with my students	()	()	()	()	()
5. My communication with the guardians of my students	()	()	()	()	()

	HIGHLY DISSATISFIED	DISSATISFIED	UNDECIDED	SATISFIED	HIGHLY SATISFIED
6. My supervisor's competence in directing his/her subordinates	()	()	()	()	()
7. The support given to the staff by my supervisor	()	()	()	()	()
8. My supervisor's appreciation of the work I do	()	()	()	()	()
9. The decision making mechanism in my institution	()	()	()	()	()
10. The support given to me in my institution to improve myself	()	()	()	()	()
11. Lesson load per week	()	()	()	()	()
12. The number of students in the classes I teach	()	()	()	()	()
13. The number of different courses that I have to teach (Ex: It is 2 courses for a teacher who teach both Social Studies and Agriculture)	()	()	()	()	()
14. The assignments and activities given to me other than teaching	()	()	()	()	()
15. That my job requires one-to-one relations with others	()	()	()	()	()
16. The salary that I get for the work I do in my institution	()	()	()	()	()
17. The guarantee that my job provides for my future	()	()	()	()	()
18. The reputation of my job in the society	()	()	()	()	()
19. The vacation opportunities that my job offers	()	()	()	()	()
20. The promotion opportunities that my job offers	()	()	()	()	()
21. The sense of achievement I feel through the work I do	()	()	()	()	()
22. Being able to do something for others while doing my job	()	()	()	()	()
23. My level of competence in my subject area (Ex: Mathematics, Turkish)	()	()	()	()	()
24. Teaching formation that I have	()	()	()	()	()
25. The coherence between my job and my personal traits	()	()	()	()	()
26. The number of hours per week allocated for the implementation of the curriculum	()	()	()	()	()
27. The coherence between the curriculum and the level of my students	()	()	()	()	()
28. The appropriateness of the content of the curriculum to the needs of my students	()	()	()	()	()
29. The meaningfulness of the content of the curriculum to my students	()	()	()	()	()

HIGHLY DISSATISFIED DISSATISFIED UNDECIDED SATISFIED HIGHLY SATISFIED

30. The balance between the theoretical and practical (practice) knowledge which the curriculum is based on	() () () () ()
31. The continuity of the curriculum with the previous and the next curricula	() () () () ()
32. The integrity of the curriculum and other curricula	() () () () ()
33. The freedom that the curriculum gives me to apply my ideas and convictions	() () () () ()
34. The addressing of the curriculum to my creativity and initiatives	() () () () ()
35. The curriculum's reflecting recent developments	() () () () ()
36. The variety of the supplementary sources and the aids provided for the implementation of the curriculum	() () () () ()
37. The level of assistance of the curriculum in terms of teaching methods and techniques	() () () () ()
38. The variety of main course books provided for the curriculum	() () () () ()
39. Standards of achievement evaluation provided in the curriculum	() () () () ()
40. The appreciation of my ideas and suggestions regarding the curriculum used	() () () () ()

Please state any additional ideas or suggestions.

APPENDIX C

GENEL İŞ DOYUMU VE DERS PROGRAMI DOYUMU ANKETİ

(TURKISH VERSION)

Değerli Meslektaşım,

İlköğretim ikinci kademe öğretmenlerinin genel iş doyumu ve izledikleri müfredat ile ilgili memnuniyet düzeylerinin belirlenmesi amacıyla bir çalışma sürdürmekteyim. Bu amaçla size sunulan ve iki bölümden oluşan veri toplama aracı ekte verilmektedir. I. Bölüm’de Kişisel Bilgiler yer almaktadır (11 soru). II. Bölüm’de ise ilköğretim ikinci kademedeki çalışan öğretmenlerin iletişim, yönetim, işin doğası, işin getirileri, bireysel özellikler, ve ders programı ile ilgili ifadeler verilmektedir. 40 maddeden oluşan bu bölümde her maddeyi inceleyerek görüşünüzü verilen beşli skala üzerinde ilgili maddeyi işaretleyerek belirtmeniz istenmektedir. Sorulara doğru veya yanlış cevap vermek söz konusu değildir. Cevapsız soru bırakmamanız çalışmanın sağlıklı tamamlanması bakımından önemlidir. Anketteki sorulara vereceğiniz içten yanıtlar, bu çalışmanın sağlıklı sonuçlandırılması açısından önem taşımaktadır.

Adınızı veya soyadınızı yazmanız gerekmemektedir. Anketteki sorulara vereceğiniz yanıtlar, bilginiz dışında başka bir amaçla kullanılmayacaktır. Katkılarınızdan dolayı teşekkür ederim.

Saygılarımla,
Eda TÜZEMEN GENÇER
ODTÜ Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü Y. Lisans Öğrencisi
Hacettepe Üniversitesi Y.D.Y.O. Okutman
e-mail: edatuzemen@superonline.com

BÖLÜM I

Aşağıdaki soruları sizce uygun olan seçeneğinin başındaki parantezin içine (X) işareti koyarak veya yazarak yanıtlayınız.

1. Lütfen bitirdiğiniz yaşı yazınız: _____
2. Cinsiyetiniz:
() Kadın () Erkek
3. Medeni durumunuz (Lütfen yazınız): _____
4. Tamamladığınız eğitim düzeyi/düzeyleri:
() Eğitim Enstitüsü
() Yüksek Öğretmen Okulu
() Üniversite (Eğitim Fakültesi)
() Üniversite (Diğer Fakülteler)
() Diğer (Lütfen yazınız.): _____

5. Kaç yıldır öğretmen olarak çalışıyorsunuz? (Lütfen yazınız): _____
6. Çalıştığınız okulun adı ve bulunduğu şehir (Lütfen yazınız):

7. Çalıştığınız kurumda 2003-2004 akademik ders yılında girdiğiniz ders(ler)i işaretleyiniz.
 Fen Bilgisi
 Matematik
 Türkçe
 Sosyal Bilgiler
 Yabancı Dil (Yabancı dili lütfen yazınız): _____
 Diğer (Lütfen yazınız): _____
8. Eğer bir önceki soruda birden fazla seçeneği işaretlediyseniz anketin ders programı ile ilgili sorularını yanıtlarken belirtilen ilk beş dersten hangisini dikkate alacağınızı lütfen yazınız. _____
9. Haftalık toplam ders yükünüz (Lütfen yazınız): _____
10. Öğretmenlik mesleğini kendi isteğinizle mi seçtiniz?
 Evet, kendi isteğimle seçtim. Hayır, koşullar böyle gerektirdi.
 Diğer (Lütfen yazınız): _____
11. Yeniden bir meslek seçme şansınız olsaydı öğretmelik mesleğini tekrar seçer miydiniz?
 Evet Kararsızım Hayır

BÖLÜM II

Aşağıda mesleğinizin çeşitli boyutları ile ilgili doyum ifadeleri bulunmaktadır. Her ifadeyi dikkatli okuduktan sonra o ifadede belirtilen durumdan ne derece memnun olduğunuzu verilen skala üzerinde (X) işareti koyarak belirtiniz.

	HIÇ MEMNUN DEĞİLİM	MEMNUN DEĞİLİM	KARARSIZIM	MEMNUNUM	ÇOK MEMNUNUM
1. Çalışma ortamımdaki huzur düzeyi	()	()	()	()	()
2. Çalışma arkadaşlarımla kurduğum iletişim	()	()	()	()	()
3. Yöneticimle kurduğum iletişim	()	()	()	()	()
4. Öğrencilerimle kurduğum iletişim	()	()	()	()	()

	HİÇ MEMNUN DEĞİLİM	MEMNUN DEĞİLİM	KARARSIZIM	MEMNUNUM	ÇOK MEMNUNUM
5. Öğrenci velileriyle kurduğum iletişimden	()	()	()	()	()
6. Yöneticimin emrindeki kişileri yönetme becerisi	()	()	()	()	()
7. Yöneticimin çalışanlarına gösterdiği destek	()	()	()	()	()
8. Yöneticimin yaptığım işler için beni takdir etmesi	()	()	()	()	()
9. Çalıştığım kurumda mevcut olan karar verme mekanizması	()	()	()	()	()
10. Çalıştığım kurumda kendimi geliştirmem için sağlanan destek	()	()	()	()	()
11. Haftalık ders yüküm	()	()	()	()	()
12. Derslerine girdiğim sınıflardaki öğrenci sayısı	()	()	()	()	()
13. Girmek zorunda olduğum farklı derslerin sayısı (Ör: Sosyal Bilgiler ve Tarım derslerine giren bir öğretmen için 2 farklı ders söz konusudur)	()	()	()	()	()
14. Dersler dışında bana verilen görev ve faaliyetler	()	()	()	()	()
15. İşimin insanlarla bire bir iletişim içinde olmayı gerektirmesi	()	()	()	()	()
16. Çalıştığım kurumda yaptığım iş karşılığında aldığım ücret	()	()	()	()	()
17. Mesleğimin geleceğim için sağladığı garanti	()	()	()	()	()
18. Mesleğimin toplumun gözündeki saygınlık düzeyi	()	()	()	()	()
19. Mesleğimin sunduğu tatil olanakları	()	()	()	()	()
20. Mesleğimin bana sunduğu terfi imkanları	()	()	()	()	()
21. Yaptığım iş karşılığında duyduğum başarı hissi	()	()	()	()	()
22. Yaptığım işte başkaları için bir şeyler yapabiliyor olmak	()	()	()	()	()
23. Öğretmenlik branşıyla (Matematik, Türkçe vb.) ilgili bireysel yeterlik düzeyim	()	()	()	()	()
24. Sahip olduğum öğretmenlik meslek bilgisi	()	()	()	()	()
25. Bireysel özelliklerimin mesleğime uygunluğu	()	()	()	()	()
26. Ders programı için ayrılan haftalık ders saati	()	()	()	()	()
27. Ders programında yer alan konuların öğrencilerimin düzeylerine uygunluğu	()	()	()	()	()
28. Ders programında yer alan konuların öğrencilerimin ihtiyaçlarını karşılama düzeyi	()	()	()	()	()
29. Ders programında yer alan konuların öğrencilerimin ilgisini çekebilme düzeyi	()	()	()	()	()

	HİÇ MEMNUN DEĞİLİM	MEMNUN DEĞİLİM	KARARSIZIM	MEMNUNUM	ÇOK MEMNUNUM
30. Ders programının üzerine kurulu olduğu teorik ve pratik (uygulama) bilgi arasındaki denge	()	()	()	()	()
31. Ders programının bir önceki ve bir sonraki yıla ait programlarla devamlılık oluşturma düzeyi	()	()	()	()	()
32. Ders programının diğer derslerin programları ile bütünlük oluşturmaları	()	()	()	()	()
33. Kullandığım ders programının kendi fikir ve kanaatlerimi rahatça uygulama serbestliğini bana vermesi	()	()	()	()	()
34. Kullandığım ders programının yaratıcılığımı ve girişimciliğime hitap etmesi	()	()	()	()	()
35. Kullandığım ders programının çağdaş gelişmeleri yansıtması	()	()	()	()	()
36. Ders programının uygulanması için sağlanan yardımcı kaynak ve araç-gereç çeşitliliği	()	()	()	()	()
37. Ders programının ders işleme yöntem ve tekniklerinde bana yardımcı olma düzeyi	()	()	()	()	()
38. Ders programı için sunulan temel ders kitaplarının çeşitliliği	()	()	()	()	()
39. Ders programında sunulan başarıyı değerlendirme standartları	()	()	()	()	()
40. Kullanılan ders programıyla ilgili görüş ve önerilerime gösterilen önem	()	()	()	()	()

Eklemek istediğiniz başka görüş ve önerileriniz varsa lütfen belirtiniz.

APPENDIX D

**FACTOR LOADS OF OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION AND
CURRICULUM SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE**

ITEM	FACTOR 1 CURRICULUM	FACTOR 2 OVERALL
1		.73
2		.54
3		.78
4	.30	.13
5	.32	.16
6		.81
7		.86
8		.81
9		.78
10		.76
11	.37	.34
12	.39	.15
13	.30	.29
14		.42
15	.34	.25
16	.43	.26
17	.46	.18
18	.39	9.510E-02
19	.19	.18
20	.52	.31
21	.57	.17
22	.46	.11
23	.32	-3.660E-02
24	.36	8.157E-02
25	.37	.13
26	.49	
27	.75	
28	.74	
29	.75	
30	.74	
31	.69	
32	.69	
33	.69	
34	.75	
35	.78	
36	.51	
37	.65	
38	.63	
39	.70	
40	.61	

APPENDIX E

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR EACH ITEM OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

HD = Highly Dissatisfied D = Dissatisfied U = Undecided S = Satisfied HS = Highly Satisfied

ITEM	HD	D	U	S	HS	M	SD
	%	%	%	%	%		
1. The degree of peace in the working place	2.1	8.8	7.7	62.7	18.7	3.87	.89
2. My communication with my colleagues	.3	2.8	4.2	57.6	35.1	4.25	.69
3. My communication with the supervisor	2	4.1	7.5	56.4	30	4.09	.84
4. My communication with my students	.3	4.3	5	57.4	33	4.18	.74
5. My communication with the guardians of my students	3.7	12.8	10.7	58	14.8	3.73	1.84
6. My supervisor's competence in directing his/her subordinates	2.5	8.2	16.1	51.9	21.3	3.81	.95
7. The support given to the staff by my supervisor	2.6	5.8	15.6	48.2	27.7	3.93	.95
8. My supervisor's appreciation of the work I do	3.7	7.3	19	53	17	3.72	.96
9. The decision making mechanism in my institution	3	10.7	20.3	55.9	10.1	3.59	.92

Continued

ITEM	HD	D	U	S	HS	M	SD
	%	%	%	%	%		
10. The support given to me in my institution to improve myself	5.5	16.9	17.5	47.6	12.5	3.45	1.08
11. Lesson load per week	3.8	11.1	5.9	62.5	16.8	3.77	.98
12. The number of students in the classes I teach	11.4	21.8	5.8	43.5	17.6	3.34	1.30
13. The number of different courses that I have to teach (Ex: It is 2 courses for a teacher who teach both Social Studies and Agriculture)	8	12.4	11.8	53.1	14.7	3.54	1.13
14. The assignments and activities given to me other than teaching	4	9.9	9.2	69.6	7.4	3.66	.90
15. That my job requires one-to-one relations with others	0	1.3	5.6	65	28.1	4.20	.59
16. The salary that I get for the work I do in my institution	27.9	37.2	12.3	20.1	2.5	2.32	1.15
17. The guarantee that my job provides for my future	10	24	16.7	40.7	8.7	3.14	1.17
18. The reputation of my job in the society	13.4	26	17.3	33.3	9.9	3.00	1.24
19. The vacation opportunities that my job offers	16.7	20.2	6	35.6	21.5	3.25	1.42
20. The promotion opportunities that my job offers	15.1	31.8	16.7	31.7	4.7	2.79	1.18
21. The sense of achievement I feel through the work I do	2.5	10.1	11.5	53.6	22.2	3.83	.97

Continued

ITEM	HD	D	U	S	HS	M	SD
	%	%	%	%	%		
22. Being able to do something for others while doing my job	.7	2.3	4	55.6	37.4	4.27	.71
23. My level of competence in my subject area (Ex: Mathematics, Turkish)	0	2	4.7	62.1	31.2	4.23	.62
24. Teaching formation that I have	.3	1.7	5.2	61.5	31.3	4.22	.64
25. The coherence between my job and my personal traits	.6	2.8	6.2	55.1	35.3	4.22	.73
26. The number of hours per week allocated for the implementation of the curriculum	8.8	20.5	9	48.9	12.8	3.36	1.20
27. The coherence between the curriculum and the level of my students	10.1	35.6	20.7	30.4	3.2	2.81	1.08
28. The appropriateness of the content of the curriculum to the needs of my students	9.8	36.1	26.1	25.4	2.6	2.75	1.03
29. The meaningfulness of the content of the curriculum to my students	7.7	34.2	23.5	31.7	2.8	2.88	1.03
30. The balance between the theoretical and practical (practice) knowledge which the curriculum is based on	10	37.4	22.2	27.6	2.8	2.76	1.05
31. The continuity of the curriculum with the previous and the next curricula	7	26.5	16	48.2	2.4	3.12	1.05
32. The integrity of the curriculum and other curricula	5.5	25.5	29.7	37	2.3	3.05	.97

Continued

ITEM	HD	D	U	S	HS	M	SD
	%	%	%	%	%		
33. The freedom that the curriculum gives me to apply my ideas and convictions	6.6	25	18.3	43.8	6.3	3.18	1.08
34. The addressing of the curriculum to my creativity and initiatives	5.9	28	20.2	40.3	5.6	3.12	1.06
35. The curriculum's reflecting recent developments	7.8	32	23.8	32	4.5	2.93	1.06
36. The variety of the supplementary sources and the aids provided for the implementation of the curriculum	15.5	35	12.3	32.1	5.2	2.76	1.20
37. The level of assistance of the curriculum in terms of teaching methods and techniques	6.4	30.3	17.3	42.3	3.6	3.06	1.06
38. The variety of main course books provided for the curriculum	15	34.9	14.3	33	2.8	2.74	1.15
39. Standards of achievement evaluation provided in the curriculum	8.7	31.6	22.3	35.7	1.7	2.90	1.04
40. The appreciation of my ideas and suggestions regarding the curriculum used	13.5	28.4	21.5	32.8	3.8	2.85	1.13