

## **The Relation between the Level of Job Satisfaction and Types of Personality in High School Teachers**

Sezer AYAN  
Faruk KOCACIK  
Cumhuriyet University  
Turkey

*Abstract: Teachers are loaded important responsibilities in educational process. The productivity and effectiveness of them are influenced by promotion, charging, job security, technological level, course load and working schedule which all are determined mostly by their institutions and influenced by noncognitive characteristics such as age, gender, family structure and finally influenced by personality types and characteristics, attitudes and behaviors, social values, competency and other personality characteristics of teachers. Purpose of this study was to establish the relationship between the level of job satisfaction of high school teachers and types of personality and to evaluate the differences of the levels of job satisfaction in accordance with the personality features. Method: The study covers teachers working in state schools in the central sub province of Sivas. Total number of the teachers work in 25 high schools at the area was one thousand and thirty-six. Fifty percent of the schools were included into the sample, and questionnaire was applied to 482 teachers. Data of the study were obtained from the questionnaire that determined the socio-demographic characteristics of the teachers, occupational satisfaction scale that determined their job satisfaction and the personality scale that determined their personality characteristics. Findings: Thirty-two percent of the teachers that answered the questionnaire were women and sixty-eight percent were males. The average score given by the teachers to all the statements in the scale in general is ( $O=3.55$ ); and it is seen that teachers are satisfied with their jobs near to an intermediary level. It is seen that more than half (62%) of the teachers have extrovert personalities. Proportion of the teachers with introvert personalities within the sample was 32%. When the differences of points that teachers obtained in the job satisfaction scale and points obtained for each of the statements included in the scale used to evaluate their personality characteristics were compared, it was found that their job satisfaction showed significant differences in terms of characteristics of liking competence, being ambitious in the social area and occupation, getting angry easily, and hiding their feelings.*

## Introduction

Work performance of the individual who spends a big portion of life in the working environment is a joint function of the personality characteristics s/he has and the situation s/he is included in, like in all other aspects of human behavior.

When the literature related to personality is examined, it is seen uncertainty. This uncertainty can be in use of this concept in very diverse meanings in daily life – and most of the times, as the synonyms of character, mental disposition, temper, or ego. However, the general belief is that personality includes the harmony of the person of the individual and the environment and the factors that make him/her unique, and therefore is an integral unit organizing various properties.

Personality develops under the influence of the inherited characteristics of the individual and the environment, in which s/he takes place in. Many dimensions can be talked of within this process, like talent, intelligence, education, feelings, joy, sorrow, beliefs, friendship, traditions, expediency, morals, way of talking, responsibility, culture, sincerity, talkativeness, jealousy, and nervousness – some known, some unknown, some of first rank (Zel; 2001: 21). The reason for such multi-dimension has been based on the complex structure of the factors constituting the personality. Strack (2006: 11) relates this diversity to the displaying of the personality characteristics in different styles. Hampson (1988: 1-4), relates the differences observed in conceptualizing the personality characteristics to the discussions between psychologists on the issue of what the basic factor that forms the personality is. This quality of multiple dimensions is shown as the grounds for imposing various meaning to personality by philosophers, theologians and sociologists and also defining the concept in psychology in several ways. Furthermore, this quality of multiple dimensions reflects in studies investigating the relationship between the personality and job satisfaction, and can limit the point of view of various scientific branches. For example, when studies relationships between the personality characteristics of individuals and acquiring occupations are considered, it is seen that sociologists historically handle non-cognitive characteristics too little (Jackson, 2006: 187), on the other hand, economists have been uninterested in these studies until recently (Uppal, 2003: 336). Freeman (1978: 135-141) relates this negligence to a professional cynicism against subjective variables that attempt to measure what people say, rather than what they do. However, attempts of explaining the reasons of behavior starting from the personality characteristics of the individual have a long history in the area of personality psychology and social psychology. In other words, personality characteristics concept in the personality psychology area has also undertaken the responsibility of explaining the reasons of behavior in terms of personality characteristics (Aizen, 2005: 1), because personality described as the “individual’s way of living” as a concept (Dubrin, 1994: 56) is based on internal factors that render the behavior of the individual consistent at different times and different from the behaviors of other individuals. This definition, recognized today by many psychologists, is a definition that includes all the generally-accepted assumptions of the idea of personality and emphasizes that personality is based on stable, internal, consistent and individual differences in general (Hampson, 1988: 1).

When literature on personality is examined, it is seen that classification of personality is done by either including personality characteristics observed throughout the population within certain dimensions according to the distribution in general, or by including individuals with similar personality dimensions within certain personality types (Eliot, G.R. and Eisdorf, C., 1982; Friedman, M. and Rosenman, R.H. 1974; Samuel, W., 1981; Rosenman, R.H. and

Chasney, M.A., 1985; Mueser et.al, 1987; Keenan A., and McBain, D.M., 1979; Powell, L.H., 1995; Gilmer, B.V.H., 1975; Batıgün, A.,D. and Şahin, N.H., 2006; Kaşlı, M., 2007). But the main point in all these descriptions and in classifications is that personality depends on internal factors that show maintenance more or less.

The Big five-factor model of personality, often entitled the Big Five, organizes the highest-level individual differences in to the following personality traits: Neuroticism (Emotional Stability), Extraversion (Surgency), Openness to Experience (Intellect), Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (Friedman, M. and Rosenman, R.H., 1974; Mueser et. al. 1987; Powell, L.H., 1995; Rantanen et.al. 2007; Costa and McCrea, 2007). The Big Five adopting hierarchic models for the structure of personality accept that the dimensions of personality stated above are formed with uniting of more specific<sup>1</sup> properties defined as sub characteristics consistent with individual items (Costa and McCrea, 2007: 785).

One alternative in defining personality is classifications of personality, which was very popular in the past, and now is drawing attentions again (Hampson, 1988: 4). What observed in these classifications is they are made according to either categorically, or according to an understanding of dimension. Categorical view or the type view is based on the assumption that all individuals are included in one of the certain types and has all the characteristics of the type it is included in, and therefore there are quality differences between them. In these classifications, since the individual cannot be defined as of any type in differing degrees, types are in fact not the same with personality characteristics, because the individual is either a member of a group or not (Eysenck, 1948: 28). Therefore, the main criticisms for personality types have been that types are arbitrarily determined, and types do not meet our intuitions. Personality has a rich and complex structure, and individual differences cannot be determined adequately by dividing all the humans into a few categories (Hampson, 1988: 4). View of dimensions, however, is based on the assumption that all individual have characteristics that are distributed throughout the population in general and that are more or less unchanging. In this classification, individuals can be at any point on a straight line extending from the point (A) to the point (B). Any quality like height or level of intelligence is common among the human beings, only, individuals have these qualities in different levels, and there are only differences of quantity among individuals, not differences of quality (Eysenck, 1948: 28-30).

Paralleling these definitions, it is seen in the psychological terminology that personality types under different names are encountered. These are type A and type B personality types, and also “introvert - extrovert” category is also talked of. Eysenck (1965: 55) defined the typical types of this dimension with introvert in one extreme and extrovert in the other as follows.

Typical introvert is a silent and closed person; s/he overly scrutinizes him/herself, likes books better and persons, and never reveals him/herself to other except for his/her very close friends; never acts with instantaneous impulses, thinks about his/her acts beforehand, rolls them over in his/her mind; s/he does not like agitation, handles daily events seriously, likes a peaceful and smooth way of living; keeps his/her feelings under strict control, and rarely act in an offensive way; s/he very seldom dissolves and is a reliable person; s/he is somehow pessimistic, values moralistic principles, and is social. Typical extrovert is friendly, likes

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, personality dimension of openness to experience is a general feature which consists of specific features such as fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, thoughts and values (Costa, 1992: 52).

parties, has a lot of friends, s/he needs people to talk, loves agitation, does not avoid risks, s/he is impulsive, likes joking, is quick in answering, likes changes, is lighthearted, optimistic, likes smiling, is active, aggressive, unable to keep his/her sentiments under strict control, and is not always a reliable person.

Eysenck accepts that these two dimensions are not the only ones explaining the human personality and there can be others. However, these two dimensions appear again and again in studies of many investigators; and according to Eysenck, they constitute the most important dimensions in describing the human acts.

It is observed for the analysis of the personality structures of individuals that the main purposes of both the five factor model and the personality dimensions factor are to evaluate individuals with similar properties within similar personality characteristics or theories and to provide easiness of analysis to scientists in explaining and understanding their behaviors (Özdevecioğlu, 2002: 116). Studies performed have revealed that there is a close relationship between job satisfaction and efficiency in work (Hampson, 1988; Özdevecioğlu, 2002; Göktaş, 2007; Friedman and Rosenman, 1974). This applies to also teachers, who undertake important functions in the basic institutions of the social structure to educational institutions in preparing students in various age groups. During the long-lasting training and education process, efficacy and efficiency of teachers who undertake important responsibilities depend on the quality of the working conditions they work in on the one hand, and to whether they possess the characteristics required by their profession on the other hand.

Convenience of teachers is frequently taken as a variable related to efficient teaching and learning (Robin and Sharon, 2003: 261). In other words, teachers can create an efficient environment of teaching and learning and be efficient and useful to the degree that they are satisfied with their jobs. With this reason, efficiency of teachers is attracting the attention of investigators, educators, and professional organizations in the recent years. However, in the review of the literature on the adequacy of education or teachers it is seen that approaches to the issue are rather different. In these studies, while a limited number of investigators have focused on personality types and characteristics, attitude and behaviors, values, talents and competency and other personality characteristics of teachers, it is observed that issues that investigators focus more are evaluation of teaching processes and outcomes (Cheng and Tsui, 1996: 7). The subject matter of the study was selected by taking these criticisms into consideration, and whether or not there was a relation between the personality types of the teachers and their job satisfaction was investigated; in other words, it was attempted to determine which personality types among teachers had more job satisfaction and job and personality harmony was studied.

The present study includes teachers working in state schools in the central district of Sivas. Although personality approaches have been taken as the basis in the study, hierarchic personality theory of Eysenck was highlighted. Eysenck determined four levels of personality, and explained that there was a hierarchic order of these. These levels are special level of response, level of accustomed behaviors, level of characteristics and level of type. The type stage, which is the fourth level of personality, is the level that marked types appear. According to him, the dominant factor of each of the stages is effective in the appearance of the type, and weights of these factors when the type is forming can change from one individual to another. Accordingly, Eysenck defined three types of type levels, namely the intro- and extrovert, “neurotic”, and “psychotic”. In the study, Eysenck’s intro- and extrovert personality dimension was divided into 7 character components, that is, sub factors, personality types of teachers were

analyzed as intro- or extrovert types according to the answers they gave to questions analyzing these factors. These sub categories are as follows (Eysenck and Wilson, 2000: 55):

1. Efficacy: Efficient persons are generally active and energetic. Those who are not efficient, however, tend to be physically inactive, idle, and get easily fatigued.
2. Being social: Social people like social gatherings, do not have difficulties to be with others, and are generally happy and at their ease within the society.
3. Taking risks: They like living risky and are in search of awards without considering much the possible harmful results.
4. Boldness: They tend to act instantaneously and to make decisions in a hurry, and even to make inappropriate decisions, and are generally objectionable, changing, and unpredictable.
5. Expressing oneself: They tend to be sentimental, understanding, and frivolous and express their feelings. Individuals that these characteristics are weak are closed, placid, cold-blooded and continent.
6. Thinking in detail: These tend to be occupied with thoughts, abstracting, philosophic questions, discussions, assumptions and knowledge for the sake of knowledge itself. Those weak in this area however, are interested in doing things rather than thinking about them; they cannot stand to produce theories in ivory towers.
7. Responsibility: Individuals that this aspect is strong are highly possible to be conscientious, trustable, serious, and meticulous to a degree to challenge them. Individuals with contrary properties tend to act randomly, delay in honoring their promises, be unpredictable, and perhaps lack the sense of responsibility in social sense.

## Material and Method

State schools in the Central District of Sivas constitute our cosmos. Total one thousand and thirty-six teachers are employed in 25 high schools.

High schools were divided into 3 separate groups:

1. Science High School, Anadolu High Schools
2. Straight High Schools
3. Vocational High Schools.

This division was made to give the teachers working in schools from different groups the chance of being included in the sample. Fifty percent of schools in each group were included in the sample, and the questionnaire was applied to the teachers of schools included in the sample. Schools in three groups and numbers of teachers in the groups are given in Table 1.

Application was performed by a team consisting of the graduate students and last-year students of Cumhuriyet University Science-Literature Faculty on May, 2007.

One questionnaire and job satisfaction scale and personality scale was used in the study.

Questionnaire: The questionnaire consists of questions directed at determining the socio-demographic characteristics of the teachers.

Job satisfaction scale: This was developed with the purpose of determining to what degree the individuals working in any profession by being a member of that profession (Kuzgun et.al., 2005: 82).

There are 20 items in the scale. Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 20 are positive items, and are scored as "Always: 5, from time to time: 3, rarely: 2, and never: 1". Items 4, 9, 10, 11, 14 and 19 are negative items, and must be scored vice versa, that is,

“Always: 1, frequently: 2, from time to time: 3, rarely: 4, and never: 5”. It is accepted that when the scores obtained are high, job satisfaction of the individual, that is, satisfaction with the essence of the profession is high (Kuzgun et al., 2005: 84).

The scale used for evaluation of personality characters of teaches and determining the personality types of teachers: In the present study, intro- and extrovert personality dimension of Eysenck’s was divided into 7 character components, that is, sub factors, and personality types of teachers was analyzed as intro and extrovert types according to their answers to items analyzing these factors in. Answers to the personality scale used to evaluate the personality characters of teachers were evaluated by grouping. The teachers who marked the option of “ I hide my feelings” and who did not mark other 12 descriptions were defined as introvert where as the teachers who did not mark “I hide my feelings” and who marked other 12 descriptions were defined as extrovert personality type.

Analyses consist of three sections. First section consists of determining the levels of job satisfaction of the teachers participating in the study according to their answers to statements in the professional satisfaction scale. For this, general average of the answers of the teachers to the statements in the professional satisfaction scale was taken. The second section consists of grouping the answers to the scale used for evaluation of personality characters of teaches and determining the personality types of teachers. The third section is the stage that differences of scores of teachers in job satisfaction scale according to their personality characteristics. The differences according to various features of overall satisfaction score of teachers were determined by  $Z^3$  test for variables with two categories and by analysis of Anova<sup>4</sup> for variables with more than two categories.

The questionnaire, job satisfaction scale and personality scale were applied one after the other by visiting the school at times allowed by the school administration.

Analyses were performed with a confidence level of 95%, and SPSS 13.0 package program was used for the analyses.

Cosmos	Planned Sample	Actual Sample
I. Group ( Anadolu- Science High Schools)		
Selçuk Anadolu High School	45	45
Anadolu Vocational Religious High School	54	-
Science High School	24	16
Necati Ersen Anadolu Teacher Training High School	29	8
Cumhuriyet Anadolu High School	36	-
Sivas Anadolu High School	18	-
Halis Gülle Anadolu High School	6	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	212	69

<sup>3</sup> These two tests from the group of nonparametric tests are used to compare the difference between the means of two independent sample group (Bayram, 2004: 80).

<sup>4</sup> Used to to determine the statistically significant difference between the means of three or more sample groups (Bayram, 2004: 99).

I. Group ( Straight High Schools)	Planned Sample	Actual Sample
Kongre High School	76	76
Halil Rifat Pasha High School	106	87
Atatürk High School	31	22
Hacı Mehmet Sabancı High School	39	8
Sivas High School	103	97
Yenişehir High School	38	15
Milli Piyango High School	35	-
4 Eylül High School	15	-
Gazi High School	42	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>305</b>

II. Group ( Vocational High Schools)	Planned Sample	Actual Sample
Anadolu Technical High Schools (Technical + Industry Vocational High School)	92	52
Girls' High School	67	32
Atatürk Anadolu Technical High School (Industry High School)	64	
Anadolu High School	11	
Trading Vocational High School (Anadolu Trading High School)	43	12
Abdulsamet Bal. Vocational Religious High School	20	
Muzaffer Sarısözen Anadolu Fine Arts Vocational High School	12	12
Sports High School	4	
Atatürk Healthcare High School	26	
Total	339	108
Grand total	1036	482

**Table 1: Distribution of the teachers working in Central District of Sivas according to schools and the Study Sample**

**Findings and Evaluation**

	Frequency	Percentage
Females	153	32
Males	328	68
No answer	1	0
Total	482	100

**Table 2: Distribution according to gender**

When distribution of participants are examined according to gender (Table 2), it is seen that more than half (68%) consists of males. Ratio of women within the sample was found to 32%.

	O	SS
2. Do you find your job important and meaningful?	4,61	0,84
7. Do you try to learn new things regarding your job?	4,41	0,87
8. Do you work in your workplace in a job suitable for your training?	4,24	1,11
15. Do you think your job is suitable for your skills?	4,12	1,07
6. Do you come to work eagerly?	4,09	1,07
17. Do you struggle with obstacles you meet when implementing your job?	4,07	0,98
20. Do you attempt to improve your professional knowledge?	4,01	0,99
18. Do you think your job is suitable for your areas of interest?	3,98	1,15
16. Do you follow publications related to your profession?	3,92	1,01
3. Do you recommend your profession to others?	3,88	1,29
1. Would you like the same job if you came to this world again?	3,71	1,47
12. Do you inquire how your colleagues implement their work?	3,39	1,14
13. Do you attend seminars and congresses to improve your professional knowledge?	3,38	1,09
5. Do you think your job allows your development?	3,29	1,38
14. Do any obstacles prevent your willingness to work?	3,16	1,15
9. Do you feel tired and bored at the end of the workday?	2,81	1,08
4. Do you ever wish to work in another job?	2,72	1,29
19. Do you ever think about changing job?	2,60	1,36
10. Would you consider to shift to another job if had the opportunity?	2,43	1,39
11. Would you consider early retirement and live a sedentary life?	2,21	1,24
General	3,55	1,15

**Table 3: Answers Given to Statements of the Job Satisfaction Scale**

When answers of the teachers participating in the study to the statements in the scale used to evaluate their job satisfaction (Table 3) are examined, it is seen according to the mean of the points teachers gave to all the statements in general (O=3.55) that teachers are satisfied with their jobs to a mediocre level.

When the statements with highest scores within those included in the scale are considered, it is seen that teachers always think their jobs important and meaningful (O=4.61). Furthermore, it is also seen that teachers frequently state that they try to learn new things as regards their jobs (O=4.41), they believe that they work in jobs suitable to their training (O=4.24), they think that their jobs are suitable to their skills (O=4.12), they come to work eagerly (O=4.09), they struggle against the obstacles they meet when implementing their professions (O=4.07) and attempt to increase their professional knowledge (O=4.01). Issues that teachers were satisfied to mediocre levels were compliance of their jobs with their areas of interest (O=3.98), following the publications related to their professions (O=3.92), recommending their

jobs to others (O=3.88) and wishing the same job if they came to world again (O=3.71), respectively.

When the statements with lowest scores in the scale are examined, it is found that teachers state that they do not think about changing profession even if they had the opportunity (O=2.43) and do not think about retiring early and living a sedentary life (O=2.21). The statements that teachers state that they do not feel tired at the end of the workday (O=2.81), they do not wish to work in another profession (O=2.72), they do not think about changing profession (O=2.60) follow these, respectively. Issues that teachers are satisfied partially are, respectively, that asking about how did their colleagues performed their works when they met them (O=3.39), to attend seminars and congresses to improve their professional knowledge (O=3.38), their professions giving them the possibility of personal improvement (O=3.29) and some obstacles in their workplaces preventing their willingness to work (O=3.16).

	Frequency	Percentage
Introvert	152	32
Extrovert	297	62
No answer	33	6
Total	482	100

**Table 4: Distribution according to Personality Characters**

When the answers to the scale used to evaluate the personality characteristics of teacher are examined by grouping (Table 4), it is seen that more than half of the teachers (62%) have extrovert personality character. Ratio of the teachers with introvert personality character is 32%.

	Suitable		Not suitable		No answer	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Liking competency	370	77	102	21	10	2
Being ambitious in the social area and in profession	365	76	108	22	9	2
Being punctual	407	84	69	14	6	1
Having and impressive and non-placid structure	215	45	252	52	15	3
Being impatient	189	39	281	58	12	2
Liking to perform more than one task at a time	253	52	217	45	12	2
Getting angry easily	193	40	276	57	13	3
Expecting approval for every task performed	191	40	281	58	10	2
Not having time to rest	226	47	248	51	8	2
Being agitated	133	28	335	70	14	3
Having areas of interest outside home and job	359	74	116	24	7	1
Hiding the feelings	278	58	195	40	9	2
Forcing oneself and others to complete tasks	402	83	71	15	9	2

**Table 5: Distribution of the Statements Included in the Personality Scale**

When the answers to statements in the scales used to evaluate the personality characteristics of teachers (Table 5) are examined, it is seen that more than half of the participants liked competence (77%), more than half (76%) stated that they were ambitious in the social area and in their profession, majority (84%) stated they are punctual to time, more than half (52%) stated that they had an impressive and non-placid structure, more than half (58%) stated that they were not impatient, more than half (52%) stated that they liked to perform more than one task at a time, more than half (57%) stated that they did not get angry easily, more than half (58%) stated that they did not expect approval for every task performed, more than half (70%) stated that they did not have an agitated structure, more than half (51%) stated that they did not have time to rest, more than half (74%) stated that they had areas of interest outside home and work, more than half (58%) hid their feelings, and majority (83%) saw themselves as individuals with the characteristic that forcing themselves and others to complete their tasks.

Personality Characteristic	M	SD	Z	P
Extrovert	3,81	0,59	2,57	0,01*
Introvert	3,66	0,57		

**Table 6: Differences in Job Satisfaction According to General Personality Characteristics**

When scores of teacher from job satisfaction scale were examined according to personality characteristics with z-test (Table 6), it was found that teachers with extrovert personality characteristics were satisfied with their jobs to higher levels as compared to teachers with introvert personality characteristics.

		O	SS	Z	p
I like competence	Suitable	3,80	0,56	2,60	0,01*
	Not suitable	3,63	0,66		
I am ambiguous in the social area and in my profession	Suitable	3,82	0,56	4,10	0,00*
	Not suitable	3,56	0,62		
I can be considered as punctual in time	Suitable	3,77	0,59	0,44	0,66
	Not suitable	3,73	0,53		
I have an impressive and non-placid structure	Suitable	3,76	0,63	-0,03	0,98
	Not suitable	3,76	0,54		
I am impatient	Suitable	3,74	0,63	-0,78	0,44
	Not suitable	3,78	0,55		
I like to perform more than one task at a time	Suitable	3,78	0,58	0,90	0,37
	Not suitable	3,73	0,58		
I easily get angry	Suitable	3,68	0,62	-2,38	0,02*
	Not suitable	3,81	0,55		
I expect approval for every task I perform	Suitable	3,74	0,57	-0,61	0,54
	Not suitable	3,77	0,59		
I have no time to rest	Suitable	3,82	0,62	2,24	0,03*
	Not suitable	3,70	0,54		
I am agitated	Suitable	3,74	0,58	-0,49	0,62
	Not suitable	3,77	0,59		
I have interest outside home and work	Suitable	3,78	0,58	0,98	0,33
	Not suitable	3,72	0,58		
I hide my feelings	Suitable	3,69	0,56	2,91	0,00*
	Not suitable	3,85	0,60		
I force myself and others to complete tasks	Suitable	3,78	0,57	1,29	0,20
	Not suitable	3,68	0,62		

\*p<0,05

**Table 7: Differences in Differences in Job Satisfaction According to Personality Characteristics**

When the differences according to each statement in the scale used to evaluate the personality characteristics of the scores obtained by teachers in the job satisfaction scale are examined with z-test (Table 7) it is seen that job satisfaction differed according to

personality characteristics of liking competence, being ambitious in the social area and profession, getting angry easily, not having time to rest and hiding their feelings.

## Discussion

Sixty-eight percent of the teachers participated in the study are males, and 32% are females. Average of the answers of the teachers to the statements in the job satisfaction scale is  $O= 3,55$  and it was determined that teachers were satisfied with their jobs to a mediocre level.

Answers to the statements in the personality scale applied show that 62% of the teachers who participated in the study display extrovert personality characteristics, and 32% display introvert personality characteristics.

When the differences between the scores obtained by teachers in the job satisfaction scale are examined, it is seen that teachers with extrovert personality characteristics have significantly higher levels of job satisfaction as compared to teachers with introvert personality characteristics. Furthermore, when the differences of the scores obtained by teachers in the job satisfaction scale is examined according to each statement included in the scale used to evaluate the personality characteristics (Table 7), it is seen that job satisfaction significantly differs with the characteristics of *liking competence, being ambitious in the social area and profession, getting easily angry, not having time to rest and hiding feelings*. According to this, it is seen that teachers stating that they like competence have greater job satisfaction as compared to those who do not, those stating they are ambitious in the social area and profession have greater job satisfaction as compared to those stating they are not, those getting angry easily have greater job satisfaction as compared to those not, those stating that they do not have time to rest as compared to those they have not, and those do not hide their feelings as compared to those who hide. These results show that teachers, who have found mostly to be extrovert, display characteristics that parallel extrovert personality characteristics like taking their chance in tasks with unknown outcomes, to be very active and continuously be occupied, liking changes and being unable to control their feelings completely. In addition, the answers of teachers with highest scores among those included in the job satisfaction scale – always thinking their job important and meaningful, stating that they try to learn new things as regards their job, thinking that they work in jobs suitable for their training, stating that their jobs are suitable for their skills and they come to work eagerly, they struggle with the obstacles they encounter in their work, and they attempt to improve their professional knowledge – parallel attributes defining extrovert personality character. In other words, data obtained from the analyses that scores obtained by teachers in scales of job satisfaction levels, personality characteristics, and job satisfaction scale of teachers according to personality characteristics are consistent with each other, and it is seen that teachers displaying extrovert have greater satisfaction with their jobs. The results of similar studies have shown that the personality characteristics unique for teachers are reflected to teaching particularly through teaching strategies and materials they use (Erdle et.al., 1985: 394-406). Therefore, teachers with certain personality characteristics are more efficient in issues like being self-contained, improving learning or controlling the class (Robin and Sharon, 2003; 261). It has been found that, for example, teachers with extrovert, balanced, and determined personality characteristics were more “taking” in using new ideas (Katz, 1992: 39-40), and creative, analytical, logical and intuitively thinking teachers with strong

imaginations (Smith et.al., 1993: 281-285) were more “taking” in using various strategies and technology as compared to sentimental teachers with realistic and social qualities.

## Conclusion

Personality has an extremely important effect on perception and evaluation of the work and environment of the individual, because behaviors of the individual are formed as a consequence of the continuous interaction between the environment s/he lives in and other individuals in the environment. Medley (1996: 8) mentions nine factors having a role on the competency of the teacher. One of these factors is the beliefs, skills, and his/her attitude and behaviors s/he displays against students during the process of education. Cheng (1996: 8) also, emphasizes that personal characteristics of teachers make important contributions to the teaching process during the development of the this process.

While the personality of the individual is affected from his/her environment, the individual in turn affects this environment through his/her personality (Özkalp; 2001: 84-85). In other words compliance of the personality structures with the work is an important factor affecting the job satisfaction. Skills related to job can be acquired, and competency can be improved. Studies analyzing the influence of the personality structures of employees on job satisfaction have shown that individuals with high levels of satisfaction have more flexible and determined personalities and those unsatisfied with their jobs are individuals who are not realistic when selecting their goals, unable to cope with the environmental difficulties and have rigid personality structures (Jackson, 2006: 189; Mount et.al., 2006: 595; Chiu et.al, 1997: 72; Loveland et.al, 2005: 245-246; Lim et.al, 1998: 339). However, what stated in studies on teachers' competence is that many factors act together for an efficient process of teaching (Ayan, et.al, 2009: 18-25). A series of factors like the organizational structure, management, culture, educational qualities, resources, tasks and duties of the school, size and composition of the class, talents of students, climate of the class, and relationships between students and the teacher can be listed among these. These studies have shown that all these factors are determining one over another in the development of an effective teaching process and on ensuring the teachers' satisfaction. Likewise, teachers become the individuals with key roles in an effective teaching process, and efficacy of the teacher depends on the satisfaction of the teacher with all these factors. In conclusion, it can be said that although personality characteristics of teachers are determining factors for and efficient training and educational process, they are not sufficient to explain the teachers' satisfaction.

## References

- Aizen, I., (2005), *Attitudes, Personality and Behavior* (2nd Edition), Berkshire, Gbr: Mcgraw-Hill Education.
- Ayan, S., Kocacık, F., Karakuş, H., (2009), “Job Satisfaction Level of High School and Affecting and Personal and Institutional Factors: A Study of Sivas City, 10: 18-25.
- Batıgün, A., Durak, Ş. N., (2006), “İş Stresi ve Sağlık Psikolojisi Araştırmaları İçin İki Ölçek: A-Tipi Kişilik ve İş Doyumu”, *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 17(1): 32-45.
- Bayram, N., (2004: *Sosyal Bilimlerde SPSS İle Veri Analizi*, Ezgi Kitabevi, Bursa.

- Cheng, Y. C.; Tsui, K. T., (1996), "Total Teacher Effectiveness: New Conception and Improvement", *International Journal Of Educational Management*, 10(6):7-17.
- Chiu, R. K., Kosinski, F. A., (1997), "Relationship Between Dispositional Traits and Self-Reported Job Satisfaction and Distress: An Investigation of Nurses and Teachers in Hong Kong", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 12 (2): 71-84.
- Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R., (1992), *NEO PI-R Revised NEO Personality Inventory Manuel*, Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P. T., Mccrae, R. R., (2007), "Felsefe ve Psikoloji Kaynaklı Yaklaşımlar", Kaplan & Sadock's *Comprehensive Textbook of Psychiatry*, (Ed: Sadock, B.J. and Sadock, V. A.), (Çev: Aydın, H., Bozkurt, A.), Güneş Kitabevi, Ankara.
- Dubrin, A., (1994), *Applying Psychology: Individual and Organizational Effectiveness*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Eliot, G. R., Eisdorf, C., (1982), *Tres and Human Health*. Springer Pub. Co.
- Erdle, S., Murray, H. G., Rushton, P., (1985), "Personality, Classroom Behavior and Student Rating of College Teaching Effectiveness: A Path Analysis", *Journal of Education Psychology*, 77: 394-406.
- Eysenck, H. J., (1948), *Dimension of Personality*, Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited, London.
- Eysenck, H. J., (1965), *Fact and Fiction in Psychology*, Penguin Books.
- Eysenck, H.J., G. Wilson, (2000), *Kişiliğinizi Tanıyın*, 4.B., (Çev: Erduran, E.), Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul.
- Freeman R., (1978), "Job Satisfaction as an Economic Variable" *Am Econ Rev.*, 68:135-141.
- Friedman, M., Rosenman, R. H., (1974), *Type a Behavior and Your Heart*, New York: Harper and Row, 85-92.
- Gilmer, B. V. H. (1975), *Applied Psychology Adjustment in Living and Work*. New York: Mcgraw Hill.
- Göktaş, Z., (2007), "Balıkesir İlinde Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin İş Doyumu ve Bazı Değişkenlerle Olan İlişisinin İncelenmesi", *Niğde Ünivrsitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 1:1.
- Hampson S. E.,(1988), *Constructions Of Personality*, Florence, Ky, Usa: Routledge.
- Jackson M., (2006), "Personality Traits and Occupational Attainment", *European Sociological Review*, 22 (2):187-199.
- Kaşlı, M., (2007), "İş Özellikleri Modelinin Otel İşletmelerinde Uygulanabilirliğine Yönelik Bir Araştırma", *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 8(2): 159-174.
- Keenan, A., McBain, G. D., (1979), "Effect of Type a Behavior, In Tolerance of Ambiguity and, Locus of Control on the Relationship between Role Stress Work Related Outcomes", *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 52: 277-285.
- Katz, Y. J., (1992), "Toward Apersonality Profile a Successful Computer-Using Teacher", *Educational Technology*, 32: 39-40
- Kuzgun, Y., Sevim, A. S., Hamacı, Z., (2005), "Mesleki Doyum Ölçeği", *Pdr'deKullanılan Ölçekler, Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmada Kullanılan Ölçme Araçları ve Programları Dizisi 1*, (Ed. Kuzgun Y. ve Bacanlı F.), Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara, 82-87.
- Lim, V. K. G., Teo, T. S. H., (1998), "Effects of Individual Characteristics on Police Officer' Work Related Attitudes", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 13 (5/6): 334-342.
- Loveland, J. M., Gibson, L. W., Lounsbury, J. W., Huffsteller,

- B. C., (2005), "Broad and Narrow Personality Traits in Relation to the Job Performance of Camp Counselor", *Child and Youth, Care Forum*, 34 (3): 241-255.
- Medley, D. M., (1982), "Teacher Effectiveness", (Ed: Mitzel, H., E.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, (5. Edition), The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Mueser, K. T., Yarnold P. R., Braynt, E. .B., (1987), "Type A Behavior and Time Urgency: Perception of Time Adjectives", *Br. J. Med. Psychology*, 60: 267-269.
- Ozdevecioğlu, M., (2002), "Kamu ve Özel Sektör Yöneticileri Arasındaki Davranışsal Çalışma Koşulları ve Kişilik Farklılıklarının Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma", *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Temmuz-Aralık, 19: 115-134.
- Ozkalp, E., Kirel, Ç., (2001), *Örgütsel Davranış*, T.C. Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim-Sağlık ve Bilimsel Araştırmalar Çalışmaları Vakfı Yayınları, No: 149, Eskişehir.
- Powell, L. H., (1995), *Issues in The Measurement of the Type A Behavior Pattern*, *Research Methods in Stress and Health Psychology*, (Ed: Kasl, S.V., Cooper, C.K.), England, John Wiley and Sons Ltd., 231-282.
- Rantenan, J., Metsapelto, R. L., Feldt, T., Pulkkinen, L., Koko, K., (2007), "Personality and Social Sciences, Long-Term Stability in The Big Five Personality Traits in Adulthood", *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 48(6): 51-518.
- Robin, K., Henson, Sharon, M., (2003), "Personality as a Predictor of Teaching Efficacy and Classroom Control in Emergency Certification Teacher", [Http//Find.Galegroup.Com](http://Find.Galegroup.Com), 04.06.2008.
- Rosenman, R. H., Chasney, M. A., (1985), *Specificity in Stress Models: Examples Drawn From Type A Behavior*, New York: C.L. Cooper.
- Samuel, W., (1981), *Personality*, London, Mcgraw Hill Book Co.
- Strac, S., (2006), *Differentiating Normal and Abnormal Personality*, New York, NY, USA: Springer Publishing Company Incorporated.
- Silah, M., (2005), "İşletmelerde Personel Seçme ve İşe Yerleştirmede Psikoteknik Bir Uygulama Örneği: Giyim Sanayi Konfeksiyon Atölyelerinde Çalışacakların Seçiminde From Lege Testi Uygulaması", *C.U. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 6 (1): 177-192.
- Smith, B., Munday, R., Windham, R., (1993), "Prediction of Teachers' Use of Technology Based on Personality Type", *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 22: 281-285
- Uppal, S., (2005), "Disability, Workplace Characteristics and Job Satisfaction", *International Journal Manpower*, 2005; 26: 336-349.
- Zel, U., (2001), *Kişilik ve Liderlik*, Seçkin Yayıncılık, Ankara.