

The Factors Affecting the Individual Education Demands of the Students Studying in the Department of Elementary Education

Ruhi Sarpkaya

Faculty of Education, Adnan Menderes University, Turkey

Abstract: The aim of this research is to explain the factors affecting the individual education demands of the students studying in the department of elementary education. The universe of research samples consists of 750 first-grade students studying in elementary education department of different universities in İzmir, Denizli, Aydın, Muğla and Manisa. The sample includes 220 students. The scale “Factors affecting the individual education demands in entering the university” is used as a means of data collection. At the end of the factor analysis, there are 19 items left in the scale and 7 factors covering these items are determined. According to the research findings, it is determined that the students are not satisfied with their departments; and it is also seen that in entering the department of elementary education, there are meaningful differences among the students opinions regarding the individual education demands according to the facts such as whether the students’ mothers work or not; whether the incomes of the students’ parents are regular or not in the “Guidance” and “Employment” dimensions of the scale and whether the students choose the department again in terms of “Individual Satisfaction”, “Qualified Education” and “Publicity” dimensions.

Key words: Individual education demands • Elementary education

INTRODUCTION

There are three aims of the primary schools: the first one is to educate good citizens giving basic citizenship knowledge; the second is to make them gain necessary knowledge and behaviors in maintaining their lives and the third one is to prepare them for the higher education. The primary school teachers are of great importance in the implementation and realization processes of these aims because they are the people who prepare the social and psychological substructures of the adults of future. Primary school education has positive effects on economic development, gain, efficiency, distribution of income and fertility in addition to child health, nutrition and child education. Primary school education make every citizens gain basic competencies in solving personal or social problems he or she will come across in his/her life and in orienting the social values and regulations[1, 2].

Throughout primary school education, a primary school teacher can accelerate the all the developments of the students or s/he can limit them by preparing ineffective environments. Primary school teacher helps the new generations reinforce their cognitive development, draw a frame of the attitudes of the

individuals towards himself, society and the world around him by helping help them give a shape to all these [3].

Primary school teachers have a strategic importance in shaping the future of a nation. Hence, the education of the primary school teachers is also of great importance. In Turkey, there are a lot of problems faced in pre and after service trainings of the primary school teachers. These problems can be listed as deficiencies in curriculums, training teachers without making any discrimination for rural and urban areas, the ignorance of the practice in pre service training, inadequate salaries and the corruption of cooperation in education.etc. Besides, teacher candidates’ having high academic success and motivation for being primary school teacher are also a big problem in educating primary school teachers effective way because the teacher should have the ability of planning, organizing, putting into practice and evaluating the teaching process according to the learning styles, development features, interest and needs of the children. Finding primary school teacher candidates having these abilities can be possible by determining their individual education demands [4-8].

In students’ choosing the department of elementary education, being aware of the factors which affect their

demands will help Faculty of Education to know itself and reconstruct themselves if needed. Therefore, when Faculties of Education, taking into consideration these factors, reconstruct themselves, they can attract more qualified, volunteer and motivated students.

The education system has two dimensions. The first one is individual education system and the other is social education system. Individual education system is the individual's opportunity to continue systematic or common teaching or education program. Individual education demand arises as a result of a series of decisions of the child, adolescent and adults in different terms and stages for participating in the some specific teaching and education programs. The individual can deal with economic and non-economic aims at the same time. S/he can demands education with a lot of aims though one or two of them can be dominant. However, it is usual to see a relationship between work and education demand especially during the terms after primary school education [9, 10].

The factors affecting individual education demand can be grouped as follows [9]:

- Personal factors (age, biological features, cognitive abilities, interests, expectation about the future... etc).
- Economic factor (the cost of education, the level of revenue, income expectation, the choice of occupation, market related expectation... etc).
- Socio-cultural factors (the descent of the family, social gender).
- Institution related factor (the education system, other institutions).

There haven't been any researches concerning the factors affecting the individual education demand of the students in entering into the department of elementary education. Generally, the individual education demand demands while entering into the university.

For instance, Kurnaz [11] asserts that factors such as The Open University's enabling the students to sustain both working and education life together, providing degree and stage progress and helping take promotion in the working place affect the individual demand for The Open University. Ünal [12] states that the students mostly choose the options "developing themselves and being a modern man" and "having a job and a higher income" as reason for higher education and he also assert that the answers about this subject don't vary according to age, gender, departments or universities. In his study aiming

to determine the factors affecting the process of choosing a job of the first grade students in the Faculty of Education, Koç [13] indicates that the wish of the family, financial conditions, the wish of obtaining a social status, the possibility of taking a job and peer group are the major factors in choosing an occupation. Özyürek and Atici [14] also point out that school advisors, families, peer groups, teachers and a variety of resource related with media are effective in the decision of secondary school students about job choice.

In their studies in which they analyze the indicators of demand for education in Spain, Beneito and *et al.* [15] claims that the opinion of making investment in universities is much more dominant than the one in secondary schools; he also claims that the women are much more inclined to higher education than the men are; that the socio-economic status of the families have much more effect on the secondary school education than it has on the high school education. Albert [16] argues that he analyzes the students' demands considering family characteristics and the indicator of labor force market; that family characteristics are important factors in the demands for higher education and that the market of labor force affects the demands for higher education.

In his research aiming to analyze the relationship between the demands for higher education and economic incentives, Fredrickson [17] maintains that there will be an increase in the number of the enrolled young students if education fees are increased, the total unemployment become more and the unemployment of the workers here decreases and he also claims that the developments in business world have immediate effects on education sector. Kim [18] also asserts that unfortunately, there have been sharp decreases in welfare level due to the extreme increases in the prices, which affecting the demands of education in a negative way. In their studies aiming to analyze the role of financial factors in the process of the students' making decision about enrolling the universities, Contan and Jong [19] establish that the school fees in terms of financial indicators in Netherlands seems of great importance for students in enrolling universities. Nevertheless, it is argued that a variety of financial support such as donatives and loans, college premium and alternative fees are more important in making decisions about enrolling.

Sa and *et al.* [20] claims that the regions where the universities are founded have an effect on the demand for universities; however, a variety of attractions of the universities are also effective. Therefore, they maintain that it is essential that a balance between these should be constructed.

Under the light of the abovementioned discussions regarding the subject, the aim of this paper is determined as “What are the opinions of the students regarding the factors affecting their individual education demands in entering into the department of elementary education?” and “Is there a meaningful difference among the opinions of the students concerning these factors according to personal variables?” Within the structure of this main aim, the subordinate aims below are tried to be answered:

- In entering the department of elementary education, what is the opinion of the students regarding the least and most affecting factors on the individual education demands for each item of the scale?
- In entering the department of elementary education, do the students opinions concerning the factors affecting individual education demand show meaningful differences according to personal variables in each dimension of the scale (according to the gender, age of the student, the situation of mother's working, income of the family, education level of the parent, accommodation place of the family, the viewpoint of the family etc.)?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The Research Model and Types of Data: The research is a kind of browsing model. The data obtained with likert type scale are in the phenomenological, judicial form and they are continuously changeable.

The Universe and Sample: The universe of the research consists of 750 first grade students studying in the department of elementary education of Adnan Menderes University, Celal Bayar University, Muğla University, Pamukkale University and 9 Eylül University. In the process of choosing samples from the universe, proportional cluster sampling method is utilized. 250 of the students studying in the department of elementary education in 5 universities abovementioned are included into the samples through random sampling technique, but 220 of them answered the questions the questionnaire. 108 students in the sampling (49.1%) are girl and 112 students (50.9%) are boys.

Tool for Data Collection: In the research, the scale developed by the researcher “*The Factors Affecting the Individual Education Demands in Entering the University*” is used in order to collect data.

In order to provide the validity of the scale, face to face continual interviews are made with the target group

of students. In these interviews, subjects such as whether the questions can determine the factors affecting individual education demands, whether the questions are clear and the issue of comprehensiveness of the questions are dealt with. The sentence structures and meaning patterns of the questions are analyzed by the experts on Turkish Language. In order for the content validity of the scale, the opinions of three experts on education administration are asked. The scale is edited according to the opinions and suggestions of the experts and students.

Before dealing with the factor analysis, anti-image correlation coefficient of the items are looked into and items with lower than 50 are omitted. After, in order to determine the factor structure of the scale, analyses of basic components are conducted. After the analytic study of factor is repeated a few times, it is seen that the scale consists of 15 factors whose value is above 1.00 and these factors explain %65.77 of all variables. Moreover, it is found that the value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sample proficiency is .74 and it is also established that Barlett's test is meaningful in the level of .05 ($p=0.00$) and all these values are adequate. In order to find solution, 6 iterations are found to be sufficient. Therefore, it is thought that a simple, easy to interpret and consistent pattern is obtained [21].

In this solution obtained according to orthogonal transformation technique with 15 factors, the load of factors is analyzed. The items whose factor load is below .30, the items loaded on more than one factor and the ones whose differences between their factor loads are below .15 are omitted from the scale. For this processes, orthogonal transformation is conducted because the correlation value between these two sub-scales is below .32 [22]. After the factor structure of the scale items becomes stable, the minimum level of factor loads is taken as .60 [23]. Here, a solution with 7 factors is obtained. The decision that the scale can be formed with 7 factors structure depends on Scree Plot graphical data.

After the analyses mentioned above, there are 19 items left in the scale and 7 factors containing these items are found. 37 items which don't match with the established criteria are omitted from the scale. 4 of the 19 items left in the scale are combined with the first factor, 3 of them with the second factor, 3 of them with the third one, 3 of them with the fourth factor, 2 of them with fifth one, 2 of them with sixth one and 2 of them is combined with the seventh factor. It is seen that the factor loads of 19 items left are between .69 and .90. It is observed that 7 factors obtained can explain %73.21 of all the variables.

Common value of variables of the scale items change between 0.540 and 0.822. Arithmetical mean of the items is found between 2.28 and 4.44; standard deviation is between 0.73 and 1.50. Cronbach alfa which is the inner consistency of the subscale is except ($\alpha=0.68$) and above the subscale ($\alpha=0.70$)

The Implementation of the Scale: After the last changes of the scale are finished, it is continued with the implementation of it. The scale is started to be implemented in the spring term of the year 2007 in the schools determined beforehand. 250 scales are distributed to the school included in to the sampling. 235 of the distributed scales come back and 220 of them are taken for evaluation.

Statistic Processes Used in Data Analysis: In this research, frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, t-test, one-way variable analysis and multiple comparison tests are utilized. Whether parametric test assumptions are true or not is controlled with the scale “Levene test for the equality of variables” for double groups and with “the test of variable homogeneity” for three or more groups. When there is a meaningful difference at the end of One-Way Anova test, in order to find what is the reason of this difference, Scheffe and LSD which are multiple comparison tests are used if the variables are equal; if they are not, Tamhane’s T2 test is used. In all of the meaningfulness tests, alpha value is accepted as $\alpha=.70$. In the analysis of the data, the SPSS 15 program is used.

Findings

Findings Related to the First Sub-Problem: Findings related to the first three items which has the highest and lowest mean of the students opinions about the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education are presented in Table 1.

In Table 1, the first item which has the lowest mean of the students’ opinions concerning the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education is “I’m satisfied with my department I’m studying now” ($X=2.45$). The mean regarding the opinion of the students “I choose this department because it is easy to find a job after graduation” is $X=2.50$ and the mean for the item “I choose this department because there is job guaranteed after graduation” is $X=2.52$. Qualitative responses of the students’ opinions regarding the first three items are in the level of “I don’t agree”.

In Table 1, the first item which has the highest mean of the students’ opinions concerning the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education is “I choose it because I have the opportunity to stay in the dormitory.” ($X=4.35$). The mean regarding the opinion of the students “I choose it because the dormitory facilities of the university are good” is $X=4.32$ and the mean for the item “I choose it impressed by the introductory articles about the university” is $X=4.29$. Qualitative responses of the students’ opinions regarding the first three items are in the level of “I absolutely agree”.

Findings Related To the Second Sub-Problem: T-test results depending on the personal variables of the students related with the dimensions of the scale of the students opinions about the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education are presented in Table 2.

According to Table 2, there is a meaningful difference in “guidance” ($t_{(88.86)}=-2,361, p<.05$) and “employment” ($t_{(216)}=-2,206, p<.05$) dimensions of the scale of students’ opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education in terms of whether the students’ mother work or not. The students whose mothers are working ($x=4.22$) considerate the guidance dimension more than the students whose mothers ($x=3.92$) are not working do. On the other hand, the students whose mothers are not working ($x=2.59$) considerate the employment dimension more compared to the students whose mothers ($x=2.21$) are working.

According to Table 2, there is a meaningful difference in “guidance” ($t_{(218)}=-2,115, p<.05$) and “employment” ($t_{(218)}=-2,300, p<.05$) dimensions of the scale of students’ opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education in terms of whether the income of the students’ families is regular or not. The students whose families incomes are regular ($x=4.06$) take into consideration the guidance dimension more compared to the students whose families incomes ($x=3.74$) are irregular. On the other hand, the students whose families incomes are regular ($x=2.42$) considerate the employment dimension less than the students whose families income ($x=2.79$) are irregular.

According to Table 2, there is a meaningful difference in “employment” ($t_{(212)}=-3,047, p<.05$) dimensions of the scale of students’ opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education in terms of whether

Table 1: Arithmetical Means and Standard Deviations Depending on the First Three Items which has the Highest And Lowest Mean of The Students Opinions about the Factors Affecting the Individual Education Demand In Entering in the Department of Elementary Education

	ITEMS	N	X	Sd
The items with the lowest mean	I'm satisfied with my department I'm studying now.	220	2.45	1.35
	I choose this department because it is easy to find a job after graduation.	220	2.50	1.10
	I choose this department because there is job guaranteed after graduation.	220	2.52	1.14
The items with the highest mean	I choose it because I have the opportunity to stay in the dormitory.	220	4.35	1.01
	I choose it because the dormitory facilities of the university are good.	220	4.32	0.99
	I choose it impressed by the introductory articles about the university.	220	4.29	0.92

Table 2: T-Test Results depending on the personal variables of the students related with the dimensions of the scale of the Students Opinions about the Factors Affecting the Individual Education Demand in Entering in the Department of Elementary Education

The Dimension of the scale		N	X	Sd	t	df	Sig.*
Guidance	<i>Mother is working</i>	43	4.2248	0.70042	2.361	88.86	0.020
	<i>Mother isn't working</i>	175	3.9162	0.99646			
Employment	<i>Mother is working</i>	43	2.2093	0.86762	-2.206	216	0.028
	<i>Mother isn't working</i>	175	2.5914	1.05055			
Guidance	<i>Regular family income</i>	169	4.0572	0.94702	2.115	218	0.036
	<i>Irregular family income</i>	51	3.7386	0.92931			
Employment	<i>Regular family income</i>	169	2.4201	1.00051	-2.300	218	0.022
	<i>Irregular family income</i>	51	2.7941	1.07320			
Employment	<i>Job Guaranteed</i>	173	2.4191	0.98644	-3.047	212	0.003
	<i>No Job Guaranteed</i>	41	2.9512	1.08285			
Personal Satisfaction	<i>I would choose this department again</i>	122	2.0635	0.85616	-11.748	206	0.00
	<i>I wouldn't choose this department again</i>	86	3.5378	0.93896			
Qualified Education	<i>I would choose this department again</i>	122	3.5902	0.97610	-2.813	206	0.005
	<i>I wouldn't choose this department again</i>	86	3.9651	0.90320			
Publicity	<i>I would choose this department again</i>	122	4.1516	0.89970	-2.617	206	0.010
	<i>I wouldn't choose this department again</i>	86	4.4535	0.68868			

*P<.05

the students' families have guaranteed job or not. The students whose families have guaranteed job ($x=2.42$) take into consideration the employment dimension more compared to the students whose families' incomes ($x=2.95$) aren't regular.

According to Table 2, there is a meaningful difference in "Personal Satisfaction" ($t_{(206)}=-11,748, p<.05$); "qualified education" ($t_{(206)}=-2,813, p<.05$) and "publicity" ($t_{(206)}=-2,617, p<.05$) dimensions of the scale of students' opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education in terms of whether the students would choose the department again. The students who would choose the department again considerate the "personal satisfaction", "qualified education" and "publicity" dimension less than the students who wouldn't choose the department again do. There is not any meaningful difference among the students' opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in

entering in the department of elementary education in any dimension of the scale in terms of gender.

According table 3, it is seen that there is a meaningful difference in "Personal Satisfaction" ($F_{(4-215)}=4,056, p<.05$), "qualified education" ($F_{(4-215)}=9,415, p<.05$) and "social esteem" ($F_{(4-215)}=3,850, p<.05$), "employment" ($F_{(4-215)}=2,721, p<.05$) and "publicity" ($F_{(4-215)}=2,651, p<.05$) dimensions of the scale of students' opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education in terms of the universities studied now. In other words, the opinions of the students concerning individual education demand in entering the university vary in a meaningful way according to the university they are studying now. In order to determine in which groups this difference takes place, Scheffe test is utilized. According to the results of Scheffe test, it is found that the students studying in Pamukkale University ($x=3,22$), considerate the dimension of personal satisfaction more compared to the students

Table 3: One-Way ANOVA Results according to Personal Variables Related to the Dimensions of the Scale of Students Opinions about the Factors Affecting the Individual Education Demand in Entering in the Department of Elementary Education

The Dimension of the Scale	Personal Variable		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.***
Personal Satisfaction	<i>The university studied now</i>	BG*	19.726	4	4.932	4.056	0.003
		WG**	261.383	215	1.216		
		Total	281.109	219			
Qualified Education		BG	29.861	4	7.465	9.435	0.000
		WG	170.107	215	0.791		
		Total	199.968	219			
Social Esteem		BG	16.007	4	4.002	3.850	0.005
		WG	223.458	215	1.039		
		Total	239.465	219			
Employment		BG	11.142	4	2.785	2.721	0.031
		WG	220.098	215	1.024		
		Total	231.240	219			
Publicity		BG	6.869	4	1.717	2.651	0.034
		WG	139.289	215	0.648		
		Total	146.158	219			
	<i>The level mother's education</i>	BG	11.044	4	2.761	4.393	0.002
		WG	135.114	215	0.628		
		Total	146,158	219			

*Between groups **Within groups ***P<.05

Table 4: One-Way ANOVA Results according to Personal Variables Related to the guidance and accommodation Dimensions of the Scale of Students Opinions concerning the Factors Affecting the Individual Education Demand in Entering in the Department of Elementary Education

The Dimension of the Scale	Personal Variable		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.*
Guidance	<i>The job of father</i>	BG	22.681	5	4.536	5.505	0.000
		WG	169.757	206	0.824		
		Total	192.438	211			
	<i>The job of mother</i>	BG	6.149	2	3.074	3.445	0.034
		WG	189.200	212	0.892		
		Total	195.349	214			
Accommodation	<i>Age of the student</i>	BG	7.320	2	3.660	4.169	0.017
		WG	190.507	217	0.878		
		Total	197.828	219			
	<i>The level of mother's education</i>	BG	10.443	4	2.611	3.594	0.007
		WG	156.166	215	0.726		
		Total	166.609	219			
	<i>The level of father's education</i>	BG	6.242	3	2.081	2.778	0.042
		WG	158.758	212	0.749		
		Total	165.000	215			
	<i>Accommodation place of the family</i>	BG	8.124	3	2.708	3.691	0.013
		WG	158.485	216	0.734		
		Total	166.609	219			
	<i>Age of the student</i>	BG	4.767	2	2.384	3.196	0.043
		WG	161.842	217	0.746		
		Total	166.609	219			

*P<.05

studying in Muğla ($x=2.46$) and Denizli ($x=2.48$) Universities; the students studying in Pamukkale ($x=4.2$) and Celal Bayar Universities ($x=3.22$) considerate the dimension of “qualified education” more than the students studying in Denizli university do ($x=3.22$); the students in Pamukkale University ($x=3.15$) take into consideration the dimension of “social esteem” more compared to the ones in Muğla University ($x=2.73$);

the students in Pamukkale University ($x=4.47$) considerate the dimension of “publicity” more compared to the students in Muğla University ($x=3.94$). According to LSD test results, it is established that the students studying in Adnan Menderes University ($x=2.82$) considerate the dimension of “employment” more compared to the ones in Denizli ($x=3.0$) and Muğla Universities ($x=2.25$).

According to Table 3, it is seen that there is a meaningful difference in “publicity” ($F_{(4-215)}=2, 651$ $p<.05$) dimension of the scale of students’ opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education in terms of the level of mother’s education. In order to determine in which groups this difference takes place, LSD test is applied. It is found that the students whose mothers graduated from secondary school ($x=3.66$) take into consideration the dimension of “publicity” less than the students whose mothers are illiterate ($x=4.40$), primary school graduate ($x=4.38$), high school graduate ($x=4.26$) and university graduate ($x=4.28$) do.

According to Table 4, it is seen that there is a meaningful difference in “employment” dimension of the scale of students’ opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education in terms of “father’s job” ($F_{(5-206)}=5, 505$ $p<.05$), “mother’s job” ($F_{(2-212)}=3, 445$ $p<.05$) and “the age of the student” ($F_{(2-217)}=4, 169$ $p<.05$). In other words, students’ opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering the university vary in a meaningful way according to “father’s job”, “mother’s job” and “age of the student” in the “guidance” dimension

In order to determine in which groups this difference takes place, LSD test is applied. In entering in the department of elementary education, it is found that from the point of father’s job, the students whose fathers have independent business ($x=3.47$) considerate the “guidance” dimension more than the students whose fathers are teachers ($x=4.23$), government employees ($x=4.10$), retired ($x=4.34$) and laborer ($x=3.92$) and from the point of mothers’ jobs, the students whose mothers are housewives ($x=3.88$), from the point of students age the ones who are 20 years old (4.25) and the students who are between 17-19 ($x=3.85$) take into consideration.

According to Table 4, it is seen that there is a meaningful difference in “accommodation” dimension of the scale of students’ opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education in terms of “mother’s education level” ($F_{(4-215)}=3, 594$, $p<.05$), “father’s education level” ($F_{(3-212)}=2, 778$ $p<.05$), “accommodation place of the family” ($F_{(3-216)}=3, 691$ $p<.05$) and “student’s age” ($F_{(2-217)}=3, 196$ $p<.05$). In other words, students’ opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering the university vary in a meaningful way according to “father’s education level”,

“mother’s education level” and “accommodation place of the family” and “student’s age” in the “accommodation” dimension.

In order to determine in which groups this difference takes place, LSD test is applied. In entering in the department of elementary education, from the point of mother’s education level, it is determined that the students whose mothers graduate from secondary school ($x=3.86$) consider the “accommodation” dimension less than the ones whose mothers are illiterate ($x=4.43$), primary school graduate ($x=4.45$) and university graduate ($x=4.58$); from the point of father’s job, the ones whose fathers graduate from secondary school ($x=3.98$) considerate the “accommodation” dimension less compared to the students whose fathers are primary school graduate ($x=4.41$) and secondary school graduate ($x=4.49$) and from the point of accommodation place of the families, the students whose families live in the center of towns ($x=3.85$) consider the “accommodation” dimension less compared to the ones whose parents live in center of provinces ($x=4.48$) and countries ($x=4.35$). There is not any meaningful difference among the students’ opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education in any dimension of the scale in terms of the incomes and viewpoints of the families.

DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The fact that the level of the students’ opinions concerning the item “I am satisfied with the department I am studying now” ($x=2.45$) which is the first item having the lowest mean of the students’ opinions for the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education is in the level of “I don’t agree” can be interpreted as in general the students are not satisfied with the department. The students’ opinion regarding the items “I choose this department because it is easy to find a job after graduation” and “I choose this department because there is job guaranteed after graduation” is in the level of “I don’t agree”. The fact that the students tend to jobs which help them to live on and be satisfied is also supported in literature when they enter into the department of elementary education. As a matter of fact, Ünal [10] argues that individual demand for higher education levels after compulsory education is mostly due to the demand for an occupation. In a research conducted by TED [24], %50.2 of the university students give the

answer “In order to have a job” to the question “Why do you want to study in a university?” The fact that there is a phenomenon opposite to the findings in literature can be attributed to the students’ voluntarily choosing the department of elementary education in. As a matter of fact, most of the students state that they don’t agree with the item “I am satisfied with the department I am studying now.”.

The first item of the students’ opinions for the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education which has the highest mean is “I choose it impressed by the introductory articles about the universities” ($x=4.29$). The qualitative value of the students’ opinions concerning this item is “I absolutely agree”. It is clear that the students are impressed by the introductory articles in newspapers while choosing the universities. Just as Yeşilyaprak [25] emphasize the fact that it is important to utilize computers, brochure, journals, books and catalogues prepared by various institutions in getting to know and analyzing the occupations. Özyürek and Atici [14] also highlight the importance of the media in choosing an occupation.

The qualitative values of both the item “I choose it because the dormitory facilities of the university are good” which has the second highest mean ($x=4.32$) and the item “I choose it because I have the opportunity to stay in the dormitory” which has the third highest mean ($x=4.35$) are in the form of “I absolutely agree”. The issue of dormitory is the common problem of the university students. According to the data in 2007-2008 education year, the number of the dormitory for the university students is 222 and the number of the beds is 201637 [26]. Given the total number of the university students is 2.372.136, it can be clearly seen that the capacity of bed is too low [27]. As it is clear, the dormitory opportunity is limited in Turkey. Hence, it can be thought that the students know beforehand that the universities’ dormitory opportunities are limited and they try to choose the universities with better dormitory opportunities.

The students whose mothers are working ($x=4.22$) in a meaningful way take into consideration the “guidance” dimension more compared to the ones whose mothers are not working ($x=3.92$). Guiding a student about a job or a school is closely related with the awareness of the student himself and the school. The fact that the abundance of social relationships and educational level of the students’ mothers who are working can contribute to the process of gaining the awareness about guidance in

positive way. In this situation, it can be said that the students’ mothers who are not working are less conscious of the “guidance” dimension. The dimension of “employment” is considered in a meaningful way more by the students whose mothers aren’t working ($x=2.59$) than the students whose mothers are working ($x=2.21$). This can be stem from the fact that the students whose mothers are not working experience financial problems and the fact that they want to have a job in order not to experience similar problems seeing their mothers’ life. However, the students whose families’ incomes are not regular ($x=3.74$) consider the guidance dimension less than the students whose families’ income are regular ($x=4.06$) do. The students whose families’ incomes are irregular ($x=2.79$) consider the employment dimension more compared to the students whose families incomes are regular (2.42). In the studies of Bekleyiş [28], Nielsen [29], Albert [16], Koç [13], Leslie and Brinkman [30] and Stafford and Lundstedt and Lynn [31], Tierney [32] it is stated that families characteristics and socio-economic factors have an effect upon the university or occupation choices of the students.

The students who say “I would choose this department again” take into consideration the personal satisfaction, qualified education and publicity dimensions less than the students who say “I wouldn’t choose that department again” do. It is apparent that the students who say that they would choose that department again are satisfied and that they think that they choose the right option for them. In this situation, it becomes clearer that they consider the personal satisfaction, qualified education and publicity dimensions less.

It is seen that there is a meaningful difference in “Personal satisfaction”, “Qualified education”, “Social esteem”, “employment” and “Publicity” dimensions of the students’ opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education in terms of the universities they are studying now. This clearly shows that the dimensions of the individual education demands should be taken into consideration by the universities in order to attract the students. As a matter of fact, Sa and Florax and Rietveld [20] argues that the demands for universities are affected by the factors related to the regions the universities are founded and by some other attractions they have.

It is seen that there is a meaningful difference in “Publicity” dimensions of the students’ opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education in

terms of the mothers' education level. Albert [16] also emphasizes that characteristics of the families are important factors in the students' demand for higher education; especially mothers' education level is more important than the fathers' education level. Stafford *et al.* [31] state that the educated families are more willing to send their children to the university than the uneducated families are.

It is determined that the students whose parents live in the center of towns ($x=3.85$) consider the dimension of "accommodation" less than the students whose parents live in the center of provinces ($x=4.48$) and countries ($x=4.35$) in entering into the department of elementary education. Regional differences and socio-economic levels come first in the list of the factor affecting individual education demand in entering the university [20, 33, 34]. It can be said that the socio-economic levels of the students who live in the center of towns is generally low. Therefore, they are expected to take into consideration the accommodation dimension more. However, in this research it is seen that they consider less. The reason of this situation can be explained with social factors rather than economic factors.

It is seen that there is a meaningful difference in various dimensions of the scale of students' opinion regarding the factors affecting the individual education demand in entering in the department of elementary education in terms of the mothers' education level, fathers' education level, accommodation place of the families, economic factors, accommodation opportunities...etc. according to this, the faculties of education should give importance to the advertisement activities (TV, internet, radio, newspapers, journal and brochures...etc.) in order to attract more qualified students to elementary education department. The students who are successful but have not got a good financial situation should be provided with accommodation, scholarship and free-refectory tickets opportunities. A qualified learning environment should be created in order to increase students' demand for elementary education department and this should be known by everyone.

REFERENCES

1. Kavak, Y., 1997. Dünyada ve Türkiye'de eğitim. Ankara: Pegem.
2. Başaran, İ.E., 1982. Temel eğitim ve yönetimi. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası.
3. Senemoğlu, N., 2003. Türkiye'de Sınıf öğretmeni yetiştirme uygulamaları, sorunlar, öneriler. SDÜ Burdur Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. Y., 4(5): 154-193.
4. Tanilli, S., 2009. Nasıl bir eğitim istiyoruz. İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Yayınları.
5. Can, N., 2004. İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin denetimi ve sorunları [Elektronik version]. Milli Eğitim Dergisi. S:161.
6. Yerlikaya, A., 2000. Köy ve şehirlerde çalışan sınıf öğretmenlerinde tükenmişlik düzeylerinin incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzurum.
7. Sarpkaya, R., 1997. Öğretmen sorunları ve çözüm önerileri. Öğretmen Dünyası Aylık Meslek Dergisi, Yıl: 18(212): 23-26.
8. Başgöz, İ., 1995. Türkiye'nin eğitim çıkmazı ve Atatürk. Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi.
9. Tural, N., 1994. Eğitim istemi. Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi. C: 27(2): 781-791.
10. Ünal, İ.L., 1996. Eğitim ve yetiştirme ekonomisi. Ankara: Epar Yayınları.
11. Kurnaz, K., 1996. Açık yüksek öğretime olan bireysel istemi etkileyen etkenlerin incelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
12. Ünal, İ.L., 1990. Eğitim bilimleri öğrencilerinin istihdam beklentileri. Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi. C:23(104-127).
13. Koç, M., 1994. KTÜ Fatih eğitim fakültesi birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin mesleki seçimlerine etki eden faktörlerin belirlenmesi. Çağdaş Eğitim. C19(204): 26-30.
14. Özyürek, R. And M. Atıf, 2002. Üniversite öğrencilerinin meslek seçimi kararlarında kendilerine yardım eden kaynakların belirlenmesi. Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi., 11: 17.
15. Beneito, P., J. Ferri, L. Molto and E. Uriel, 2001. Determinants of the for education in Spain. Appl. Econ., 33: 1541-1551.
16. Albert, C., 2000. Higher education demand in Spain: the influence of labor market signals and family background" Higher Education, V. 40, Number 2, September 2000, pp: 147-162(16).
17. Fredrikson, P., 1997. Economic incentives and the demand for higher education. Scand. J. Econ., 99(1): 129-142.
18. Kim, H.Y., 1988. The consumer demand for education. The Journal of Human Resources, Vol. 23, No. 2 (Spring, 1988), pp: 173-192.
19. Contan, E. And F. Jong, 2002. The demand for higher

- education in the Netherlands, 1950-'99. CBP Discussion Paper. [Http://www.cbp.nt/eng/pub/discussie/12/disc12.pdf](http://www.cbp.nt/eng/pub/discussie/12/disc12.pdf), Eriřim tarihi, 01/09/2006.
20. Sa, C., R. Florax and P. Rietveld, 2003. Determinants of the regional demand for higher education. Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper. <http://cgb.nl/eng/pub/discussie/12/disc12.pdf>, Eriřim tarihi 01/01/2004.
21. Büyüköztürk, Ş., 2002. Sosyal bilimleri için veri analizi el kitabı. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
22. Tabashnick, B.G. and L.S. Fidell, 1996. Using Multivariate Statistics, (third edition), New York: College Publishers.
23. Yurdağul, H., 2009. Güvenirlik ve geçerlik üzerine bir şema. <http://yunus.hacettepe.edu.tr/~yurdagul/3/indir/OlcekGelistir1.pdf>. Eriřim: 27/09/2009.
24. TED, 2006. Türkiye'de üniversiteye giriş sistemi. Ankara: TED Yayınları.
25. Yeşilyaprak, B., 2003. Eğitimde rehberlik hizmetleri. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
26. MEB, 2009. Milli eğitim istatistikleri örgün eğitim. http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/istatistik/meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2007_2008.pdf. Eriřim tarihi 25/08/2009.
27. OSYM, 2009. 2007-2008 Öğretim yılı yükseköğretim istatistikleri. <http://osym.gov.tr/BelgeGoster.aspx?F6E10F8892433CFFF88F742D0D71125168BB5005A7961B47>. Eriřim tarihi 25/08/2009.
28. Bekleyiş, F., 2007. Öğrencilerin mesleki ilgi alanları ve ailenin meslek seçimine etkisi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bolu.
29. Nielsen, S.H., 2001. How sensitive is the demand for primary education to changes in economic factors. J. African Econ., 10(2): 191-218.
30. Leslie, L.L. and P.T. Brinkman, 1987. Student Price Response in higher education. J. Higher Edu., Vol.58/2, 197-202.
31. Stafford, K.L., S.B. Lundstedt and A.L. Lynn, 1984. Social and ekonomik factors affecting participation in higher education. J. Higher Edu., 55: 5.
32. Tierney, M.L., 1980. The impact financial aid on student demand for public/private higher education. J. Higher Edu., 51: 5.
33. Zumeta, W., 1996. Meeting the demand for higher education without breaking the bank: a framework for the design of state higher education policies for an era of increasing demand. The Journal of Higher Education, 67(4): 367-425. <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-1546%28199607%2F08%2967%3A4%3C367%3AMTDFHE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Y>Eriřim: 20/03/2009.
34. Engels, R.A., 1975. A framework for assessing higher education supply and demand results for the southern region:1970-80. JHE. Vol. XLVI No:1. Eriřim: 20/03/2009.