OHS ACADEMY
İş Sağlığı ve Güvenliği Akademi Dergisi
Açık Erişim
Journal of Occupational Health and Safety Academy
Open Access

e-ISSN: 2630-578X

10.38213/ohsacademy.1031998 Yıl 2022, Cilt 5, Sayı 1, Sayfa: 13-22 https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ohsacademy

Determination of Emergency Self-Efficacy of Employees in a Public University

Meral ŞAHİN DURGUT[1*], Hüseyin VAPUR[2]

[1]Property Protection and Security Department, Espiye Vocational School, Giresun University, Giresun, Turkey
[2]Miner Engineering Department, Engineering Faculty, Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey

Article History
Received: 03.12.2021
Accepted: 14.04.2022
Published: 30.04.2022

Research Article

Abstract - This study was conducted to determine the suitability of the personnel participating in the research at a public university in the Black Sea region to be selected as emergency team members. The sample selection method was not used in the study, and university employees who agreed to participate in the study and could be reached were included in the study. 317 of 1600 personnel working at the university participated in the study voluntarily. A questionnaire containing introductory information and the "Emergency Teams Employee Self-Efficacy Scale" developed in 2018 were used in data collection. The total mean score of the participants from the scale was determined as 3.26±0.39. As a general comment, the scale average score is high. It was observed that the mean scores of the scale factors were ordered from the highest to the lowest points as interest, competence, and desire factors. In the study, there was no relationship between the self-efficacy for emergency team membership according to age, experience, unit of work and occupational accident and occupational disease status of the participants, while there was no relationship between self-efficacy for emergency team membership according to gender, position, encountering an emergency and education level found. It was determined that 86 of the 314 participants, 27.39%, of the personnel who were eligible to be selected for the emergency teams among the participants in the research, and that being self-sufficient was an important step in the selecting of an emergency team member.

Keywords- *Emergency, emergency team, disaster, occupational health and safety, self-efficacy*

Bir Kamu Üniversitesinde Çalışanların Acil Durum Öz Yeterliliklerinin Tespit Edilmesi

Meral ŞAHİN DURGUT[1*], Hüseyin VAPUR[2]

[1] Mülkiyet Koruma ve Güvenlik Bölümü, Espiye Meslek Yüksekokulu, Giresun Üniversitesi, Giresun, Türkiye
[2] Maden Mühendisliği Bölümü, Mühendislik Fakültesi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana, Türkiye

Makale Tarihçesi
Gönderim 03.12.2021
Kabul 14.04.2022
Yayım 30.04.2022

Araştırma Makalesi

Oz− Bu çalışma, Karadeniz bölgesinde yer alan bir kamu üniversitesinde araştırmaya katılan personellerin acil durum ekibi üyesi olarak seçilmeye uygunluğunu belirlemek amacı ile yapılmıştır. Çalışmada örneklem seçimi yöntemine başvurulmamış, araştırmaya katılmayı kabul eden ve ulaşılabilen üniversite çalışanları çalışmaya dâhil edilmiştir. Üniversitede çalışan 1600 personelin 317'si çalışmaya gönüllülük esasına göre katılım sağlamıştır. Veri toplamada tanıtıcı bilgilerin yer aldığı bir anket formu ve 2018 de geliştirilen 'Acil Durum Ekipleri Çalışan Öz Yeterlilik Ölçeği' kullanılmıştır. Katılımcıların ölçekten aldıkları toplam puan ortalaması 3.26±0.39 olarak tespit edilmiştir. Genel bir yorum olarak ölçek ortalama puanı yüksektir. Ölçek faktörlerinin puan ortalamalarının en yüksekten başlamak üzere en düşük puanlara doğru ilgi, yetkinlik ve istek faktörleri şeklinde sıralandığı görülmüştür. Araştırmada katılımcıların yaş, tecrübe, çalışılan birim ile iş kazası ve meslek hastalığı yaşama durumlarına göre acil durum ekibi üyeliği için öz yeterlik durumları arasında ilişki bulunamamışken cinsiyet, konum, acil durumla karşılaşma ve eğitim düzeylerine göre acil durum ekibi üyeliği için öz yeterli olma durumları arasında ilişki bulunmuştur. Araştırmaya katılanlardan acil durum ekiplerine seçilebilmeye uygun nitelikte olan personelin 314 katılımcıdan 86'sı yani %27.39'u olduğu ve öz yeterli olmanın acil durum ekibi üyesi seçilme durumunda önemli bir merhale olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler **–** *Acil durum, acil durum ekibi, afet, iş sağlığı ve güvenliği, öz yeterlik*

Cite (APA): Durgut, M. Ş. & Vapur, H. (2022). Determination of Emergency Self-Efficacy of Employees in a Public University . OHS ACADEMY , 5 (1) , 13-22 . DOI: 10.38213/ohsacademy.1031998

[1] meral.sahin@giresun.edu.tr 0000-0002-9287-2839
[2] hvapur@cu.edu.tr Orcid id: 0000-0003-4438-3982
*Sorumlu Yazar / Corresponding Author: meral.sahin@giresun.edu.tr, Giresun Üniversitesi, Giresun/Türkiye

1. Introduction

Emergency; these are events that require immediate intervention such as fire, explosion, the spread of dangerous chemicals, poisoning, epidemics, radioactive leaks, sabotage, and natural disasters that may occur in the whole or part of the workplace or affect the workplace from outside (Regulation on Emergencies at Workplaces, 2013). Emergencies are major events that require urgency but are often of a scale that can be dealt with locally (Annotated Glossary of Disaster Management Terms, 2021). They interrupt normal functioning and order in a certain part or all of the workplaces, require urgent intervention and create a state of crisis. Emergencies that cause physical or environmental damage can be natural or man-made. Floods, workplace violence resulting in trauma or bodily harm, radiological accidents, civil disturbances, fires (OSHA, 2001) or an earthquake in a hospital, a fire at a gas station, poisoning of people from workplace food, and epidemic disease in a public institution, all are different it is an emergency and the probability of experiencing these situations in the workplaces is determined by risk assessments, and emergency plans are created with the results, which determine the course of action to be followed when such situations occur. A disaster, which is not an event itself, but a result of it, is a natural, technology or human-induced event that causes physical, economic, and social losses for the whole society or certain segments of the society, stops or interrupts normal life and human activities, and where the coping capacity of the affected society is not sufficient. (Annotated Glossary of Disaster Management Terms, 2021). Disasters can occur anytime, anywhere, in many forms. The development of these dangers, which we do not know beforehand, sometimes takes days, sometimes comes out suddenly, and confronts humanity with its frightening consequences, and adversely affects local, national, and regional economies. Earthquakes, bird flu, SARS, avalanche, storm, flood, volcanic eruption, landslide, tsunami, fire, hazardous materials, ship and plane crash, terrorism, etc. are examples of disasters (Kadıoğlu, 2011). When emergencies are not intervened, they can reach the size of a disaster and cause loss of life and property. Being prepared in advance for emergencies that may occur in the workplace due to the similarity of the causes and consequences of emergencies and disasters, will organize and assist the situation with information and training when an emergency occurs, and have the appropriate equipment to minimize/prevent the workplace and employees from the negative effects of the emergency, a sufficient number of well-trained employees must be assigned in advance.

Emergencies and precautions to be taken in our legislation are defined in Articles 11th, 12th, and 30th of the Occupational Health and Safety Law No. 6331, and the Regulation on Emergency Situations at Workplaces has been published based on these articles. According to the 11th article of this regulation, the employer;

- Extinguishing team; to immediately intervene in the fires that may occur in the workplace, to control the fire, if possible, to prevent the spread of the fire, and to carry out extinguishing activities,
- Rescue team; post-emergency in workplaces; to carry out search and rescue work of employees, visitors, and other persons,
- Protection team; to prevent panic and confusion that may arise due to an emergency, to carry out coordination works between emergency teams (ET), to carry out counting works, to inform the response teams of relevant national and local institutions, when necessary,
- First aid team; to perform the first aid interventions of the people who are adversely affected by the emergency, creates.

Considering the danger class of the workplace while creating the teams; It assigns at least one specially equipped and specially trained employee as support staff, up to every 30 employees in workplaces in the very dangerous class, up to every 40 employees in the workplaces in the dangerous class, and up to every 50 employees in the workplaces in the less hazardous class. For the first aid team, it is obligatory to have one person for 10-15-20 employees, respectively, in workplaces that are classified as very dangerous, dangerous, and less dangerous (First Aid Regulations, 2015). Keeping the employees with the specified qualifications ready will ensure the sustainability of the enterprises in emergencies, prevent or reduce the damages that may occur to the enterprise, prevent the dangers to which the employees will be exposed, be prepared and take quick action on many issues such as rescuing the personnel who had an accident. Just as the creation of ET's is vital, so is the selection of the right team members. In this context, in the selection of an ET member;

- Volunteering, being educated and self-efficacy (SE),
- The age difference between individuals and their fields of work (Kırtaş and Altundağ, 2019),
- Having work experience,
- Getting to know the business well,
- Being physically sufficient and not having any health problems,
- Being psychologically competent,
- Lack of phobias such as heights, enclosed spaces,
- Occupational health and safety rules must be observed.

Today, in general, the people to be selected for ET's are determined when they are successful in the training and when they volunteer for this task or by assignment, even if they are not volunteers. However, it is unknown whether individuals are SE for choosing ET's apart from the above-mentioned features.

SE is one of the basic concepts at the center of Albert Bandura's social learning theory. According to Bandura, SE belief affects how to behave in the face of difficult tasks and situations, setting goals, efforts to reach goals, and how long one can face or avoid the difficulties encounter therefore, SE is an important quality in both personal and professional life (Bandura, 1997). In the workplace; A first aid team member who cannot help a person with bleeding because he cannot trust himself, a fire crew member who cannot intervene because he is afraid of a simple fire or cannot use the fire extinguisher, or even faints when faced with such emergencies, and the possibility of himself creating an emergency by dropping the response equipment on his feet is high An employee selected as an ET member; While it is evaluated as a source of benefit, it is clear that it can also be a source of danger (Yalçın, 2018). For all these reasons, it is aimed to determine the eligibility of employees selected as ET members in this study.

2. Material and Method

Today, in general, the people to be selected for ET's are determined when they are successful in the training and when they volunteer for this task or by assignment, even if they are not volunteers. However, it is unknown whether individuals are SE for choosing ET's apart from the above-mentioned features. This research; is descriptive and cross-sectional. It was made for all employees at a public university in the Black Sea region. The sample selection method was not used in the study, and university employees who agreed to participate in the study and could be reached were included in the study. The study was carried out between January and March 2021. 317 of 1600 personnel working at the university participated in the study on a voluntary basis. Due to the incomplete filling of the data forms, 3 data forms were eliminated and 314 fully filled data forms were included in the study. A questionnaire containing introductory information and the "Emergency Team Employee Self-Efficacy Scale (ETESEC)" developed by Manav and Yalçın (2018) were used in data collection. In the questionnaire form, there is introductory information of the participants such as gender, age, education level, position, unit of work. The scale consists of 3 factors and 19 questions. There are 9 questions in the competence factor, 6 questions in the desire factor, and 4 questions in the interest factor in the scale. The scale is 5-point Likert type and for each question; 1. "I strongly disagree", 2. "I do not agree", 3. "I am undecided", 4. "I agree", 5. "I strongly agree". 10-11-12-13 in the request factor of the scale. The questions are reverse-oriented questions. It has been stated that employees who give the answer to these questions strongly agree - agree - undecided will not be suitable for being a team member (Yalçın, 2018). A score between 23 and 91 can be obtained from the scale. The reliability of the scale (Cronbach's Alpha) was found to be 0.80. SPSS 22.0 program was used in the analysis of the data. The t-test and Kruskal Wallis test were used to compare the SE of the employees according to their demographic characteristics. The significance level was accepted as 0.05Ethics committee approval was obtained with the decision of Giresun University Social Sciences, Science and Engineering Research Ethics Committee dated 06.01.2021 and numbered 06/18. In order to conduct the research, the consent of all participants was obtained and permission was obtained from the scale developers via e-mail. The research is limited to the data of 314 personnel working at a public university in the Black Sea region and the values measured by ETESEC.

3. Research Findings

Participants of the research; 64.6% are male, 28.7% are undergraduate graduates, 60.5% are administrative staff, 63.1% are working in academic units, 77.4% have not encountered an emergency before, 89.8% of them did not experience any work accident or occupational disease, their mean age was 39.58±8.19 and their mean professional experience was 12.08±8.35.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Variable	Group	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	203	64,6
	Female	111	35,4
Educational Status	Primary School Degree	8	2,5
	Middle School Degree	12	3,8
	High School Degree	47	15,0
	Associate Degree	25	8,0
	Bachelor's Level Degree	90	28,7
	Master's Degree	56	17,8
	Doctorate Degree	76	24,2
Position	Administrative	190	60,5
	Academic	124	39,5
Worked Unit	Administrative	116	36,9
	Academic	198	63,1
Encounter an Emergency	Yes	71	22,6
	No	243	77,4
Work Accident - Experiencing Occupational Disease	Yes	32	10,2
	No	282	89,8
Age Avg.		39.58±8.19	
Experience Avg.		12.08±8.35	

Table 2. Mean Scores of the Participants from the Scale and Its Factors

Scale Factors	Mean	Standard Deviation (SD)	Minimum and Maximum
Competency Factor	3,31	0,60	1 - 5
Desire Factor	2,70	0,43	1 - 5
Interest Factor	3,53	0,47	1 - 5
ETESEC	3,26	0,39	1,21 – 4,79

As seen in Table 2, the total mean score of the participants in ETESEC was determined as 3.26±0.39. It was seen that the mean scores of the scale factors were ordered from the highest to the lowest as interest, competence, and desire factors.

Table 3. Comparison of the Scale Mean Scores of the Participants with the Descriptive Features-1

Factors	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Competency Factor	Male	203	3,35	0,57	1,797	0,073
	Female	111	3,23	0,65	1,727	
Desire Factor	Male	203	2,69	0,40	-0,378	0,705
	Female	111	2,71	0,47	-0,360	
Interest Factor	Male	203	3,49	0,46	-2,150	**0,032**
	Female	111	3,61	0,47	-2,140	
ETESEC	Male	203	3,28	0,36	0,856	0,393
	Female	111	3,24	0,45	0,807	
Position						
Competency Factor	Administrative personal	190	3,33	0,64	0,607	0,544
	Academical personal	124	3,28	0,54	0,629	
Desire Factor	Administrative personal	190	2,74	0,45	2,048	**0,041**
	Academical personal	124	2,64	0,38	2,116	
Interest Factor	Administrative personal	190	3,56	0,51	1,395	0,164
	Academical personal	124	3,48	0,40	1,470	
ETESEC	Administrative personal	190	3,28	0,43	1,099	0,273
	Academical personal	124	3,23	0,34	1,151	
Encounter an Emergency						
Competency Factor	Yes	71	3,48	0,62	2,794	**0,006**
	No	243	3,26	0,59	2,730	
Desire Factor	Yes	71	2,66	0,40	-0,879	0,380
	No	243	2,71	0,43	-0,918	
Interest Factor	Yes	71	3,46	0,46	-1,469	0,143
	No	243	3,55	0,47	-1,493	
ETESEC	Yes	71	3,34	0,43	2,000	**0,046**
	No	243	3,24	0,38	1,885	
Work Accident - Experiencing Occupational Disease						
Competency Factor	Yes	32	3,45	0,63	1,441	0,151
	No	282	3,29	0,60	1,378	
Desire Factor	Yes	32	2,67	0,46	-0,416	0,678
	No	282	2,70	0,42	-0,389	
Interest Factor	Yes	32	3,41	0,46	-1,574	0,117
	No	282	3,54	0,47	-1,606	
ETESEC	Yes	32	3,33	0,44	0,977	0,329
	No	282	3,26	0,39	0,877	
Worked Unit						
Competency Factor	Administrative	116	3,29	0,65	-0,35	0,735
	Academic	198	3,32	0,58	-0,339	
Desire Factor	Administrative	116	2,72	0,44	0,608	0,550
	Academic	198	2,69	0,42	0,598	
Interest Factor	Administrative	116	3,52	0,41	-0,353	0,724
	Academic	198	3,54	0,50	-0,372	
ETESEC	Administrative	116	3,25	0,43	-0,316	0,760
	Academic	198	3,27	0,38	-0,306	

When Table 3 is examined, according to the t-test results; A significant difference was found between the gender variable of the participants and the interest factor (p:0.032), and the difference was due to female participants. A significant difference was found between the position variable and the request factor (p:0.041), and the difference was due to the administrative staff, and the average of the administrative staff was found to be higher than the academic staff. High scores indicate that administrative staff is more willing than academic staff in terms of emergency SE. A significant difference was found between the variable of encountering an emergency before and the competency factor (p:0.006) and ETESEC (0.046), and the difference stems from those who stated that they had encountered an emergency before, these people are more competent in terms of emergency SE. No

significance could be determined according to the participants' previous work accident-occupational disease status and the unit they worked in (p>0.05).

Table 4. Comparison of the Scale Mean Scores of the Participants with the Descriptive Features-2

Factors	Age	N	Mean	SD	t	P
Competency Factor	40 and below	190	3,287	0,615	-0,839	0,402
	41 and above	124	3,345	0,585	-0,848	
Desire Factor	40 and below	190	2,72	0,432	1,226	0,221
	41 and above	124	2,66	0,416	1,235	
Interest Factor	40 and below	190	3,537	0,457	312	0,730
	41 and above	124	3,518	0,487	251,169	
ETESEC	40 and below	190	3,258	0,395	-0,243	0,808
	41 and above	124	3,27	0,395	-0,243	
Experience						
Competency Factor	10 years and below	164	3,32	0,63	0,229	0,819
	11 years above	150	3,3	0,57	0,230	
Desire Factor	10 years and below	164	2,73	0,43	1,629	0,104
	11 years above	150	2,66	0,42	1,631	
Interest Factor	10 years and below	164	3,58	0,45	1,918	0,056
	11 years above	150	3,48	0,49	1,910	
ETESEC	10 years and below	164	3,28	0,41	0,997	0,320
	11 years above	150	3,24	0,38	0,999	

When Table 4 is examined, according to the t-test results; no significance could be determined according to the age and experience variables of the participants (p>0.05).

Table 5. Comparison of the Scale Mean Scores of the Participants with the Descriptive Features-3

Factors	Educational Status	N	Mean Rank	x²	p	Significant Difference
Competency Factor	(1) Primary School	8	177,75	6,929	0,327	
	(2) Middle School	12	166,83			
	(3) High School	47	165,69			
	(4) Associate	25	193,84			
	(5) Bachelor's Level	90	153,95			
	(6) Master's	56	153,99			
	(7) Doctorate	76	143,66			
Desire Factor	(1) Primary School	8	130,31	21,021	**0,002**	Between 2 and 7, Between 3 - 4, 5, 6, 7.
	(2) Middle School	12	201,04			
	(3) High School	47	204,73			
	(4) Associate	25	137,50			
	(5) Bachelor's Level	90	151,23			
	(6) Master's	56	154,89			
	(7) Doctorate	76	140,20			
Interest Factor	(1) Primary School	8	180,38	4,677	0,586	
	(2) Middle School	12	147,04			
	(3) High School	47	177,32			
	(4) Associate	25	167,24			
	(5) Bachelor's Level	90	155,49			
	(6) Master's	56	153,88			
	(7) Doctorate	76	146,33			
ETESEC	(1) Primary School	8	170,00	11,118	0,085	
	(2) Middle School	12	163,33			
	(3) High School	47	186,93			
	(4) Associate	25	187,76			
	(5) Bachelor's Level	90	149,27			
	(6) Master's	56	149,47			
	(7) Doctorate	76	142,78			

When Table 5 is examined, a significance was determined between the education variable and the desire factor according to the Kruskal Wallis test result (p:0.002) and pairwise comparisons were applied with the Mann Whitney U test to determine this difference. For the request factor; Between secondary school graduates and doctoral graduates (p<0.048 u:295,000), between high school graduates and associate degree (p<0.004 u:344,000), between high school graduates and undergraduate graduates (p<0.001 u: 1367,500), between high school graduates A difference was found between master's graduates (p<0.003 u:878,000) and between high school graduates and doctoral graduates (p<0.000 u:1043,500).

Table 6. Identification of Suitable Personnel for ET's

Total number of participants	314	Number of personnel eligible for ET's
Stage 1: Not getting enough points from the request factor	*89*	*225*
Stage 2: 10-11-12-13. giving unsolicited answers to questions	*135*	*90*
Stage 3: Not getting enough points from the Competency Factor	*3*	*87*
Stage 4: Not getting enough points from the interest factor	*1*	***86***

There are 4 stages for personnel who can be selected for ET's.

In the 1st and 2nd stages, the demand factor was evaluated. When the answers given to the request factor are scored, the lowest 6 and the highest 30 points can be obtained. 10-11-12-13, which are questions with a score between 18-30 points from the specified score range and reverse-oriented questions. It is recommended that participants who give one of the answers "strongly agree-agree-decided" should not be selected for the ET's. The data form of 89 participants for the 1st stage and 135 for the 2nd stage under the specified conditions was eliminated due to these conditions.

In the third stage, the competence factor was evaluated. When the answers given to the competence factor are scored, the lowest 9 and the highest 45 points can be obtained. It is recommended that those who score between 9-18 from the specified score range should not be selected for ET's. When the answers given to the competency factor were examined, it was determined that the competency factor score of 3 participants was 18 points and below, and these people were not competent to choose ET's.

In stage 4, the factor of interest was evaluated. When the answers given to the interest factor are scored, the lowest 8 and the highest 16 points can be obtained. It is recommended that those who score between 8-10 points from the specified score range should not be selected for ET's. When the answers given to the interest factor were examined, it was determined that 1 participant's interest factor score was 10 points or less and these people were not related to the ET's.

According to the developers of the scale, the main distinguishing factor for selection for ET membership is the desire factor. It is recommended to evaluate the other factors after the primary factor of the scale is evaluated (Yalçın, 2018). For this reason, 4 stages were created for selection to ET membership, and according to the evaluation, it was determined that 86 (27.39%) out of 314 participants filled the scale at the public university where the research was carried out were suitable for ET membership.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

This study, which was carried out to determine the eligibility of the personnel participating in the research at a public university in the Black Sea region to be elected as a member of ET; The total mean score of the participants from ETESEC was determined as 3.26±0.39. As a general comment, the scale average score is high.

While 64.6% (n:203) of the participants were men, 35.4% (n:111) were women. While the participation rate of men was found to be higher in the studies conducted by Çetin (2020) and Yalçın (2018) on the same scale, the participation rate of women is higher in the study of Demirtaş (2020). The high male frequency of the participants in this study can be attributed to the fact that male employees at the university want to be included in the study with a higher frequency.

The mean age of the participants in this study was 39.58±8.19. The mean age of the research assistant physicians who participated in the study of Çetin (2020) was found to be 26.6±3.3.

When the four stages created in terms of SE status according to the variables of competence, desire, and interest for the selection of the participants to the ETs were evaluated, the desire factor was evaluated in the 1st and 2nd stages, and 89 and 135 people, respectively, were excluded from the selection of ET because they could not get enough points from this variable. This result is compatible with the views that the demand variable in the scale development study is the variable that should be evaluated primarily because it is the most difficult to change with education and gives the most obvious results in the elimination process (Yalçın, 2018). This result is also compatible with the study of Çetin (2020) in our national literature (13).

The individual's self-belief or self-judgment to successfully perform a certain performance is called SE. As Bandura states, people's levels of SE can vary according to the environment, conditions, type of task, difficulty level of the task, and the level of mastery of the person towards that job (Bandura, 1997). Therefore, the result of the interest factor averages that the personnel participating in the research have the highest average can be explained by their perception and interest in the duties and conditions for ET membership.

If the individual has a high belief in SE, she has a perception that she will be more successful in the activities related to that job (Cassidy and Eachus, 2002). Lee and Ko (2010), in their study on nurses, found that there was a positive relationship between SE perception and performance, while nurses with low SE belief had low performance, and nurses with high SE belief had higher performance. The increase in individual SE provides up to a 31% increase not only in the individual but also in team performance (Biswas, 2008). In this study, team building emphasizes that is important for responding to emergencies, as revealed by the sub-title of request (Yalçın, 2018).

While individuals' doubts about their SE belief may cause them to give up their efforts in the face of difficulties (Sert, 2020), Larson and Luthans (2006) stated that individuals' self-confidence increased and they could act more courageously in difficult tasks thanks to SE. For this reason, it is thought that in cases where the decisive struggle is more important, such as emergencies and disasters, the SE levels of those in charge should be examined with qualitative studies, and measures to increase SE levels should be determined and put into practice.

It has been observed that the mean scores of the scale factors are ordered from the highest to the lowest as interest, competence, and desire factors.

In the study, there was no relationship between SE status for ET membership according to age, experience, unit of work, and occupational accident and occupational disease status of the participants, while a relationship was found between SE status for ET membership according to gender, position, encountering an emergency and education level.

It was determined that 86 of the 314 participants, i.e., 27.39%, of the personnel who were eligible to be selected as ETs among the participants in the research, and that being SE was an important step in the case of being selected as an ET member.

In the determination of those who will take charge in situations where the decisive struggle is more important such as emergencies and disasters;

- Implementation of ETESEC before the elections, if it can be done to weed out the weak ones in terms of a will,
- Increasing the frequency of training given by the university occupational health and safety coordinator and civil defense units to increase the SE status and create general awareness,
- Examining SE levels with qualitative studies and
- It is thought that measures to increase SE levels should be determined and put into practice.
- Since the results of this study represent a limited population, it is recommended to conduct more comprehensive and qualitative studies on SE.

References

Bandura, A., (1997), Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control, New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Biswas, S. N., (2008), "Personality, Generalized Self Efficacy & Team Performance: A Study of Rural Development Teams", Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 44, (2), 234-256.

Cassidy, S. and Eachus, P., (2002), "Developing the Computer Self-efficacy (CSE) Scale: Investigating the Relationship between CSE, Gender and Experience with Computers", Journal of Educational Computing Research, 26(2), 169– 189.

Demirtaş, E. S., (2020), Okullarda Bulunan Acil Durum Ekiplerinin Öz Yeterliliklerinin Değerlendirilmesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gümüşhane Üniversitesi, Gümüşhane.

Çetin, A. M., (2020), Ankara Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Hekim Araştırma Görevlilerinin Acil Durumlara Yaklaşım Özyeterliği, Halk Sağlığı Anabilim Dalı, Tıpta Uzmanlık Tezi, Ankara.

How to Plan for Workplace Emergencies and Evacuations, (2001), U.S. Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Administration, OSHA, 3088.

Kadıoğlu, M., (2011), Afet Yönetimi Bekleyilmeyeni Beklemek, En Kötüsünü Yönetmek. İstanbul: Marmara Belediyeler Birliği Yayını sf:163.

Kırtaş, H. A. ve Altundağ, H., (2019), "İş Yeri Acil Durum Ekiplerinin Eğitimi", İSG Akademik, 1(1), 49-57.

Larson, M. and Luthans, F., (2006), "Potential Added Value of Psychological in Predicting Work Attitudes", Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 13, 44-61.

Lee, T. W. and Ko, Y. K., (2010), "Effects of Self-Efficacy, Affec-tivity and Collective Efficacy on Nursing Performance of Hospital Nurses", Journal of Advanced Nursing, (66), 839-848.

Sert, H. N., (2020), Sosyoekonomik Düzeyi Düşük Yerleşim Bölgelerinden Yaşayan Ergenlerde Çocukluk Çağı Travmaları ve Öz Yeterlik Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çağ Üniversitesi, Mersin.

Regulation on Emergencies at Workplaces, Official Gazette History: 18.06.201, Number of Official Gazette: 28681,
https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/File/GeneratePdf?mevzuatNo=18493&mevzuatTur=KurumVeKurulusYonetmeligi&mevzuatTertip=5, Date of access: 10.11.2021.

Annotated Glossary of Disaster Management Terms, https://www.afad.gov.tr/aciklamali-afet-yonetimi-terimleri-sozlugu, Date of access: 09.04.2021.

First Aid Regulations, Official Gazette History: 29.07.2015, Number of Official Gazette: 29429, https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/mevzuat?MevzuatNo=20992&MevzuatTur=7&MevzuatTertip=5, Date of access: 08.05.2021.

Yalçın, F., (2018), Acil Durumlarda Çalışanların Öz Yeterliliği: Bir Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul.

Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest was declared by the authors.

Researchers' Participation Rates

SAHIN M., who is the responsible author of this study, made the design of the study, performed the literature review, wrote the article, and provided the data collection, statistical analyzes and interpretation of the analyzes of the study. Therefore, the participation rate of SAHIN M. is 80%. VAPUR H., the second author of the study, formed the main concept and idea of the study. Therefore, the contribution rate of VAPUR H. is 20%.