

The Investigation of Self-Efficacy Levels Among Faculty of Sports Students in Terms of Some Variables

Mehmet YILDIRIM¹, Sema USLU²

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38021/asbid.1154749>

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

¹Yozgat Bozok University,
Faculty of Sport Science,
Yozgat/Türkiye

²Master Degree, Sorgun
Public Education Center,
Yozgat/Türkiye

Corresponding Author:
Mehmet YILDIRIM
mehmet2682@hotmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this research; It is the examination of the self-efficacy levels of the Faculty of Sports Sciences students according to some variables. The universe of the research consists of 1096 students studying in different programs at Yozgat Bozok University Faculty of Sport Sciences in the 2022-2023 academic year. The universe of the research consists of 304 students selected on a voluntary basis among 1096 students studying in different programs at Yozgat Bozok University Faculty of Sport Sciences in the 2022-2023 academic year. In the study "Self-Efficacy Scale", which was adapted Turkish by Yıldırım and İlhan (2010) was used to determine the self-efficacy levels of students. In the analysis of the data, descriptive frequency (n), percentage (%), arithmetic mean (\bar{x}) and standard deviation (sd) were used to determine the personal characteristics of the participants. The "Cronbach alpha coefficient" method was used for internal consistency in determining the level of reliability values of the study. In the study, kurtosis and skewness values of the data set were examined and it was determined that the data showed a normal distribution, and parametric tests (t-Test, Anova) were used in statistical analysis. It was determined that the most important one of the sub-dimensions of the self-efficacy scale was the not give up dimension. It has been found that the students' self-efficacy levels are at a high level. There were statistically significant differences between students' self-efficacy levels according to the variables of department, family monthly income level, and still active sports with license.

Keywords: Self-efficacy, Student, Sports

Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Öz Yeterlilik Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi

Öz

Bu araştırmanın amacı; Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi öğrencilerinin öz yeterlilik düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesidir. Araştırmanın evrenini 2022-2023 Eğitim-Öğretim yılında Yozgat Bozok Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Fakültesinde farklı programlarda öğrenim gören 1096 öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın evrenini ise 2022-2023 Eğitim-Öğretim yılında Yozgat Bozok Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Fakültesinde farklı programlarda öğrenim gören 1096 öğrenci içerisinde kolayda örnekleme tekniği ile ve gönüllülük esasına dayalı olarak seçilen 304 öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada öğrencilerin öz yeterlilik düzeylerini belirlemeye yönelik olarak ise Türkçe geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması Yıldırım ve İlhan (2010) tarafından yapılan "Öz Yeterlilik Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde öncelikle katılımcıların kişisel özelliklerini belirlemeye ilişkin betimleyici frekans (n), yüzde (%), aritmetik ortalama (\bar{x}) ve standart sapma (ss) kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın güvenilirlik değerleri düzeyinin saptanmasında ise iç tutarlılık için "Cronbach alpha iç tutarlılık katsayısı" yöntemi uygulanmıştır. Araştırmada veri setinin basıklık ve çarpıklık değerleri incelenmiş ve verilerin normal dağılım sergilediği tespit edilerek, istatistiki analizlerinde parametrik testler (bağımsız örneklem t-testi, tek yönlü Anova) kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada elde edilen sonuçlar incelendiğinde; öz yeterlilik ölçeği alt boyutlarının en önemlisinin yılmama boyutu olduğu belirlenmiştir. Öğrencilerin öz yeterlilik düzeylerinin yüksek seviyede olduğu bulunmuştur. Bölüm, aile aylık gelir düzeyi, lisanslı olarak hala aktif spor yapma durumu değişkenlerine göre öğrencilerin öz yeterlilik düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklar tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Öz yeterlilik, Öğrenci, Spor

Received:
15.03.2023

Accepted:
23.09.2023

Online Publishing:
28.03.2024

Introduction

In today's world, constant and rapid technological developments have brought numerous innovations to educational field recently. Hence, university students, who are about to complete the last chapter of their professional specialization in a given field, are required to be sharp-minded, assertive, enthusiastic and ambitious individuals when competing with each other (Sezer et al., 2006; Altun, 2019). In parallel with this, information production in education displays an unprecedented growth, broadening students' horizon to a large extent (Taşdemir, 2012).

Education is the foundation of technological, social and cultural development in a society (Taşdemir, 2012). While science has considered education as a mental process in the past years, mind and body unity approach gained importance recently (Araç Ilgar and Cihan, 2018). Sports is not only an individual phenomenon but also encompasses all individuals in a society and forms a global structure consisting of many different social and cultural infrastructures. Thus, along with contributing to physical and mental health, it also increases an individual's excitement, willingness, ambition and competitive strength, which eventually improves their personality traits (Yıldırım et al., 2006; Mutlu et al., 2014; Ekici et al., 2011). One of the decisive factors which affect an individual's academic success is a student's general perception of self-sufficiency regarding a certain department (Taşdemir, 2012). Practical and theoretical knowledge in an educational process bear utmost importance for personal, social and emotional development. Similarly, one of the foremost tasks for modern universities is to educate analytical, creative, objective, solution-oriented and productive individuals with critical thinking and problem-solving skills (Altun, 2019; Aydın, 2011).

Based on social learning theory, the concept of self-efficacy was first introduced by Bandura (1977) (Hamurcu, 2006; Özçelik and Kurt, 2007). Self-efficacy is defined as the sum of an individual's beliefs and values which affect the way they control and achieve certain actions to overcome existing problems when carrying out a certain task (Gürcan, 2005; Chen et al., 2001; Zimmerman, 2000; Çubukçu and Girmen, 2007; Turan et al., 2016; Koballa and Crawley 1985). In other words, self-efficacy can be defined as an individual's personal ability to reveal and organize various personal skills successfully and display a certain performance in a task (Azar, 2010; Aksoy and Diken, 2009; Ekici et al., 2007; Aliyev, 2016; Griffin, 1998). Thanks to an internal belief of self-efficacy, individuals can be aware of their skills and transformation of these skills into success (Luszczynska et al., 2005). In this respect, self-efficacy can be considered as an individual's belief in their personality and skills (Karademir, 2010; Yıldırım and İlhan, 2010; Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy often emerges in an individual's reactions to and behaviors against a certain problem, thus uncovering their opinions and feelings in their following actions (Gül and Adıgüzel, 2015). Individuals who possess sufficient abilities with a low level of self-efficacy usually encounter problems in realizing

their potential and thus suffer from negative feelings such as anxiety, helplessness or depression. On the other hand, individuals with a high level of self-efficacy often display a more self-assured, assertive, active, relaxed and strong attitude towards challenging situations, which eventually help them fully benefit from their personal skills (Gül and Adıgüzel, 2015; Kaptan and Korkmaz, 2001; Bozdağ, 2020; Senemoğlu, 2004; Bandura, 1997; Bray, 2004; Gibson, 1999; Gibson, Randel and Early, 2000; Guzzo et al., 1993; Myers et al., 2004; Shea and Guzzo, 1987; Aydın, 2011; Karaç Öcal, Toros and Öztürk, 2020).

Self-efficacy greatly contributes to and improves an individual's learning abilities within time (Altun, 2019). Therefore, it is considered to affect all members of a society in different aspects and at different levels. It is undeniable that students at a faculty of sports must possess a high level of self-efficacy in order to fulfill their potential in terms of their learning performance and benefiting from their theoretical and practical knowledge. In this respect, the present study aims to analyze faculty of sports students' levels of self-efficacy in terms of different variables. Main research questions of the present study are as follows:

Are there any statistically significant differences between the students' self-efficacy scale sub-dimension and mean total scale scores in terms of: gender, department, grade level, monthly family income, father's level of education, mother's level of education, sports branch, years of sports experience, and being an active licensed athlete?

Materials and Methods

This section describes research model, the population and sample of the present study, data collection process and methods, and data analysis.

Research Model

Survey model has been used in the research. Descriptive statistics have been included.

The Population and Sample of the Study

The population of the present study consisted of 1096 students who studied at different departments at Faculty of Sports Sciences at Yozgat Bozok University during 2022-2023 academic year. The sample of the study consisted of 304 students selected from the population on a voluntary basis using convenience sampling method.

Data Collection Tools

The survey used in the present study entails two different parts. The first part is a demographic information form which collects data about the participants' personal and socio-economic features,

while the second part benefits from a “The Self-Efficacy Scale” developed by Sherer et al. (1982). The scale was later adapted to Turkish by Yıldırım and İlhan (2010) for validity and reliability tests.

The Self-Efficacy Scale

The scale which was adapted to Turkish by Yıldırım and İlhan (2010) uses a 5-point Likert scale (1-Never, 2-Rarely, 3-Sometimes, 4-Often, and 5-Always). Minimum and maximum scale scores vary between 17 and 85, and a higher participant score points to a higher level of self-efficacy. Item 2-4-5-6-7-10-11-12-14-16-17 are reverse-scored items. The self-efficacy scale consists of three dimensions: initiative (9 items), effort (5 items) and persistence (3 items). The total reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as .80.

The present study measured the total Cronbach alpha value of the scale as .87. While, according to Özdamar (1999), a Cronbach alpha value higher than .60 is sufficient for a reliable scale, Kalaycı (2010) argues that Cronbach alpha values must be higher than .80 for a highly reliable scale. Therefore, the self-efficacy scale used in the present study meets the reliability criteria.

Data Analysis

The obtained data were analyzed using SPSS 20.0 package program. Prior to the statistical analysis of the participants’ data, it is of vital importance to prepare them for a detailed analysis. In this respect, it is particularly important to pay attention to kurtosis and skewness coefficients (Şimşek, 2007). A kurtosis and skewness value lower than 3 and 10, respectively, is an indication of a normal data distribution (Kline, 2016). In the present study, the kurtosis and skewness values varied between -0.083/-0.825 and 0.047/-0.670, respectively, indicating that the obtained data displayed a normal distribution. As a result, parametric tests were used for statistical analysis.

In the present study, frequency analysis was used to describe the participants’ demographic features. Later, t test and ANOVA were used to analyze differences between the participants’ self-efficacy scale sub-dimension and mean total scale scores. Finally, multiple comparison tests (Tukey and Tamhane) were used depending on the variance homogeneity. The statistical significance level was taken as 0.05 for all these tests.

Ethics of Research

During the current research, “Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive” has been acted upon.”

Findings

The participants’ demographic data are given in detail in Table 1.

Tablo 1

The Participants' Demographic Data

		N	%
Gender	Female	129	42.4
	Male	175	57.6
Department	Physical Education and Sports Teaching	80	26.3
	Coaching Education	101	33.2
	Sports Management	123	40.5
Grade level	Freshman	117	38.5
	Sophomore	82	27.0
	Junior	47	15.5
	Senior	58	19.0
Monthly family income	Low	32	10.5
	Middle	221	72.7
	High	51	16.8
Mother's level of education	Illiterate	31	10.2
	Primary school	162	53.3
	Middle school	52	17.1
	High school	46	15.3
	University	13	4.1
Father's level of education	Illiterate	12	3.9
	Primary school	115	37.8
	Middle school	69	22.7
	High school	81	26.7
	University	27	8.9
Sports branch	Individual sports	155	51.0
	Team sports	149	49.0
Years of sports experience	Less than a year	48	15.8
	1-3 year(s)	67	22.0
	4-6 years	70	23.0
	7 years or more	119	39.2
Being an active licensed athlete	Yes	95	31.3
	No	209	68.7

It can be seen in Table 1 that 129 (42.4%) participants were female, while 175 (57.6%) of them were male. 80 (26.3%) participants studied at the department of physical education and sports teaching, 101 of them (33.2%) studied coaching education and, finally, 123 (40.5%) of them studied sports management. The numbers of freshman, sophomore, junior and senior students were 117 (38.5%), 82 (27.0%), 47 (15.5%) and 58 (19.1%), respectively. While 32 (10.5%) participants' families had a poor income, 221 (72.7%) of them come from middle-income families. Only 51 (16.8%) participants had a family with a higher income. The participants' mothers' level of education also varied, as 31 (10.2%) of them were illiterate, 162 (53.3%) of them were primary school graduates, 52 (17.1%) of them were middle school graduates, 46 (15.3%) of them were high school graduates, and 13 (4.3%) of them were university graduates. Similarly, as for their fathers' level of education, 12 (3.9%) of them were illiterate, 115 (37.8%) were primary school graduates, 69 (22.7%) of them were middle school graduates, 81 (26.6%) of them were high school graduates, and 27 (8.9%) were university graduates. 155 (51.0%) participants were engaged in individual sports, whereas 149

(49.0%) of them were engaged in team sports. The participants' years of sports experience also varied, as 48 (15.8%) of them had less than a year of experience, while 67 (22.0%) of them had a sports experience of 1-3 year(s), 70 (23.0%) had 4-6 years of experience, and 119 (39.1%) of them had seven years of experience or more. While 95 (31.3%) participants were active licensed athletes, 209 (68.8%) of them were not.

The findings related to self-efficacy scale mean sub-dimension and total scores are given in Table 2.

Table 2

Self-Efficacy Scale Mean Sub-Dimension and Total Scores

	N	Min	Max	\bar{x}	Sd
Initiative	304	1.00	5.00	3.98	.74
Effort	304	1.20	5.00	3.99	.72
Persistence	304	1.33	5.00	3.64	.78
Total	304	29.00	85.00	66.79	10.79

It can be seen in Table 2 that the most significant self-efficacy scale sub-dimension was effort. It was also observed that the participants' levels of self-efficacy were high (\bar{x} = 66.79).

T test results are given in Table 3.

Table 3

t Test Findings

	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	t	p
Initiative	Female	129	3.93	.75	-1.104	.270
	Male	175	4.02	.74		
Effort	Female	129	3.91	.77	-1.681	.094
	Male	175	4.05	.68		
Persistence	Female	129	3.56	.75	-1.600	.111
	Male	175	3.70	.80		
Total	Female	129	65.64	11.27	-1.602	.110
	Male	175	67.64	10.38		
	Sports Branch	N	Mean	Sd	t	p
Initiative	Individual	155	4.06	.71	1.911	.057
	Team	149	3.90	.77		
Effort	Individual	155	4.06	.70	.254	.789
	Team	149	3.98	.74		
Persistence	Individual	155	3.62	.76	-.478	.633
	Team	149	3.66	.81		
Total	Individual	155	67.50	10.55	1.165	.245
	Team	149	66.06	11.03		
	Licensed Athlete	N	Mean	Sd	t	P
Initiative	Yes	95	3.95	.83	-.444	.657
	No	209	3.99	.70		
Effort	Yes	95	4.09	.77	1.532	.126
	No	209	3.95	.70		

Persistence	Yes	95	3.85	.79	3.183	.002
	No	209	3.55	.76		
Total	Yes	95	67.64	11.83	.921	.358
	No	209	66.41	10.29		

According to Table 3, there were no statistically significant differences between self-efficacy scale mean sub-dimension and total scores in terms of gender and sports branch. However, as for being an active licensed athlete, a statistically significant difference was found in persistence sub-dimension in favor of those who were active licensed athletes.

ANOVA findings in terms of the participants’ departments are given in Table 4.

Table 4

ANOVA Findings in Terms of The Participants’ Departments

	Group	N	\bar{x}	Sd		df	F	p	Difference
Initiative	Phy. Ed. Teaching	80	3.98	.84	A.G	2	.100	.905	-
	Coaching Education	101	3.96	.67	W.G	301			
	Sports Management	123	4.00	.73	Total	303			
Effort	Phy. Ed. Teaching	80	3.95	.83	A.G	2	.520	.595	-
	Coaching Education	101	3.96	.71	W.G	301			
	Sports Management	123	4.04	.66	Total	303			
Persistence	Phy. Ed. Teaching	80	3.59	.82	A.G	2	3.630	.028	Management > Coaching
	Coaching Education	101	3.51	.77	W.G	301			
	Sports Management	123	3.78	.74	Total	303			
Total	Phy. Ed. Teaching	80	66.41	12.75	A.G	2	.683	.683	-
	Coaching Education	101	66.04	10.40	W.G	301			
	Sports Management	123	67.65	9.70	Total	303			

Table 4 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in persistence sub-dimension in terms of the participants’ departments. It was observed that the participants studying sports management had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to those studying coaching education.

ANOVA findings in terms of the participants’ grade levels are given in Table 5.

Table 5

ANOVA Findings in Terms of The Participants' Grade Levels

	Group	N	\bar{x}	Sd		df	F	p	Difference
Initiative	Freshman	117	4.03	.79	A.G	3	1.824	.143	-
	Sophomore	82	3.99	.64	W.G	300			
	Junior	47	4.10	.67	Total	303			
	Senior	58	3.79	.81					
Effort	Freshman	117	3.97	.73	A.G	3	1.532	.206	-
	Sophomore	82	4.05	.70	W.G	300			
	Junior	47	4.13	.71	Total	303			
	Senior	58	3.85	.73					
Persistence	Freshman	117	3.74	.83	A.G	3	2.204	.088	-
	Sophomore	82	3.67	.74	W.G	300			
	Junior	47	3.61	.74	Total	303			
	Senior	58	3.43	.72					
Total	Freshman	117	67.38	11.24	A.G	3	2.139	.095	-
	Sophomore	82	67.21	9.85	W.G	300			
	Junior	47	63.68	10.48	Total	303			
	Senior	58	66.71	11.06					

Table 5 demonstrates that there were no statistically significant differences between self-efficacy scale mean sub-dimension and total scores in terms of the participants' grade levels.

ANOVA findings in terms of the participants' monthly family income are given in Table 6.

Table 6

ANOVA Findings in Terms of The Participants' Monthly Family Income

	Group	N	\bar{x}	Sd		df	F	p	Significant Difference
Initiative	Low	32	3.55	.90	A.G	2	9.283	.000	High > Middle, Low
	Middle	221	3.98	.71	W.G	301			
	High	51	4.26	.62	Total	303			
Effort	Low	32	3.81	.91	A.G	2	3.472	.032	High > Low
	Middle	221	3.97	.71	W.G	301			
	High	51	4.21	.59	Total	303			
Persistence	Low	32	3.55	.72	A.G	2	.646	.525	-
	Middle	221	3.63	.78	W.G	301			
	High	51	3.74	.83	Total	303			
Total	Low	32	61.75	13.43	A.G	2	7.069	.001	High > Middle, Low
	Middle	221	66.63	10.38	W.G	301			
	High	51	70.66	9.40	Total	303			

According to Table 6, some statistically significant differences were observed between mean initiative and effort sub-dimension scores and total scale scores in terms of the participants' monthly family income. In the initiative sub-dimension, it was found that the participants who had a high-income family had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to those who had a middle- and low-income family and that the participants who had a middle-income family had a higher level of self-

efficacy compared to those who had a low-income family. Similarly, in the effort sub-dimension, the participants who had a high-income family had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to those who had a low-income family. Finally, in terms of mean total scale scores, the participants who had a high-income family had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to those who had a middle- and low-income family, and, in a similar vein, the participants who had a middle-income family had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to those who had a low-income family.

ANOVA findings in terms of the participants’ mothers’ level of education are given in Table 7.

Table 7

ANOVA Findings in Terms of The Participants’ Mothers’ Level of Education

	Group	N	\bar{x}	Sd		df	F	p	Difference
Initiative	Illiterate	31	4.05	.77	A.G	4	.996	.410	-
	Primary school	162	3.99	.70	W.G	299			
	Middle school	52	3.85	.80	Total	303			
	High school	46	3.95	.75					
	University	13	4.28	.86					
Effort	Illiterate	31	3.94	.77	A.G	4	.985	.416	-
	Primary school	162	4.01	.78	W.G	299			
	Middle school	52	3.87	.65	Total	303			
	High school	46	4.02	.58					
	University	13	4.29	.64					
Persistence	Illiterate	31	3.66	.84	A.G	4	.367	.832	-
	Primary school	162	3.66	.74	W.G	299			
	Middle school	52	3.64	.89	Total	303			
	High school	46	3.52	.73					
	University	13	3.76	.86					
Total	Illiterate	31	67.22	11.54	A.G	4	.980	.419	-
	Primary school	162	67.06	10.75	W.G	299			
	Middle school	52	65.01	10.96	Total	303			
	High school	46	66.30	9.92					
	University	13	71.30	11.83					

It can be seen in Table 7 that no statistically significant differences were found between self-efficacy scale mean sub-dimension and total scores in terms of the participants’ mothers’ level of education.

ANOVA findings in terms of the participants’ fathers’ level of education are given in Table 8.

Table 8

ANOVA Findings in Terms of The Participants’ Fathers’ Level of Education

	Group	N	\bar{x}	Sd		df	F	p	Difference
	Illiterate	12	3.68	1.10	A.G	4	1.823	.124	-

Initiative	Primary school	115	4.02	.71	W.G	299			
	Middle school	69	4.06	.63	Total	303			
	High school	81	3.85	.76					
	University	27	4.16	.84					
Effort	Illiterate	12	3.71	.97	A.G	4	1.494	.204	-
	Primary school	115	4.04	.70	W.G	299			
	Middle school	69	4.01	.55	Total	303			
	High school	81	3.88	.83					
Persistence	University	27	4.17	.69					
	Illiterate	12	3.50	.83	A.G	4	1.374	.243	-
	Primary school	115	3.74	.74	W.G	299			
	Middle school	69	3.59	.73	Total	303			
Total	High school	81	3.52	.84					
	University	27	3.80	.83					
	Illiterate	12	62.25	15.64	A.G	4	2.122	.078	-
	Primary school	115	67.66	10.02	W.G	299			
	Middle school	69	67.49	9.77	Total	303			
	High school	81	64.65	11.86					
	University	27	69.74	11.94					

It is evident in Table 8 that there were no statistically significant differences between self-efficacy scale mean sub-dimension and total scores in terms of the participants' fathers' level of education.

ANOVA findings in terms of the participants' years of sports experience are given in Table 9.

Table 9

ANOVA Findings in Terms of The Participants' Years of Sports Experience

	Group	N	\bar{x}	Sd	df	F	p	Difference	
Initiative	Less than a year	48	3.95	.67	A.G	3	.715	.544	-
	1-3 year(s)	67	3.88	.70	W.G	300			
	4-6 years	70	4.03	.67	Total	303			
	7 years or more	119	4.02	.83					
Effort	Less than a year	48	3.84	.84	A.G	3	1.342	.261	-
	1-3 year(s)	67	3.94	.72	W.G	300			
	4-6 years	70	4.00	.63	Total	303			
	7 years or more	119	4.07	.71					
Persistence	Less than a year	48	3.57	.87	A.G	3	.829	.479	-
	1-3 year(s)	67	3.56	.75	W.G	300			
	4-6 years	70	3.62	.73	Total	303			
	7 years or more	119	3.73	.79					
Total	Less than a year	48	65.52	11.70	A.G	3	1.022	.383	-
	1-3 year(s)	67	65.37	10.32	W.G	300			
	4-6 years	70	67.27	9.44	Total	303			
	7 years or more	119	67.83	11.40					

As seen in Table 9, no statistically significant differences were observed between self-efficacy scale mean sub-dimension and total scores in terms of the participants' years of sports experience.

Discussion and Conclusion

The study findings clearly demonstrated that effort was the most significant self-efficacy scale sub-dimension and that the participants' levels of self-efficacy were high (\bar{x} = 66.79).

No statistically significant differences were observed between the participants' self-efficacy scale mean sub-dimension and total scores in terms of gender and sports branch. However, a statistically significant difference was found in persistence sub-dimension in favor of those who were active licensed athletes. As can be seen, female and male participants' self-efficacy scale scores did not display any statistically significant differences. Therefore, it can be stated that both female and male participants enjoyed their lives and lived comfortably when compared with each other.

Altun (2019) did not observe any statistically significant differences in terms of gender. Similarly, Turan, Karaoğlu, Kaynak and Pepe (2016) did not report any statistically significant differences in a study on faculty of physical education and sports students. In addition, Yenice (2012); Yıldırım and İlhan (2010); Şensoy and Aydoğdu, (2008); Uysal and Kösemen (2013); Hodges and Carron (1992); Aydın (2011); Pekel (2016); Zeldin and Pajares (2000); Shyu and Huang (1999); Gülşen (2016); Buğdaycı (2018); Gürol, Altunbaş and Karaaslan (2010); Seçkin and Başbay (2013); Köksal (2008); Yakut (2018); Telef and Karaca (2011); Canpolat and Çetinkalp (2011); Bozkurt (2014); Uysal (2013); Çikrikci (2012); Kıvılcım (2014); Gün and Büyükgöze (2015); Yokuş and Yürüdü (2015); Duman (2018); Toklu (2010); Varol (2007); Alkan (2018); Özkatar Kaya (2018); Kuşcu (2021); Orhan (2019); Turan et al. (2016); Böke, Kartal and Doğan (2019); Kazanoğlu (2019); Kantarcıoğlu (2018) and Milner and Woolfolk-Hoy (2003) did not find any statistically significant differences between the participants' levels of self-efficacy in terms of gender. Thus, the findings of the present study overlap with the findings of the studies mentioned above.

In the existing literature, there are also some studies which report statistically significant results in terms of gender as a variable. For instance, Aypay (2010), Creed and Patton, (2003), and Britner and Pajares (2006) observed that females' self-efficacy scale scores were higher compared to males. On the other hand, Yıldızçiçek (2019) stated that males' levels of self-efficacy were higher compared to females. As a result, the findings of these studies contradict with the findings of the present study.

It was also found in the present study that being engaged in an individual or team sports branch was not a decisive factor for the participants' levels of self-efficacy.

Buğdaycı (2018), Hodges and Carron (1992), Turan et al. (2016), Kantarcioğlu (2018) and Gülşen (2016) analyzed their participants' levels of self-efficacy in terms of their sports branches and did not observe any statistically significant differences between the participants' mean scale scores when it comes to being engaged in a team or individual sports. While these findings overlap with those of the present study, Dinç (2011) indicated that the participants engaged in team sports had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to those engaged in individual sports, thus differing from the findings of the present study. In the study of Yarımkaya et al., (2015), which aimed to investigate the depression levels of children aged 13-17, it was stated that the sports activities performed by the application group made a significant difference in the depression levels of the children.

It can be argued that the participants who are active and licensed athletes gain valuable experience in different stressful environments such as competitive games and tournament camps and become more confident and overcome stressful situations on their own, which contributes to their levels of self-efficacy.

Kazanoğlu (2019) conducted a study on the licensed athletes' levels of self-efficacy and found a statistically significant difference between licensed and unlicensed athletes, as the former had higher self-efficacy scale scores. Likewise, Yıldız (2017) and Yıldızçiçek (2019) demonstrated that the participants' levels of self-efficacy displayed statistically significant differences in terms of being a licensed athlete. These studies overlap with the findings of the present study.

The present study found a statistically significant difference in persistence sub-dimension in terms of the participants' departments, as the participants studying sports management had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to those studying coaching education.

It can be considered likely that students at the department of sports management maintain a more assertive and positive attitude when they focus on a new task in their lives and attempt vigorously to realize their future plans or, similarly, force themselves to put an end to any problems which bother them. Therefore, these attitudes help them possess a higher level of self-efficacy compared to the students at the department of coaching education.

Alkan (2018) observed that students at the department of coaching education are more persistent in a given task and thus make more attempts to fulfill it compared to students at the department of physical education and sports teaching. However, it was also found that the latter had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to the students at the department of coaching education. In effect, the findings of this study overlap with the findings of the present study. Similarly, Yenice (2012) too reported various findings which support those of the present study.

Varol (2007) and Altun (2019) reported that students at the department of physical education and sports teaching had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to those at the department of sports management. Orhan (2019), similarly, observed a statistically significant difference between the departments of teaching and management.

Uysal (2013) and Uysal and Kösemen (2013), on the other hand, did not find any statistically significant differences among different departments, which contradicts with the findings of the present study.

No statistically significant differences were observed between self-efficacy scale mean sub-dimension and total scores in terms of the participants' grade levels. It can be argued that students' experiences, knowledge accumulation, motivation and productive skills during each year of their university education do not significantly affect their levels of self-efficacy. Thus, students usually perform their learning tasks thanks to their active participation in applied and theoretical courses at the university.

Özkatar Kaya (2018), Alkan (2018), Berkant and Ekici (2007), Kuşcu (2021), Tekkurşun (2015), Tekeli (2017), Kazanoğlu (2019), Yenice (2012) and Uysal and Kösemen (2013) did not find any statistically significant differences among students' levels of self-efficacy in terms of their grade level, thus overlapping with the findings of the present study.

However, Altun (2019) found that senior students had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to freshman, sophomore and junior students. Similarly, Öncü (2012), Küçük Kılıç and Öncü (2013), Oğuz Oğuz (2009), Altunçekiç et al., (2005), Özenoğlu (2006) and Oğuz (2012) reported in their respective studies that a higher grade level was directly proportional to a higher level of self-efficacy. Ünlü and Kalemoglu (2011) and Durdukoca (2010) carried out a study on the students' levels of academic self-efficacy and found a statistically significant difference in favor of freshman students. In a similar vein, Pekel (2016) reported a statistically significant difference among the participants' academic self-efficacy scores. The findings of these studies differ from the findings of the present study.

In the present study, some statistically significant differences were found between initiative and effort sub-dimension mean scores and total scale scores in terms of the participants' monthly family income. For example, in the initiative sub-dimension, the participants coming from a high-income family had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to those coming from a middle- and low-income family. Similarly, the participants coming from a middle-income family had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to those coming from a low-income family. In the effort sub-dimension, the participants coming from a high-income family had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to those

coming a low-income family. As far as mean total scale scores are concerned, it was found that the participants coming from a high-income family had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to those coming from a middle- and low-income family, just as the participants coming from a middle-income family had a higher level of self-efficacy compared to those coming from a low-income family. In general, a directly proportional relationship can be established between a participant's monthly family income and level of self-efficacy. In other words, students with a higher income often feel more themselves confident and self-efficacious. As a result, they do not avoid facing challenges, overcome their problems effectively, do not give up easily, and persist in a given task, all of which contributed to their high levels of self-efficacy.

Vardarlı (2005), Kayhan Yardımcı (2007), Biçer (2009) and Özkan (2019), Sakarya (2013), Balyan (2009), Çelik (2013) and Aydiner (2011) also underlined the importance of economic status of a family for a positive level of self-efficacy, which overlaps with the findings of the present study.

Böke at al., (2019), Yıldırım (2018) and Alkan (2018) did not observe any statistically significant differences between the students' monthly family incomes and levels of self-efficacy. However, Kantarcıoğlu (2018) found a statistically significant difference between the participants' monthly incomes and levels of self-efficacy. Unlike Kantarcıoğlu (2018), Kumar and Lal (2006), Ceylan (2013), Yazıcı (2015), Yakut (2018) and Telef and Karaca (2011) did not report any statistically significant differences between the participants' monthly family incomes and levels of self-efficacy. Thus, the findings of these studies contradict with the findings of the present study.

The present study did not observe any statistically significant differences between self-efficacy scale mean sub-dimension and total scores in terms of mother's and father's level of education. Therefore, it can be suggested that parents' level of education is not a decisive factor for the students' levels of self-efficacy.

Duman (2018) reported a statistically significant difference between mother's and father's level of education in terms of their effect on the participants' level of self-efficacy, which contradicts with the findings of the present study. In addition, no other studies overlapping with the findings of the present study were found in the current literature.

In the present study, no statistically significant differences were found between self-efficacy scale mean sub-dimension and total scale scores in terms of the participants' years of sports experience. Given that an athlete's years of sports experience defines their sportive past and experiences, it seems likely that the students participating in the present study do not feel it necessary to prepare themselves and reach success in their own branches as they can easily find required

information through different means of technology, which makes years of sports experience an insignificant factor for their levels of self-efficacy.

Toklu (2010) did not find any statistically significant differences among different coaches' years of tennis playing experience, which overlaps with the findings of the present study.

It can be concluded that demographic features lead to various differences in the students' levels of self-efficacy. In today's world, the world of education witnesses massive changes, which also affect and transform university students inevitably. Young individuals comprises the new generation which is expected to keep up with the ongoing changes in the society and thus shape and restructure its future. It is of vital importance for them to gain self-efficacy and self-confidence in every aspect and believe in their strength as an individual. In this respect, one of the foremost duties of a society is to provide young people with activities which will improve their levels of self-efficacy and bring them experiences. Therefore, the present study and various other studies in the existing literature offer important findings for this purpose.

In line with the findings of the present study, the following recommendations can be made for future studies on this topic:

- The present study was conducted on the students studying at different departments of Faculty of Sports Sciences at Yozgat Bozok University. Future studies may broaden the population and sample of the study to compare their findings with those of the present study.

- Students should be given the right to make their own choices and express their opinions in order to become more comfortable in their own educational environments.

- Students should be encouraged to participate in a number of varying sports events and organizations about the importance of self-efficacy in order to measure and improve their levels of self-efficacy at an early age.

- Students should participate in detailed surveys in order to explore their views on individual self-efficacy.

- Students should be offered different types of sports events which will contribute to their self-efficacy.

- Students should be encouraged to participate in different events which will contribute to their self-efficacy at their own university departments.

- The findings of the present study should be shared with all students at Faculty of Sports Sciences and thus help them identify their own shortcomings within the framework of the present study.

Ethics Committee Permission Information

Ethics review board: Yozgat Bozok University Ethics Committee

Date of ethics assessment document: 22.02.2023

Issue number of the ethics evaluation document: E-45513789-770-126746

Statement of Researchers' Contribution Rates

Both authors contributed equally at all stages of the research.

References

- Aksoy, V., & Diken, İ. H. (2009). Rehber öğretmen özel eğitim öz yeterlik ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 10(1), 29-42. doi: 10.1501/Ozlegt_0000000131
- Aliyev, R. (2016). *Sosyal bilişsel öğrenme, Eğitim Psikolojisi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Alkan, İ. (2018). *Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin engellilere yönelik tutumlarının öz yeterlilikleri açısından incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hatay Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Hatay.
- Altun, M. (2019). *Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu'nda öğrenim gören öğrenciler ile diğer fakültelerde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin genel öz-yeterliliklerinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Bartın Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bartın.
- Altunçekiç, A., Yaman, S., & Koray, Ö. (2005). Öğretmen adaylarının öz-yeterlik inanç düzeyleri ve problem çözme becerileri üzerine bir araştırma (Kastamonu ili örneği). *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 13(1), 93-102.
- Araç Ilgar, E., & Cihan, B. B. (2018). Metaphoric Perceptions of School Principals towards Physical Education Term. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 7(5), 194-205. doi:10.5430/ijhe.v7n5p194
- Aydiner, B. B. (2011). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşam amaçlarının alt boyutlarının genel öz-yeterlik yaşam doyumu ve çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sakarya.
- Aypay, A. (2010). Genel öz-yeterlik ölçeğinin (GÖYÖ) Türkçe'ye uyarlama çalışması. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(2), 113-131.
- Azar, A. (2010). Ortaöğretim fen bilimleri ve matematik öğretmen adaylarının öz yeterlilik inançları. *Zonguldak Karaelmas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(12), 235-252.
- Balyan, M. (2009). *İlköğretim 2.kademe ve ortaöğretim kurumlarındaki öğrencilerin beden eğitimi dersine yönelik tutumları, sosyal beceri ve öz yeterlik düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması*. Doktora Tezi, Ege Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191–215.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman Company.
- Berkant, H. G., & Ekici, G., (2007). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının fen öğretiminde öğretmen öz-yeterlik inanç düzeyleri ile zeka türleri arasındaki ilişkinin değerlendirilmesi. *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(16), 113-132.
- Biçer, E. (2009). *Parçalanmış ve tam aileye sahip ergenlerin atılmanlık ve sosyal yetkinlik beklenti düzeylerinin bazı demografik değişkenler açısından incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

- Bozdağ, B. (2020). Examination of psychological resilience levels of high school students. *World Journal of Education*, 10(3), 65-78. doi:10.5430/wje.v10n3p65
- Bozkurt, Ş. (2014). *Okul sporlarına katılan öğrencilerin katılım motivasyonu, başarı algısı ve öz yeterliliklerinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Antalya.
- Böke, H., Kartal, M., & Doğan, A. (2019). Gençlik merkezine devam eden bireylerin öz yeterlik düzeylerinin araştırılması. *Journal of Global Sports and Education Research*, 2(1), 35-44.
- Bray, S. (2004). Collective efficacy, Group goals and group performance of a muscular endurance task. *Small Group Research*, 35(2), 230-238. doi: 10.1177/1046496403260531
- Britner, S. L., & Pajares, F. (2006). Sources of science self-efficacy beliefs of middle school students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 43(5), 485-499. doi: 10.1002/tea.20131
- Buğdaycı, S. (2018). *Antrenörlerin iletişim becerileri ile öz yeterliliklerinin incelenmesi*. Doktora Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Canpolat, A. M., & Çetinkalp, Z. K. (2011). İlköğretim II. kademe öğrenci-sporcuların başarı algısı ve öz yeterlilik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilim Dergisi*, 13(1), 14-19.
- Ceylan, İ. (2013). *Ergenlerin benlik saygısı ve duygusal öz-yeterlik düzeylerinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, İzmir.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62-83. doi: 10.1177/109442810141004
- Creed, P. A., & Patton, W. (2003). Predicting two components of career maturity in school based adolescents. *Journal of Career Development*, 29(4), 277-290.
- Çelik, D. (2013). *Üstün zekalı olan ve olmayan öğrencilerin mükemmeliyetçilik ve akademik öz yeterlikleri arasındaki ilişki*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Çikrıkci, Ö. (2012). *Üstün yetenekli öğrencilerin biliş ötesi farkındalık düzeyleri ile öz yeterlik algılarının yaşam doyumunu yordama gücü*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Trabzon.
- Çubukçu, Z., & Girmen, P. (2007). Öğretmen adaylarının sosyal öz-yeterlik algılarının belirlenmesi. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(1)
- Diñç, Z. (2011). Social self-efficacy of adolescent who participate in individual and team sports. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 39(10), 1417-1424. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2011.39.10.1417
- Duman, T. (2018). *Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumları ve akademik öz yeterlilik düzeylerinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hitit Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Çorum.
- Durdukoca, F. S. (2010). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının akademik öz yeterlik algılarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 10(1), 69-77.
- Ekici, G., Gürçay, D., & Yılmaz, M. (2007). Akademik öz yeterlilik ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33, 253-259.
- Ekici, S., Çolakoğlu, T., & Bayraktar, A. (2011). Dağcılık sporuyla uğraşan bireylerin bu spora yönelme nedenleri üzerine bir araştırma. *Niğde Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(2), 110-119.
- Gibson, C. (1999). Do they do what they believe they can? group efficacy and group effectiveness across tasks and cultures. *Academy of Management Journal*. 42, 138-152.
- Gibson, C., Randel, A., & Early, P., (2000). Understanding group efficacy. *Group and Organization Management*. 25, 67-98. Doi: 10.1177/1059601100251005
- Griffin, N. C. (1998). Cultivating self-efficacy in adolescent mothers: a collaborative approach. *Professional School Counseling*, 1(4), 53.
- Guzzo, A., Yost, R., Campbell, J., & Shea, P. (1993). Potency in groups, articulating a construct. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 87-106. Doi: 0.1111/j.2044-8309.1993.tb00987.x
- Gül, İ., & Adıgüzel, O. (2015). Sağlık kurumları yöneticiliği lisans bölümü öğrencilerinin öz yeterlilik düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 8(36), 864. Doi: 10.17719/jisr.2015369549

- Gülşen, B. A. (2016). *Sporcularda kendinle konuşma ve öz yeterlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Burdur.
- Gün, F., & Büyükgöze, H. (2015). Araştırma görevlilerinin bireysel gelişim inisiyatifinde öz yeterliğin rolü. *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(2), 418-432. Doi: 10.14686/buefad.v4i2.5000139086
- Gürcan, A. (2005). Bilgisayar öz yeterliği algısı ile bilişsel öğrenme stratejileri arasındaki ilişki. *Eğitim Araştırmaları*, 19, 179-193.
- Gürol, A., Altunbaş, S., & Karaaslan, N. (2010). Öğretmen adaylarının öz yeterlilik inançları ve epistemolojik inançları üzerine bir çalışma, *E-Journal Of New World Sciences Academy*, 5(3), 1395-1404.
- Hamurcu, H. (2006). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının fen öğretimine yönelik öz yeterlik inançları. *Eğitim Araştırmaları*, 24, 112-122.
- Hodges, L., & Carron, A. (1992). Collective efficacy and group performance. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 23, 48-76.
- Kalaycı, Ş. (2010). *SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri*. (5. Baskı). Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kantarcıoğlu, A. (2018). *Kütahya merkezde görev yapan beden eğitimi öğretmenleri ile taşrada görev yapan beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin mesleki öz yeterliliklerinin incelenmesi ve karşılaştırılması*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Kütahya.
- Kaptan F., & Korkmaz, H. (2001) Fen eğitiminde probleme dayalı öğrenme yaklaşımı. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20, 191-192.
- Karaç Öcal, Y., Toros, T., & Öztürk, R. Y. (2020). A Study on goal orientations, self-efficiency and motivational climate of active athletes with sports disabilities in physical education and sports. *Ambient Science*, 7(1), 360-365. Doi: 10.21276/ambi.2020.07.sp1.0a48
- Karademir, N. (2010). Coğrafya öğretmenlerinin alanlarına ilişkin öz-yeterlik algılarının incelenmesi. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 5(4), 2034–2048.
- Kayhan Yardımcı, F. (2007). *İlköğretim öğrencilerinde algılanan sosyal destek ile öz yeterlik ilişkisi ve etkileyen değişkenlerin incelenmesi*. Doktora Tezi, Ege Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Kazanoğlu, İ. (2019). *Lise öğrencilerinin spora yönelik tutumları ve öz yeterlilik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi Kış Sporları ve Spor Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Erzurum.
- Kıvılcım, P. (2014). *Öğretmenlerde iş doyumunu, öz yeterlik inancı ve yaşam doyumunu ilişkisinin karşılaştırılması*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Toros Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Mersin.
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). New York: Guilford Publications.
- Koballa, T. R., & Crawley, F. E. (1985). The influence of attitude on science teaching and learning, *School Science and Mathematics*, 85(3), 222-232. Doi: 10.1111/j.1949-8594.1985.tb09615.x
- Köksal, F. (2008). *Antrenörlerin liderlik tarzları ile öz yeterlilikleri arasındaki ilişki*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Kumar, R., & Lal, R. (2006). The role of self-efficacy and gender difference among the adolescents. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 32(3), 249-254.
- Kuşcu, Ş. (2021). *Spor lisesinde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin iletişim becerileri ile sporcu öz yeterlilik alguları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Aydın.
- Küçük Kılıç, S., & Öncü, E. (2013). *6.Ulusal Spor Bilimleri Öğrenci Kongresi: Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin bilişötesi öğrenme stratejileri ve akademik öz-yeterlilikleri*. Erciyes Üniversitesi, Kayseri.
- Luszczynska, A., Gutierrez-Dona, B., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). General self-efficacy in various domains of human functioning, Evidence from five countries. *International Journal of Psychology*, 40(2), 80-89. Doi: 10.1080/00207590444000041
- Milner, H.R., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2003). Teacher self efficacy retaining talented teachers: A case study of an African American teacher. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 203-276.
- Mutlu, T.O., Şentürk, H. E., & Zorba, E. (2014). Üniversite öğrencisi tenisçilerde empatik eğilim ve iletişim becerisi. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, (1), 129-137. Doi: 10.14486/IJSCS85

- Myers, N., Feltz, D., & Short, S. (2004). Collective efficacy and team performance, A longitudinal study of collegiate football teams, *Group Dynamics. Theory, Research and Practice*. 8(2), 126-138. Doi: 10.1037/1089-2699.8.2.126
- Oğuz Oğuz, A. (2009). *Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının akademik öz yeterlik inançları*, VIII. Ulusal Sınıf Öğretmenliği Eğitimi Sempozyumu, 15-28, Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.
- Oğuz, A. (2012). Academic self-efficacy beliefs of prospective primary school teachers. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 2(2), 15-28.
- Orhan, E. (2019). *Öğretim ilke ve yöntemi dersi alan beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmen adaylarının öz yeterliliklerinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Fırat Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Elazığ.
- Öncü, H. (2012). Akademik öz yeterlik ölçeğinin Türkçeye uyarlanması. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13(1), 183-206.
- Özçelik, H., & Kurt, A. (2007). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin bilgisayar öz yeterlikleri: Balıkesir ili örneği. *İkögretim Online*, 6(3), 441-451.
- Özdamar, K. (1999). *SPSS ile Biyoİstatistik*. Eskişehir: Kaan Kitabevi.
- Özenoğlu, K. H. (2006). *Fen bilgisi öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin biyoloji ile ilgili öz yeterlik inançlarının karşılaştırılması*. Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Özkan, G. (2019). *Üniversite öğrencisi kadın futbolcuların toplumsal cinsiyet algıları ile sporcu öz yeterlilik algıları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Aydın.
- Özkatar Kaya, E. (2018). *Beden eğitimi öğretmeni adaylarının epistemolojik inançları, akademik öz düzenleme ve öz yeterlilik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Doktora Tezi, Erciyes Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Kayseri.
- Pekel, A. (2016). *Spor yöneticiliği bölümünde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin akademik öz yeterlilikleri ve üniversite yaşam kalitesi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Erciyes Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Kayseri.
- Sakarya, O. (2013). *Ergenlerin ruhsal belirtileri ile duygusal öz yeterlik düzeylerinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Seçkin, A., & Başbay, M. (2013). Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmeni adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin öz-yeterlik inançlarının incelenmesi. *International Periodical For The Languages*, 8, 253-270. Doi: 10.7827/TurkishStudies.5305
- Senemoğlu, N. (2004). *Gelişim öğrenme ve öğretim*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Sezer, F., İşgör, İ. Y., Özpolat, A. R., & Sezer, M. (2006). Lise öğrencilerinin öz yeterlilik düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13, 129-137.
- Shea, G. P., & Guzzo, R.A., (1987). Group effectiveness: what really matters?. *Sloan Management Review* 28(3), 25-31.
- Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R.W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports*, 51(2), 663-671. Doi: 10.2466/pr0.1982.51.2.6
- Shyu, H., & Huang, L. (1999). The relation of academic self-efficacy to academic out comes for senior high school students, *Journal of Educationand Psychology*, 22(2), 267-294.
- Şensoy, O., & Aydoğdu, M. (2008). Araştırma soruşturma tabanlı öğrenme yaklaşımının fen bilgisi öğretmen adaylarının fen öğretimine yönelik öz-yeterlik inanç düzeylerinin gelişimine etkisi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28(2), 69-93.
- Şimşek, O. F. (2007). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesine giriş, temel ilkeler ve lisrel uygulamaları*. Ankara: Ekinoks.
- Taşdemir, C. (2012). Lise son sınıf öğrencilerinin matematik öz-yeterlik düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi (Bitlis ili örneği). *Karadeniz Fen Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(6), 39-50.
- Tekeli, Ş. C. (2017). *Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmeni adayları ile diğer öğretmen adaylarının sosyal görünüş kaygısı ve akademik öz-yeterlik düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bartın.
- Tekkurşun, G. (2015). *Beden eğitimi öğretmen adaylarının öz yeterlik inançlarının incelenmesi (Gazi ve Kafkas Üniversitesi örneği)*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

- Telef, B. B., & Karaca, R. (2011). Ergenlerin öz yeterliliklerinin ve psikolojik semptomlarının incelenmesi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 8(16), 499- 518.
- Toklu, O. (2010). *Tenis antrenörlerinde liderlik özellikleri ve öz yeterlilik arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi*, (yüksek lisans tezi), Selçuk Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Turan, M. B., Karaoğlu, B., Kaynak, K., & Pepe, O. (2016). Özel yetenek sınavlarına giren adayların genel öz yeterlilik düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Spor Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(1), 17-26. Doi: 10.25307/jssr.274319
- Uysal, İ., (2013). Akademisyenlerin genel öz yeterlilik inançları: AİBÜ eğitim fakültesi örneği. *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 3(2), 144-151.
- Uysal, İ., & Kösemen, S. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının genel öz yeterlilik inançlarının incelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(2), 217-226.
- Ünlü, H., & Kalemoğlu, Y. (2011). Academic self-efficacy of Turkish physical education and sport school students. *Journal of Human Kinetics*, 27, 190-203. Doi: 10.2478/v10078-011-0015-z
- Vardarlı, G. (2005). *İlköğretim ikinci kademe öğrencilerinin öz-yeterlilik düzeylerinin yordanması*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ege Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Varol, B. (2007). *Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmenliği bölümü öğrencilerinin öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin öz-yeterlilikleri*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Niğde Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Niğde.
- Yakut, S. (2018). *Taekwondo antrenörlerinin kademe düzeylerine göre yaşam doyum öz yeterlilik ve benlik saygısının incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kütahya Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kütahya.
- Yarımkaya, E., Akandere, M., & Akgül, F. (2015). Investigation of the effect of sportive activities on depression levels of children between 13-17 years old. *Journal of Educational & Instructional Studies in The World*, 5(4), 17-26.
- Yazıcı, S. (2015). *Evli ve bekâr yetişkinlerin genel öz-yeterlilik ve benlik saygılarının incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Yenice, N. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının öz-yeterlilik düzeyleri ile problem çözme becerilerinin incelenmesi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 11(39), 36-58.
- Yıldırım, D. A., Yıldırım, E., Ramazanoğlu, F., Uçar, Ü., Tuzcuoğulları, Ö. T., & Demirel, E. T. (2006). Üniversite öğrencilerinin spora bakış açıları ve spor yapma durumu. *Doğu Anadolu Araştırmaları*, 4(3), 49-53.
- Yıldırım, F., & İlhan, İ. Ö. (2010). Genel öz yeterlilik ölçeği Türkçe formunun geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 21(4), 301-308.
- Yıldırım, S., (2018). *Psikoloji yüksek lisans öğrencilerinin öz yeterlilik algıları ile benlik saygılarının değerlendirilmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Üsküdar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Yıldız, A. B. (2017). *Sporcularda zihinsel dayanıklılık ve öz yeterlilik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Yıldızççek, C. (2019). *Psikolojik bir rahatsızlık olan egzersiz bağımlılığının öz yeterlilik ile ilişkisinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kütahya Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kütahya.
- Yokuş, T., & Yürüdür, F. E. (2015). Müzik öğretmeni adaylarının üst bilişsel farkındalık ve öz-yeterlilik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Turkish Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 22-34.
- Zeldin, A. L., & Pajares, F., (2000). Against the odds: self-efficacy beliefs of women in mathematical, Scientific and technological careers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 215-246.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 82-91. Doi: 10.1006/ceps.1999.1016



This paper is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).