

# Examination of Self-Efficacy Levels of Physical Education Teachers and Trainer Candidates in Terms of Different Variables

Ertuğrul GENÇAY <sup>1A</sup>

<sup>1</sup> İstanbul Yeni Yüzyıl University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Recreation Department İstanbul, TÜRKİYE  
Address Correspondence to Ertuğrul GENÇAY: e-mail: ertugrulgencay1@gmail.com

*Conflicts of Interest: The author(s) has no conflict of interest to declare.*

*Copyright & License: Authors publishing with the journal retain the copyright to their work licensed under the CC BY-NC 4.0.*

*Ethical Statement: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited.*

(Date Of Received): 10.08.2023 (Date of Acceptance): 18.03.2024 (Date of Publication): 31.08.2024  
A: Orcid ID: 0000-0001-9169-8843

## Abstract

Self-efficacy belief is the belief of individuals in performing a particular job by relying on the knowledge, experience and skills needed for the job. In this study, it was aimed to examine the general self-efficacy of physical education and sports teacher candidates and coach candidates in terms of different variables. The sample of the study consists of 245 teacher and coach candidates, 124 female and 121 male, with an average age of 21.87±2.36 years, studying at Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam University Faculty of Sport Sciences in the 2022-2023 academic year. The general self-efficacy scale developed by Magaletta and Oliver (13) and validated and reliable in Turkish by Yıldırım and İlhan (24) was used as a data collection tool. Obtained data were analyzed with Independent sample-t test and One-way Anova test. In terms of gender, candidates do not differ in their self-efficacy ( $p>0.05$ ). It is understood that those who see their professional future as negative get a lower score than those who see their professional future as positive in the persistence-insistence sub-dimension, although their total self-efficacy and starting sub-dimension are higher ( $p<0.05$ ). It is observed that physical education teacher and coach candidates differ in the starting sub-dimension of the self-efficacy scale according to their past athletic status ( $p<0.05$ ). Accordingly, those who have 2 branches have higher scores in the starting dimension than those who have no branches. It was found that teacher and coach candidates differed in the sub-dimension of not giving up, trying to start and continuing-persistence of the self-efficacy scale in terms of departments ( $p<0.05$ ). However, it was not found to be significant in terms of their total self-efficacy ( $p>0.05$ ). As a result, it was found that the self-efficacy of physical education teacher and coach candidates did not differ in terms of gender. In terms of the departments studied, the self-efficacy scale of teacher and coach candidates; It was found that they differed in the sub-dimension of not giving up, starting and continuing effort. From this point of view, it can be said that having an athlete background in a certain sports branch at the stage of admission to the departments they study can contribute positively to their future professional life.

**Keywords:** Physical education and sports teacher, trainer, self-efficacy.

## Beden Eğitimi Öğretmeni ve Antrenör Adaylarının Öz yeterlik Düzeylerinin Farklı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi

### Özet

Öz-yeterlik inancı, bireylerin belirli bir işi o iş için gerekli olan bilgi, deneyim ve becerilere güvenerek yerine getirebileceğine olan inancıdır. Bu çalışmada beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmen adayları ile antrenör adaylarının genel öz yeterliklerinin farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Araştırmanın örneklemini 2022-2023 eğitim-öğretim yılında Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Fakültesinde öğrenim gören, yaş ortalaması  $21,87 \pm 2,36$  yıl olan 124'ü kadın, 121'i erkek 245 öğretmen ve antrenör adayından oluşmaktadır. Veri toplama aracı olarak Magaletta ve Oliver (13) tarafından geliştirilen ve Yıldırım ve İlhan (24) tarafından Türkçe geçerlilik ve güvenilirliği yapılan genel öz-yeterlik ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen veriler Independent sample-t testi ve One-way ANOVA testi ile analiz edildi. Cinsiyete göre adayların öz-yeterlik algıları farklılık göstermemektedir ( $p > 0,05$ ). Mesleki geleceğini olumsuz görenlerin, olumlu görenlere göre toplam öz yeterliliklerinin ve başlama alt boyutunun yüksek olmasına rağmen ( $p < 0,05$ ) sürdürme çabası-ısrar alt boyutunda mesleki geleceğini olumlu görenlere göre daha düşük puan aldıkları anlaşılmaktadır ( $p < 0,05$ ). Beden eğitimi öğretmeni ve antrenör adaylarının geçmişindeki sporculuk durumlarına göre, öz yeterlilik ölçeği başlama alt boyutunda farklılaştıkları görülmektedir ( $p < 0,05$ ). Buna göre 2 branşı olanlar, hiç branşı olmayanlara göre başlama boyutunda daha yüksek puana sahiptirler. Öğretmen ve antrenör adaylarının bölümlere göre öz yeterlilik ölçeğinin yılmama, başlama ve sürdürme çabası-ısrar alt boyutunda farklılaştıkları bulunmuştur ( $p < 0,05$ ). Ancak toplam öz yeterlilikleri açısından farklılaşma olmadığı bulunmuştur ( $p > 0,05$ ). Sonuç olarak beden eğitimi öğretmeni ve antrenör adaylarının öz yeterliklerinin cinsiyete göre farklılaşmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Öğretmen ve antrenör adaylarının bölümler açısından öz yeterlilik ölçeğinin yılmama, başlama ve sürdürme çabası-ısrar alt boyutunda farklılaştıkları, beden eğitimi öğretmeni ve antrenör adaylarının geçmişindeki sporculuk durumlarına göre öz yeterlilik ölçeği başlama alt boyutunda farklılaştıkları bulunmuştur ( $p < 0,05$ ). Bu açıdan bakıldığında öğrencilerin öğrenim gördükleri bölümlere kabul aşamasında belirli bir spor dalında sporcu geçmişine sahip olmalarının gelecekteki mesleki yaşamlarına olumlu katkı sağlayabileceği söylenebilir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmeni, antrenör, öz yeterlilik.

### INTRODUCTION

Competence is the possession of professional knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to perform related duties in a profession. The fulfillment of the duties expected of the employee at the desired level is expressed as the acquisition of knowledge and skills that will perform a behavior (16). Self-efficacy belief is one of the most basic concepts of Bandura's social learning theory, and it is the belief of individuals in performing a particular job by relying on the knowledge, experience and skills needed for the job (5). Self-efficacy is the belief that by taking an active role on the actions taking place around the person, it will contribute to the process at the beginning and until the end (4). Self-efficacy refers to a person's knowledge and experience rather than abilities. The concept of self-efficacy includes elements such as internal motivation, which is formed as a result of the organization of the necessary knowledge and experience and the evaluation of the gains to be achieved together with the risk analysis while preparing an action plan (24). According to Bandura (5) the most important feature of those with high self-efficacy is; is that they quickly recover from their failures and persist in their actions without giving up. Self-efficacy is not about one's special abilities, but about one's judgments. Self-efficacy is a special case of what a person can do in a particular area. For example, a sprinter may be confident in sprint competitions but this to be not in long-distance running (25).

Belief in self-efficacy not only forms an important part of self-efficacy belief, it also affects people's motivation and behavior, but on the other hand, actions that will change people's lives. Bandura defines self-efficacy as the belief in one's own abilities to manage and program conditions to develop (4). Beliefs about self-efficacy do not generally reflect the person's capacity or abilities, but express their beliefs about their capacity under certain special circumstances (7). Self-efficacy makes a difference in the individual's belief in his own feelings and thoughts. When the sense of self-efficacy is low, this can create a feeling of stress, anxiety, depression, and desperation in the person (5).

A strong sense of efficacy in thinking increases the level of decision-making and facilitates cognitive activities and performance in different settings, including academic achievement. Self-efficacy can be effective when behavior is involved in determining the activities people will do.

Self-efficacy beliefs do not refer to someone's abilities or skills, but only to what the person believes they can do under certain circumstances, regardless of the abilities or skills they actually have. Thus, self-efficacy includes both a person's competencies and beliefs to be able to function successfully (5).

Conversely, it is stated that self-efficacy has a contextual quality rather than a general concept, because a person's self-efficacy may differ in different situations (3).

For example, a teacher who does not have sufficient self-efficacy in the science lesson may have sufficient and high self-efficacy in the language lesson (18). Many studies reveal that self-efficacy beliefs have a positive effect on teachers' motivation and performance levels (1,2,6,11). Self-efficacy belief is much stronger than the individual's true competence in terms of its effect on individuals' emotional states and motivations (23).

As a result, according to this situation, there can be no possibility of an effective learning environment. With the increase of a teacher's job satisfaction, he will contribute to the learning levels of his students by doing his job in the most effective and productive way, and this depends on his self-efficacy belief (17). All these emphasize that self-efficacy is just as important in the process of self-actualization (22). Self-efficacy belief is determined by the following conditions: The four sources of information listed below in descending order: '1' active mastery experiences, '2' indirect experiences, '3' verbal persuasion, and '4' physiological and emotional states. Efficacy beliefs produce their effects through four processes: cognitive, motivational, emotional, and selective processes (3, 12).

Self-efficacy is a concept whose importance is increasingly understood in every field. In this sense, the present study aimed to examine the general self-efficacy of physical education and sports teacher candidates and coach candidates in terms of different variables.

From this point of view, answers to the following sub-problems were sought.

1. Are there any difference in general self-efficacy of physical education teacher and coach candidates according to their genders?
2. Are there any difference in general self-efficacy levels between physical education teacher and coach candidates?
3. Do the positive/negative perception of the professional future of physical education teacher and coach candidates affect their general self-efficacy levels?
4. Are the general self-efficacy of physical education teacher and trainer candidates affected by their past sports?

## METHOD

### Sample

The sample of the study consists of 245 teacher and coach candidates, 124 female and 121 male, with an average age of  $21.87 \pm 2.36$  years, studying at the Faculty of Sports Sciences at KSU in the 2022-2023 academic year. 245 people participated in the study on a voluntary basis. Before applying the scale, the participants were informed by the researcher to fill in the questionnaire. Answering the questionnaire took a total of 15 minutes. Study, KSU. It was applied by the Medical Research Ethics Committee (TAREK) with the decision dated 14.06.2022 and numbered 08, after obtaining the permission of the ethics committee.

### Data Collection Tools

The general self-efficacy scale developed by Magaletta and Oliver (13) and validated in Turkish by Yıldırım and İlhan (24) was used in the study. The general self-efficacy scale is a scale that aims to determine the general self-efficacy level of the individual. In this study, the "How well does it describe you?" The likert-type format was used, in which the answers differing between "never" and "very good" answers can be given in a five-stage manner. Items 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 17 in the scale are reverse scored. An increase in the score indicates an increase in self-efficacy belief. Scale; It consists of three sub-dimensions as "starting", "not giving up" and "continuing effort-insistence". While the internal consistency coefficient of the Turkish version of the scale was found to be 0.80, the internal consistency coefficient of the scale used in the current study was found to be 0.94.

## Analysis of Data

The collected data were processed in the SPSS 21 Package program. Z values of skewness and kurtosis were examined to determine whether the obtained data showed a normal distribution. The Z value was found to be between -1.96 and +1.96 ( $p < 0.05$ ) and the distribution was considered normal by the Tabachnick & Fidell (21). According to this; Independent Samples T Test was used for differences between independent and paired groups, and one-way analysis of variance (Anova) was used for comparisons of more than two groups. In statistical comparisons, their significance was interpreted according to  $p < 0.05$  values.

## FINDINGS

**Table 1.** Classification of physical education teacher and coach candidates according to some socio-demographic characteristics

| Variables                                |                   | f   | %    |
|------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----|------|
| Gender                                   | Male              | 121 | 49,4 |
|                                          | Female            | 124 | 50,6 |
|                                          | Total             | 245 | 100  |
| Section                                  | Teacher candidate | 174 | 71   |
|                                          | Trainer candidate | 71  | 29   |
|                                          | Total             | 245 | 100  |
| Age                                      | up to 19          | 35  | 14,3 |
|                                          | Between 20 -22    | 126 | 51,4 |
|                                          | 23- And Above     | 84  | 34,3 |
|                                          | Total             | 245 | 100  |
| How do you see your professional future? | Positive          | 188 | 76,7 |
|                                          | Negative          | 57  | 23,3 |
|                                          | Total             | 245 | 100  |
| Have you played any sports in the past?  | No                | 102 | 41,6 |
|                                          | Yes               | 102 | 58,3 |
|                                          | Total             | 245 | 100  |

Table 1 shows that 50.6% of the individuals participating in the research are women and 49.4% are men. 71% of the participants are from the teaching department and 29% from the coaching department. Those who see their professional future positively are 76.7%. those who see it negatively constitute 23.3%. Participants were asked; 58.3% of them answered yes, 41.6% of them no.

**Table 2.** T-test results of self-efficacy levels of physical education teacher and coach candidates in terms of gender

|                        | Gender | N   | $\bar{X}$ | Ss     | t      | df  | p    |
|------------------------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|--------|-----|------|
| Do not give up         | Male   | 121 | 3,2744    | ,19855 | -,756  | 243 | ,450 |
|                        | Female | 124 | 3,2935    | ,19826 |        |     |      |
| Start                  | Male   | 121 | 1,7056    | ,41516 | -,405  | 243 | ,686 |
|                        | Female | 124 | 1,7278    | ,44432 |        |     |      |
| Persistence-insistence | Male   | 121 | 4,2617    | ,43292 | -,671  | 243 | ,503 |
|                        | Female | 124 | 4,2984    | ,42253 |        |     |      |
| Total self-efficacy    | Male   | 121 | 2,6751    | ,15194 | -1,198 | 243 | ,232 |
|                        | Female | 124 | 2,6991    | ,16125 |        |     |      |

Table 2. It is seen that there is no significant difference between the general self-efficacy beliefs of male candidates and female candidates in terms of gender [ $t(243) = 1.198$ ] ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 3.** Self-efficacy independent sample t-test results according to the opinions of physical education teachers and coach candidates about their professional future

|                               | How do you see your professional future? | N   | $\bar{X}$ | Ss     | t      | df  | p     |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----|-----------|--------|--------|-----|-------|
| <b>Do not give up</b>         | Negative                                 | 76  | 3,2895    | ,19213 | ,909   | 243 | ,364  |
|                               | Positive                                 | 169 | 3,2817    | ,21764 |        |     |       |
| <b>Start</b>                  | Negative                                 | 76  | 1,5855    | ,40846 | -3,996 | 243 | ,000* |
|                               | Positive                                 | 169 | 1,7759    | ,44368 |        |     |       |
| <b>Persistence-insistence</b> | Negative                                 | 76  | 4,4035    | ,42848 | 3,745  | 243 | ,000* |
|                               | Positive                                 | 169 | 4,2249    | ,37249 |        |     |       |
| <b>Total self-efficacy</b>    | Negative                                 | 76  | 2,6464    | ,14807 | -3,142 | 243 | ,002* |
|                               | Positive                                 | 169 | 2,7056    | ,17266 |        |     |       |

In Table 3, it is understood that those who see their professional future as positive have higher self-efficacy and starting sub-dimension compared to those who see their professional future negatively ( $p < 0.05$ ), but those who see their professional future as positive get lower scores in the persistence sub-dimension ( $p < 0.05$ ). In this respect, persistence and persistence are important for a positive perception of the professional future.

**Table 4.** One Way Anova test results of physical education teachers and coach candidates in terms of departments

|                               | Departments       | N   | $\bar{X}$ | Ss     | t      | df  | p     |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----|-----------|--------|--------|-----|-------|
| <b>Do not give up</b>         | Teacher candidate | 174 | 3,3057    | ,20021 | 2,713  | 243 | ,007* |
|                               | Trainer candidate | 71  | 3,2310    | ,18407 |        |     |       |
| <b>Start</b>                  | Teacher candidate | 174 | 1,6717    | ,39968 | -2,606 | 243 | ,010* |
|                               | Trainer candidate | 71  | 1,8275    | ,48013 |        |     |       |
| <b>Persistence-insistence</b> | Teacher candidate | 174 | 4,3257    | ,41635 | 2,635  | 243 | ,009* |
|                               | Trainer candidate | 71  | 4,1690    | ,43597 |        |     |       |
| <b>Total self-efficacy</b>    | Teacher candidate | 174 | 2,6800    | ,14148 | -1,139 | 243 | ,256  |
|                               | Trainer candidate | 71  | 2,7051    | ,18933 |        |     |       |

Table 4. It is seen that the self-efficacy scale of teacher and coach candidates differed in the sub-dimension of not giving up, trying to start and continuing-persistence ( $p < 0.05$ ). However, there was no significant difference in terms of total self-efficacy ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 5.** One Way ANOVA test results according to the sportsmanship status of physical education teacher and coach candidates in their past

|                               |                | Sum of Squares | Mean Squares | Sd   | F     | P     | difference |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|------|-------|-------|------------|
| <b>Do not give up</b>         | Between groups | ,165           | 2            | ,083 | 2,122 | ,122  |            |
|                               | Within groups  | 9,423          | 242          | ,039 |       |       |            |
|                               | Total          | 9,588          | 244          |      |       |       |            |
| <b>Start</b>                  | Between groups | 1,407          | 2            | ,704 | 3,907 | ,021* | 1-3        |
|                               | Within groups  | 43,589         | 242          | ,180 |       |       |            |
|                               | Total          | 44,996         | 244          |      |       |       |            |
| <b>Persistence-insistence</b> | Between groups | 1,046          | 2            | ,523 | 2,911 | ,056  |            |
|                               | Within groups  | 43,486         | 242          | ,180 |       |       |            |
|                               | Total          | 44,532         | 244          |      |       |       |            |
| <b>Total self- efficacy</b>   | Between groups | ,093           | 2            | ,047 | 1,910 | ,150  |            |
|                               | Within groups  | 5,911          | 242          | ,024 |       |       |            |
|                               | Total          | 6,004          | 244          |      |       |       |            |

1-No 2-Yes, I was an athlete in 1 branch 3-Yes, I was an athlete in 2 branches

Table 5 shows that physical education teachers and coach candidates differ in the starting sub-dimension of the self-efficacy scale according to their past athletic status ( $p<0.05$ ). According to this, those who have 2 branches have higher scores in the starting dimension than those who have no branches.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this section, the sub-problems organized for the purpose of the research were evaluated statistically, and the findings were interpreted and discussed, respectively.

1. Are there any difference in general self-efficacy of physical education teacher and coach candidates according to their genders?

In our study, no significant difference was found in the self-efficacy of physical education teacher and coach candidates in terms of gender ( $p>0.05$ ). In many studies on the subject, similar results were found in terms of gender, Kangalgil M. (9), Sandıkçı and Öncü (19), Kahramanoğlu and Ay (7), Seçkin and Başbay (20), Koparan et al. (10), Seçkin and Başbay (20) attributed the decrease in social status differences between women and men, in coordination with the social and technological developments in the society, to the fact that women are more involved in their social and business lives. From this point of view, it shows that the concept of self-efficacy, which is defined as the individual's belief that he can influence the events that affect his life by exhibiting a certain level of motivation Bandura (4) is also valid for the self-efficacy of students studying in the field of sports sciences.

2. Are there any difference in general self-efficacy levels between physical education teacher and coach candidates?

It is seen that there is no significant difference in terms of self-efficacy of teacher and coach candidates according to their departments ( $p>0.05$ ). Uysal (23) In his study, it was revealed that the general self-efficacy beliefs of pre-service teachers were not statistically significant to the department variables. In this respect, our study reveals similar results with the literature. However, in our study, it was observed that the general self-efficacy scale differed in the sub-dimension of not giving up, trying to start and continuing-persistence ( $p<0.05$ ). Accordingly, pre-service teachers achieved higher values in the sub-dimension of not giving up and continuing-persistence, while pre-service coaches obtained higher values in the sub-dimension of starting. From this point of view, it can be said that physical education teacher candidates come to the fore in this aspect, since achieving success in a subject undoubtedly requires persistence and determination.

3. Are the general self-efficacy of physical education teacher and trainer candidates affected by their past sports?

In our study, it is seen that physical education teacher and coach candidates differ in the starting sub-dimension of the self-efficacy scale according to their past athletic status ( $p<0.05$ ). In the study conducted by Seçkin & Başbay (20) it was found that doing regular sports affects self-efficacy belief. When both studies are evaluated together, it can be said that doing sports in the past will positively affect self-efficacy belief for both physical education teachers and coach candidates. From this point of view, it can be said that having an athlete background in a certain sports branch at the stage of admission to the physical education and sports school can contribute positively to his future professional life.

4. Do the positive/negative perception of the professional future of physical education teacher and coach candidates affect their general self-efficacy levels?

Although the total self-efficacy and starting sub-dimension of those who see their professional future as negative are higher ( $p<0.05$ ), it is understood that those who see their professional future as positive have a lower score in the persistence sub-dimension than those who see their professional future as positive ( $p<0.05$ ). According to Banadura (5) the most distinguishing feature of those with high self-efficacy is that they do not give up despite failures and carry out their actions with determination. Therefore, persistence and persistence are important in perceiving the professional future positively. Many studies on this subject also show that there is a positive relationship between professional future-career choice and self-efficacy (14).

As a result of the study, both physical education teachers and teachers who provide sports education such as coaching can create a curriculum that will provide students with health skills, create health awareness and increase their efficiency and productivity during the lesson (15). From this point of view; It can be thought

that increasing the self-efficacy levels of physical education teachers and trainers is important for students and athletes to progress at the desired level and to develop the behaviors, attitudes, skills and knowledge they will need.

## REFERENCES

1. Bandura A, & Locke, EA, Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2003; 88(1): 87-99.
2. Bandura A, Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review*, 1977; 84(2), 191-215.
3. Bandura A. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. 1nd ed. Prentice-Hall, NJ: Englewood Cliffs , 1986: 123-125.
4. Bandura A. Self-efficacy. *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior*. 4 nd ed. Ramachaudran Academic Press, 1994: 234-235.
5. Bandura A. Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. 2 nd ed. W H Freeman/Times Books/ Henry Holt & Co. WH. Freeman and Company. 1997: 235-237.
6. Cho YJ & Shim SS, Predicting teachers' achievement goals for teaching: The role of perceived school goal structure and teachers' sense of efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2013; 32, 12–21.
7. Evers WJG, Brouwers A & Tomic W, Burnout and self-efficacy: A study on teachers' beliefs when implementing an innovative educational system in the Netherlands. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 2002; 72(2), 227–243.
8. Kahramanoglu R, & Ay Y, Analysis of Primary Teacher Candidates' Perceptions of Special Field Proficiency in Terms of Various Variables. *International Journal of Turkish Literature, Culture and Education*, 2013; 2(2), 285-301.
9. Kangalgil M, Examination of physical education teachers' participation in and possession of special field competencies. *Journal of Sport Sciences, Hacettepe J. of Sport Sciences*, 2014; 25(2), 94-103.
10. Koparan S, Ozturk F, & Korkmaz H, Examination of physical education teachers' self-efficacy and physical education teacher competence. *National Physical Education and Sports Instructor. Congress 25-27 May, Van/Yyu Education Faculty Journal Special Issue*, 2011;52-61.
11. Lee B, Cawthon S, & Dawson K, Elementary and secondary teacher self-efficacy for teaching and pedagogical conceptual change in a drama-based professional development program. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2013; 30(1), 84-98.
12. Maddux J E. *Self-efficacy , adaptation, and adjustment: Theory, research, and application*. 2nd ed. I J E M & J Lewis, Plenum Press. 1995:89-90.
13. Magaletta PR, OJ, Their Relations with Self-Efficacy, Optimism, and General Well-Being. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1999; 55(5), 539-551.
14. Markham G, Balkin D, & Baron R, Inventors and New Venture Formation . *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 2002; 27(2), 149-165.
15. Martin JJ, & Kulinna PH, The development of a physical education teachers' physical activity self-efficacy instrument. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 2003; 22(2), 219-232.
16. MEB. *Teaching competencies, general and special field competencies of the teaching profession*. MEB Publications, 2008
17. Moè A, Pazzaglia F & Ronconi L, When being able is not enough. The combined value of positive affect and self-efficacy for job satisfaction in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2010; 26(5), 1145-1153.
18. Paraskeva F, Bouta H & Papagianni A, Individual characteristics and computer self-efficacy in secondary education teachers to integrate technology in educational practice. *Computers and Education*, 2008; 50(3), 1084-1091.
19. Sandıkçı M, & Öncü E, Determination and Comparison of Efficacy Perceptions and Attitudes of Teacher Candidates in Physical Education and Other Fields towards Teaching Profession. *Pamukkale Journal of Sport Sciences*, 2013; 4(1), 135-151.
20. Seçkin A & Başbay M, Examining the self-efficacy beliefs of physical education and sports teacher candidates regarding the teaching profession. *International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 2013; 8(8), 253-270.
21. Tabachnick BG ve Fidell, LS. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 8nd ed. Pearson Education. 2013: 167-168.
22. Tsahannen-Moran M & Johnson D, Exploring literacy teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: Potential sources at play. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2011; 27, 751-761.
23. Uysal I, Examination of general self-efficacy beliefs of teacher candidates. *Journal of Education and Training Research*, 2013; 2(2), 217-226.
24. Yıldırım F & İlhan Ö, Validity and Reliability Study of the Turkish Form of the General Self-efficacy Scale. *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry*, 2010; 21(4), 301-308.
25. Zulkosky K, *Self-Efficacy : A Concept Analysis*. *Journal Compilation, Wiley Periodicals, Inc.*, 2009; 44(2), 93-102.