



THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS AND RESISTANCES TO CHANGE

Semiha Şahin¹ⁱ,

Özge Aydın Demirel²

¹Dokuz Eylül University,
Izmir, Turkey

²Teacher, Minister of Education,
Balıkesir, Turkey

Abstract:

Self-efficacy is referring to the people' perceptions and beliefs regarding their thinking, creativity, ability and know-how. Concepts such as change, development, novelty and innovation are studied in educational institutions and schools more than as in all institutions and businesses. In this concept, the relationship between people' self-efficacy perceptions and the ability of people to cope with the problems in the process of change and to produce new solutions to these problems is a matter of curiosity. For this reason, teachers' perceptions regarding self-efficacy and resistance to change were investigated. The aim of the study is to determine the self-efficacy and resistance to change levels of primary school teachers and to determine the level of resistance to change of variables mentioned in the self-efficacy. Relational screening model was used in the study and the data obtained by quantitative data collection. The sample of this research consists 368 teachers serving in 40 official primary schools in Manisa-Salihli in 2013-2014 education year. The data of the study were obtained by "Teachers' Resistance to Change Scale" and "General Self-Efficacy Scale." Data analysis included frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, r- statistic and multiple regression analysis tests. As a result of the research, it is seen that teachers' self-efficacy perceptions are "I agree" in all the sub-dimensions and in every part of the scale, and teachers' perceptions of resistance to change are "I do not agree" in all sub-dimensions and in every part of the scale. Self-efficacy explains indifference size of resistance to change is as 19 %, passive-active resistance is as 13 % and reluctance dimension is as 16 % in a low level. Low levels do not mean that self-efficacy is less effective in resistance to change. Almost 20 % of these factors are important in resistance to change, and other factors are required to be detected.

ⁱ Correspondence: email semiha.sahin@deu.edu.tr

Keywords: change, resistance to change, self-efficacy, primary school teacher, secondary school teacher

1. Introduction

Nowadays, the rapid developments in knowledge and technology that continuously increase its importance constitute the source of change in social, economic and political context. The information and technology used is always replaced with a new one, and it is a difficult process to follow. Sağlam (1979) describes the current society we live in "change" and states that "*it is one of our fundamental problems that societies cannot keep up with this change*". Changes in the society and the individual are triggering the change in the organizations; the organizations have to be in a circle and regenerate themselves (Sabuncuoğlu and Tüz, 1996). In this context, the forces which make change inevitable in organizations are almost external. The growth and pressure at the economic level, new business areas and the speed which technology has taken to human life have led to the emergence of new and complex organizations and the need for workers with high skills (Alkan, 1997; Doğan, 2000; Özençel, 2007). For this reason, changes in organizations become inevitable in order to increase effectiveness and efficiency, to monotonize, to strengthen organizational, coordinational and to increase time-saving (Kuvan, 2001; Sabuncuoğlu and Tüz, 1996; Yeniçeri, 2002). It's obvious that personal and professional characteristics of individuals who represent the work force at all levels are advanced. One of these personal characteristics is self-efficacy of the two; self-efficacy is one of the factors that explain emotional intelligence. Lewin (1974), who introduces organizational change the first agenda, explains it through the process of change and freezing, expresses the positive reactions of the employees to the change as "desire" and the negatives as "resistance". Rainey described resistance to change as the behaviours that served the preservation of the same situation against to the status quo (Timurkan, 2010). Dent and Goldberg (1999) explain the reasons of resistance to change as reluctance, laziness, disagreement, emotional effects, lack of trust, fear of failure, weakness of the outputs, and misconceptions that arise from change, surprises and uncertainty by referring to different authors such as Kreitner and Griffen. Coch and French (1948), in their research at the Tavistock Institute, were determined the forces in the process of change in four chapters as escape from tension, emphasis on production and management pressure. There is not a single way of change in the organizations; sometimes to remain silent, sometimes to organize other workers, and sometimes not to do business. There may be some very difficult situations to realize the resistance (Hill, 2010: 59). Başaran (1992: 299; Judson, 1991) tackles the reactions to the change in three headlines. Active fighter: have clear and hard reactions given to those who support change. Passive fighter: have the reactions such as stopping work, inaction and confrontation. Resentment: have the reactions such as slowing work, stopping withdrawing, asking relocation of the place, complaining about change. Dent and Goldberg (1999), benefits from the same writers, put in order education, participation, simplification, controversy, guiding, coercion, debate, financial support, political

support as the strategies of managing resistance to change well. It can be perceived as a threat when necessary conditions aren't provided at schools (Doğan, 2002). In this case, individuals may exhibit change acceptance and implement change, he or she may also display an unqualified attitude or can activate active resistive methods such as disruption of job, making mistake by knowing (Koçel, 2005; Judson, 1991). Resistance to change can be shown because of some reasons such as fear of losing job, and not being able to do new jobs, loss of authority, uncertainty, wrong belief in change, dissatisfaction and inadequate self-esteem (Hussey, 1998; Kaynak, 1995; Koçel, 2005; Sabuncuoğlu and Tüz, 1996). For this reason, the needs of individuals should be determined well, and the deficiencies should be reduced with communication and education intermediaries (Doğan, 2002; Helvacı; 2010). Individuals must have some qualities and competencies to perceive all these situations and to respond to their own needs. Bandura (1995) describes the belief in so-called features and competencies which will provide to manage expected situations as self-efficacy.

2. Self-efficacy

The concept of qualification is "*special knowledge and qualification that provides the power to make a job*" (TDK, 2006). On the other hand, self-efficacy is believed to be the ability of the individual to achieve a certain performance by organizing the necessary activity and to make a successful performance (Bandura, 1986). General self-efficacy is believed to be the key competence for individuals to perform in their own environment (Işık, 2001). In general terms, the perception of the individuals in the business environment is defined as general competence at what level in order to be able to fulfill the task. According to this, self-efficacy occurs as a result of evaluating individuals activities (Bandura, 1986). Individuals act in each case by examining their skills and competencies, personality traits, knowledge and experience levels and motivations, shortly their competencies. Individuals will act if they believe that they are sufficient at relevant task, activity or situation. According to this, the self-efficacy belief is an extremely important incentive (Türk, 2008). According to Bandura (1986) first of all, self-efficacy belief explains the future performance more than past performance and cognitive ability in the future. Secondly, self-efficacy belief can be improved and this performance can be directly changed. Thirdly, the belief that the person will succeed determine the patience which he or she will show and how soon he or she will recover from the emotional, causal, and negative experiences. Thirdly, the belief that person will succeed determine the patience that he or she show in patience, and how soon he or she has recovered from the negative experiences. Factors affecting self-efficacy perception are examined in four groups including personal experiences, results from the experiences of others, social endorsement, and the emotional state of individual. Experiences are important in terms of improving the belief of competence considering to the past and present achievements. In this regard, failures can be attributed to a strong sense of self-efficacy. Failures are not based on lack of talent, it is based on not to show patience, unplannedness or other factors (Bandura, 1986). The model is effective in self-efficacy

belief in observation (Pajores, 2002). The success of model can affect observer positively or negatively (Bandura, 1995). While social approval support and encouragement affect self-efficacy belief positively, non-constructive criticism prevents it (Bandura, 1986 and Pajores, 2002). But incentive may be effective if it is genuine. Excessive courage or scrubbing can bring a belief of exaggerated proficiency, and self-confidence can decrease fastly in a small failure.

While self-efficacy belief affects performance and success, Bandura (1995) indicates that it affects countless things, and summed it up fewer than four titles. In cognitive function, conceptual and analytical thinking come into prominence. Individuals with low self-esteem are weak in analytical thinking and they keep their goals low level. Motivational function points to how much effort self-efficacy spend while achieving its goals, more effort and maintaining effort long. In this case, foresight leads to motivation and actions. According to emotional work, the feeling of stress and depression come to the fore depending on the beliefs of people on their abilities, for example; in difficult and threatening situations. Those who believe that they cannot manage the threats have a high degree of anxiety. Whereas, those who have high self-efficacy rate reduce the anxiety and the worry (Kasap, 2012). One of the most important factors affecting the choices made and will made is self-efficacy. Because people tend to the choices which they believe to do and they avoid the choices which have **failure** risks. All these choices change person's environment, status and life (Bandura, 1995).

2.1 Dimensions of Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is a special belief according to the task and the situation. Therefore, a person's self-efficacy must be examined according to the environment, time and work done (Bandura, 1986). Işık (2001) examines self-efficacy in three areas; task-specific, field-specific and in general. Task-specific self-efficacy can be called as role qualification with micro-analytical approach (Bandura, 1986; Wilson and Kolb, 1949). They considered general self-efficacy as a quality and they also considered special self-efficacy as a situational phenomenon and complementary associated (Işık; 2001).

2.2 Resistance to Change and Teachers' Self-efficacy Beliefs

It is understood that how important human factor is in effective implementation of the change. The individuals are examining his or her skills and abilities, personality properties, knowledge and level of experience, motivation, shortly his or her competencies. The individual takes action and shows resistance when he or she has the belief that his or her competencies are sufficient in case of change (Stein and Wang, 1988, Türk, 2008). Individuals' belief in competence, including the process of change are influenced by physiological and emotional reactions such as excitement, stress, fear and provides tips if the outcome will be successful or unsuccessful. Individuals with high self-efficacy aware of wide career options in front of them and they act according to this way (Bandura, 1995). While positive emotions strengthen self-efficacy, negative emotions weakens self-efficacy belief, engender more stress and thrill, this ultimately affects performance negative (Bandura, 1986). For these reasons, it may not be very

possible to involve everyone in situation of change (Hussey, 1998). Taymaz (1997) stated that some individuals may be able to support change and some may reject change with his or her perception of damage. The author recommends that initiatives of change must be applied after preventative ways were founded to prevent to individuals who have negative behaviours in change applications. In this case, it is beneficial to examine the self-efficacy beliefs of individuals as one of the factors that reduce change. High self-efficacy affects analytical thinking, predicting results, target determination, planning and implementation, adaptation to different sensations, effort and fortification and performance positively (Bandura, 1995; Kasap, 2012). Self-efficacy helps to increase efficiency of individual, thus increasing efficiency of organization, helps to exhibit a wise and across problems (Bandura, 1986; Türk, 2008). For this reason, self-efficacy is a subject that needs to be dealt with in education organizations as well as in other organizations to increase success and productivity. The association of self-efficacy and change, people believing that they can cope with the problems that will arise in each area so as to adapt to innovations, to lead innovations and taking risks of uncertainty in the correct actions, based on a positive effect (Bandura, 1995; Basım, Korkmazyürek and Tokat, 2008; Stein and Wang, 1988). Teaching is a professional job which has individual, social, cultural, scientific and technological dimensions. Qualifications of teachers are widely discussed in the literature to be able to do the teaching profession successfully and it is emphasized that a teacher who performs in accordance with the principles of contemporary education will no longer be the only one who teaches lecturers, and gives a note to an exam (Baskan, 2001). The teacher's self-efficacy belief is known as the belief that teachers will demonstrate the necessary behaviour to fulfill the teaching function in a successful manner (Alıcı, 200: 87). Teachers with a high sense of proficiency strive very hard to teach, get important educational decisions more clear and quick, they are more eager and successful ad less stressful in their programmes and less stressed and flexible and tolerant to their students (Kiremit, 2006: 5). Under such a trust, it is understood that he or she knows the strategies of teaching and trust on the past (Kiremit, 2006). However, the most important obstacle of change is that there are many changes, resistance to change, inability to predict the outcome of change and the lack of leadership addition to the cultural pressure in Töremen's research done in 2002. While teachers are most concerned with the lack of capacity of the school about change, and they are subject to problems to the lack of information about change. However, they have stated that they do not have much trouble with the desire to receive new duties and responsibilities (Gürses and Helvacı, 2011). The change and development in education system is using a different teaching strategy, creating a new approach compared to before and using a new different teaching strategy by a teacher. The attitude of a teacher to a new innovation is gaining importance there. It must be known how a teacher shows reaction to an innovation to raise quality of teaching (Balıcı, 2003). Self-efficacy of teachers will play an important role in the answer of this question. In the research that can be reached in the literature, according to Hsiqo, Chang, Tu and Chen (2011), innovative approaches of teachers who have high self-efficacy are high. Also the relationship have been identified between teachers' self-efficacies and problem solving

skills, methods and styles, positive practices (Wolters and Daugherty, 2007) and students' achievements (Gibson and Dembo, 1984). Accordingly, as Önen and Öztuna stated that the prerequisite being able to achieve an effective and successful education teaching process may be called self-efficacy (Eskici, 2013). When the literature is examined, Bovey and Hede (2001) have examined the relationship between negative feelings and thoughts in organizations, and the relationship between resistance to change, Davis has examined the reactions of employees in information technology, Gürses and Helvacı have examined the reasons for teachers to resist a change. Also resistance to change has examined with such elements; employee position of teachers, duration of service, socio-economic level and location, school type and school size too (Çakır, 2009; Demirtaş, 2012; Korkut, 2009, Kurşunoğlu, 2006; Taştan, 2013). Also, İnandı, Yeşil, Karatepe and Uzun, Çalık, Koşar, and Er (2013) have done studies that address the relations of teachers to resistance to change with self-efficacy. But only the relations between variables have examined in one of these studies. Çalık and others examined the regression of the self-efficacy to resistance to change in general and they have looked at the dimensions of self-efficacy from the different perspectives. In this study, the relationship between the teachers' self-efficacies and resistances to change includes discrepancies in terms of both content and method. It can be called from this maintenance that the research has specific originalities in the field. It is expected that the results of this study which is influenced by the impact of resistance to change will contribute to the field and application.

1.1 The Purpose of the Research

The aim of the research is to examine the relationship between the primary and secondary school teachers' self-efficacies and resistance levels of change.

1.2 Sub-Problems

1. Is there any positive relation between self-efficacy belief and resistance to change belief according to the primary and secondary teachers' perceptions?
2. Is self-efficacy belief an important interpretation of resistance to change according to the primary and secondary school teachers' perceptions?

2. Method

In this research, relational screening model is used and the data is obtained by quantitative data collection method. The dependent variable of the study is resistances of teachers to organizational change; the independent variable is self-efficacy belief. The data of the study was obtained by using "General Self-efficacy Scale" and "Resistance Scale of teachers to organizational change".

2.1 Population and Sample

The population of this research is composed of 1107 teachers served in 95 official primary and secondary schools in Mnisa-Salihli in 2013-2014 education-teaching year.

Random sampling method is used in this study and at least 10% of the schools were randomly selected according to the figures that make up population. 179 women, 189 male totally 368 volunteer teachers served in these school composed the population of the research.

2.2 Data Collection Tools

For the creation and determination of data collection tools, considerable literature has been scanned and expert opinion has been taken.

2.2.1 Resistance to Change Teacher Scale

In order to determine resistances of teachers to change, in the first stage the 40-question item pool which aims to describe resistance to change was created by benefiting from the literature (Balci, 2001; Helvacı, 2010; Judson, 1991; Özdemir, 1998; Taştan, 2013, Töremen, 2002; Yeniçeri, 2002). 24-articled scale has developed as a result of screening of the literature, investigation of the related researches (Koçel, 2005; Hussey, 1997) and consultation of an expert opinion. The created scale was applied to the primary and secondary school teachers by pilot scheme. On the scale, the first, forth, sixth, eleventh, sixteenth, twentieth items were graded reversed. According to exploratory factor analysis; (Kaiser Meyer Olkin=.87, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity=2482.64 p=.000) values have obtained and based on appropriate values, the structure of the scale is determined by the analysis of the basic components. In order for an item to be represented in a factor, it has to have a factor load of at least '240'' and the difference between the load values of the items in the factor and the load values in other factors must be higher (Büyüköztürk, 2011). As a result of the factor analysis 3 items with scale-negative correlation were first removed, then an item which has a factor load of: 40 was subtracted, and the scale has been finalized for 24 items. The results of the factor loads, the self-discharge, the variance and reliability coefficients of the scale are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Resistance to change scale factor loads of teachers, self-value, described variance and reliability coefficients

Dimension	Loads Factor	Self-value	Described Variance	Cronbach Alfa
Lack of loss (10items)	.496- .777	6.430	26,792	.83
Passive-active resistance (8 items)	.458- .657	1.815	7,561	.72
Intolerance (6 items)	.428 - .736	1.644	6,850	.67
Total			41,203	.86

According to table 1, the three-factor structure describes 41,20% of the variance.

2.2.2 General Self-efficacy Scale

The original 23-item version of the scale was developed by Sherer and his friends (1982). The original scale consisted of two-factor structure including general self-efficacy and social self-efficacy. Magaletta and Oliver's widely used the General Self-efficacy Scale of 17-item (1999), which was adapted to Turkish by Yıldırım and İlhan

(2010), was used in this study. Although there are studies in which this scale was previously adapted to Turkish, it was started from the translation phase of the scale to work the scale because of some problems; the scale was translated into Turkish and then English by five academicians from different fields in three separate groups, it is also evaluated for culture, compliance, merchantability and fitness for purpose. In addition, criterion validity and test-repeat test application was performed. The internal consistency coefficient of the entire scale (Cronbach Alfa) has been found .80. In this study, Cronbach Alfa was calculated .83.

2.3 Data Collection

For the application of measurement instruments, application permission has been granted from the Ethics Committee and Manisa National Education Ministry, teachers have been provided with the description of the measuring tools and the volunteers are provided to participate in the research by taking permissions from the school principals. The scale up to number of teachers was delivered to the schools where the number of teachers is too high by the researcher and the scales were gathered by going again. 376 scales which were applied to the 400 teachers serving in the 40 official primary and secondary schools in Salihli were examined, the 8 scale in which all or one part of the scale has left blank were eliminated and 368 scales were taken into consideration.

2.4 Data Analysis

SPSS 15.0 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) was used to analyze the data in the research. In order to calculate the level of prediction and relation between two variables, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) and multiple regression analysis were used. Significance level has been stated as $p < 0.05$.

3. Findings of the Research

In this part, response to the questions of the research has been searched. For this, descriptive statistics of all variables were calculated first, then the status of the assumptions has been checked and results of regression analysis have been presented. The arithmetic mean and standard deviation results for all variables are given in Table 2.

Table 2: The distribution of perceptions concerning the resistances of teachers to change with their self-sufficiencies (N=36)

Scale	̄	SD	Min.	Max.	Skewn.	Kurtosis
Resistance to change	2,03	11,47	24,00	87,00	,351	,350
Indifference	2,15	6,53	10,00	45,00	,769	1,088
Active-Passive Resistance	2,01	4,63	8,00	34,00	,527	1,019
Unwillingness	1,88	2,90	6,00	23,00	,384	-,602
Self-efficacy	4,07	9,54	2,59	5,00	-,378	-,602
Starting	4,13	6,14	1,56	5,00	-,779	,287
Undaunting	4,01	3,30	1,80	5,00	-,440	-,228
Effort-Persistence	3,99	2,07	2,33	5,00	-,268	-,651

As seen in table 2, it is seen that the teachers' levels of resistance to change are low level ($\textcircled{=}$ 2, 15-1,88). This level is more distinct in the difference dimension ($\textcircled{=}$ 2,15). In the self-efficacy, it is seen that perceptions of the teachers are positive ($\textcircled{=}$ 4,13-3,99). This result is the most distinct in the starting dimension ($\textcircled{=}$ 4,13). The relationship between the primary and secondary school teachers' perceptions in relation to resistance to change and their perceptions of general self-efficacy are given in table 3.

Table 3: R statistics results showing the relationship between the teachers' self-sufficiencies and their resistances to change

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Indifference	1.00	.54**	.431**	-.289**	-.358**	-.165**
2. Active-passive resistance		1.00	.366**	-.236*	-.366*	-.182**
3. Unwillingness			1.00	-.241**	-2.95**	-.243**
4. Starting				1.00	.585**	.338**
5. Undaunting					1.00	.431**
6. Effort-persistence						1.00

*relevance coefficient $\alpha=0.05$ (two-way analysis)

**relevance coefficient $\alpha=0.01$ (two-way analysis)

When the Table 3 is examined, there is a low and moderate negative relationship between the dimensions of the resistance to change ($r=-.366^*,-.165^*$). There is a low and moderate negative relationship in between the indifference dimension of resistance to change ($r=-.166^{**}$) and the effort-persistence dimension of self-efficacy ($r=-.118^*$). A moderate negative directional relationship has found between the active-passive dimension of the resistance to change and undaunting dimension of The self-efficacy ($r=-.366^*$).The other mid-level relationships is between the indifference dimension of resistance to change and the undaunting dimension of self-efficacy ($r=-.358^{**}$). In table 4, the regression results of resistance to change of self-efficacy's indifference dimension are given.

Table 4: Results of regression analysis predicting scores of self-efficacy on "indifference" dimension

	Variables	B	SE	β	t	p	R ²	Tolerance	VIF
Indifference	Stable	37,730	2,414		15,631	,000	,138	,650	1,539
	Starting	-1,156	,578	-,121	-2,001	046		,596	1,679
	Undaunting	-2,839	,624	-,287	-4,554	,000		,804	1,243
	Effort-Persistence	-,013	,514	-,001	-,026	,979			

According to the values in table 4, the indifference dimension, which is a dependent variable, predicts to the starting, undaunting and effort-persistence dimensions of self-efficacy in a meaningful level ($R=0,400, R^2=0,138, p<0.01$). According to this, the independent variables together describe 14% of the total variance in the dependent variable. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β) the importance of predictive variables on the indifferent dimension is listed as "undaunting", "starting" and "effort-persistence". According to t-test results $p<0.05$ in a meaningful level with dependent variable, the difference is meaningful between regression coefficients of the

“undaunting” (p=0.000) and the “starting” dimensions (p=0.046). The predicting level results of resistance to change of self-efficacy’s active-passive dimension are given in Table 5.

Table 5: Results of regression analysis predicting scores of self-efficacy on "active-passive" dimension

	Variables	B	SE	β	t	p	R ²	Tolerance	VIF
Active-Passive	Stable	27,174	1,728		15,728	,000	,120	,650	1,539
	Starting	-2,004	,414	-,295	-4,845	,000		,596	1,679
	Undaunting	-,235	,446	-,034	-,528	,598		,804	1,243
	Effort-persistence	-,461	,368	-,069	-1,252	,211			

According to table 5, the active-passive dimension predicts in a meaningful level (R=0.351, R²=0,120, p<0.01) to the “starting”, “undaunting” and “persistence” dimensions of general self-efficacy. According to this, the independent variable together describes 12% of the total variance in dependent variable. According to standardized regression coefficient (β), the importance of the predicting variables on the dimension of active-passive resistance is listed “starting”, “effort-persistence” and “undaunting”. According to t-test result p<0.05 in a meaningful level with dependent variable only the difference in regression coefficients of only “starting” dimension (p=0.000) is meaningful.

Table 5: Results of regression analysis predicting scores of self-efficacy on "starting" dimension

	Variables	B	SE	β	t	p	R ²	Tolerance	VIF
Unwillingness	Stable	18,366	1,090		16,848	,000	,108		
	Starting	-,375	,261	-,088	-1,437	,152		,650	1,539
	Undaunting	-,816	,282	-,186	-2,897	,004		,596	1,679
	Effort-Persistence	-,560	,232	-,133	-2,414	,016		,804	1,243

According to table 5, the “starting”, “undaunting” and “persistence” dimensions of self-efficacy predicts to “starting” resistance dimension in a meaningful way (R=0,358, R²=0,108, p<0.01). According to this, independent variables together describes to 11% of the total variance in dependent variable. According to standardised regression coefficient (β), the importance of the predicting variables on the dimension of unwillingness is listed as, “undaunting”, “effort-persistence” and “starting”. According to t-test result, p<0.05 in a meaningful level the difference with dependent variable and regression coefficients of only the “undaunting” (p=0.004) and “persistence” (p=0.016) dimensions are meaningful.

4. Results and Discussion

According to the result of this study, it is a positive situation that the teachers' resistance levels to change are low level. In another way, the teachers aren't very resistant to change. While the teachers most show resistance by indifference, namely by

performing reckless manner, they perform less unwilling or reluctant behaviour. It is possible to say that the teachers in this situation are satisfied with the how much information they are given and they only do business with instruction. However, in the case of change, they behave more cautious about their reluctance to go to work and taking it slow. The ideal is to minimize these resistances and even completely reset them. This finding is also consistent with other research, too (Çakır, 2009; Demirtaş, 2012; Doğru and Uyar, 2012; Şentürk, 2007). According to this result, it is revealed that authorities must give education and organize activities to the administrators and teachers.

In addition to this, it is seen that the teachers have a positive self-belief levels. While the teachers self-believe in starting are higher, they believe in themselves less in undaunting, be ardent and persistent. According to this, teachers are better at being adapting to difficult and complicated jobs, being patient and determined, completing the job and trying to success. Besides, the teachers are better at such topics; self-reliance, standing firm and forcing themselves to finish the job. With this important and positive outcome, they have to make necessary arrangements and work for a better level in this regard as well. Because Ayık, Savaş ve Yücel (2015) stated that the individuals have a high self-efficacy beliefs are more ardent and insistent by choosing more difficult and assertive aims. According to them, this situation contains to be receptive to changers and innovations. There is a negative directional relationship between the dimensions of resistance to change and self-efficacy. However, there is a moderate negative relationship between "indifference" and "active-passive" dimensions of resistance to change and "undaunting" dimension of self-efficacy. From this result, it can be said that the teachers who behave indifferent or active-passive to change have fallen frustration more in the face of a new situation. According to this, it is said that while the teachers' self-sufficiency levels are higher, their resistance to change are lower. The lowest level of relationship is between the "indifference" and "active-passive" dimensions of self-efficacy and "effort-persistence" dimension of self-efficacy. It is understood from this, there is a more limited relationship between working with effort and persistence to change. Self-efficacy describes 14% which is a ratio creates about one in seventh, to the "indifference" dimension of resistance to change. In this relationship, the description level in the dimensions of the "undaunting" and "starting" is meaningful. Self-efficacy describes the "active-passive" dimensions by 13% and the "undaunting" dimension by 11%. Only the starting in the active-passive dimension, the undaunting and effort-persistence in the unwillingness dimension are more important. These results Show that the self-efficacy belief is one of the elements affecting resistance to change. Although the percentage of the predicting is seen at a low level, for example in topics such as being indifferent to change, disregarding. Self-efficacy has a remarkable effect on being indifferent to change and disregarding topic. These results were supported by İnandı, Yeşil, Karatepe and Uzun (2015) in a limited way. Because, according to the results of the research mentioned, there are only two dimensions of relationship between self-efficacy and resistance to change. Teachers' perceptions in self-sufficiency and its sub-dimensions are in the level of "I agree" teachers' perceptions

are in the level of "I do not agree" in resistance to change and its sub-dimensions. A negative relationship was found in low and medium level between self-efficacy and resistance to change according to the dimensions. Self-sufficiency describes that the undaunting dimension of resistance to change is by 14%, active-passive resistance is by 12% (the difference in starting dimension is meaningful) and unwillingness dimension is by 10% in a low level (the difference in undaunting and effort-persistence is meaningful). The low levels shouldn't necessarily mean that self-efficacy has less effect on resistance to change. The effect of 10% to 15% of these factors to resistance to change is important and the necessity of determining of other factors is revealed.

References

1. Alıcı, M. (2000). İlkokul öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetiminde yetkinlik beklentisi rolünün İngiltere ve Türkiye'de seçilen bir araştırma grubu üzerinde incelenmesi. Retrieved form www.yok.gov.tr/egfak/meral.htm.
2. Alkan, C. (1997). *Eğitim teknolojisi* (5. Baskı). Ankara: Anı Yayınevi.
3. Ayık, A., Savaş, M. & Yücel, E. (2015). İlkokullarda görev yapan okul müdürlerinin genel öz yeterlik ile örgütsel bağlılık algıları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8, 193-218.
4. Balcı, A. (2003). *Örgütsel sosyalleşme kuram strateji ve taktikler*, Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
5. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: a social cognitive theory*; Nj: Prentice Hall.
6. Bandura, A. (1995) Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies In A Bandura (Ed) self-efficacy in changing societies, New york: Cambridge University.
7. Basım, H. N., Korkmazıyürek, H. & Tokat, A. O. (2008). "Çalışanların öz yeterlilik algılamasının yenilikçilik ve risk alma üzerine etkisi: kamu sektöründe bir araştırma", *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 19, 121-130 (2008). (DOAJ, EBSCO)
8. Baskan, G. A. (2001). Öğretmenlik mesleği ve öğretmen yetiştirmede yeniden yapılanma, *Denge Mat. L.fi.*, Ankara.
9. Başaran, İ. E. (1982). *Eğitime Giriş*. Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası.
10. Bovey, W. H. & Hede, A. (2001). Resistance to organizational change: The role of defence mechanisms. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16/7, 534-548.
11. Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2011). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı* (14. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
12. Coch, L. & French, J (1948) "Overcoming resistance to change", *Human Relations*, 1(4): 512-32.
13. Çakır, B. S. (2009). *İlköğretim okullarındaki yönetici ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel değişime ve örgütsel değişime direnme olgularını algılamaları üzerine bir araştırma*.

- (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
14. Çalık, T. & Er, E. (2014). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin okulun değişime açıklığı ile değişim kapasitesi algıları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi, *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 20(2), 151-172.
 15. Çalık, T.; Koşar, S.; Kılınç, A. Ç. & Er, E. (2013). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin değişime direnme davranışları ile öz yeterlikleri arasındaki ilişki, *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6 (2), Retrived from.
 16. Davis, K. A. (2004). *Information technology change in the architecture, engineering, and constructing industry: An Investigation of Individuals' resistance*. (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Virginia University of Technology.
 17. Demirtaş, H. (2012). İlköğretim okullarının değişime açıklığı. *İlköğretim Online*, 11, 18-34.
 18. Dent, E. B., & Goldberg, S. G. (1999). Challenging "resistance to change". *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 35(1), 28.
 19. Doğan, İ. (2002). *Sosyoloji, kavramlar ve sorunlar* (5. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.
 20. Doğru, S. & Uyar, M. (2012). Milli eğitim bakanlığı taşra örgütlerinin değişmeye direnme eğilimleri üzerine bir araştırma: Konya ili örneği. *Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32, 119-143.
 21. Eskici, M. (2013). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin yapılandırmacı yaklaşıma ilişkin öz yeterlik algıları ile tutumları. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Doktora Tezi
 22. Gibson, S. ve Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569-582.
 23. Gürses, G. & Helvacı, M. A. (2011). Öğretmenlerin okullarda değişime karşı direnme nedenleri. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 8(1), 1541-1561.
 24. Helvacı, M. A. (2010). *Eğitim örgütlerinde değişim yönetimi* (2. Baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.
 25. Hill, L. A. (2010). *Değişimi yönetmek*. Çeviren: Melis İnan. İstanbul: Optimist Yayınları.
 26. Hsiao, H.C., Chang, J.C., Tu, Y.L. & Chen, S.C. (2011). The impact of selfefficacy on innovative work behavior for teachers. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 1 (1), 31-36.
 27. Hussey, D. E. (1997). *Kurumsal değişimi başarmak* (2. Baskı). Çeviren: Tülay Savaşer. İstanbul: Rota Yayınları.
 28. Işık, İ. (2001). Özyeterlik inancı: Yönetici rolleri açısından bir inceleme. Marmara Üniversitesi Doktora Tezi.
 29. İnandı, Y., Yeşil, H., Karatepe, R. & sterdikleri Direnç Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi, *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(2), 563-581.
 30. Judson, S. A. (1991). *"Minimizing resistance to Change"-Changing Behaviour in Organization*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

31. Kasap D. (2012). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öz yeterlik inançları ile mesleklerine yönelik bilgisayar ve internet kullanımları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Yayınlanmış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Denizli: Pamukkale Üniversitesi.
32. Kaynak, T. (1995). *Organizasyonel davranış ve yönlendirilmesi* (2. Baskı). İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayın Dağıtım.
33. Kiremit & Gökler (2010). Fen bilgisi öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin biyoloji öğretimi ile ilgili öz-yeterlik inançlarının karşılaştırılması, *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 27, 41-54.
34. Kiremit, H. (2006). Fen bilgisi öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin biyoloji ile ilgili öz-yeterlik inançlarının karşılaştırılması. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi doktora tezi
35. Koçel, T. (2005). *İşletme yöneticiliği; yönetim ve organizasyon, organizasyonlarda davranış, klasik-modern-çağdaş yaklaşımlar* (10. Baskı). İstanbul: Arıkan Basımevi.
36. Korkut, M. (2009). *İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel değişmeye ilişkin görüşleri: Çanakkale ili örneği*. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Çanakkale On Sekiz Mart Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
37. Kurşunoğlu, A. (2006). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel değişmeye ilişkin tutumları: denizli ili örneği*. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
38. Kuvan, H. (2001). *Örgütsel değişim ve değişime direnme olgusunun kamu ve özel sektörde algılanması üzerine bir araştırma*. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
39. Lewin, K. (1947), "Frontiers in group dynamics II. channels of group life; social planning and action research", *Human relations*, 1(2), 143-153.
40. Önen, F. & Öztuna, A. (2005, Mart). Fen bilgisi ve matematik öğretmenlerinin öz yeterlik duygusunun belirlenmesi. İstek Vakfı Okulları I. Fen ve Matematik Öğretmenleri Sempozyumu'nda sunulan bildiri, İstanbul. Retrived from <http://www.oldweb.yeditepe.edu.tr/yeditepe/GetFile.aspx?aliaspath...1+sayi...do> c.
41. Özençel, E. (2007). *Örgütsel değişimin ve değişime direnme olgusunun algılanması üzerine bir araştırma* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
42. Pajares, F. (2002). Overview of social cognitive theory and of self-efficacy. Retrived from <http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/eff.html> adresinden alınmıştır.
43. Sabuncuoğlu, Z. & Tüz, M. (1996). *Örgütsel psikoloji* (2. Baskı). Bursa: Ezgi Kitabevi Yayınları.
44. Sağlam, M. (1979). *Örgütsel Değişme*. Ankara: Doğan Basımevi.
45. Stein, M. K., & Wang, M. C. (1988). Teacher development and school improvement: The process of teacher change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4, 171-187.
46. Şentürk, S. (2007). *İstanbul ili ilköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin değişime dirençleri ve direnç nedenleri* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

47. Taştan, M. (2013). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenleri için kişisel ve mesleki değişime açıklık ölçeklerinin geliştirilmesi: Bir uygulama. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 35, 1-20.
48. Taymaz, H. (1997). *Uygulamalı okul yönetimi*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Yayınları.
49. Timurkan, K. (2010). Örgütsel yapının örgütsel değişime direnç üzerindeki etkisi: İzmir Tapu ve Kadastro Bölge Müdürlüğü'nde Bir Uygulama, Doktora Tezi. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
50. Töremen, F. (2002). Eğitim Örgütlerinde Değişimin Engel ve Nedenleri. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12 (1), 185-202.
51. Türk, Ö. (2008). İlköğretim sınıf öğretmenlerinin öz yeterlikleri ve mesleki doyumlarının incelenmesi. Yeditepe Üniversite Yüksek lisans tezi.
52. Wilson, L. & Kolb, W. L. (1949). *Sociological analysis-an introductory text and case book*. Harcourt: Brace and comp.
53. Wolters, C. A., & Daugherty, S. G. (2007). Goals structures and teachers' sense of efficacy: their relation and association to teaching experience and academic level. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99 (1), 181-193.
54. Yeniçeri, Ö. (2002). *Örgütsel değişimin yönetimi: sorunlar, yöntemler, teknikler, stratejiler ve çözüm yolları*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.
55. Yıldırım, F. & İlhan, İ. Ö. (2010). Genel özyeterlilik ölçeği türkçe formunun geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 21 (4), 301-308.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).