

Investigation On Self Efficacy of Fine-Arts Teachers According to Different Variables

Kerem Cořkun¹ & Meral Cořkun²

Abstract: Purpose of the present study is to investigate self-efficacy of fine arts teachers according to different variables. The present study was designed in correlational research. 230 fine arts teachers were included through convenience sampling. The data were collected through the FATSES developed by Kayserili, Coskun, & Coskun (2017). The data were analysed through skewness and kurtosis coefficients, independent t-test, and Kruskal-Wallis test. As a result of the data analysis, it was found that fine-arts teaching self-efficacy does not vary according to marital status and gender variables, but there is a significant difference in terms of years of experience. The Fine-arts teachers with over 21 years of experience scores are significantly higher than the fine arts teachers whose years of experience are lower than 21 years. Research findings were addressed social-cognitive theory and professional life cycle of Huberman (1989). In addition to that it was concluded that marriage does not lead to decrease in self-efficacy of married fine-arts teachers and teaching fine-arts is not gendered profession.

Key Words: Self-efficacy, fine-arts teachers, marital status, gender, and years of experience.

DOI: 10.29329/mjer.2018.138.8

¹ Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Artvin Çoruh Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Temel Eğitim Bölümü, Sınıf Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı, keremcoskun@artvin.edu.tr

² Öğr. Gör., Artvin Çoruh Üniversitesi, Artvin Meslek Yüksekokulu

INTRODUCTION

Concept of teacher is one of the key components in instructional process as well as curriculum, student, learning environment. Because teacher is the person who plans, executes, assesses, and evaluates instructional process. Therefore, teacher must possess certain characteristics in order to effectively manage instructional process. Self-efficacy is one of those characteristics.

Self-efficacy can be defined as personal belief how an individual will perform behaviours for a task in the future (Bandura, 1986). Self-efficacy influences cognitive and affective process of thought. Self-efficacy has three dimensions as cognitive, motivational, and affective. Cognitive dimension is related scenario which is thought. Individual with poor self-efficacy focuses on negative scenario in performing a task, in turn his cognition is negatively influenced. As a result his performance is poor. On the contrary, better self-efficacy leads individual to think on positive scenario, and his behaviour yields optimum results and outcome in coping with environmental demands (Bandura, 1993; 1999; 2018).

Motivational process of self-efficacy, another dimension of self-efficacy, is about what extent and individual motivates himself for a specific task. Self-efficacy plays a key role in determining which task is fulfilled, how much an individual is ready, decisive against a difficulty and problem, how failure is reacted (Bandura, 1982; 1993; 2000).

The third dimension of self-efficacy is about affective process. Individuals with lower self-efficacy thinks he is not successful in doing a task, he exaggerates possible difficulty and impediment, feels excessive stress and anxiety. Therefore, his performance does not generate desired outcome (Bandura, 1982; 1993; 1999; 2000).

Sense of self-efficacy flourishes from four ways. These ways are mastery experience, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal (Bandura, 1997). Mastery experience is the most influential ways in forming sense of self-efficacy, because mastery experience requires direct engagement in a task. Mastery experience depends on accomplishments or failures in a task. While positive results increases sense of self-efficacy, failures leads to reduction in self-efficacy. Success or failure must be repetitive. Because repetitive success or failure form stabilized sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

Vicarious experience is related to observation of others. Sense of self-efficacy is not solely formed by directly experienced mastery. Sense of self-efficacy also rises from vicarious experience by observing others. Other people's successful trials instil positive sense of self-efficacy in observer. Therefore vicarious experience depends on social comparison. If observer evaluates himself equal with performer, his evaluation will serve more precise criteria and increase sense of self-efficacy. Sense-of

self-efficacy formed by modelling others are weaker and subject to change than sense of self-efficacy developed from mastery experience.

Verbal persuasion is another source of self-efficacy. Forming sense of self-efficacy through verbal persuasion involves interpersonal support. If a teacher is persuaded to have necessary skill for teaching, his sense of self-efficacy will be boosted. However, sense of self-efficacy formed by verbal persuasion is weaker than sense of self-efficacy by mastery experience (Bandura, 1997; 1999; 2000; Tschannen-Moran, 2007).

Emotional arousal is another source of sense of self-efficacy. Stressful circumstances produce emotional arousal and emotional arousal provides information as to personal competency. Consequently, emotional arousal another factor forming sense of self-efficacy. People are dependent on their state of emotional arousal in evaluating their stress and anxiety when they do task. High emotional arousal negatively influences performance (Bandura, 1997).

Sense of self-efficacy is very crucial in performing necessary behaviours, effectively coping with stress and difficulties in professional career. Furthermore, sense of self-efficacy is very influential in choosing profession (Bandura, 2002).

Teaching is the profession which sense of self-efficacy is effective. Mastery experience has very seminal function in forming high teacher self-efficacy. Successful instructional activities, planned and executed by a teacher, will increase teacher self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, Hoy, 1998).

Vicarious experience makes contribution to teacher self-efficacy. Teacher observe his colleagues, develop teacher self-efficacy based on his observation (Tschannen et al., 1998). If colleagues is successful, this success will boost teacher self-efficacy in observing teacher.

Verbal persuasion is another way of forming teacher self-efficacy. If parents, school principals, and colleagues persuade a teacher to have necessary skill, teacher self-efficacy rises.

Forming high teacher self-efficacy has positive outcome for instructional process. For instance teachers with high self-efficacy motivate their students (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Ross, 1992), spend most of their time on instructional activities rather than preventing disruptive behaviours of students (Gibson & Dembo, 1984), are more open to changes, more efficacious in making instruction more diverse, more competent in taking students' needs into consideration (Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988). In addition to that, teachers who has lower teacher self-efficacy, tend to criticize their students in the case of failure, give up instructional activities, use external rewards in reinforcement, punishment (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Therefore, investigation on teacher self-efficacy reveal key indicators about instructional process and their performances.

Goal of the study: Teacher self-efficacy has very important implications on learning environment from academic achievement to classroom management. Thus, there is large body of research about teacher self-efficacy. In the relevant literature, relationship between teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout, jobs tress (Klassen, 2010; Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010), the association of self-efficacy with job satisfaction (Viel-Ruma, Houchins, Jolivette, & Benson (2010), the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014), impact of teacher self-efficacy on academic achievement (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone, 2006), the correlation between level of teacher self-efficacy and teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress (Klassen & Chiu, 2010), effect teacher self-efficacy on preschool teachers' self-efficacy on literacy gain, classroom quality, and children's language development (Gou, Piasta, Justice, & Kaderavek, 2010), teacher self-efficacy and teaching effectiveness (Klassen & Tze, 2014), teacher self-efficacy and inclusive instructional practices (Malinen, Savolainen, Engelbrecht, Nel, Nel, & Tlale, 2013) were addressed. Furthermore, more specifically primary school teachers' self-efficacy (Guo, Connor, Yand, Roehrig, & Morrison, 2012; Lee, Cawthon, & Dawson, 2013; Ramey-Gassert, Shroyer, & Staver, 1996, Rimm-Kaufmann & Sawyer, 2004), science teachers' self-efficacy (Blonder, Benny, & Jones, 2014; Cakiroglu, Capa-Aydin, & Hoy, 2012; Thompson, 2015), mathematics teachers' self-efficacy (Swars, 2005; Swars, Daane, & Giesen, 2006), preschool teachers' self-efficacy (Gou et al., 2010; Kim & Kim, 2010) were investigated .No study has investigated fine-arts teachers self-efficacy according to several variables. Therefore, the present study aims to examine fine-arts teacher's self-efficacy according to gender, years of experience, age, marital status variables. In the present study it was queried whether fine-arts teacher's self-efficacy significantly vary according to gender, years of experience, age, and marital status. Moreover, detecting factors affecting self-efficacy of fine-arts teachers helps to improve fine-arts teachers' instructional performance, creating positive classroom environment.

METHOD

Design of the Study: In the present study, it was assumed that social reality is independent from mind and can be reached through reliable ways that can be repeated. Moreover, the present study depends on such quantification of fine-arts teachers' self-efficacy that quantitative research tradition was employed. Moreover, the present study was designed in correlational research, one of the quantitative research traditions, due to the fact that its purpose is to reveal variance between fine-arts teachers' self-efficacy and gender, marital status, age, years of experience (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012).

Sampling: Random sampling, which was thought to represent the research population, was used. As a result of random sampling, 305 fine-arts teachers were included in the study. Ages of the participant fine arts teachers were categorized according to APA age categories. The participant fine

arts teachers who are aged between 20 years and 40 was coded as the first adulthood while ages between 41 years and 60 years were coded as middle adulthood. On the other hand, year of experience was coded ten years by ten years. Characteristics related to the participant fine arts teachers were shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Characteristics of the Research Sample

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)	Total
Marital Status	Single	70	23	305
	Married	235	77	
Gender	Female	215	70.5	305
	Male	90	29.5	
Years of Experience	1-10 Years	125	41	305
	11-20 Years	104	34	
	21-30 Years	38	12.5	
	31-40 Years	38	12.5	

Instrument: Data were collected through the Fine Arts Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale (FATSES) developed by Kayserili, Coskun & Coskun (2017). The FATSES includes 11 items and consists of three sub-scale as “*Self-Efficacy for Preparatory and Practical Process (SEPPP)*”, “*Self-Efficacy for Instructional Process (SEIP)*”, and “*Self-Efficacy for Diversities (SED)*”. The FATSES’s Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient is .90. Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the SEPPP is .90, Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient for the SEIP is .81, and SED’s Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient is .83. The FATSES also has good model fit indices (RMSEA= .07, CFI= .97, GFI= .90, TLI= .96, IFI= .97). The FATSES is a likert type scale and each likert was divided into 2 degree. The Highest score of the FATSS is 110 and the lowest score of the FATSES is 11. Based on aforementioned explanations it was concluded that the FATSES could produce reliable and valid results in assessing fine-arts teachers self-efficacy.

RESULTS

Results About Marital Status Variable:

Normality test was conducted through skewness and kurtosis to decide which statistical test would be carried out in order to detect whether there is significant difference between scores of male fine-arts teachers and scores of female fine-arts teachers. Normality tests results about marital status variable were indicated in Table 2.

Table 2. Normality Test Results Related to Marital Status

Marital Status	Measurement	n	df	\bar{X}	Skeweness	Kurtosis
Single	Overall			93.70	-.84	.93
	SEPPP	70	70	42.94	-.84	.85
	SEIP			25.32	.76	.73
	SED			25.42	-.94	.67
Married	Overall			95.01	-.76	.02
	SEPPP	235	235	44.04	-.83	-.17
	SEIP			25.35	.67	.54
	SED			25.14	.71	-.71

Normality test results indicated that the data about marital status variable have normal distribution because of the fact that kurtosis and skeweness coefficients was found to vary between -1.00 and 1.00 (Field, 2009). Therefore, it was decided that independent t-test, one of the parametric tests, would be used so as to reveal whether fine-arts teaching self-efficacy varies according to marital status. Independent t-test was displayed in Table 3.

Table 3. Independent T-Test Results

Sub-Scales	Marital Status	n	\bar{X}	Sd	Df	t	p
Overall	Single	70	93.70	12.83	303	.86	.54
	Married	235	95.01	10.94			
SEPPP	Single	70	42.94	6.14	303	1.54	.35
	Married	235	44.04	4.91			
SEIP	Single	70	25.32	3.35	303	.06	.80
	Married	235	25.35	3.57			
SED	Single	70	25.42	3.85	303	.38	.83
	Married	235	25.14	3.63			

Results of independent t-test indicate there is no significant difference between scores of the married fine-arts teachers and single fine-arts teachers in overall scores of the FATSES and all of its sub-scales. Based on this result it can be said that self-efficacy of the fine-arts teachers does not change with respect to marital status ($t_{(303)} = .86; p > .05; t_{(303)} = 1.54; p > .05; t_{(303)} = .06; p > .05; t_{(303)} = .38; p > .05$).

Results About Gender Variable:

Normality test was carried out so as to decide which statistical test would be used to determine if fine-arts teaching self-efficacy varies according to gender. Normality tests was carried out based on skeweness and kurtosis. Results of the normality tests was displayed in Table 4.

Table 4. Normality Test Results of Gender Variable

Gender	Measurement	n	df	\bar{X}	Skeweness	Kurtosis
Female	Overall			94.80	-.84	.48
	SEPPP	215	215	43.85	-.94	.60
	SEIP			25.17	-.93	.81
	SED			25.77	-.93	.32
Male	Overall			94.50	-.63	.09
	SEPPP	90	90	42.74	-.65	-.16
	SEIP			25.76	-.75	.53
	SED			25.10	-.89	.91

Results about normality test of gender variables all of the scores have normal distribution because of the fact that kurtosis and skeweness coefficients range between -1.00 and 1.00. As a result of the normality tests Independent t-test was decided to be used in order to reveal whether self-efficacy of the fine arts teachers vary according to gender variable. Results of independent t-test were shown in Table 5

Table 5. Independent T-Test Results Related to Gender Variable

Sub-Scales	Gender	n	\bar{X}	Sd	Df	t	p
Overall	Female	235	94.80	12.44	303	.21	.83
	Male	90	94.50	8.62			
SEPPP	Female	235	43.85	5.59	303	.36	.74
	Male	90	43.61	4.25			
SEIP	Female	235	25.17	3.83	303	-1.33	.18
	Male	90	25.76	2.57			
SED	Female	235	25.77	3.75	303	1.45	.14
	Male	90	25.10	3.46			

As a result of independent t-test it was found that there is no significant difference between scores of female fine-arts teachers and male overall scores of male fine-arts teachers in overall of the FATSSES and all of the its sub-scales it ($t_{(303)} = .21$; $p > .05$; $t_{(303)} = .36$; $p > .05$; $t_{(303)} = -1.33$; $p > .05$; $t_{(303)} = 1.45$; $p > .05$).

Results of Years of Experience Variable:

Normality test results was conducted to decide which statistical test would be used. Normality analysis was carried out based on Kolmogorov-Smirnov due to the fact that all categories of years of experience has frequency over 30. Table 6 indicates normality test results.

Table 6. Normality Test Results

Years of Experience	Measurement	n	df	\bar{X}	Skewness	Kurtosis
1-10 Years	Overall			93.20	-1.04	-1.40
	SEPPP	125	125	91.58	-.37	.45
	SEIP			97.68	-1.01	1.15
	SED			105.26	-1.78	-2.42
11-20 Years	Overall			43.40	-1.10	1.22
	SEPPP	104	104	42.49	.36	-.72
	SEIP			43.75	-.78	.67
	SED			48.57	-1.72	1.55
21-30 Years	Overall	38	38	24.68	-1.00	1.27
	SEPPP			24.55	-.67	.12
	SEIP			26.84	-.18	-.80
	SED			28.21	1.25	1.55
31-40 Years	Overall	38	38	3.53	-1.00	.77
	SEPPP			3.56	-.43	-.31
	SEIP			4.22	-1.44	1.73
	SED			2.14	-1.90	3.42

Overall scores and the SED sub-scale scores of the fine-arts teachers whose years of professional experience range between 1-10 years don't have normal distribution and scores from the its sub-scales don't have normal distribution according to years of experience. Based on the results, it was concluded that Kruskal Wallis Test would be used in the data analysis due to the fact that each categories of the independent variable, years of professional experience, have the scores which don't have normal distribution.

Table 7. Results of Kruskal-Wallis

Sub-Scales	Years of Experience	n	\bar{X}	Sd	Mean Rank	df	X	p
Overall	1-10 Years	125	93.20	11.84	142.12	3	56.29	.54
	11-20 Years	104	91.58	10.38	124.54	3		
	21-30 Years	38	97.68	8.63	174.97	3		
	31-40 Years	38	105.26	6.48	244.71	3		
SEPPP	1-10 Years	125	43.40	5.556	141.50	3	55.49	.35
	11-20 Years	104	42.49	4.92	126.82	3		
	21-30 Years	38	43.75	3.77	167.50	3		
	31-40 Years	38	48.57	2.69	246.71	3		
SEIP	1-10 Years	125	24.68	3.80	136.63	3	49.85	.80
	11-20 Years	104	24.55	3.38	130.29	3		
	21-30 Years	38	26.84	1.95	187.84	3		
	31-40 Years	38	28.21	1.87	234.16	3		
SED	1-10 Years	125	25.47	3.53	148.98	3	46.63	.83
	11-20 Years	104	24.53	3.56	124.36	3		
	21-30 Years	38	25.84	4.22	166.08	3		
	31-40 Years	38	28.47	2.14	231.53	3		

Kruskal Wallis analysis results revealed that there is significant difference in favour of the experienced in overall scores of the FETSES and all of the sub-scales of the FATSES. In other words, scores of self-efficacy vary according to years of professional experience ($p < .05$). Furthermore, from Table 6 it can be concluded that the fine-arts teachers who have more than 30 years of professional experience, scored highest points from the FATSES and its all of the subscales.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Education process has three components as curriculum, teacher, and student. This process is multi-faceted so numerous variables can influence. Self-efficacy can be considered those variables. Self-efficacy is very important for fine-arts teachers to deliver effective instruction, and create positive learning environment in classrooms as well as other teachers. In the present study, it was revealed that there is no significant difference between self-efficacy of married fine-arts teachers and self-efficacy of single fine-arts teachers. This finding can be explained with view of marriage and division of labour household among participant fine-arts teachers. Marriage results in burden on mates such as childbearing, childrearing, housework, financial responsibility. View of marriage has changed from traditional family to egalitarian family. Maternal employment has caused this change of view and husbands have taken more responsibility in childrearing, housework but woman have helped and owned more responsibility in financial burden in return (Botkin, Weeks, & Morris, 2000; Claffey & Mickelson, 2009, Goldscheider, Bernhardt, & Lappergard, 2015). Egalitarian view of marriage among

married fine-art teachers may prevent their level of self-efficacy from decreasing compared to the single fine-arts teachers' level of self-efficacy.

Results also indicated that there is no significant difference between self-efficacy of male fine-arts teachers and that of the female fine arts teachers. This results can be explicated through social-cognitive theory, which generated the concept of self-efficacy. Social cognitive theory addresses gender-related issues in a unified social cultural conceptual framework (Bandura, 1986). According to social cognitive theory, cultural conceptual framework about gender roles are results of large social influence arising from familial and societal systems. Gender related information is conveyed through modelling. A great deal of gender related information is gained by observing a model in home settings or work place context. Enactive process is another process to construct gender-related information. Enactive process provides basis to distinguish whether a behaviour, enacted is appropriate or not. This requires feedback from others and self-evaluation. In other words, evaluation of behaviour helps to construct gender-related information (Bandura, 1986; Bussey & Bandura, 1999; Rosenthal & Zimmerman, 1978). Gender related information based on both modelling and enactive process influence self-efficacy in turn self-efficacy effects career choice (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy is one of the most influential factors that determine people to select their careers. Self-efficacy also have an impact people's belief how well they will perform certain behaviors required in their careers. In the present study female and male fine-arts teachers have equal self-efficacy related to fine-arts teaching. In other words teaching fine-arts is not confined to any gender types and the participant male and female fine-arts teacher equally believe how well that they have been delivering teaching instructions about fine-arts. Results on gender does not confirm findings of the study conducted by Demirci & Ozyurek (2017); Irris (1991), Kiviet & Miji (2003), Klassen & Chiu (2010), Schwarzer & Hallum (2010) Irris reported that male science teachers have better science teaching self-efficacy than female science teachers possess and attributed this significant difference to the fact that science teaching is male-oriented profession. However, the present study sought out that male and female teachers have equal self-efficacy of fine-arts teaching. This results can be considered as the proof that teaching fine-arts is not a gender specific occupation. On the other hand results on gender are coherent with findings of the researches by Azar (2010), Cakiroglu & Gencer (2007).

As for the results about years of experience, it was found that the participant teachers' self-efficacy varies according to years of experience and it was observed that significant difference in favour of the fine-arts teachers whose years of experience are between 31 years and 40 years exists. Results also revealed that even though there is no linear relationship between self-efficacy and years of experience, self-efficacy most diminishes between 11 years and 20 years but reaches peaks at 40 years of experience. Klassen & Chiu (2010) noted that self-efficacy increase during early career and mid-career but significantly decreases after mid-career. Huberman (1989) pointed out that teacher

professional life cycle includes stages as *survival* and *discovery* (1 and 3 years), *stabilization* (4-6 years), *experimentation* and *activism* (7-18 years), *serenity* (19-30 years), *disengagement* (31-40 years). Huberman (1989) added that teachers whose are at the stage of serenity, experience a loss in energy and enthusiasm and compensate energy and enthusiasm with sense of confidence. In the research sample the fine-arts teachers whose years of experience are between 21 years and 30 years can be considered as serenity teachers. The fine arts teachers at the stage of serenity, scored highest after the fine-arts teachers with whose years of experience vary between 31 years and 40 years. As a result serenity fine-arts teachers seem to have compensated loss in their energy and enthusiasm with self-efficacy. The fine arts teachers with more than 31 years of experience can be thought as disengagement stage teacher according to the life-cycle by Huberman (1989). However, in the research sample the fine-arts teachers who have more than 31 years of experience marked highest points from the FATSES and its sub-scales. Therefore, results about years of experience do not confirm Huberman's life-cycle of teacher profession. Results on years of experience revealed that self-efficacy of the participant fine-arts teachers increases by age excluding to the period between 11 years and 20 years. The significant difference in favour of the fine arts teachers whose years of experience are over 20 years can be explained through self-efficacy theory and nature of fine-arts. Results also can prove that the more the participant fine-arts teachers have, the more their self-efficacy increases. Mastery experience is the most influential way of improving self-efficacy. Having experience in fine-arts teaching appears to make the participant fine-arts teaches more adept. In addition to that, the participant fine-arts teachers whose years of experience are over 21 years may have had more mastery experiences during their careers and in turn mastery experiences may have instilled a belief that they have become more efficacious in teaching fine-arts. Another reason about the highest level of self-efficacy of the participant fine-arts teachers whose years of experience are over 21 years is related to nature of the fine-arts. Basically teaching fine-arts is completely different from mathematics teaching, science teaching, elementary teaching because of the fact that fine-arts teaching depends on performing arts such as oil painting, water colour, handcrafts, drawing so those arts requires certain duration of time. The participant teachers whose years of experience are over 21 years may have find enough time to boost their fine-arts skills. As result of certain time of period, their fine-arts teaching self-efficacy have increased significantly. Results of the study about are not supported by findings of the studies in the relevant literature. Day & Gu (2007) reported that the teachers who are in mid-career are more motivated. Klassen & Chiu (2010) noted that teacher self-efficacy increases between early career and mid-career and peaks at mid-career and began to decrease after mid-career. Ghaith & Yaghi (1997) found that teacher self-efficacy is negatively correlated with teaching experience. Guo, Justice, Sawyer, & Topkins (2011) noted that self-efficacy of preschool teachers are not related to teaching experience. On the contrary results of the study about years of experience confirm several research in the relevant literature. Ross, Cousins, & Gadalla (1996) found

that *teacher self-efficacy increases by teaching experience*. Wolters & Daugherty (2007) pointed out that *some aspects of teacher self-efficacy are positively correlated with teaching experience*. Holzberger, Philipp, & Kunter (2013) found out that *teaching experience increases self-efficacy*. Walker & Slear (2011) concluded that *teacher self-efficacy are related to teaching experience*. Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy (2001) found that *teaching experience has mediate impact on teacher self-efficacy*.

The present study, designed in correlational research, revealed that fine-arts teachers' self-efficacy does not vary according to gender and marital status. Therefore, male and female fine-arts teachers have equally fine-arts teaching self-efficacy. In addition to that, teaching fine-arts are not confined to any gender and cannot be viewed as a gendered profession. Furthermore, years of experience is influential variable in determining fine-arts teachers' self-efficacy. During the professional-cycle more experience makes the fine-arts teachers more efficacious.

REFERENCES

- Azar, A. (2010). In-service and pre-service secondary science teachers' self-efficacy beliefs about science teaching. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 5(4), 175-188.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37 (2), 122-147.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28 (2), 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9 (3), 75-78.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Self-Efficacy Efficacy in Changing Societies. (Ed, A. Bandura). *Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blonder, R., Benny, N., & Jones, M. G. (2014). Teaching self-efficacy of science teachers. In *The role of science teachers' beliefs in international classrooms* (pp. 3-15). SensePublishers.
- Botkin, D. R., Weeks, M. N., & Morris, J. E. (2000). Changing marriage role expectations: 1961–1996. *Sex Roles*, 42(9-10), 933-942.
- Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review*, 106(4), 676-713.
- Cakiroglu, J., Capa-Aydin, Y., & Hoy, A. W. (2012). Science teaching efficacy beliefs. In *Second international handbook of science education* (pp. 449-461). Springer Netherlands.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(6), 473-490.
- Claffey, S. T., & Mickelson, K. D. (2009). Division of household labor and distress: The role of perceived fairness for employed mothers. *Sex Roles*, 60(11-12), 819-831.

- Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2007). Variations in the conditions for teachers' professional learning and development: Sustaining commitment and effectiveness over a career. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33, 423– 443
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Gencer, A. S., & Cakiroglu, J. (2007). Turkish preservice science teachers' efficacy beliefs regarding science teaching and their beliefs about classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher education*, 23(5), 664-675.
- Ghaith, G., & Yaghi, H. (1997). Relationships among experience, teacher efficacy, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher education*, 13(4), 451-458.
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(4), 569-582.
- Goldscheider, F., Bernhardt, E., & Lappegård, T. (2015). The gender revolution: A framework for understanding changing family and demographic behavior. *Population and Development Review*, 41(2), 207-239.
- Guo, Y., Connor, C. M., Yang, Y., Roehrig, A. D., & Morrison, F. J. (2012). The effects of teacher qualification, teacher self-efficacy, and classroom practices on fifth graders' literacy outcomes. *The Elementary School Journal*, 113(1), 3-24.
- Guo, Y., Justice, L. M., Sawyer, B., & Tompkins, V. (2011). Exploring factors related to preschool teachers' self-efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(5), 961-968.
- Guo, Y., Piasta, S. B., Justice, L. M., & Kaderavek, J. N. (2010). Relations among preschool teachers' self-efficacy, classroom quality, and children's language and literacy gains. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 1094-1103.
- Guskey, T. (1988). Mastery learning and mastery teaching: how they complement each other . *Principal*, 68 (1), 6-8.
- Holzberger, D., Philipp, A., & Kunter, M. (2013). How teachers' self-efficacy is related to instructional quality: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(3), 774-786.
- Huberman, M. (1989). The professional life cycle of teachers. *Teachers College Record*, 91(1), 31-57.
- Kaysirili, E., Coşkun, M., & Coşkun, K. (2017). Görsel sanatlar öğretimi öz-yeterlilik ölçeği: geçerlilik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 12(14), 73-84.
- Kim, Y. H., & Kim, Y. E. (2010). Korean early childhood educators' multi-dimensional teacher self-efficacy and ECE center climate and depression severity in teachers as contributing factors. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(5), 1117-1123.
- Kiviet, A. M., & Mji, A. (2003). Sex differences in self-efficacy beliefs of elementary science teachers. *Psychological Reports*, 92(1), 333-338.
- Klassen, R. M. (2010). Teacher stress: The mediating role of collective efficacy beliefs. *The Journal of educational research*, 103(5), 342-350.
- Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of educational Psychology*, 102(3), 741-756.

- Klassen, R. M., & Tze, V. M. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy, personality, and teaching effectiveness: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review, 12*, 59-76.
- Lee, B., Cawthon, S., & Dawson, K. (2013). Elementary and secondary teacher self-efficacy for teaching and pedagogical conceptual change in a drama-based professional development program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 30*, 84-98.
- Malinen, O. P., Savolainen, H., Engelbrecht, P., Xu, J., Nel, M., Nel, N., & Tlale, D. (2013). Exploring teacher self-efficacy for inclusive practices in three diverse countries. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 33*, 34-44.
- Ramey-Gassert, L., Shroyer, M. G., & Staver, J. R. (1996). A qualitative study of factors influencing science teaching self-efficacy of elementary level teachers. *Science Education, 80*(3), 283-315.
- Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Sawyer, B. E. (2004). Primary-grade teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes toward teaching, and discipline and teaching practice priorities in relation to the "responsive classroom" approach. *The Elementary School Journal, 104*(4), 321-341.
- Rosenthal, T. L., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1978). *Social learning and cognition*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ross, J. (1992). Teacher efficacy and effects of coaching on student achievement". *Canadian Journal of Education, 17* (1), 51-65.
- Ross, J. A., Cousins, J. B., & Gadalla, T. (1996). Within-teacher predictors of teacher efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12*, 385– 400.
- Schwarzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. *Applied Psychology, 57*(s1), 152-171.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy: Relations with teacher engagement, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion. *Psychological Reports, 114*(1), 68-77.
- Stein, M. ve Wang M. (1988). Teacher development and school improvement: The process of teacher change. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4*(2), 171-187.
- Swars, S. L. (2005). Examining perceptions of mathematics teaching effectiveness among elementary preservice teachers with differing levels of mathematics teacher efficacy. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 32*(2), 139.
- Swars, S. L., Daane, C. J., & Giesen, J. (2006). Mathematics anxiety and mathematics teacher efficacy: What is the relationship in elementary preservice teachers?. *School Science and Mathematics, 106*(7), 306-315.
- Thompson, B. J. (2015). *Science teacher self-efficacy and student achievement: A quantitative correlational study* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix).
- Tschannen-Moran, M, Woolfolk-Hoy A. ve Hoy K.W.(1998). Teacher efficacy: its meaning and measurement. *Review of Educational Research, 68* (2),202-248.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783– 805.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 944 –956.

Viel-Ruma, K., Houchins, D., Jolivette, K., & Benson, G. (2010). Efficacy beliefs of special educators: The relationships among collective efficacy, teacher self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 33(3), 225-233.

Walker, J., & Slear, S. (2011). The IMPACT of principal leadership behaviors on the efficacy of new and experienced middle school teachers. *NASSP Bulletin*, 95(1), 46-64.