iojes
www.iojes.net

International Online Journal of Educational Sciences

ISSN: 1309-2707



Determination of Value Education Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Prospective Teachers

Filiz Çetin[1]

[1] *Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, Ankara, Turkey*

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 26.07.2016
Received in revised form 15.10.2016
Accepted 25.10.2016
Available online 16.11.2016

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the level of values education self-efficacy beliefs in students studying in a Faculty of Education. The working group of the study comprised 550 students studying in 7 different teaching programs in the Faculty of Education, Gazi University in the fall semester of the 2015-2016 academic year. The data was collected using the Values Education Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale developed by the researcher. The data obtained from the study was analyzed with SPSS software. The data was analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, t-test for independent groups when comparing groups and variance analysis techniques. According to the results of the analysis, the level of self-efficacy beliefs regarding values education among prospective teachers differs significantly depending on gender, academic achievement and their level of satisfaction with their departments.

© 2016 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:
values, perception of efficacy, teacher training, professional development

Introduction

Humanity has been experiencing rapid progress in the last few centuries. One of the most important features of the century we live in is that the changes occurring are rapid, unpredictable and highly varied. In our ever-changing world, even predictions about the future may become obsolete in a very short period of time and there are many arguments and counter arguments about what will happen in the near future (Koylu, 2007). Political, social, cultural changes and developments have increased the importance of individuals acquiring values which allow them to establish effective and efficient communication and develop enduring solutions that conform to ethical rules (Kale, 2007). This is important as it can be argued that recent historical and technological developments may have caused people to turn away from enduring spiritual and human values.

To value something means to favor that situation, action, thought or feeling over any other. Values are the source of people's behavior and they are also used by people to judge their own and others' e behavior. Values define what is important for people, shape their desires and preferences and they indicate what is desirable and what is not (Erdem, 2003).

Values also explicitly or implicitly manifest the abilities of an individual or a group and they affect decisions about the form, method, and purpose of any activity undertaken (Kluckhohn, 1951).

The function of values for individuals and society is to provide a perspective on and awareness of their own existence and surroundings. Values held by the individuals provide ethical criteria for individuals and societies and guide them as they try to make sense of the facts and events occurring around them, as

[1] Corresponding author's address: Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of EducationBosna Block No:230 Teknikokullar-Ankara
Telephone:+903122021821
e-mail:ficetinsc@gmail.com
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2016.04.008

© 2016International Online Journal of Educational Sciences (IOJES) is a publication of Educational Researches and Publications Association (ERPA)

well as determining the importance of these facts/events and their own position with regard to them (Yesil &Aydın 2007).

Behavior is driven by values, directly or indirectly. Children learn about values from their parents and schools and reflect these values in their learning processes. In other words, values have a significant influence on learning (Berkowitz, 2002). For example, Bloom orders the factors that determine learning at school into 'cognitive introduction behaviors', 'affective introduction characteristics' and the 'quality of education.' In this context, he emphasizes that affective features not only exist before the educational process, but also emerge as a product after the educational process. He states that 'affective introduction characteristics' have the power to explain the variation in learning products at the rate of twenty five percent based on the learning model in schools (Bloom, 1971). In this framework, it is thought that affective introduction behaviors will have an effect of more than one quarter upon achieving learning in case of detecting deficiencies in cognitive introduction behaviors (Ozcelik, 1998).Values education provided at formal education institutions is a school-based activity that directly or indirectly improves the students' perspectives on and knowledge about values. It provides students with the skills necessary to ensure that they behave in accordance with certain values (Hooper, 2003). The quality of the environment created in the school and the classroom is important for an effective values education. Relations within the school and the nature of the environment should be taken into account when trying to support values education (Dilmac, Ertekin & Yazıcı, 2009).

If education tries to foster only the cognitive and psychomotor skills, this will lead to problems in attaining other abilities such as values, attitudes and ensuring social cohesion and identifying common objectives will be difficult if not impossible. This shows how important it is to have systematic and effective values education in schools. For this purpose, concepts and issues related to values education must be internalized by teachers (Yazıcı, 2006).

As one major element in education, the teacher is as important as the program itself in values education. Children go to their teachers when they face difficulties, starting from their very first day at school. From the children's perspective, the teacher teaches, educates, looks after and becomes friendly with them. In short, he/she tries to fulfill their demands and tries to help lay the foundations of their developing personality (Oktay, 1999). For the children, it is the teacher that makes values valuable. Teachers are thus important role models who help individuals grasp and internalize values. Their own faith in the education they provide is as important as their knowledge and skills.

Teachers are required to be fully qualified within their profession. This is closely related to good education and the belief that they can successfully carry out their duties and responsibilities (Yılmaz, Koseoglu, Gercek & Soran,2004). The idea of 'self-efficacy beliefs' emerged for the first time as a variable in Bandura's Social Learning Theory. These are individual judgments on how well individuals can perform the necessary actions when dealing with the possible situations they might face(Bandura, 1994).

Self-sufficiency grows as the individual gets more experienced. Individuals can develop their self-efficacy beliefs observing their own experiences or other people (Lee, 2005).

The way individuals perceive their self-efficacy affects their way of thinking and emotional responses. Individuals who strongly believe in their self-efficacy can be more efficient even when they face difficult situations. Those who do not believe in their self-efficacy believe that their tasks are much more difficult than they actually are. Such a way of thinking increases anxiety and the level of stress and restricts the perspectives necessary to effectively solve problems (Uredi &Uredi, 2006). In addition, a teacher who does not believe his/her self-efficacy will not be able to transmit confidence to students and assert authority over them (Aksu, 2008). Therefore, believing in their own self-efficacy helps individuals to increase their level of success (Goddard, Hoy & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2000; Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca & Malone, 2006). The self-efficacy beliefs of a teacher are, however, not only significant for student success. They are also related to many psycho-social elements, including self-confidence, openness, job satisfaction, occupational motivation, and performance. Confidence in one's self-efficacy is a significant predictor of many positive teaching practices (Bumen, 2009).

Therefore, the self-efficacy beliefs that prospective teachers develop will affect the opinions, attitudes and behaviors that they exhibit while carrying out their profession (Sahin, Zade & Direk, 2009). Thus, it is very important to determine the level of prospective teachers' beliefs in their own self-efficacy in teaching values.

Purpose of the Study

The overall aim of this study is to identify the level of self-efficacy beliefs regarding values education among prospective teachers. In line with this general purpose, the following sub-questions were set:

1. What do the prospective teachers believe about their own self-efficacy regarding values education?

2. Is there a significant difference between prospective teachers depending on gender, academic success and/or the level of satisfaction with their departments?

Method

Research Design

This is a survey study that aims to determine the level of self-efficacy beliefs regarding values education among prospective teachers. The survey model is a research method that describe an existing or past situation as it is. In that sense, the research is based on a descriptive survey model (Karasar, 2012).

Sample and Population

The working group of the study consists of 550 senior students studying at the Faculty of Education at Gazi University within the scope of 7 teaching programs, as follows: Turkish: 75, Preschool: 100, Science: 99, Social Studies: 50, Art, Crafts and Design: 71, Guidance: 55, English: 100. 76% of students are female and 24% are male students. All students were contacter through their respective departments and were selected randomly. No sampling was conducted among these students. As a result, the working group of the study comprises of 550 students studying in 7 different teaching programs in the Gazi University Faculty of Education.The group is composed of 76% female, 24% male students.

Data Collection Tool

Value education self-efficacy beliefs scale. The "Values Education Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale" developed by Cetin (2016) was used to collect the data. It is a Likert scale that comprises 26 items and 4 sub-dimensions. Answers are graded between 5 and 1, from "Completely Agree" to "Completely Disagree".The highest possible score is 130 and the lowest possible score is 26. All of the items in the scale are positive and there are no reverse-scored items. The scale comprises of four sub-dimensions: Planning, implementation, cooperation, and evaluation. The Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) coefficient of 0.94 and Bartlett's test result (Chi-Square 3544.93; $p < .001$) were significant.The proportion of the total explained variance from these four factors was 60.44%.The reliability and internal consistency coefficient were estimated using the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient. The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients were calculated respectively for each subscale and overall scale and were as follows:For the first subscale (planning) .87; for the second subscale (application) .91; for the third subscale (cooperation) .85; for the fourth subscale (evaluation) .95;and for the whole scale.84.

Data Analysis

A t test for independent groups was used to determine whether the self-efficacy beliefs of prospective teachers regarding values educationwere affected by gender. Variance analysis techniques were used to determine whether academic success and satisfaction with their department had an effect on the opinions of the students.

Results

The table shows the results of t-test and variance analysis conducted according to perception variables of gender, success and level of satisfaction with the department, based on the data obtained forthe level of self-efficacy beliefs regarding values educationin prospective teachers. Distribution of values education self-efficacy scores of prospective teachers are presented in table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of value education self-efficacy scores of prospective teachers

	N	M	SD	Min.	Max.	Number of Items
self-efficacy	550	96.32	12.50	43	127	26

According to Table 1, when the overall mean scores of the students are analyzed, the arithmetic mean seems to be (M = 96.32). When 550 prospect teachers who participated in the study are categorized in 5-choice response categories ("high (88.41 points or above), medium (67.51-88.40), low (67.60 points and lower)", 421 (76.55%) of them had a self-efficacy mean score of 88.41 - 130.00. The research shows that the level of self-efficacy beliefs of prospective teachers regarding values education were at a high value. Table 2 shows the results of the t-test on the values education self-efficacy belief scores.

Table 2. The table shows the results of the t-test on the value education self-efficacy belief scores

Scale Sizes	Gender	N	M	SD	t	*P*
Planning	Female	407	25.99	3.59	5.46	0.000***
	Male	143	24.07	3.70		
Implementation	Female	407	34.44	4.95	5.31	0.000***
	Male	143	31.93	4.64		
Cooperation	Female	407	22.96	3.26	1.66	0.098
	Male	143	22.43	3.47		
Evaluation	Female	407	14.37	2.60	2.51	0.013*
	Male	143	13.79	2.27		
Total	Female	407	97.76	12.58	4.89	0.000***
	Male	143	92.22	11.33		

* P<.05, *** P<.001

As it can be seen in Table 2, the values education self-efficacy means scores of female students (M = 97.76) are different from the mean scores of male students (M = 92.22). the According to the t-test, this difference [t(548)=3.70, p<0.001] is significant. According to these results, the self-efficacy scores of female students are higher than male students. In other words, female students have more confidence in their ability to teach values.On the other hand, all sub-dimensions apart from the "cooperation" sub-dimension are in line with the results obtained in general. In order to determine the effect of the variable of gender upon self-efficacy scores for values education in detail, eta-square (η^2) value was calculated. The eta-square value was calculated as .042 in the entire scale. In other words, it had a “low” effect size. This finding shows that 4% of the variation in students’ self-efficacy perceptions is explained by the variable of gender. Examining the eta-square values in terms of lower dimensions of the scale, on the other hand, it is observed that the sub-factor of “Planning” has a low level, at .051, the sub-factor of “Application” .048, and the sub-factor of “Evaluation” .011. Table 3 shows the results of the variance analysis results of the values education self-efficacy belief scores based on academic success variable.

As can be seen in Table 3 the results of the variance analysis used to test the significance of the difference between the success of the student and the average values education self-efficacy scores showed that there is a significant difference between the success of the student and their values education self-efficacy scores [F(2-547)= 36.08, p<0.001].The Scheffe test was conducted to determine which group caused the differences. The results showed that students with a "very good" level of success in classes (M=106.66) scored more in self-efficacy compared to "good" (M=96.09) and "average" (M=92.74) students. Likewise, good

students scored more in self-efficacy than average students.The results showed that more successful students have higher values education self-efficacy scores than less successful students. It is observed that the distribution of scores obtained from the entire scale shows a parallelism with lower dimensions of the scale. In order to determine the effect of the variable of academic achievement upon the self-efficacy scores of values education in detail, the eta-square (Ƞ^2) value was calculated. The eta-square value was calculated as .117 in the entire scale. In other words, it has a "moderate" effect size. This finding shows that approximately 12% of the variation in students' self-efficacy beliefs is explained by the variable of academic achievement. Examining the eta-square values in terms of lower dimensions of the scale, on the other hand, it is observedthat the sub-factor of "Planning" has a moderate level, .080, the sub-factor of "Application" .120, the sub-factor of "Cooperation" .104 and the sub-factor of "Evaluation" has a low level, .037.Table 4 shows the results of the variance analysis results of the values education self-efficacy belief scores based on the student's level of satisfaction with their department.

Table 3. Shows the results of the variance analysis results of the value education self-efficacy belief scores based on academic success variable

Scale Sizes	Academic Success	N	M	SD	F	p	Significant Difference
Planning	1.very good	71	28.07	2.23	23.75	0.000***	1-2,1-3
	2.good	293	25.40	3.71			
	3.average	186	24.66	3.75			
Implementation	1.very good	71	37.96	3.77	37.34	0.000***	1-2,1-3,2-3
	2.good	293	33.72	4.68			
	3.average	186	32.31	5.02			
Cooperation	1.very good	71	25.15	2.57	31.78	0.000***	1-2,1-3,2-3
	2.good	293	22.97	3.06			
	3.average	186	21.69	3.47			
Evaluation	1.very good	71	15.48	1.13	10.57	0.000***	1-2,1-3
	2.good	293	14.00	2.72			
	3.average	186	14.08	2.47			
Total	1.very good	71	106.66	7.71	36.08	0.000***	1-2,1-3,2-3
	2.good	293	96.09	12.17			
	3.average	186	92.74	12.39			

*** P<.001

Examining Table 4; a significant difference is observed between the self-sufficiency scores obtained by preservice teachers from the entire scale according to satisfaction with their departments [$F_{(4-545)}$=31.25, p<0.001]. According to the results of the Scheffe test that was conducted for determining the groups causing this difference; it is observed that students that are "very satisfied" with their departments (M=103,52) have higher score averages of self-sufficiency compared to students that are "satisfied" (M=99.16), "a little satisfied" (M=91,70), "dissatisfied" (M=88,11) and "strongly dissatisfied" with their departments (M=88,37). Based on this result, it could be suggested that satisfaction with their departments contributes to the development of a positive self-sufficiency concerning the value education of preservice teachers.

Table 4. Shows the results of the variance analysis results of the value education self-efficacy belief scores based on the level of satisfaction with the department.

Scale Sizes	Satisfaction Rating	N	M	SD	F	p	Significant Difference
Planning	1	90	27.06	2.97	24.42	0.000***	1-3,1-4,1-5 2-3,2-4,2-5
	2	249	26.44	3.82			
	3	100	23.87	3.57			
	4	44	22.98	2.65			
	5	67	23.93	2.63			
Implementation	1	90	36.33	4.41	22.64	0.000***	1-3,1-4,1-5 2-3,2-4,2-5
	2	249	34.78	5.14			
	3	100	31.74	4.58			
	4	44	30.55	4.04			
	5	67	31.90	3.20			
Cooperation	1	90	24.88	2.63	27.85	0.000***	1-3,1-4,1-5 2-3,2-4,2-5
	2	249	23.38	3.42			
	3	100	21.91	3.34			
	4	44	20.82	1.97			
	5	67	20.67	1.85			
Evaluation	1	90	15.26	2.52	22.68	0.000***	1-3,1-4,1-5 2-3,2-4,2-5
	2	249	14.56	2.33			
	3	100	14.18	2.16			
	4	44	13.77	1.48			
	5	67	11.88	2.89			
Total	1	90	103.52	10.16	31.25	0.000***	1-3,1-4,1-5 2-3,2-4,2-5
	2	249	99.16	12.61			
	3	100	91.70	11.41			
	4	44	88.11	8.04			
	5	67	88.37	9.13			

*** P<.001

It is observed that the distribution of scores obtained from the entire scale shows a parallelism with the lower dimensions of the scale. In order to determine the effect of the variable of satisfaction with their departments upon the self-efficacy scores regarding values education in detail, the eta-square (η^2) value was calculated. The eta-square value was calculated as .187 in the entire scale. In other words, it has a "high" effect size. This finding shows that approximately 19% of the variation in students' self-efficacy beliefs is explained by the variable of satisfaction with their departments. Examining the eta-square values in terms of lower dimensions of the scale, on the other hand, it is observed that the sub-factor of "Planning" has a high level, .152, the sub-factor of "Application" .142, the sub-factor of "Cooperation" .170 and the sub-factor of "Evaluation" .143.

Discussion and Conclusion

The research findings indicate that prospective teachers'beliefs in their self-efficacy regarding values education are at a high level.Since a high level of trust in one's own self-efficacy has a positive effect on the quality of education, we can conclude that prospective teachers are in a psychologically advantageous position (Gibson & Dembo 1984).

The self-efficacy beliefs of prospective teachers with regard to values education have been analyzed here according to gender, academic achievement and students' level of satisfaction with their department.The evaluation showed that the prospective teachers' self-efficacy beliefs regarding values education differ throughout the scale and its sub-dimensions.

The arithmetic means of the scores on the basis of gender show that female prospective teachers perceive themselves to be more capable than male prospective teachers do throughout the scale and its sub-dimensions.However, even though the findings show that the variable of gender creates a difference in self-efficacy scores, it is observed that the variable of gender has a "low" effect upon the self-efficacy beliefs regarding values education.These results coincide with findings in the literature that point to the fact that the gender variable creates differences in self-efficacy beliefs(Jones & Wheatley, 1990; Morgil, Secken& Yucel,2004; Karadeniz & Ozdemir, 2006; Uredi & Uredi, 2006; Britner & Pajares 2006; Coskun, Gelen &Ozturk,2009; Cetin, 2012)

The arithmetic means of the scores for academic achievement according to the scale show that academic success as a factor affects self-efficacy beliefs.However, the findings regarding the effect of academic achievement upon self-efficacy beliefs with regard to values education show that this effect is "moderate". There are many studies that show that there is a positive relationship between self-efficacy and academic achievement (Hampton & Mason, 2003; Zimmerman &Kitsantas, 2007; Ulper&Bagcı,2012; Altun &Yazıcı, 2013; Kirmizi, 2015). In that regard, these findings show similarities with the literature.

The average score of prospective teacher based on their level of satisfaction with their departments shows that the level of satisfaction changes the level of belief in their self-efficacy regarding values education.The findings regarding the effect of prospective teachers' satisfaction with their departments on their self-efficacy beliefs as they pertain to values education show that this effect is "high".Although there is only a limited number of studies in the literature, the findings they present confirm our findings. (Coskun, 2010; Erdogan &Arsal, 2015).

As a result, having belief in their self-efficacy regarding values education will help prospective teachers to guide their students cognitively, emotionally, socially and academically.Both the school and the teacher have an effect on the development of values. Because of that, helping prospective teachers to develop their self-efficacy beliefs during the training period, and taking the factors that play a role in the development of self-efficacy fully into consideration are both very important.

In recent years, the Turkish education system has paid special interest to values education and a great deal has been done to improve it. Since self-efficacy beliefs have an effect on the quality of education, such improvements have to be based on scientific data so that all that work is not in vain. This can only be done by increasing the number of studies on values education and implementing the results.

References

Akbas, O.(2004). *Türk milli eğitim sisteminin duyussal amaclarının ilköğretim ikinci kademedeki gerçekleşme derecesinin değerlendirilmesi***.** Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Ankara.

Aksu, H.H.(2008). Ögretmen adaylarının matematik öğretimine yönelik öz-yeterlilik inançları. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8(2), 161-170

Altun, F., &Yazıcı H.(2013). Ergenlerin benlik algılarının yordayıcıları olarak: akademik öz-yeterlik inancı ve akademik başarı. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 21(1), 145-156.

Bandura, A. (1994) *Self-efficacy*. V.S. Ramachaudran (Ed), Encyclopedia of human behavior, (pp. 71-81). New York. Academic Press.

Berkowitz, M.W.(2002). The science of character education . W.Damon (Ed.). *Bringing in a new era in character education.* (pp.43-63.) Stanford: California: Hoover Institution Press.

Bloom, Benjamin S. (1971). Mastery learning, J.H. Block (Ed.). *Mastery learning: theory and practice. (*pp. 47-63). New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Britner, SL.,& Pajares F.(2006). Sources of science self-efficacy beliefs of middle school students**.** *Journal of Research In Science Teaching,* 43(5), 485–499.

Bumen, N.T.(2009). *İlk ve ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin özyeterlik inançlarının incelenmesi: İzmir ili ö*rneği, 18. ulusal egitim bilimleri kurultayı. 18 Eylül 2010 tarihinde http://www.pegem.net/akademi/ kongrebildiri_detay.aspx?id=101344 adresinden erişilmiştir.

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: 473–490.

Cetin, S.(2012). Determining classroom management self-efficacy beliefs of teacher candidates. *Energy Education Science and Technology Part B: Social and Educational Studies*, 4(4), 2239-2246.

Cetin, F.(2016). Developing a scale to measure prospective teachers' self-efficacy belief in value education, *Revista De Cercetare Si İnterventie Sociala*, 53, 39-54.

Coşkun, E., Gelen, G., &Özturk, E.P.(2009). Türkçe öğretmen adaylarının öğretimi planlama, uygulama ve değerlendirme yeterlik algıları, *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6 (12), 140-163.

Coskun, M.K.(2010).Din kültürü ve ahlak bilgisi öğretmenlerinin özyeterlik algılarının çesitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Sosyal Bilimler Arastırmaları Dergisi*. 1, 95-109.

Dilmac, B., Ertekin, E.,& Yazıcı, E.(2009). Değer tercihleri ve öğrenme stilleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi, 7* (17), 27-47.

Erdem, A.R.(2003). Üniversite kültüründe önemli bir unsur: değerler. *Değerler Egitimi Dergisi*, 1(4), 25-34.

Erdogan, D.G, &Arsal, Z.(2015). Öğretmen adaylarının akademik branş memnuniyetleri ile öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelme ve kariyer geliştirme arzuları arasındaki ilişki. *Uluslararasi Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4, 147-171.

Gibson, S.,& Dembo, M.H.(1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psycholog*, 76: 569-582.

Goddard, R.D., Hoy, W.K., &Woolfolk-Hoy, A.W.(2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(2), 479-507.

Hampton, N. Z., & Mason, E. (2003). Learning disabilities, gender, sources of selfefficacy, self-efficacy beliefs, and academic achievement in high school students. *Journal of School Psychology*, 41, 101–112.

Hooper, C.(2003).Values education study. Literature Review. In V. Zbar, D.Brown, B.Bereznicki (Eds.). *Values education study-final report, (*pp. 168-212). Melburne: Curriculum Corporation.

Jones, M.G.,& Wheatley. J.(1990). Gender differences in teacher-student interactions in science classrooms. *Journal of Research in Science Teach*, 27(9), 861-874.

Kağıtçıbaşı, C.(1988). *İnsan ve insanlar*. İstanbul: Evrim Basim Yayim.

Kale, N.(2007). *Nasıl bir değerler eğitimi? Eğitim ve değerler.* Değerler ve eğitimi uluslararası sempozyumu. İstanbul: Değerler Eğitimi Merkezi Yayınları.

Karadeniz, C., &Özdemir N.(2006). Sosyal bilgiler ogretmen adaylarinin cografya alanina iliskin oz yeterlik inanclari (Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Örneği). *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Egitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* 22, 23-30.

Karasar, N.(2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler*. Ankara: Nobel Yayin Dagitim.

Kirmizi, O.(2015). Yükseköğretimde ingilizce öğrenen öğrencilerin akademik öz-benlik, öz-yeterlik, öz-düzenleme ve basarıları arasındaki ilişki. *Yuksekogretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 5(1), 32-40.

Kluckhohn, C,(1951). Values and value orientations in the theory of action: An exploration indefinition and classification. İn T. Parsons, E. Shils (Eds.). *Toward a general theory of action. (*pp. 388-433). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Koylu, M.(2007). Kuresel baglamda degerler egitimine duyulan ihtiyac. *Degerler ve Egitimi Uluslararasi Sempozyumu.* İstanbul: Degerler Egitimi Merkezi Yayinlari.

Lee, W.S. (2005). *Encyclopedia of school psychology*, Sage Publication. 521-522.

Morgil, I. Secken, N.,& Yucel, A.S.(2004). Kimya öğretmen adaylarının öz-yeterlik inançlarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *BAU Fen Biimleri. Enstitüsü. Dergisi,* 6(1): 62-72.

Özçelik, D.A. (1998). *Eğitim programları ve öğretim.* Ankara: OSYM Yayınları,

Oktay, A.(1999). *Yasamin sihirli yillari: Okul öncesi dönem.* İstanbul: Epsilon Yayincilik.

Sahin, F.S., Zade, B.M.,& Direk, H.(2009). *Ögretmen adaylarinin öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutum ve yaşam doyum düzeyleri,* XVİİİ. Ulusal Egitim Bilimleri Kurultayi, Ege Universitesi-İzmir.

Ulper, H.,& Bagci, H.(2012). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine dönük öz yeterlik algıları. *Turkish Studies - İnternational Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*. Volume 7(2), 1115-1131. doi:10.7827/TurkishStudies.3039

Uredi, I. & Uredi, L.(2006). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının cinsiyetlerine, bulundukları sınıflara ve başarı düzeylerine göre fen öğretimine ilişkin öz-yeterlik inançlarinin karşılaştırılması, *Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 1(2)*. 1-8.

Yazıcı, K. (2006). Değerler eğitimi'ne genel bir bakış. *Türklük Bilimi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 19, 499-522.

Yesil, R.,&Aydin, D.(2007). Demokratik değerlerin eğitiminde yöntem ve zamanlama. *Turkiye Sosyal Arastirmalar Dergisi,* 11(2):65-84.

Yılmaz, M.,Koseoglu, P., Gercek, C.,& Soran, H.(2004). Yabancı dilde hazırlanan bir öğretmen öz-yeterlik ölçeginin turkçe'ye uyarlanması. *Hacettepe Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 27, 260-267.

Zimmerman, B. & Kitsantas, A.(2007). Reliability and validity of Self-Efficacy for Learning Form (SELF) scores of college students. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie/Journal of Psychology*, 215(3), 157-163.