

Research Article

Determining self-efficacy levels of the English language teachers for the education of gifted students¹

İrem Girgin^{2*} and Gökhan Ilgaz³

Interdisciplinary Disability Studies Program, Social Sciences Institute, Trakya University, Edirne, Türkiye

Article Info

Received: 14 April 2022
Revised: 3 June 2022
Accepted: 14 June 2022
Available online: 30 June 2022

Keywords:

Gifted education
English language teaching
Self-efficacy
Teacher self-efficacy for gifted education
Self-efficacy scale for education of gifted students

2149-360X/ © 2022 by JEGYS
Published by Young Wise Pub. Ltd.
This is an open access article under
the CC BY-NC-ND license



Abstract

Gifted student education has been the centre of many studies until now. Even though there was an amount of studies examining gifted education there was limited amount of studies related to self-efficacy levels of English Language Teachers for gifted students. Therefore, the aim of this study is to determine the self-efficacy levels of English Language Teachers towards gifted student education and examining teachers' age, professional seniority levels and gender variables. This study was carried out with 352 volunteer English Language Teachers (291 women, 61 men) who worked in the 2020-2021 academic year in the Educational Institutions related to the Ministry of National Education in Turkey. As a result, it was found that self-efficacy beliefs of English Language Teachers towards education of gifted students in both sub-dimensions and total scores of the scale were around 80 out of 100. Therefore, it was revealed that teachers' self-efficacy beliefs were high. Also, the results of the analysis showed that self-efficacy beliefs of English Language Teachers towards the education of gifted students increased with the age variable. In addition to these results, it was found that the self-efficacy beliefs of English Language Teachers increased as their teaching Professional seniority levels increased. Lastly, there was no significant difference in the whole scale and its sub-dimensions related to gender variable. In addition to that, literature review of the studies about teachers' professional seniority and gender variables revealed that, a consensus could not be reached. In order to eliminate this ambiguity, further studies are needed on this subject. On the other hand analysis of the scale revealed that items with the lowest average on the scale showed that, self-efficacy scores of English teachers in subjects such as behaviour control, implementation of the Individual Education Program and classroom control were lower than the other items.

To cite this article:

Girgin, I., & Ilgaz, G., (2022). Determining self-efficacy levels of the English language teachers for the education of gifted students. *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists*, 10(2), 279-289. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17478/jegys.1119736>

¹ This study was produced from first author' master thesis.

² Corresponding Author, Master student, Interdisciplinary Disability Studies Program, Social Sciences Institute, Trakya University, Edirne, Türkiye. E-mail: iremgrgn.0@gmail.com ORCID: 0000-0002-5361-9945

³ Assoc.Prof., Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, Trakya University, Edirne, Türkiye. E-mail: gokhani@trakya.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0001-8988-5279

Introduction

To this day, many definitions have been made by academicians to explain the word gifted. According to the literal meaning, the word “gifted” refers to individuals that are bestowed special talents by God (Akarsu, 2004). In a more academical context, gifted student is an individual who demonstrates above-average skills in one or more of the physical, social, emotional or cognitive contexts compared to their peers (Stephens & Karnes, 2000). Education of gifted individuals is one of the issues that have been emphasized both in Turkey and abroad in recent years. The concept of gifted individuals doesn't only cover academic success thus a gifted individual may have talent in art, leadership, sports or many other fields (Reynolds & Birch, 1988).

Giftedness can manifest in more than one area; Talent above the average in areas such as perception, analysis skills and language skills, which develop under the influence of environmental factors and the mental characteristics that an individual brings with heredity, may indicate giftedness (Baykoç, 2010). Throughout history, studies on the education of gifted individuals have attracted the attention of researchers (Karnes, Stephens, & James, 2000). It is also important to consider the education of gifted individuals within the framework of foreign language education.

In the international academy context, the concept of gifted individuals have been defined as individuals who have superior skills compared to their peers, have talents or abilities in multiple areas such as creativity, art, academic and leadership, and can analyze information faster than their peers (Renzulli, 1986; Wagner & Sternberg, 1982). Studies that examine gifted education revealed gifted individuals need special training to support their development. Therefore, review of the educational context mentions the qualifications of the educational staff involved in the education of these individuals are also important (Piske, Stoltz, & Machado, 2014).

The adequacy of normal education programs in meeting the educational needs of gifted individuals is questioned since the education programs for gifted individuals should be versatile and have features that will support the mental development of these individuals; so that gifted individuals can use their skills more effectively (Steiner & Carr, 2003). Knowledge and competencies of educators are considered just as important as education programs for gifted education. The concept that expresses teachers' knowledge and competencies is associated with self-efficacy. According to Bandura (1977), self-efficacy is expressed as an individual's ability to direct his behaviours towards a determined goal to be successful. Bandura (1993) stated that individuals with high self-efficacy have more strategically flexible, cognitively skillful and motivational functions compared to other individuals. Studies have revealed that individuals who have the ability to successfully cope with various stressful situations are individuals with high general self-efficacy; therefore, they perform their duties more effectively (Schwarzer, 1992). Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, and Malone mentioned (2006), that there is a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and student satisfaction. Thus, educators with higher general self-efficacy levels can complete challenging tasks more effectively (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008).

The concept of teacher self-efficacy has been defined as specific to the field, task and context rather than a general self-confidence structure (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Although studies have been conducted in different disciplines related to teacher self-efficacy, it has been observed that there are limited amount of studies on the self-efficacy of English teachers regarding the education of gifted students.

Darling-Hammond, Flook, Cook-Harvey, Barron, and Osher (2020) stated that when children are supported within all areas of their development, individuals improve their abilities, confidence and motivation. This finding supports the idea that when the language skills of gifted individuals are supported, their linguistic abilities will improve.

Considering the effect of teachers' self-efficacy on the quality of teaching process, it is important to determine the professional self-efficacy of English teachers for the education of gifted individuals. Examining the professional skills and abilities of teachers in foreign language education is of great importance in the training of these students so that gifted individuals who represent us in many global and local areas do not have foreign language problems in their future lives.

Problem of Study

- What is English Language Teachers' level of self-efficacy regarding gifted students?

Sub-problems

- What is English Language Teachers' level of self-efficacy regarding gifted students according to age variable?
- What is English Language Teachers' level of self-efficacy regarding gifted students according to professional seniority variable?
- What is English Language Teachers' level of self-efficacy regarding gifted students according to gender variable?

Method

Research Design

In order to examine the general perceptions of English teachers regarding the education of gifted individuals, this study was carried out in survey method. Survey method is preferred to investigate the relationship between two or more variables in the same population (Karasar, 2011; Leedy & Omrod, 2010). To add more to this study was conducted to investigate English Language Teachers' perceptions on gifted education according to gender, age and professional experience.

Participants

Questionnaire items were added to the prepared scale and it was opened to the participation of English teachers via e-survey. The scale was presented to the participation of teachers between 27.05.2021 and 04.06.2021 and the analysis was carried out with the data obtained from 352 people.

The participants of this study took part in this study on a voluntary basis. Since the data were collected over the internet, it was obtained by simple random sampling. The scale developed by the researchers, "The Self-Efficacy Scale for Gifted Students for English Teachers", was used to collect data. The stages of preparation of the scale are presented below.

Data Collection Instrument

Self-Efficacy Scale for Education of Gifted Students-English Teachers (SESEGF-ELT)

In this study, "Self-Efficacy Scale for Gifted Students" developed by the researchers was used to collect data. Scale consists of two dimensions; Preparation (4 items) and Classroom (4 items) and a total of eight items (Appendix 1 and Appendix 2). For the validity analyzes of the scale two data sets obtained by randomly dividing the data obtained from 352 individuals by approximately 50% is used. The two-factor structure obtained by Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was subjected to Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) with the other data set. As a result of the analysis, $\chi^2/sd=2.94$, TLI=.92 and CFI=.95 values were obtained. Accordingly, the model is within acceptable limits (Brown, 2006; Hu and Bentler, 1999; Schumacker and Lomaks, 1996; Sümer, 2000). ; Thompson, 2004). The Cronbach's Alpha coefficients calculated from the EFA data set of the scale for Preparation, Classroom and the whole scale are .89, .83 and .88. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficients calculated from the DFA data set of the scale for the Preparation, Classroom and the whole scale were found to be .86, .78 and .87. These values show that the internal consistency coefficient is acceptable (Özdamar, 2004).

Data Analysis

In the study, the mean and standard deviation of the items, dimensions and the overall scale were calculated. In order to interpret the self-efficacy levels of the teachers towards the gifted, the average of the dimensions and the scores obtained from the total scale was interpreted by dividing it by the number of items. In this study, teachers' self-efficacy was examined in terms of age, seniority and gender variables. No grouping was made for age and seniority. For this purpose, the mean and standard deviation of both variables were calculated. For the age variable, the mean was 37.16 and the standard deviation was 8.09. The standard deviation was considered as the cutoff point. Ages between 1 standard deviation below the mean ($37.16-8.09=29.07$) and 1 standard deviation above the mean ($37.16+8.09=45.25$) were identified as "medium", those below 1 standard deviation (less than 29.07) were identified as "young" and ages above the standard deviation (over 45.25) were identified as "advanced age".

A similar situation was also applied for the seniority variable. For descriptive statistics, the distribution of the total scores according to the variables of the study was examined, and normality tests were evaluated depending on the group

size. Kruskal-Wallis test was used when one-way analysis of variance was not provided in the seniority variable in cases where normality was provided. In order to find the source of the significant difference in the analysis of variance, LSD was used if the variance was homogeneous, and Tamhane test was used when it was not. In order to find the source of the significant difference in the Kruskal-Wallis test, Bonforonni correction was made and the Mann-Whitney U test was performed. The Mann-Whitney U test was performed when the t-test was not provided in cases where normality was achieved in the gender variable. A significance value of .05 was accepted in all analyzes. The effect size Cohen d coefficient (Lenhard & Lenhard, 2016) was calculated for the results that were significant.

Findings

In order to obtain data about the general distribution of teachers' self-efficacy, descriptive statistics of each item were made and presented in the table.

Table 1

English Language Teachers' Self-efficacy Levels for Gifted Education According to SESEGF-ELT Items

Items	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
I can notice my gifted student in English classes.	352	50.00	100	86.40	13.27
I can prevent the negative behaviours of my gifted student that disrupt the positive classroom atmosphere in the English lessons.	352	20.00	100	78.42	15.93
I can make my gifted student value learning English.	352	40.00	100	83.90	14.28
I can eliminate the situations that cause my gifted student to not be in harmony with his/her classmates in English class.	352	30.00	100	77.10	16.04
I can differentiate the forms of assessment for my gifted student in English class.	352	10.00	100	82.59	17.42
I can prepare an Individualized Education Program (IEP) for my gifted student.	352	10.00	100	83.43	19.59
I can apply the Individualized Education Program (IEP) that I have prepared for my gifted student.	352	10.00	100	80.33	19.31
I can develop teaching materials for my gifted student in English class.	352	20.00	100	82.41	17.86

As seen in Table 1, first three items with the highest mean in the scale emerged as item 1, item 3 and item 7. On the other hand, the items with the lowest average were determined as the 2nd item, 5th item and 8th item. When these items were examined, it was found that the self-efficacy scores of English teachers in subjects such as behaviour control, implementation of the Individual Education Program and classroom control were lower than the other items. Therefore, these issues can be addressed in the future as an in-service training for English teachers.

Table 2

English Language Teachers' Self-efficacy Levels for Gifted Education According to SESEGF-ELT Scales Sub-Dimensions

Sub-scales of SESEGF-ELT	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Total Item Numbers
Classroom /Instruction Dimension	352	166	400	325.82	47.32	81.46
Instructional Preparation Dimension	352	100	400	328.77	63.01	82.19
SESEGF-ELT Scale Total	352	340	785	654.60	97.75	81.82

According to Table 2, it is seen that the self-efficacy beliefs of English teachers towards the education of the gifted are around 80 out of 100 in both sub-dimensions and total scores of the scale. Therefore, it can be stated that teachers' self-efficacy belief scores are high.

In order to determine whether the self-efficacy beliefs of English teachers for the education of the gifted differ significantly according to age groups, it was examined whether the groups met the normality assumptions. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the normality assumptions were not met. Therefore, the Kruskal-Wallis test was applied and the results were presented in Table 3.3.

Table 3
English Language Teachers' Self-efficacy Levels According to Their Ages

Sub-scales	Age groups	N	Rank Average	Chi-square
Classroom	Young	57	161.94	5.251
	Middle Aged	247	174.19	
	Advanced Aged	48	205.67	
Preparation	Young	57	150.73	4.401
	Middle Aged	247	181.03	
	Advanced Aged	48	183.77	
Total	Young	57	152.79	5.095
	Middle Aged	247	177.99	
	Advanced Aged	48	196.98	

As seen in Table 3 self-efficacy beliefs of English teachers towards the education of the gifted increased with age in terms of both sub-dimensions and the average rank of the total scores. As a result of the analysis, no significant difference was found between the mean rank of the groups.

In order to determine whether the self-efficacy beliefs of English teachers for the education of the gifted differ significantly according to professional seniority, it was examined whether the groups met the normality assumptions. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the normality assumptions were not met. Therefore, the Kruskal-Wallis test was applied and the results are presented below.

Table 4
English Language Teachers' Self-efficacy Levels According to Their Professional Seniority

Sub-scales	Seniority Groups	N	Rank Average	Chi-Square
Classroom	Low Seniority	55	169.18	4.758
	Middle Seniority	254	172.75	
	High Seniority	43	207.99	
Preparation	Low Seniority	55	155.23	3.418
	Middle Seniority	254	178.62	
	High Seniority	43	191.20	
Total	Low Seniority	55	158.54	4.681
	Middle Seniority	254	175.87	
	High Seniority	43	203.17	

As shown in Table 4, it is seen that the mean ranks in both sub-dimensions and total scores increase with the the level of seniority. However, as a result of the analysis, no significant difference was found between the groups.

In order to understand whether there is a significant difference between self-efficacy scores according to gender, the normality assumption was checked and it was determined that the entire scale and its sub-dimensions did not meet the normality assumptions. As a result, Mann-Whitney U test was performed and the results are given in below.

Table 5
English Language Teachers' Self-efficacy Levels According to Gender

Sub-scales	Gender	N	Rank Average	Row Sum	Mann-Whitney U Values
Classroom	Female	291	175.23	50990.50	8504.5
	Male	61	182.58	11137.50	
Preparation	Female	291	180.45	52512.00	7725
	Male	61	157.64	9616.00	

Total	Female	291	178.08	51820.50	8416.5
	Male	61	168.98	10307.50	

As seen in Table 5 examination of class sub-dimension revealed that while the average rank of the men is high, the mean rank of the women in preparation and total is higher. As a result of the analysis, no significant difference was found according to gender in the whole scale and its sub-dimensions.

Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, the level of self-efficacy beliefs of English teachers towards the education of gifted students and the differences according to age, professional seniority and gender were examined. his study was carried out with the participation of 352 volunteer English teachers working in Turkey in the 2020-2021 educational. In this study with the survey method, the data was collected with the scale "English teachers' self-efficacy in teaching gifted students" that researchers developed.

The study first aimed to determine the level of self-efficacy beliefs of English teachers towards gifted education. As a result, teachers' self-efficacy perceptions were determined high in terms of items, dimensions and in the whole scale. Considering that teachers' self-efficacy beliefs positively affect their classroom management skills (Poulou, Reddy, & Dudek, 2018), it can be said that the high self-efficacy beliefs of English teachers regarding gifted students are related to teachers' ensuring that gifted students are successful.

Studies show that teachers with high self-efficacy levels experience professional satisfaction more compared to other teachers; moreover, it was also stated that teachers with high self-efficacy levels experienced lower levels of work-related stress (Caprara, Scabini, & Barni, 2011). Considering the positive effects of supporting and increasing teachers' self-efficacy levels on both teachers and students, teacher self-efficacy still emerges in the field as a subject that needs to be studied (Bandura, 1977).

To add more, studies related to literature mention that variables such as age and professional experience are among the factors that determine teachers' self-efficacy (Shaukat, Vishnumolakala, & Bustami, 2018). As the second aim of the study, the self-efficacy values of English teachers were examined in the light of the age variable. As a result, it was determined that as the age of the teachers increased, their self-confidence scores towards self-efficacy beliefs also increased. Considering these findings, it can be said that the self-efficacy of English teachers increase as they get older.

Third aim of the study was to examine the professional seniority of teachers. As a result of the analysis, no differentiation was observed between self-efficacy scores according to seniority levels. In a previous study, it was stated that teachers' self-efficacy is in a non-linear relationship with professional experience (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). As defined by Wolters and Daughtery (2007) when teachers' professional experience increases, their self-efficacy levels also increase. Studies on the relationship between professional experience and teacher self-efficacy show that a clear consensus on the subject has not been reached. Therefore, further investigation on this subject should be done in the future.

The final purpose of the study was to examine teachers' self-efficacy scores according to the gender variable. As a result of the analysis, it was seen that there was no significant difference according to gender groups. These findings are similar to the study of Odanga, Raburu, and Aloka (2015).

Limitations and Recommendations

In previous studies, it has been stated that supporting students academically, emotionally and socially contributes to their abilities, their confidence and motivation (Darling-Hammond, Flook, Cook-Harvey, Barron, & Osher, 2020). The results obtained in this study show that these students can have a significant support in their abilities, confidence and motivation, since they indicate that teachers have high self-efficacy and therefore have a high potential to support gifted individuals academically, emotionally and socially. It is thought that this study, which was prepared to determine the self-efficacy levels of English teachers, may be effective in preventing the inadequacies that may be experienced in the education of gifted students. Identifying the subjects teachers show low self-efficacy scores and providing in-service training on these subjects can play an important role in the education of gifted students.

Acknowledgment

This article is adapted from first authors' master thesis. We would like to thank every researcher who contributed to our scale development process. Below you can find the ethics committee permission report and the scale translated into English to be used for further research.

Biodata of Author



İrem Girgin is an English Language teacher. She graduated from Abant İzzet Baysal University English Language Teaching programme in 2018. She received her master's degree from Trakya University, Interdisciplinary Disability Studies programme in 2021. She has studies in fields Language Development, Gifted Students and Special Education. She is currently working in Ministry of Education Türkiye. **Affiliation:** Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Van, Türkiye. **E-mail:** iremgrn.0@gmail.com **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5361-9945



Assoc. Prof. **Gökhan Ilgaz** works at Trakya University Educational Sciences Department. He received his bachelors degree in Science Teaching Department from Trakya University in 2004. He completed his masters degree in Curriculum and Instructions programme in Trakya University in 2006. He received his doctorate certificate in Science Teaching Department from Gazi University in 2011. He has studies in areas Self-efficacy, self-regulation, science teaching, curriculum designing. He is currently working as deputy head of Science Department, Head of Curriculum and Instruction also Director of Institute of Roma Language and Culture Studies in

Trakya University. **Affiliation:** Trakya University, Edirne, Türkiye. **E-mail:** gokhani@trakya.edu.tr **ORCID:** 0000-0001-8988-5279

References

- Abu-Tineh, A.M., Khasawneh, S.A. & Khalaileh, H. A. (2011). Teacher self efficacy and classroom management styles in jordanian schools, *Management Education*, 25(4), 175-181.
- Akarsu, F. (2004). *Üstün yetenek kavramı*, Türkiye Üstün Yetenekli Çocuklar Kongresi Seçilmiş Makaleler Kitabı, 63(1), 127-168, Çocuk Vakfı Yayınları
- Bain, S. K., McCallum, R. S., Bell, S. M., Cochran, J. L. ve Sawyer, S. C. (2010). Foreign language learning aptitudes, attitudes, attributions, and achievement of postsecondary students identified as gifted. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 22(1), 130-156. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1932202X1002200106>
- Barni, D., Russo, C. & Danioni, F. (2018). Teachers' values as predictors of classroom management styles: A relative weight analysis, *Frontiers Psychology*, 9, 1-5
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, (28), 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning*, Pearson Longman
- Baykoç Dönmez, N. (2011). *Üstün Yetenekli Çocuklar ve Eğitimleri*, Özel Gereksinimli Çocuklar ve Özel Eğitim. Ankara: Eğitimci Kitap.
- Caprara, G.V., Barbaranelli, C., Borgogni, L. & Steca, P. (2003). Efficacy beliefs as determinants of teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(4), 821-832.
- 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
- Caprara, G. V., Scabini, E. & Barni, D. (2011). *I Valori Nell'Italia Contemporanea*, Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Çakıroğlu, E. (2008). The teaching efficacy beliefs of pre-service teachers in the USA and Turkey. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 34, 33-44.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B. & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97-140
- Dinçer, S. (2019). Investigation of the Gifted Education Self-Efficacy of Teachers Work with Gifted Students, *Journal of Gifted Education and Creativity*, 6(3), 167-174.
- Garfinkel, A., Allen, L. Q. ve Neuharth-Prichett, S. (1993). Foreign language for the gifted: Extending affective dimensions. *Roeper Review*, 15(4), 235-238.
- Güneş, A. (2015). Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Üstün Yetenekliler Eğitimine İlişkin Tutum ve Öz-yeterliliklerinin İncelenmesi, *Üstün Zekâlılar Eğitimi ve Yayıncılık Dergisi*, 2(1),12-16.
- Hu, L. & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives, *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1-55
- Karasar, N. (2011). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

- Karnes, F. A., Stephens, K. R., Whorton, J. E. (2000). Certification and specialized competencies for teachers in gifted education programs. *Roepers Review*, 22(3), 201-202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783190009554035>
- 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.
- Kılıç, V. C. (2015). Türkiye'de üstün ve özel yetenekli çocuklara yönelik bir eğitim politikası oluşturulamaması sorunu üzerine bir değerlendirme. *21. Yüzyılda Eğitim ve Toplum Eğitim Bilimleri Ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 4(12), 145-154.
- Leedy P.D. & Ormrod J.E. (2010). *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. 9th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Lenhard, W. & Lenhard, A. (2016). Computation of Effect Sizes, *Psychometrica*.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2016). Bilim ve sanat merkezleri yönergesi. *Tebliğler Dergisi*, cilt 79
- Odanga, S. J. I., Raburu, P. A. & Aloka, P. J. O. (2015). Influence of Gender on Teachers' Self-Efficacy in Secondary Schools of Kisumu County, Kenya. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 4(3), 189-198.
- Okan, Z. ve İşpınar, D. (2009). Gifted students perceptions of learning English as a foreign language. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 4(4), 117-126.
- Oral, E. (2017). Examination of Pre-School Teachers' Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Self-Efficacy Regarding Gifted Education, *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists*, 5(4), 49-58.
- Özdamar, K. (2004). *Paket Programlar İle İstatistiksel Veri Analizi*, Eskişehir: Kaan Kitabevi.
- Piske, F. H. R., Stoltz, T. & Machado, J. (2014). Creative Education for Gifted Children, *Creative Education*, 5, 347-354.
- Poulou, M. S., Reddy, L. A. & Dudek, C. M. (2018). Relation of teacher self-efficacy and classroom practices: A preliminary investigation, *School Psychology International*, 40(1), 25-48.
- Renzulli, J. S. & Reis, S. M. (1991). The reform movement and the quiet crisis in gifted education. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 35(1), 26-35.
- Reynolds, M.C. ve Birch, J. W. (1988). *Adaptive Mainstreaming (A Primer for Teachers and Principals)*, Longman Inc., London.
- Sak, U. (2010). *Üstün Zekalılar: Özellikleri, Eğitimleri ve Tanınmaları*. Baskı, Maya. Akademi Yayınevi, Ankara
- Schumacker, E. R. & Lomax, G. R. (1996). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Schwarzer, R. (1992). *Self-efficacy: Thought control of action*. Washington DC: Hemisphere.
- Schwarzer, R. & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 57(1), 152-171.
- Seyhan, B. (2015). *Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin üstün yetenekli çocuklara yönelik alguları ile tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi).
- Shaukat, S., Vishnumolakala, V. R. & Bustami, G. A. (2018). The impact of teachers' characteristics on their self-efficacy and job satisfaction: a perspective from teachers engaging students with disabilities, *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 19(1), 68-76.
- Stephens, K. R. ve Karnes, F. A. (2000). State definitions for the gifted and talented revisited. *Exceptional Children*, 66(2), 219-238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290006600206>
- Sternberg, R. & Wagner, R. (1982). A Revolutionary Look at Intelligence. *Gifted Children Newsletter*, 3(11).
- Sümer, N. (2000). Yapısal Eşitlik Modelleri: Temel Kavramlar ve Örnek Uygulamalar, *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 3(6), 49-74.
- Thompson, B. (2004). *Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis: Understanding concepts and applications*. American Psychological Association.
- Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, A.W. & Hoy, W.K. (1998). Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning and Measure, *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 202-248.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783-805.
- Wolters, C. A., & Daugherty, S. G. (2007). Goal structures and teachers' sense of efficacy: Their relation and association to teaching experience and academic level, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(1), 181-193.

Appendix 1

Self-Efficacy Scale for Education of Gifted Students-English Teachers (SESEGF-ELT)

Self-Efficacy Scale for Education of Gifted Students-English Teachers (SESEGF-ELT)		
Age: _____ Gender: Female () Male () Year of employment: _____		
Explanation: This scale is developed to determine self-efficacy levels of English Language Teachers regarding gifted student education. Please read the sentences below carefully and identify a number between 0 to 100 for each item. You can refer to the scale below to determine the number.		
Never Sometimes Always %0 % 10 %20 %30 %40 %50 %60 %70 %80 %90 %100		
No	Items	Percentage
1	I can notice my gifted student in English classes.	
2	I can prevent the negative behaviours of my gifted student that disrupt the positive classroom atmosphere in the English lessons.	
3	I can make my gifted student value learning English.	
4	I can eliminate the situations that cause my gifted student to not be in harmony with his/her classmates in English class.	
5	I can differentiate the forms of assessment for my gifted student in English class.	
6	I can prepare an Individualized Education Program (IEP) for my gifted student.	
7	I can apply the Individualized Education Program (IEP) that I have prepared for my gifted student.	
8	I can develop teaching materials for my gifted student in English class.	


Appendix 2

Self-Efficacy Scale for Education of Gifted Students-English Teachers (SESEGF-ELT) – Turkish Version

İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Üstün Yetenekli Öğrencilere İlişkin Özyeterlikleri Anketi ve Ölçeği												
Yaşınız: Cinsiyetiniz: Kadın () Erkek () Meslekte Çalışma Yılıınız:.....												
<p>Açıklama: Bu ölçek İngilizce öğretmenlerinin üstün yeteneklilere ilişkin öz-yeterliklerinin belirlenmesi amacıyla geliştirilmiştir. Aşağıda üstün yeteneklilere ilişkin öz-yeterlik seviyelerini içeren bir dizi cümle yer almaktadır. Her bir cümleyi okuyup yeterliliklerinizi tanımlama oranını bırakılan boşluğa yazınız. Oranları aşağıda verilen ölçekten yararlanarak saptayabilir ve istediğiniz sayıyı yazabilirsiniz.</p> <p>Aşağıdaki durumlarla ilgili olarak kendi durumunuzu oran(%) olarak yazınız.</p>												
		Asla			Bazen				Her zaman			
		%0	%10	%20	%30	%40	%50	%60	%70	%80	%90	%100
No	Maddeler											Yüzde
1	İngilizce dersinde sınıftaki üstün yetenekli öğrencimi fark edebilirim.											
2	İngilizce dersinde sınıftaki üstün yetenekli öğrencimin olumlu sınıf atmosferini bozan olumsuz davranışlarını engelleyebilirim.											
3	Üstün yetenekli öğrencimin İngilizce öğrenmeye değer vermesini sağlayabilirim.											
4	Üstün yetenekli öğrencimin İngilizce dersinde sınıf arkadaşları ile uyum içerisinde olmamasına neden olan durumları ortadan kaldırabilirim.											
5	İngilizce dersinde üstün yetenekli öğrencim için değerlendirme biçimlerini farklılaştırabilirim.											
6	Üstün yetenekli öğrencim için Bireysel Eğitim Programı (BEP) hazırlayabilirim.											
7	Üstün yetenekli öğrencim için hazırladığım Bireysel Eğitim Programını (BEP) uygulayabilirim.											
8	İngilizce dersinde üstün yetenekli öğrenci için öğretim materyali geliştirebilirim.											


Appendix 3

Ethical Committee Permittance


T.C.
TRAKYA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER ARAŞTIRMALARI ETİK
KURULU

Oturum Sayısı: 2021/05
KARAR NO: 2021.05.35
Karar Tarihi: 26.05.2021

Akademik Danışmanlığımı Üniversitemiz Eğitim Fakültesi Öğretim Üyesi Doç.Dr. Gökhan ILGAZ'ın yaptığı, Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İnterdisipliner Engelli Çalışmaları Anabilim Dalı Engelli Çalışmaları Bölümü Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi İrem GIRGİN tarafından, Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu'nda değerlendirilmek üzere gönderilen "İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Üstün Yeteneklilerin Öğretimine İlişkin Özyeterliklerinin Belirlenmesi" başlıklı araştırma dosyası incelenmiştir. Araştırmanın gerçekleştirilmesinde etik bilimsel standartlar açısından sakınca bulunmadığına mevcudan oy birliği / oy çokluğu ile karar verilmiştir.


Prof. Dr. Ayhan GENÇLER
Başkan
Araştırma ile ilişkisi var yok
Toplantı Katılım evet hayır

Prof. Dr. Rıdvan CANIM
Üye
Edebiyat Fakültesi
Araştırma ile ilişkisi var yok
Toplantı Katılım evet hayır

Prof. Mehmet UZUN
Üye
Güzel Sanatlar Fakültesi
Araştırma ile ilişkisi var yok
Toplantı Katılım evet hayır

Prof. Dr. Gökhan ILGAZ
Üye
Roman Dili ve Kültürü Arş.Enst.
Araştırma ile ilişkisi var yok
Toplantı Katılım evet hayır

Prof. Ahmet Hamdi ZAFER
Üye
Devlet Konservatuarı
Araştırma ile ilişkisi var yok
Toplantı Katılım evet hayır

Prof. Dr. Cem ÇUHADAR
Üye
Eğitim Fakültesi
Araştırma ile ilişkisi var yok
Toplantı Katılım evet hayır

Doç. Dr. Ahmet Emre DAĞTAŞOĞLU
Üye
İlahiyat Fakültesi
Araştırma ile ilişkisi var yok
Toplantı Katılım evet hayır

Doç. Dr. Esma MİHLİ AYANLAR
Üye
Mimarlık Fakültesi
Araştırma ile ilişkisi var yok
Toplantı Katılım evet hayır

Doç. Dr. Emre ATILGAN
Üye
Proje Koordinasyon Uyg.ve Arş.Merk.
Araştırma ile ilişkisi var yok
Toplantı Katılım evet hayır

Doç. Dr. Hakkı Mevlüt ÖZCAN
Üye
Kariyer Uygulama ve Araştırma Merkezi
Araştırma ile ilişkisi var yok
Toplantı Katılım evet hayır

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Levent DOĞAN
Üye
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
Araştırma ile ilişkisi var yok
Toplantı Katılım evet hayır

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ayşegül KILIÇ
Üye
Balkan Araştırma Enstitüsü
Araştırma ile ilişkisi var yok
Toplantı Katılım evet hayır

