

Language Teaching and Educational Research

e-ISSN 2636-8102

Volume 5, Issue 2 | 2022

The Investigation of School Administrators' English Self-efficacy Beliefs

Murat Akkoyun
Muhammet İbrahim Akyürek

To cite this article:

Akkoyun, M., & Akyürek, M. İ. (2022). The investigation of school administrators' English self-efficacy beliefs. *Language Teaching and Educational Research (LATER)*, 5(2), 126-141. <https://doi.org/10.35207/later.1181185>

[View the journal website](#)



[Submit your article to LATER](#)



[Contact editor](#)



Copyright (c) 2022 *LATER* and the author(s). This is an open access article under CC BY-NC-ND license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Research Article

The investigation of school administrators' English self-efficacy beliefs

Murat Akkoyun ✉ ORCID

Educational Administration Specialist-Teacher, Ministry of National Education, TÜRKİYE

Muhammet İbrahim Akyürek* ✉ ORCID

Assistant Professor, Educational Administration Department, Faculty of Education, Selcuk University, TÜRKİYE

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine the English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators. The research adopts the cross-sectional survey model to determine the English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators. The sample of the study consists of 305 administrators working in schools in the districts of Konya, Türkiye. In the study, the "English self-efficacy belief scale" developed by Hancı Yanar and Bümen (2012) was used to determine English self-efficacy beliefs. The measurement tool used in the study was applied in April 2022. According to the results of the study, school administrators' English self-efficacy beliefs are at a low level (the level of "very little fits"). While the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators showed a significant difference according to the variables of duty, professional seniority and administration seniority, there was no significant difference based on gender, age, educational status and school type variables. Language activities can be organized in schools with the participation of all education stakeholders in order to increase the English self-efficacy of school administrators depending on the language training to be carried out.

Received
28 September 2022

Accepted
24 November 2022

Keywords
school administrator
self-efficacy
English self-efficacy
belief

Suggested APA citation: Akkoyun, M., & Akyürek, M. İ. (2022). The investigation of school administrators' English self-efficacy beliefs. *Language Teaching and Educational Research (LATER)*, 5(2), 126-141. <https://doi.org/10.35207/later.1181185>

Note(s) from the author(s)

» *Corresponding author

Author(s)' statements on ethics and conflict of interest

Ethics statement: We hereby declare that research/publication ethics and citing principles have been considered in all the stages of the study. We take full responsibility for the content of the paper in case of dispute.

Statement of interest: We have no conflict of interest to declare.

Funding: None

Acknowledgements: None

Introduction

Foreign language education has been increasing in importance in our country in recent years. In today's world, where scientific studies and technological developments exceed national borders, the need to transmit and share information in an effective way makes it necessary to learn other world languages, especially English, which has become a global language (Ünsal, 2021). Therefore, in order to keep up with worldwide development, foreign language courses are given importance in our country, as in many countries (Özer & Korkmaz, 2016).

Language learning ability varies depending on many factors such as age, culture, motivation and aptitude but according to recent studies (Kasap, 2021; Ünsal, 2021; Tunç & Kozikoğlu, 2022), individual differences form the basis of these factors. The learning speed of each student differs individually or understanding of something for each student cannot be achieved at the desired level. It is thought that these individual differences may be due to students' beliefs (Oxford, 1990). One of the most important individual differences in the learning process is the concept of self-efficacy. Undoubtedly, self-efficacy belief is one of the factors that affect the desire and motivation to learn (İlbeği & Çeliköz, 2020). It is very important to develop self-efficacy beliefs in students for an effective education since the student achieves success to the extent that he believes he can succeed. In other words, the student who does not believe in himself cannot make the necessary effort to achieve something or to fully fulfill the tasks assigned to him (Arslan, 2012). In addition, Duman (2007), in his study conducted with the English self-efficacy scale he developed, revealed that self-efficacy greatly affects student achievement. The self-efficacy belief of a person in learning a second language is not what or how much is known about the language, but the determination of what he/she can do in activities consisting of four basic skills of this language. The extent to which an individual finds himself/herself competent in these four skills is directly proportional to his/her self-efficacy belief in this matter (Büyükduman, 2006). Language education consists of these four basic skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking), and these four basic skills are integrated and in harmony with each other (Gömleksiz & Kılınç, 2014).

One of the most significant factors affecting language learning process is self-efficacy belief. Bandura (1994) defines self-efficacy as an individual's self-judgment about his ability to successfully organize the activities needed to perform a certain action. Self-efficacy beliefs are a factor that has an impact on people's motivation, determining their attitudes and directing their lives (Akyürek, 2020). Self-efficacy is associated with work-related performance such as productivity, coping with difficult tasks, career choice, learning and attainment, adapting to new technology (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). According to Senemoğlu (1999), self-efficacy is defined as a person's ability to deal with various issues, his/her ability to perform a certain activity, and his/her belief in one's own capacity. In other words, self-efficacy is the individual's thoughts about his own ability and effectiveness in any field (Woolfolk, 2016.) As a result, self-efficacy belief in foreign language education is one of the most important factors that language educators should evaluate (Büyükduman, 2006). In this context, there are also some institutions regarding language education and self-efficacy should be considered and given importance. These include schools. It can be stated that the language skills and competencies of the administrators who lead the development of schools are very significant and the most important reason for this is that the administrators should develop themselves and closely follow the current international developments in education and management. The role of leadership in ensuring school

effectiveness and school improvement is indisputable. It has been observed that a school administrator with effective leadership characteristics influences teacher and student success (Aydoğan, 2018). Effective instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators are effective in improving student outcomes through improving teacher practices and providing highly effective, professional learning opportunities (Campbell, Chaseling, Boyd & Shipway, 2019).

Having a sufficient level of self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators is important in terms of ensuring the effectiveness in schools because there is a strong belief that one can achieve or realize a task in line with a goal in schools will enable to reach the goal (Akyürek, 2020). The school administrator is a manager who has effective communication competence, speaks a foreign language, has command of communication technology, manages information, and believes in education (Açıklan, 2016). School administrators who have self-efficacy in foreign language have goals such as following the developments in the world, the scientific studies in the target language, communicating with different cultures and people, and self-development (Can & Can, 2014). Therefore, it is important to examine the self-efficacy of school administrators for a more effective school management. Efficacy is a tool that serves to understand the thoughts and the motivation of the school administrators. At the same time, efficacy is related to the behavior of administrators and the school environment they create (McCollum & Kajs, 2007). Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) group the school leader's perception of efficacy into two groups; his beliefs about his self-efficacy to improve teaching and learning (Leader's Self Efficacy) and his beliefs about the collective capacity of colleagues in surrounding schools to improve learning (Leader's Collective Efficacy). In both groups, the practices and behaviors of the school leaders are effective on the school and classroom environments and the learning of the students. It is stated that this effect is mutual (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008).

English language education continues to gain great importance in Türkiye. In Türkiye, foreign language education is compulsory at various levels, starting from primary school to undergraduate education as in other countries. However, when we look at the studies, it is observed that teaching and learning a second foreign language is not yet at the desired level (Arslan & Akbarov, 2010; Can & Can, 2014). In this context, it is very important for the education stakeholders in schools, who need to follow the current developments of the age according to globality, to be able to use English, which is widely used and functional in the world, at a level to follow the developments about education. Prapphal (2008) claims that educational quality and standards at different points in the teaching and assessment process can be achieved by providing teachers, learners, administrators and stakeholders, or end users to recognize the goals, nature, benefits and drawbacks of each testing and assessment method when evaluating English language learning outcomes. School administrators, who have the primary responsibility for improving schools, need to learn and use English at a sufficient level in order to lead the school and develop it in parallel with the developments in the world. The fact that school administrators in Türkiye do not take place as separate staffs from teaching and are not subjected to a training process has also affected the English self-efficacy beliefs. There is no need for English or no other foreign language requirement in the criteria determined for the assignment of school administrators for four years. In addition, the sufficient level of English self-efficacy of school administrators will enable the monitoring and implementation of global developments in education in schools. Thus, success and development in schools will be increased. In this context, no research was found in

the measurement of English self-efficacy levels of school administrators, especially according to some demographic variables (gender, age, duty, educational status, administration seniority and school type). In terms of seeing the effect of these demographic variables, the study will contribute to the literature. Therefore, examining the English language efficacy of school administrators in Türkiye can guide education politicians and decision makers, and may contribute to the education literature. In this context, the aim of the study is to determine the English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators. The sub-problems determined in this direction are as follows:

1. What is school administrators' level of English self-efficacy beliefs?
2. Do school administrators' English self-efficacy beliefs differ in terms of demographic characteristics (gender, age, duty, educational status, administration seniority and school type)?

Methodology

Model of the study

This study is in the cross-sectional survey model to determine the English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators. In the survey model, the individual or the subject in the study is tried to be described as it is in the conditions in which it is located (Karasar, 2015). In the cross-sectional survey model, the variables to be described are measured one at a time. English self-efficacy levels of school administrators were defined in this way at one time through an existing validated and reliable scale.

Population and sample

The population of the study consists of 1360 administrators (principals and assistant principals) working in schools in the districts (Karatay, Meram and Selcuklu) located in the city center of Konya in Türkiye (Ministry of National Education [MNE], 2022). According to the 95% confidence interval, the lower limit for the sample size of the study is 306 (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2014). The sample of the research consists of 305 administrators (principals and assistant principals) working in schools in the districts (Karatay, Meram and Selcuklu) located in the city center of Konya in the 2021-2022 academic year. The number of samples according to the population in this study is sufficient according to the 95% confidence interval (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2014). Sampling of administrators was carried out by simple random sampling. Randomness refers to the situation in which the units based on the sampling are equally likely to be selected for the sample (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2012). In particular, a list was made and the participants were randomly selected.

In Table 1, descriptive statistics regarding the demographic characteristics of the participants (gender, age, duty, educational status, administration seniority and school type) are given.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics on demographic characteristics of the participants

Variables		<i>N</i>	%
Gender	Female	31	10.2
	Male	274	89.8
Age	21-30	16	5.2

	31-40	130	42.6
	41-50	118	38.7
	51 and older	41	13.5
Duty	Principal	135	44.2
	Assistant principal	170	55.8
Educational Status	Undergraduate	223	73.1
	Postgraduate	82	26.9
Management Seniority	1-5 years	121	39.7
	6-10 years	87	28.6
	11-15 years	41	13.4
	16 years and over	56	18.3
School type	Kindergarten	16	5.4
	Primary school	81	26.6
	Secondary school	155	50.8
	High school	53	17.4
Total		305	100

When Table 1 is examined, according to the gender variable, it is seen that men are more common than women with 89.2%. This may be due to the fact that female school administrators are given limited duties in Türkiye or that women prefer this duty less because of their different responsibilities in administration. According to the age variable, the highest rate is 31-40 with 41.5%, and the lowest rate is 5.5% with managers in the 21-30 age group. According to the duty variable, it is seen that the assistant principals are more than the principals with 55.4%. According to the variable of educational status, it is seen that those with undergraduate are more than those with postgraduate, with 71.7%. According to the management seniority variable, the highest rate is 1-5 years with 39.4%, and the lowest rate is 13.2% with 11-15 years managers. According to the school type variable, the highest rate is composed of secondary school with 49.8% and the lowest rate is composed of administrators working in kindergarten with 5.5%.

Data collection tool

In the study, the “English self-efficacy belief scale” developed by Hancı Yanar and Bümen (2012) was used to determine English self-efficacy beliefs. The scale is a five-point Likert type scale. The measurement tool was developed in the form of 34 items and based on 4 theoretical dimensions. These dimensions are; reading (1-8 items), writing (9-18 items), listening (19-28 items) and speaking (29-34 items). In this context, confirmatory factor analysis was performed to confirm the factor design of the instrument. As a result of confirmatory factor analysis, the t values of the latent variables explaining the observed variables were found to be significant at the .01 level. Since significant t values were obtained for all items in the model, all indicators were included in the model. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis of the English self-efficacy belief scale are given in Table 2.

Table 2. The results of confirmatory factor analysis of the self-efficacy belief scale in English

Compliance measurements	Measured value	Reference range
p	.00	< .01
X ² /sd	2.57	≤ 3

RMSEA	.07	≤ .08
SRMR	.02	≤ .05
NNFI - CFI	.95 - .95	≥ .95

When the table is examined, it is seen that the p value is significant at the .01 level. In many confirmatory factors analyzes, it is normal for the p value to be significant due to the large sample size. For this reason, alternative fit indices regarding the fit between the two matrices were evaluated. In this context, it can be stated that the X^2/sd , SRMR, NNFI and CFI values are excellent, and the fit index of the RMSEA value has a good fit. As a result, it can be stated that the four-factor structure of the 34-item self-efficacy belief scale (reading factor 8, writing factor 10, listening factor 10 and speaking factor 6 items) was confirmed as a model. In this direction, within the scope of reliability analysis, first of all, item analysis was examined by using item-total correlation. In addition, the reliability of the scale was checked by using Cronbach's alpha. The results of the reliability analysis of the English self-efficacy belief scale are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Reliability analysis results of the self-efficacy belief scale in English

	Alpha value	Item-total correlation
Reading	.91	.59-.76
Writing	.85	.73-.55
Listening	.95	.63-.86
Speaking	.96	.68-.88
English self-efficacy (General)	.99	.31-.91

The internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) of the English self-efficacy belief scale is .99. In this context, it can be interpreted that the internal consistency coefficient of the English self-efficacy belief scale is sufficient for the reliability of the scale scores. Item-total correlations for all items in the scale ranged from .31 to .91. When the item-total correlations are examined, it can be interpreted that the items in the scale distinguish individuals well.

Data collection and analysis

The measurement tool used in the study was applied to 305 school administrators working in Konya, Türkiye, in April 2022, by the researchers, and the data were collected. The data were transferred to digital media by coding in order to be ready for analysis. Within the scope of the analysis of the data, firstly, the condition of meeting the normality assumption of the data set was examined. The kurtosis and skewness coefficients and the mean, mode and median values were examined. The values of kurtosis, skewness and standard deviation calculated for the scale are as follows; .55, 1.02, .92. The kurtosis and skewness values in the study are between ± 2 . These results are interpreted as the data set has a normal distribution (George & Mallery, 2010). In addition, in the analyzes conducted, it was determined that the arithmetic mean was 2.01, the mode value was 1.00 and the median was 1.83. The closeness of these values indicates that the data set is normally distributed (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). In addition to these, the predicted sample size is usually shown as 30 and larger in order to put forward an assumption that the distribution does not deviate excessively from the normal distribution.

However, most research in the social sciences is done on smaller groups. In the literature, there are studies showing that the use of a parametric statistic does not cause a significant deviation in the "p" significance level to be calculated in the analysis, if the sizes of each of the subgroups are 15 or higher (Büyüköztürk, 2013). In this context, parametric test techniques were chosen and used to test the sub-problems of the research. In this context, within the scope of the analysis of the data, firstly descriptive statistics such as percentage and frequency analyzes were conducted. In addition, t-test was applied for independent samples in variables with two subcategories, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied for variables with three or more subcategories. Dunnett's C multiple comparison test was used as the group variances were not equal in order to determine which groups had significant differences between the group means as a result of ANOVA. In the interpretation of the findings, the significance value was taken as $p < .05$. The grading range of the English self-efficacy belief scale is as follows; It does not suit me at all (1.00-1.79), it does not suit me very little (1.80-2.59), it does not suit me a little (2.60-3.39), it fits quite well (3.40-4.19), it suits me completely (4.20-5.00).

Findings

Within the scope of the first sub-problem of the research; The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators was examined. Table 4 includes descriptive statistics on the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics on the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators

Dimensions	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	<i>SS</i>
Reading	305	2.08	1.01
Writing	305	1.98	.91
Listening	305	2.01	.95
Speaking	305	1.91	1.00
English self-efficacy (General)	305	2.00	.92

When Table 4 is examined; it is seen that school administrators' English self-efficacy beliefs are at the level of "very little fits" ($\bar{x} = 2.00$). In addition, when the English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators are examined on the basis of dimensions, it is seen that they are at the level of "very little fit" in the dimensions of reading ($\bar{x} = 2.08$), writing ($\bar{x} = 1.98$), listening ($\bar{x} = 2.01$) and speaking ($\bar{x} = 1.91$). When the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators on the basis of dimensions is examined; the highest dimension was reading and the lowest dimension was speaking.

Within the scope of the second sub-problem of the research; English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators were examined according to demographic characteristics (gender, age, duty, education level, seniority of management and school type). Table 5 shows the findings regarding the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators according to the gender variable.

Table 5. T-test results on the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators by gender variable

Dimensions	Gender	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Reading	Female	31	2.07	.92	303	.05	.95
	Male	274	2.08	1.02			
Writing	Female	31	1.96	.86	303	.17	.86
	Male	274	1.99	.92			
Listening	Female	31	2.02	.96	303	.04	.96
	Male	274	2.01	.96			
Speaking	Female	31	1.80	.86	303	.70	.48
	Male	274	1.93	1.01			
English self- efficacy(General)	Female	31	1.97	.85	303	.18	.85
	Male	274	2.01	.93			

**p* < .05

According to Table 5, The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators does not show a significant difference in terms of gender ($t(303) = .18, p > .05$). Reading ($t(303) = .05, p > .05$), writing ($t(303) = .17, p > .05$), listening ($t(303) = .04, p > .05$) and speaking ($t(303) = .70, p > .05$) dimensions of school administrators' English self-efficacy beliefs do not show a significant difference according to the gender variable.

The findings regarding the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators by age variable are given in Table 6.

Table 6. One-way analysis of variance results regarding the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators by age

Dimensions	Age	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant Difference</i>
Reading	21-30(1)	16	2.64	1.23	9.92	.00*	1-3, 2-3, 2-4
	31-40(2)	130	2.35	1.14			
	41-50(3)	118	1.80	.72			
	51 and older (4)	41	1.84	.95			
Writing	21-30(1)	16	2.52	1.02	9.12	.00*	1-3, 1-4, 2-3, 2-4
	31-40(2)	130	2.21	.96			
	41-50(3)	118	1.76	.74			
	51 and older (4)	41	1.72	.91			
Listening	21-30(1)	16	2.57	1.07	9.01	.00*	1-3, 1-4, 2-3, 2-4
	31-40(2)	130	2.24	1.03			
	41-50(3)	118	1.80	.78			
	51 and older (4)	41	1.70	.89			
Speaking	21-30(1)	16	2.54	1.07	8.70	.00*	1-3, 2-3
	31-40(2)	130	2.14	1.09			
	41-50(3)	118	1.64	.78			
	51 and older (4)	41	1.75	.98			
English self- efficacy (General)	21-30(1)	16	2.57	1.06	9.95	.00*	1-3, 1-4, 2-3, 2-4
	31-40(2)	130	2.24	1.01			
	41-50(3)	118	1.76	.70			

51 and older (4)	41	1.74	.89
------------------	----	------	-----

p < .05

According to Table 6, there is a significant difference in the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators according to the age variable ($F= 9.95, p< .05$). According to the results of Dunnett's C test, which was conducted to find out between which groups there are differences among age groups; The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators in the 21-30 age group ($\bar{x}= 2.57$ -“it fits very little”) is higher than that of the administrators in the 31-40 age group ($\bar{x}= 2.24$ -“very little fits”). In addition, the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators in the 31-40 age group ($\bar{x}= 2.24$ -“very little fits”) was between the ages of 41-50 ($\bar{x}= 1.76$ -“doesn't fit me at all”) and 51 years and older ($\bar{x}= 1.74$ -“doesn't suit me at all”) is higher than the administrators in the groups.

A significant difference was determined according to the age variable regarding the reading ($F= 9.92, p< .05$), writing ($F= 9.12, p< .05$), listening ($F= 9.01, p< .05$) and speaking ($F= 8.70, p< .05$) dimensions. The level of English self-efficacy beliefs about reading, writing, listening and speaking dimensions of school administrators in lower age groups is relatively higher than that of administrators in higher age groups.

The findings regarding the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators according to the duty variable are given in Table 7.

Table 7. T-test results on the level of English Self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators by duty variable

Dimensions	Duty	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Reading	Principal	135	1.94	.99	303	2.18	.02*
	Assistant principal	170	2.19	1.02			
Writing	Principal	135	1.87	.91	303	1.96	.04*
	Assistant principal	170	2.07	.90			
Listening	Principal	135	1.87	.94	303	2.47	.01*
	Assistant principal	170	2.13	.95			
Speaking	Principal	135	1.81	1.01	303	1.74	.08
	Assistant principal	170	2.00	.98			
English self-efficacy (General)	Principal	135	1.88	.92	303	2.21	.02*
	Assistant principal	170	2.10	.92			

p < .05

According to Table 7; The level of school administrators' self-efficacy beliefs in English shows a significant difference in terms of the duty variable ($t(303)= 2.21, p< .05$). The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of assistant principals ($\bar{x}= 2.10$ -“very little fits”) is higher than that of principals ($\bar{x}= 1.88$ -“very little fits”).

According to the duty variable, the dimensions of reading ($t(303)= 2.18, p< .05$), writing ($t(303)= 1.96, p< .05$) and listening ($t(303)= 2.47, p< .05$) a difference has been detected. The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of assistant principals regarding the reading, writing and listening dimensions is relatively higher than that of principals. In addition, the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators regarding the speaking dimension does not show a significant difference in terms of the task variable ($t(303)= 1.74, p> .08$).

The findings regarding the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators according to the variable of educational status are given in Table 8.

Table 8. T-test results on the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators according to the variable of educational status

Dimensions	Educational Status	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Reading	Undergraduate	223	2.00	1.04	303	2.39	.01*
	Postgraduate	82	2.29	.91			
Writing	Undergraduate	223	1.94	.93	303	1.36	.17
	Postgraduate	82	2.09	.86			
Listening	Undergraduate	223	1.96	.98	303	1.56	.11
	Postgraduate	82	2.14	.89			
Speaking	Undergraduate	223	1.87	1.04	303	1.27	.20
	Postgraduate	82	2.03	.88			
English self-efficacy (General)	Undergraduate	223	1.95	.95	303	1.73	.08
	Postgraduate	82	2.14	.84			

**p* < .05

According to Table 8; The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators does not show a significant difference in terms of the variable of educational status ($t(303)= 1.73$, $p > .05$).

The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators regarding the reading dimension shows a significant difference in terms of the variable of educational status ($t(303)= 2.39$, $p < .05$). The level of English self-efficacy beliefs regarding the reading dimension of school administrators with a graduate degree ($\bar{x}= 2.29$ -“it fits very little”) is higher than that of administrators with a bachelor's degree ($\bar{x}= 2.00$ -“it fits very little”). In addition, the dimensions of writing ($t(303)= .17$, $p > .05$), listening ($t(303)= .04$, $p > .05$) and speaking ($t(303)= .70$, $p > .05$) the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators does not show a significant difference according to the variable of educational status.

Table 9 shows the findings regarding the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators according to the seniority of administration variable.

Table 9. One-way analysis of variance results on the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators according to the seniority of administration variable

Dimensions	Seniority of administration	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Significant difference
Reading	1-5 years (1)	121	2.34	1.12	6.37	.00*	1-4
	6-10 years(2)	87	2.03	.96			
	11-15 years(3)	41	1.94	.94			
	16 years and over(4)	56	1.70	.74			
Writing	1-5 years(1)	121	2.18	.97	6.04	.00*	1-4, 2-4
	6-10 years(2)	87	2.03	.92			
	11-15 years(3)	41	1.80	.84			
	16 years and over(4)	56	1.63	.67			
Listening	1-5 years(1)	121	2.26	1.05	7.21	.00*	1-3, 1-4, 2-4
	6-10 years(2)	87	2.01	.91			

		11-15 years(3)	41	1.79	.93		
		16 years and over(4)	56	1.64	.64		
Speaking		1-5 years(1)	121	2.14	1.11	4.48	.00* 1-4
		6-10 years(2)	87	1.87	.98		
		11-15 years(3)	41	1.78	.91		
		16 years and over(4)	56	1.61	.71		
English self-efficacy (General)		1-5 years(1)	121	2.24	1.01	6.59	.00* 1-4, 2-4
		6-10 years(2)	87	2.00	.90		
		11-15 years(3)	41	1.83	.86		
		16 years and over(4)	56	1.65	.64		

* $p < .05$

According to Table 9, there is a significant difference between the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators in terms of administration seniority variable ($F = 6.59, p < .05$). According to the results of Dunnett's C test, which was conducted to find out between which groups there are differences among managerial seniority groups; The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators in the 1-5 years ($\bar{x} = 2.24$ -“very little” level) and 6-10 ($\bar{x} = 2.57$ -“very little” level) years groups is higher than that of the administrators in the 16 ($\bar{x} = 1.65$ -“doesn't suit me at all”) years and above group.

A significant difference was determined according to the seniority of administration variable regarding the reading ($F = 6.37, p < .05$), writing ($F = 6.04, p < .05$), listening ($F = 7.21, p < .05$) and speaking ($F = 4.48, p < .05$) dimensions. The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators in lower seniority groups regarding reading, writing, listening and speaking dimensions is relatively higher than that of higher seniority groups. Table 10 shows the findings regarding the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators according to the school type variable.

Table 10. One-way analysis of variance results on the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators by type of school variable

Dimensions	Types of School	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Significant Difference
Reading	Kindergarten(1)	16	1.77	.69	.95	.41	---
	Primary school(2)	81	2.05	1.04			
	Secondary school(3)	155	2.08	1.01			
	High school(4)	53	2.22	1.05			
Writing	Kindergarten(1)	16	1.85	.69	.39	.76	---
	Primary school(2)	81	1.97	.87			
	Secondary school (3)	155	1.97	.91			
	High school(4)	53	2.09	1.03			
Listening	Kindergarten(1)	16	1.76	.77	.71	.54	---
	Primary school(2)	81	1.99	.87			
	Secondary school (3)	155	2.01	.97			
	High school(4)	53	2.13	1.08			
Speaking	Kindergarten(1)	16	1.72	.73	.38	.76	---
	Primary school(2)	81	1.91	.96			
	Secondary school(3)	155	1.91	1.01			
	High school (4)	53	2.00	1.09			

English self- efficacy (General)	Kindergarten(1)	16	1.78	.70	.64	.59	---
	Primary school(2)	81	1.99	.89			
	Secondary school(3)	155	2.00	.93			
	High school (4)	53	2.12	1.02			

* $p < .05$

According to Table 10, there is no significant difference between school administrators' level of English self-efficacy beliefs according to the school type variable ($F = .64, p > .05$). The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators regarding reading ($F = .95, p > .05$), writing ($F = .39, p > .05$), listening ($F = .71, p > .05$) and speaking ($F = .38, p > .05$) dimensions does not show a significant difference according to the school type variable.

Discussion and Conclusion

Within the scope of the first sub-problem of the research; it was concluded that school administrators' English self-efficacy beliefs were at a low level. This is a negative quality for effective and successful schools. By following the international developments and qualified practices in education, international cooperation can be increased through projects and similar practices. Only these elements are not the quality of successful schools, but they are an indication that there is little cooperation in schools and that they are not successful. The result of the research shows partial similarity with the findings of the research conducted by Gömleksiz & Kılınç (2014). Although the results are not directly related to school administrators, this study, which is considered in the sample of high school students, shows similarity in English self-efficacy among school stakeholders. According to the results of the research conducted by Gömleksiz & Kılınç (2014); it was determined that high school students' English self-efficacy beliefs were at a moderate level. Students who spend more time on English have higher English self-efficacy beliefs. Based on these results, it can be said that low self-efficacy beliefs negatively affect students' attitudes, behaviors and academic achievements towards English (Gömleksiz & Kılınç, 2014). Similarly, Mikulecky (1996) concluded in his study that the success rate of students with high self-efficacy perceptions is high, while the success rate of students with low self-efficacy perception is similarly low. According to the current study, it was determined that the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators was low on the basis of dimensions; the highest-level dimension was reading, and the lowest-level dimension was speaking. According to this result, it can be said that all dimensions affect the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators, but the reading dimension is comparatively higher than the other dimensions.

Within the scope of the second sub-problem of the research; English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators were examined according to demographic characteristics (gender, age, duty, educational status, administration seniority and school type). The level of school administrators' English self-efficacy beliefs did not show a significant difference in terms of gender. This may be due to different cultural and social characteristics of the sample groups. Along with the general average, the gender factor does not have a significant effect on the basis of dimensions. There is no study similar to the current study before, but there are some studies that do not overlap with the results of the current research when evaluated in terms of school stakeholders. Aktamis et al. (2016) found that male students had higher self-efficacy levels in

terms of gender. In the study conducted by Valizadeh (2021), a significant difference was found between the self-efficacy of men and women in favor of women. Sample group differences or socio-cultural differences may be the source of the results of these studies, which do not match the results of the current research.

A significant difference was found between the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators according to the age variable. The level of both general English self-efficacy beliefs and English self-efficacy beliefs related to reading, writing, listening and speaking dimensions of school administrators in the younger/lower age groups is relatively higher than that of the administrators in the older age groups. This may be due to individuals in younger/lower age groups being more open to innovations and wanting to improve themselves or due to their up to date English education

The level of school administrators' self-efficacy beliefs in English showed a significant difference in terms of the duty variable. The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of assistant principals is higher than that of principals. This may be due to the fact that assistant principals want to reach foreign resources in order to both promote themselves or may be that assistant principals are younger than the principals. The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of assistant principals regarding the reading, writing and listening dimensions is relatively higher than that of principals. In addition, the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators regarding the speaking dimension did not show a significant difference in terms of the duty variable. This may be a sign that school administrators lack the language skills necessary to adequately express their emotions and ideas in English.

The level of school administrators' English self-efficacy beliefs did not show a significant difference in the overall scale and in the dimensions in terms of the variable of educational status. Regarding the reading dimension, postgraduate graduates have higher English self-efficacy beliefs. This may be due to the fact that postgraduate administrators do more foreign-sourced readings for professional development purposes.

A significant difference was found between the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators, according to the variable of seniority of administration. It was concluded that administrators with less professional seniority (less experienced) perceive the level of self-efficacy beliefs in English higher than administrators with more professional seniority (experienced). It can be stated that less experienced administrators have stronger beliefs about their ability to reach a goal and fulfill a responsibility in English or may be that administrators with less professional seniority are younger than the administrators with more professional seniority. A significant difference was found according to the seniority of administration variable regarding the dimensions of reading, writing, listening and speaking. The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators in lower seniority groups regarding reading, writing, listening and speaking dimensions is relatively higher than that of higher seniority groups. It can be said that experienced administrators do not consider themselves sufficient in expressing and communicating in English.

There was no significant difference between the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators according to the school type variable. The level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators regarding the dimensions of reading, writing, listening and speaking did not show a significant difference according to the school type variable. In addition, the research finding does not coincide with the research findings conducted by Bozkurt and

Ekşioğlu (2018). In the study conducted by Bozkurt and Ekşioğlu (2018), the level of English self-efficacy showed a significant difference according to the school type variable. The sample group differences may be the reason why this study's findings don't coincide with the findings of the study conducted by Bozkurt and Ekşioğlu (2018).

According to the results of the research, school administrators' English self-efficacy beliefs are at a low level. While the level of English self-efficacy beliefs of school administrators showed a significant difference according to the variables of age, duty, professional seniority and administration seniority; there was no significant difference according to gender, age, educational status and school type variables. Suggestions regarding the research results are as follows:

- School administrators can be provided with theoretical and practical English language training.
- Language activities can be organized in schools with the participation of all education stakeholders in order to increase the English self-efficacy of school administrators depending on the language training to be carried out.
- In this study, school administrators' English self-efficacy beliefs were examined. Similar studies can be conducted in relation to school administrators' English self-efficacy beliefs and variables such as effective school, school leadership, school climate, school culture.
- In this study, school administrators were taken as a sample. Similar studies can be conducted by sampling teachers in order to determine both the school and class-based aspects of English self-efficacy beliefs.

References

- Açıkalın, A. (2016). *Okul yöneticiliği: Toplumsal, kurumsal ve teknik yönleriyle*. Ankara: Pegem A. [School management: With its social, institutional and technical aspects]
- Arslan, M. & Akbarov, A. (2010). The matter of motivation-method and solution offers in foreign language teaching in Turkey. *Selçuk University, Journal of Faculty of Letters*, 24, 179-191.
- Aktamış, H., Özenoğlu Kiremit, H. & Kubilay, M. (2016). Investigation of students' self-efficacy beliefs according to science achievements and demographic characteristics. *Adnan Menderes University Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7(2), 1-10.
- Akyürek, M. İ. (2020). An investigation of school administrators' self-efficacy perceptions in terms of some variables. *Dicle University Journal of Ziya Gökalp Faculty of Education*, 38, 72-83.
- Arslan, A. (2012). Predictive power of the sources of primary school students' self-efficacy beliefs on their self-efficacy beliefs for learning and performance. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12, 1907-1920.
- Aydoğan, A. G. (2018). *Instructional and administrative behaviours of school administrators: Polatlı case*. Unpublished master's thesis. Başkent University Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior*, 4, 71-81.
- Bozkurt, M. A. & Ekşioğlu, S. (2018). Lise öğrencilerinin İngilizce öz yeterlik düzeyleri. *Ahi Evran University Journal of Kırşehir Education Faculty*, 19(1), 440-452. [English self-efficacy levels of high school students]
- Büyükduman, F. İ. (2006). *The relationship between teaching self efficacy and self efficacy in using English as a foreign language of pre-service English teachers*. (PhD thesis). Yıldız Technical University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.

- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem. [*Scientific research methods*]
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2013). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem. [*Manual of data analysis for social sciences*]
- Can, E. & Can, C.I. (2014). Problems encountered in second foreign language teaching in Turkey. *Trakya University Journal of Education*, 4(2), 43-63.
- Campbell, P., Chaseling, M., Boyd, W., & Shipway, B. (2019). The effective instructional leader. *Professional Development in Education*, 45(2), 276-290.
- Duman, B. A. (2007). *Lise öğrencilerinin ingilizce'ye yönelik öz yeterlik algı puanlarının cinsiyete, alanlara ve farklı düzeylere göre ingilizce başarısını yordama gücü*. Unpublished master's thesis. İstanbul: Yıldız Technical University, Graduate School of Social Sciences. [*The predictive power of high school students' English self-efficacy perception scores according to gender, fields and different levels*]
- George, D. & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, 17.0 update* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Gist, M. E. & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: a theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 2.
- Gömleksiz, M. N. & Kılınç, H. H. (2014). High school 12th grade students' perceptions of self-efficacy beliefs for English. *Fırat University Journal of Social Sciences*, 24(2), 43-60.
- Gürbüz, S. & Şahin, F. (2014). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri: Felsefe-yöntem-analiz*. Ankara: Seçkin. [*Research methods in social sciences: Philosophy-method-analysis*]
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M. & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing, Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139-152.
- Hancı Yanar, B. & Bümen, N. T. (2012). Developing a self-efficacy scale for English. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 20(1), 97-110.
- İlbeği, A. S. & Çeliköz, M. (2020). Investigation of English self-efficacy beliefs of the students who are studying English at preparatory schools. *IBAD Journal of Social Sciences*, 8, 14-34.
- Karasar, N. (2015). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler*. Ankara: Nobel. [*Scientific research method: Concepts, principles, techniques*]
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: the contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 496-528.
- McCollum, D. L. & Kajs, L. T. (2007). School administrator efficacy: assesment of beliefs about knowledge and skills for successful school leadership. *Advances in Educational Administration*, 10, 131-148.
- Mikulecky, L., Lloyd, P. & Huang S. C. (1996). *Adult and esl literacy learning self efficacy questionnaire*. Indiana University, Bloomington.
- MNE (2022). *2021-2022 academic year education statistics*. accessed from <https://konya.meb.gov.tr/>.
- Oxford, R. (1990). Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 1(1).
- Prapphal, K. (2008). Issues and trends in language testing and assessment in Thailand. *Language Testing*, 25(1), 127-143.
- Özer, B. & Korkmaz, C. (2016). Factors affecting student achievement in foreign language teaching. *EKEV Academy Journal*, 67, 59-84.
- Senemoğlu, N. (1999). *Gelişim öğrenme ve öğretim kuramdan uygulamaya*. Ankara: Gazi kitapevi. [*Development learning and teaching from theory to practice*]
- Tunç, M. & Kozikoğlu, İ. (2022). Students opinions about the factors that make learning English language difficult *e-Kafkas Journal of Educational Research*, 9, 279-298.
- Ünsal, F. (2021). Personality traits on foreign language learning. *YYU Journal of Education Faculty*, 18(2), 332-357.

- Valizadeh, M. (2021). An investigation into the effects of demographic factors on efl learners' self-efficacy beliefs. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 9(4), 300-308.
- Woolfolk, A. (2016). *Educational Psychology* (13.baskı). England: PEARSON Education Limited.