

THE RESEARCH OF EFFICACY PERCEPTION OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS WHO TRANSFERRED FROM PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHING

Çağrı Hamdi ERDOĞAN¹

Ziya BAHADIR²

ABSTRACT³

The aim of this research is to examine the efficacy perceptions of physical education teachers and of physical education teachers who transferred from primary school teaching. The efficacy perceptions of physical education teachers and of physical education teachers who transferred from primary school teaching have been examined in terms of gender, in-service training status, type of school (secondary-high school), the location of the school, the school's physical education class infrastructure and the actively involved sports branch variances. A total of 268 physical education teachers who work in the province of Kayseri participated in the screening model survey conducted in 2013-2014 academic year, 46 of them had transferred to physical education teaching from primary school teaching. The data of the survey has been gathered by means of "Efficacy Scale of Physical Education Teachers" which was developed by Ünlü et al in 2008. According to the research result, while the efficacy perceptions of most of the physical education teachers are "good enough"; the efficacy perceptions of the primary school teachers who transferred to physical education teaching are lower than those physical education teachers whose primary branches are physical education. In addition, while there has been a significant correlation between most of the physical education teachers' efficacy perception and gender, in-service training status, the location of the school, the school's physical education class infrastructure and actively involved sports branch; no correlation has occurred in terms of school types.

Key Words: Physical Education Teacher, Primary School Teacher, Efficacy, Teacher's Efficacy, Field Substitution

BEDEN EĞİTİMİ ÖĞRETMENLERİ İLE SINIF ÖĞRETMENLİĞİNDEN GEÇİŞ YAPAN BEDEN EĞİTİMİ ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN YETERLİK ALGILARININ İNCELENMESİ

ÖZ

Bu araştırmanın amacı, beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin ve sınıf öğretmenliğinden geçiş yapan beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin yeterlik algılarının incelenmesidir. Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin ve sınıf öğretmenliğinden geçiş yapan beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin yeterlik algıları cinsiyet, meslekteki hizmet süresi, çalışılan okul türü (ortaokul-lise), okulun bulunduğu yerleşim yeri, beden eğitimi dersi alt yapısı ve aktif olarak uğraşılan spor dalı değişkenleri açısından incelenmiştir. Tarama modelinde gerçekleştirilen araştırmaya 2013-2014 eğitim-öğretim yılında Kayseri ilinde görev yapmakta olan ve 46'sı sınıf öğretmenliğinden geçiş yapmış olan toplam 268 beden eğitimi öğretmeni katılmıştır. Araştırmanın verileri Ünlü ve ark. (2008) tarafından geliştirilen "Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenleri Yeterlik Ölçeği" aracıyla toplanmıştır. Araştırma sonucuna göre beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin genelinin yeterlik algıları "çok yeterli" olarak bulunmuşken; sınıf öğretmenliğinden beden eğitimi öğretmenliğine geçiş yapanların yeterlik algıları, diğer beden eğitimi öğretmenlerine göre düşük seviyede çıkmıştır. Ayrıca beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin genelinin yeterlik algıları ile cinsiyet, meslekteki hizmet süresi, okulun bulunduğu yerleşim yeri, beden eğitimi dersi alt yapısı ve aktif olarak uğraşılan spor dalı arasında anlamlı bir ilişkiye rastlanılmışken; çalışılan okul türü ile anlamlı bir ilişki ortaya çıkmamıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Beden Eğitimi Öğretmeni, Sınıf Öğretmeni, Yeterlik, Öğretmen Yeterliği, Alan Değişikliği

¹ Erciyes University, Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, PhD Student

² Erciyes University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Academic Member

³ This study is from a masters' thesis study.

INTRODUCTION

Education is the process of creating terminal change in the behaviour of an individual through his or her own experience and deliberately (Ertürk, 1986). Education is the process of gaining behaviour and efficacy that contain knowledge, skills, attitudes and values required by individual, cultural, political, economic and social life to individuals (Yalız, 2006). In this context, the general aim of education is to help individuals to fit into society by improving their cognitive, affective, psychomotor and social skills at a high level (Varış, 1998).

In a country, the teacher, who is the most important element of the system, is in charge of train the manpower needed for the development of new generations and the country (Küçükahmet, 1993). The better the methods and techniques used in education and training, the better the tools and equipment are to be organized, the better a course of action is adopted, and if the teacher is in enough, it is not possible to obtain the result expected from education (Gündüz, 2003; Sünbül, 2005). It is a well-known fact that a good education is given in schools is necessary in order to be able to advance as a society and to reach the wealth level in developed countries (Seferoğlu, 2004).

Physical education is the process of making intentionally changes (physical, affective, social and mental) in his/her behaviour to the purpose of physical education by means of participating in the physical movements. Unlike other areas of education, "movement learning and learning through movement" is taken as a basis in physical education (Tamer ve Pular, 2001). It is thought that it is possible to reach the aims of the physical education courses which are included in the education programs and which have

an important place in the general education and to bring the desired behavioural changes in the individuals to the stage with the researcher innovative and creative physical education teachers (Ünlü, 2008).

Physical education and sports lessons have importance in terms of growing up the students as physically and emotionally strong individuals and getting them to take a place in society as healthy individuals. Students learn the benefits of regular physical activity, active living and workouts through physical education teachers. In addition, sports culture is taught to students by qualified physical education teachers.

Efficacy is a variable that emerges for the first time in Bandura's Social Learning Theory and is individual judgments on how well individuals can perform the necessary actions to cope with possible situations (Bıkmaz, 2002). Efficacy is the belief that an individual has the capacity to organize and successfully perform the necessary activity to demonstrate a certain performance (Bandura, 1994). Efficacy is a concept that means special knowledge and skills and capacity that provide the power to do a job (Alkan ve Hacıoğlu, 2003). It is to have the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to perform a role successfully (Sezgin, 1980).

According to the Ministry of National Education, professional competence is defined as "having the professional knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for the fulfilment of the duties of a profession in a qualified manner" (M.E.B, 2008). The concept of efficacy refers to the knowledge, understanding, skills and attitudes required to fulfil the duties and responsibilities required by the teaching when evaluated in terms of the teacher (Akar, 2007). When the concept of efficacy is handled in terms of physical

education teaching, it can be expressed as knowledge, understanding, skills and attitudes required in order to fulfill the duties and responsibilities required of physical education teachers (Ünlü, 2008). According to Bandura (2002), efficacy beliefs affect how people think, feel, how motivate themselves and their movements; these perceptions of efficacy are particularly important in the teaching profession. Ashton and Webb (1986) point out that the teachers with low levels of proficiency are faced with deficiencies in their class discipline, motivation and success, and teachers with high levels of efficacy tend to raise these deficiencies.

The higher the perception of teachers' professional efficacy, the higher the classroom achievements are (Elliott, 2000). The teachers having of higher perception efficacy make effort for a high level of learning and development by taking into account the social and cultural differences, interests of their students. Teachers with low levels of perception efficacy have problems in motivating their students (Ekici, 2006).

At the beginning of the academic year 2012-2013, the Ministry of National Education put the 12 year compulsory education system known as the 4+4+4 education system in the schools (MEB, 2012a). With this implementation, for the purpose of eradicating the increasing number of the primary school teachers, with the decision of the Board of Education and Discipline of dated 07/07/2009 and numbered 80, and in the direction of the opinion numbered 5110 dated 12/09/2012, for the year 2012; primary school teachers were allowed to apply for changes in the field (physical education, music, etc.) written in diplomas (MEB, 2012b).

The education pre-service received by physical education teachers and primary

school teachers has been directed to different areas. While primary school teacher candidates are studying at universities to teach primary school students, physical education teacher candidates are completing university educations to implement physical education classes. With the implementation of field change of the Ministry of National Education, physical education teachers who graduated from the physical education and sports departments of the universities and the teachers who graduated from the primary school teaching departments of the universities as a result a situation arises in which both of them serve as "physical education teachers" in the schools. In this case, it is a matter of debate and curiosity that the perception of efficacy of the physical education teachers who come with the field change and these efficacy perceptions are at what level in comparison to the teachers whose actual field is physical education.

The main aim of this research is to determine the efficacy perceptions of physical education teachers and of physical education teachers who transferred from primary school teaching and to compare these efficacy perceptions. In the survey, it is also observed the efficacy perceptions of most of the physical education teachers in the sample; in terms of variances of gender, duration of work in service, type of school they work in, place where the school is located, infrastructure of the school for physical education lesson and sports branch actively engaged in.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

In this part of the study, the model of the research, the universe and the sample, the data collection tools and the information about the data analysis are given.

Research Model

The research is a survey on the general screening model for examining the efficacy perceptions of physical education teachers and of physical education teachers who transferred from primary school teaching.

Screening model is a research approach that attempts to identify a situation existing in the past or present as it exists (Karasar, 2008).

Universe and Sample

The universe of the research consisted of a total of 514 physical education teachers, who work in the public schools within the provincial borders of Kayseri in 2013-2014 academic year, 57 of them have transferred from the primary school teaching with the branch change.

The sample of the research consisted of 268 physical education teachers chosen from the research universe. 77 (28.7%) of the physical education teachers from the sample group were women and 191 (71.3%) were men. 46 of the physical education teachers in the sample have transferred from the primary school teaching and the major branch of 222 of them were physical education.

Data Collection Tools

In the research, "Personal Information Form" and "Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale" were used as data collection tools. The "Personal Information Form" was prepared by the researchers, taking into account the expert opinion and similar research in the literature. The "Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale" used in the research is a scale developed by Ünlü and his friends (2008) to identify the perceptions of efficacy of physical education teachers and physical education teacher candidates. This scale consisting of 78 items in total, has 6 subscales "Program and Content

Information, Learning and Teaching Process, Monitoring and Evaluation of Learning and Development, Student Recognition, School-Family and Community Relations, Personal and Professional Development".

The items of the scale prepared in accordance with five-point Likert type, rang from "1 very dissatisfied" to "5 very satisfied". In the scale, as the points of the physical education teacher increase, the perception of physical education teaching efficacy increase; as the points on the scale decreases, the result is that the perception of efficacy of physical education teachers decreases also. The reliability coefficients of the scale were calculated as 0.88 for Personal and Professional Development, 0.81 for Student Recognition, 0.93 for Learning and Teaching Process, 0.71 for Monitoring and Evaluation of Learning and Development, 0.87 for School-Family and Community Relations and finally 0.65 for Program and Content Information for all subscales of the scale.

Data Analysis

SPSS 17.0 package program was used for statistical analysis. The arithmetic average (\bar{x}) and standard deviation (Ss) techniques were used as descriptive statistics in order to examine the perceptions of efficacy of physical education teachers and physical education teachers who transferred from primary school teaching.

Also in the comparisons made; T test method was used for paired comparisons, for independent groups and one way analysis of variance method (one way ANOVA) was used for multiple comparisons. $p < 0.05$ was taken as the criterion when the significance (p) levels were interpreted.

RESULTS

Table 1. Average Obtained by Physical Education Teachers from Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale

Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale	N	\bar{X}	Sd
Program and Content Knowledge	268	4.24	.865
Learning and Teaching Process	268	4.18	.841
Monitoring and Evaluating of Learning, Development	268	4.14	.903
Student Recognition	268	4.30	.891
School-Family and Community Relationships	268	4.22	.977
Self-Improvement and Professional Development	268	4.30	.910
Teacher Efficacy Scale Average Score	268	4.26	.860

Table 1 shows the average obtained by physical education teachers attending the survey from the general and sub-scales of the Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale. According to this, it is seen that the physical education teachers have obtained an average of $\bar{X}=4.26$ from the general average of the Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale. It has been seen that the physical education teachers obtained average from the

dimension of "Student Recognition – Self-Improvement and Professional Development" $\bar{X}=4.30$; "Program and Content Knowledge" dimension $\bar{X}=4.24$; "School-Family and Community Relations" dimension $\bar{X}=4.22$; $\bar{X}=4.18$ from the dimension of "Learning and Teaching Process" and $\bar{X}=4.14$ from the dimension of "Monitoring and Evaluating of Learning, Development".

Table 2. The Average Obtained by The Physical Education Teachers And The Physical Education Teachers Who Transferred From The Primary School Teaching From The General And Sub-Scales Of The Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale.

Physical Education Teachers Whose Main Field is Physical Education			
Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale	N	\bar{X}	Sd
Program and Content Knowledge	222	4.54	.416
Learning and Teaching Process	222	4.47	.370
Monitoring and Evaluating of Learning, Development	222	4.42	.565
Student Recognition	222	4.59	.443
School-Family and Community Relationships	222	4.55	.530
Self-Improvement and Professional Development	222	4.63	.420
General Average	222	4.56	.391
Physical Education Teachers Transferring From Primary School Teaching			
Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale	N	\bar{X}	Sd
Program and Content Knowledge	46	2.78	.977
Learning and Teaching Process	46	2.75	1.014
Monitoring and Evaluating of Learning, Development	46	2.79	1.014
Student Recognition	46	2.90	1.155
School-Family and Community Relationships	46	2.63	1.076
Self-Improvement and Professional Development	46	2.76	1.045
General Average	46	2.80	.998

Table 2 shows the average obtained by the physical education teachers and the physical education teachers who

transferred from the primary school teaching from the general and sub-scales

of the Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale.

According to the Table 2, physical education teacher whose main field is physical education have obtained the average that the highest in order is that "Self-Improvement and Professional Development \bar{x} =4.63, Student Recognition \bar{x} =4.59, School-Family and Community Relations \bar{x} =4.55, Program and Content Knowledge \bar{x} =4.54, Learning and Teaching Process \bar{x} =4.47, and Learning Monitoring and Evaluation of Learning Development \bar{x} =4.42 from the Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale". On the other hand, they obtained an average of 4.56 out of the total of the Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale.

According to the Table 2, physical education teacher transferring from primary school teaching have obtained the average that the highest in order is that "Student Recognition \bar{x} =2.90, Learning Monitoring and Evaluation of Learning Development \bar{x} =2.79, Program and Content Knowledge \bar{x} =2.78, Self-Improvement and Professional Development \bar{x} =2.76, Learning and Teaching Process \bar{x} =2.75 and School-Family and Community Relations \bar{x} =2.63 from the Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale". In addition, it was determined that physical education teachers who transferring from the primary school teacher had an average of \bar{x} =2.80 from the overall scale in the research sample.

Table 3. Comparison of Physical Education Teachers' and Physical Education Teachers Transferring From the Primary School Teachers' Point in Terms of Average Obtained From the Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale

Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale	FIELD	N	\bar{x}	Sd	t	p
Program and Content Knowledge	Transferring from Primary School Teaching	46	2.78	.977	-19.688	0.000
	Main Field is Physical Education	222	4.54	.416		
Learning and Teaching Process	Transferring from Primary School Teaching	46	2.75	1.014	-19.761	0.000
	Main Field is Physical Education	222	4.47	.370		
Monitoring and Evaluating of Learning, Development	Transferring from Primary School Teaching	46	2.79	1.014	-15.147	0.000
	Main Field is Physical Education	222	4.42	.565		
Student Recognition	Transferring from Primary School Teaching	46	2.90	1.155	-16.712	0.000
	Main Field is Physical Education	222	4.59	.443		
Family-School and Community Relationships	Transferring from Primary School Teaching	46	2.63	1.076	-18.099	0.000
	Main Field is Physical Education	222	4.55	.530		
Self-Improvement and Professional Development	Transferring from Primary School Teaching	46	2.76	1.045	-20.004	0.000
	Main Field is Physical Education	222	4.63	.420		
General Average	Transferring from Primary School Teaching	46	2.80	.998	-20.072	0.000
	Main Field is Physical Education	222	4.56	.391		

Table 3 shows that comparison of Physical Education Teachers' and

Physical Education Teachers Transferring from the Primary School Teaching Point

in terms of Average Obtained from the Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale in research sample. According to this, it is seen that compared to the physical education teachers who have transferred from primary school teaching, physical education teachers, whose main field is physical education obtain higher averages in all the sub-scales and the

overall scale of the Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale in research sample. Moreover, in terms of the averages they have obtained from all the sub-scales and the scale, it is found that there is a meaningful difference in favour of the physical education teachers, whose main field is physical education.

Table 4. Comparison of Physical Education Teachers in terms of Some Variables in terms of Average Obtained from Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale

Gender	N	\bar{X}	Sd	t	p	
Female	77	4.10	.973	-1.991	0.048	
Male	191	4.33	.804			
Total	268	4.26	.860			
In-Service Training Status	N	\bar{X}	Sd	f	p	Difference Tukey
0-5 years	37	4.51	.447	14.513	0.000	1>5,6
6-10 years	69	4.47	.437			2>5,6
11-15 years	55	4.46	.634			3>5,6
16-20 years	71	4.26	.901			4>5,6
21-25 years	20	3.12	1.326			
26-30 years	16	3.49	1.230			
Total	268	4.26	.860			
School Type	N	\bar{X}	Ss	t	p	
Secondary School	147	4.21	.868	266	0.315	
High School	121	4.32	.851			
Total	268	4.26	.860			

Table 5. Comparison of Physical Education Teachers in terms of Some Variables in terms of Average Obtained from Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale(Cont.)

Location	N	\bar{X}	Sd	f	p	
Village/Town	38	4.27	1.054	7.865	0.000	
County	61	4.12	.915			
City	23	3.57	1.090			
Metropolis	146	4.42	.664			
Total	268	4.26	.860			
Infrastructure Physical Education Lesson	N	\bar{X}	Ss	f	p	Difference Tukey
Sufficient	40	4.63	.666	4.983	0.008	1>2,3
Partly	116	4.25	.872			
Insufficient	112	4.14	.879			
Total	268	4.26	.860			
Branch of Sports	N	\bar{X}	Ss	f	p	Difference Tukey
Individual Sports	74	4.55	.403	89.823	0.000	1>3
Team Sports	137	4.54	.407			2>3
Non-sports	57	3.21	1.221			
Total	268	4.26	.860			

In Table 4, a comparison has been made in terms of the averages obtained from the Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale by general of physical education teachers in the research sample according to some variables. In comparisons, while there has been a significant difference in terms of most of the physical education teachers' efficacy perception and gender, in-service training status, the location of the school, the school's physical education class infrastructure and variables of sports branch; no difference has been found in terms of variable of school types.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The efficacy perceptions of physical education teachers and of physical education teachers who transferred from primary school teaching have been examined in this research. According to research findings, when the efficacy perceptions of physical education teachers whose main field is physical education have been determined as (\bar{X} =4.56) "good enough"; the efficacy perceptions of the physical education teachers who transferred from the primary school teaching have been found to be (\bar{X} =2.80) "partially enough".

When physical education teachers, whose main field is physical education are evaluated according to the sub-scales of the Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale, they perceive themselves as being "enough" (\bar{X} =4.24) in terms of "Program and Content Knowledge", "enough" (\bar{X} =4.18) in terms of "Learning and Teaching Process" and "enough" (\bar{X} =4.14) in terms of "Monitoring and Evaluating of Learning, Development". When it is evaluated according to other sub-scales, it seems that physical education teachers whose main field is physical education have the efficacy

perceptions as being "good enough" (\bar{X} =4.30) in terms of "Student Recognition", "good enough" (\bar{X} =4.22) in terms of "School-Family and Community Relations" and "good enough" (\bar{X} = 4.30) in terms of "Self-Improvement and Professional Development".

When we evaluate the physical education teachers who transferred from primary school teaching according to the sub-scales of the Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale, it has been reached the conclusion that they perceive themselves as "partially enough" in all sub-scales.

It was found that the average scores were \bar{X} =2.78 for "Program and Content Knowledge", \bar{X} =2.75 for "Learning and Teaching Process", \bar{X} =2.76 for "Monitoring and Evaluating of Learning, Development", \bar{X} =2.90 for "Student Recognition", \bar{X} =2.63 for "School-Family and Community Relations", \bar{X} =2.79 for "Self-Improvement and Professional Development" according to the sub-scales.

When general of physical education teachers' efficacy perceptions results were examined, most of physical education teachers' efficacy perceptions were found to be "good enough" (\bar{X} =4.26). When most of physical education teachers were evaluated according to the sub-scales of the Physical Education Teachers Efficacy Scale, they perceive themselves as being "good enough" (\bar{X} =4.30) in terms of "Student Recognition - Self-Improvement and Professional Development" extent, "good enough" (\bar{X} =4.24) in terms of "Program and Content Knowledge" extent, "good enough" (\bar{X} =4.22) in terms of "School-Family and Community Relations" extent, "enough" (\bar{X} =4.18) in terms of "Learning and Teaching Process" extent, "enough" (\bar{X}

=4.14) in terms of "Monitoring and evaluating of learning, Development" extent.

The qualification perceptions of the physical education teachers who participated in the research were examined according to variables of gender, in-service training status, school types, the location of the school, the school's physical education class infrastructure and actively involved sports branch in the research conducted while there has been a significant correlation between most of the physical education teachers' efficacy perception and gender, in-service training status, the location of the school, the school's physical education class infrastructure and actively involved sports branch; no correlation has occurred in terms of school types.

Ünlü (2008) and Kaya (2010) have found that physical education teachers' efficacy perceptions are "enough" in their research. When our research is evaluated in terms of efficacy perceptions of most of physical education teachers, it is approximately parallel to the results of this research. As a result of our research, it is parallel to these researches in terms of gender variable.

In their research about the efficacy, İzci (1999), Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy (2001), Ünlü (2008), Topçu (2009) and Kaya (2010) have found a meaningful difference between the efficacy perceptions and in-service training status of the persons participating in the research. In consequence, our study overlaps with the results of this research in terms of the in-service training status (professional seniority) in the profession.

In their research about the efficacy, Ünlü (2008) and Kaya (2010) have not found any significant difference between

efficacy perceptions and the school type (school level) they worked of the physical education teachers who participated in the research. As a result of our research, it is parallel to these researches in terms of school type variable.

In his research about the efficacy, İzci (1999) has found that efficacy perceptions in the research-examination dimension of the teachers who participated in the research showed a significant difference compared to the place where they worked. As a result of our research it is parallel to this side of this research.

According to the research findings, a significant difference has been found when efficacy perceptions of most of physical education teachers were compared according to school's physical education class infrastructure. It is seen that no research has been found in the literature to compare this result of the research.

In their research about the efficacy, Ünlü (2008) and Kaya (2010) have not found any significant difference between the physical education teachers who participated in the research and sport branch. As a result of our research, it has not corresponded with the results of this research in terms of sport branch variable.

According to research findings, in terms of the overall scale and all sub-scales, physical education teachers, whose main field is physical education, perceived themselves as being enough at higher level than the physical education teachers transferred from primary school teaching. Moreover, in terms of the averages they have obtained from all the sub-scales of the and the overall scale, it has been found a significant difference in favour of

the physical education teachers, whose main field is physical education.

As physical education teachers, whose main field is physical education, has a high efficacy perception is a positive situation; it is a negative situation that the efficacy perceptions of the physical education teachers who transferred from primary school teaching are in the middle level (partially enough). This situation has the possibility of directly or indirectly affecting the duties and responsibilities of the physical education teacher profession, the functioning of physical education and sports activities in schools.

When we evaluate the physical education teachers who transferred from primary school teaching, the result that efficacy perceptions of these persons is low compared to the physical education teachers whose main field is physical education, has been reached. In September, 2012, the Ministry of National

Education gave primary school teachers the right to transfer to their sub-branch, and perhaps many teachers have transferred to fields that they have not much information for various reasons. Physical education is also one of these fields.

The result of our research suggests that in the case that people who are not specialists in the field of physical education and sports teach physical education, there is a possibility that those people may remain incapable compared to the people who are competent and this may lead to different problems for physical education lesson. Being taught the physical education lesson by teachers whose main field is not physical education and who have not enough efficacy perception for physical education teaching is a situation that needs to be questioned by the Ministry of National Education.

REFERENCES

1. Akar E. İlköğretim Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmenliği Son Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Öğretmenlik Mesleğine Verdikleri Değer ve Mesleki Yeterlilikleri, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyonkarahisar 2007: 96 [In Turkish]
2. Aktaş I. ve Walter J. Öğretmen Adaylarının Mesleki Yeterlilik Duygusu. Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2005; 4: 127-131 [In Turkish]
3. Alkan C. ve Hacıoğlu F. Öğretmenlik Uygulamaları, Alkım Yayınevi, İstanbul, 2003: 39 [In Turkish]
4. Ashton, P. T. And Webb, R. B. Making A Difference: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Student Achievement. London and New York: Longman, 1986: 96
5. Bandura A. Self-Efficacy In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Human Behavior, New York: Academic Press., 1994; 4: 71-81
6. Bandura A. Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies. Cambridge University Press. United Kingdom, 2002: 82
7. Bıkmaz H. F. Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Fen Öğretiminde Öz Yeterlilik İnancı Ölçeğinin Geçerlik ve Güvenirlilik Çalışması, Eğitim Bilimleri Uygulama Dergisi, 2002; 2: 197-210 [In Turkish]
8. Çapri B. ve Çelikkaleli Ö. Öğretmen Adaylarının Öğretmenliğe İlişkin Tutum ve Mesleki Yeterlilik İnancılarının Cinsiyet, Program ve Fakültelerine Göre İncelenmesi, İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2008; 9: 33-53 [In Turkish]
9. Ekici G. Meslek Lisesi Öğretmenlerinin Öğretmen Öz – Yeterlilik İnançları Üzerine Bir Araştırma, Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2006; 6: 87-96. [In Turkish]
10. Elliott E. Wales Curriculum: The Contribution Of Development Education, Development Education Centre, Birmingham, 2000: 45
11. Ertürk S. Eğitimde Program Geliştirme, METEKSAN Ltd. Şti. Baskı Tesisleri, Ankara, 1986: 3 [In Turkish]
12. Gündüz H. B. Öğretmenlik Mesleğine Giriş, Pegem A Yayıncılık, Editör: Mehmet Durdu Karslı, Ankara, 2003: 319 [In Turkish]
13. İzci E. Ortaöğretim Kurumlarında Görev Yapan Öğretmenlerin Öğretmenlik Meslek Bilgisi Yeterliliklerinin Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi, Doktora Tezi, İnönü Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Malatya, 1999: 280 [In Turkish]
14. Kara, İ. İlköğretimde Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Beden Eğitimi Dersi Öğretimine İlişkin Yeterlilik Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul, 2007: 110 [In Turkish]
15. Karasar N. Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara, 2008: 86 [In Turkish]
16. Kaya K. Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin Mesleki Yeterlilik Algıları, Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2010: 123 [In Turkish]
17. Kösterelioğlu İ. M. ve Kösterelioğlu A. Stayjer Öğretmenlerin Mesleki Yeterliliklerini Kazanma

- Düzelelerine İlişkin Algıları, Sakarya Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Dergisi 2008; 10: 257-275 [In Turkish]
18. Küçükahmet L. Öğretmen Yetiştirme, Gazi Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Matbaası, Ankara, 1993: 62. [In Turkish]
19. M.E.B. (2012a) 12 Yıllık Zorunlu Eğitime Yönelik Uygulamalar, T.C. MEB Özel Kalem Müdürlüğü, 2012/20 no'lu Genelge. [In Turkish]
20. M.E.B. (2012b) Öğretmenlerin İl İçi Alan Değişikliği Kılavuzu, T.C. MEB İnsan Kaynakları Genel Müdürlüğü. [In Turkish]
21. M.E.B. Öğretmen Yeterlikleri: Öğretmenlik Mesleği Genel ve Özel Alan Yeterlikleri, Devlet Kitapları Müdürlüğü, Ankara 2008: 8-38, 204-217 [In Turkish]
22. Seferoğlu S. S. Öğretmen Yeterlikleri ve Mesleki Gelişim, Bilim ve Aklın Aydınlığında Eğitim Dergisi, 2004; 5: 40-45 [In Turkish]
23. Sezgin S. İ. Becerili İnsan Gücünün Yetiştirilmesi Araştırması, M.E.B Etüt ve Programlama Dairesi Yayını, Ankara, 1980: 173 [In Turkish]
24. Sünbül, A. M. Öğretmenlik Mesleğine Giriş, Pegem A Yayıncılık, Editör: Özcan Demirel ve Zeki Kaya, Ankara, 2005: 306 [In Turkish]
25. Tamer K. ve Pulur A. Beden Eğitimi ve Sporda Öğretim Yöntemleri, Kozan Ofset Yayıncılık, Ankara, 2001: 14, 151 [In Turkish]
26. Topçu Z. N. Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Genel Yeterliliklerine ve Öğrenme İhtiyaçlarına İlişkin Algıları, Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Ankara, 2009: 147 [In Turkish]
27. Tschannen-Moran M. and Woolfolk-Hoy A. Teacher Efficacy: Capturing and Elusive Construct. Teaching and Teacher Education, 2001; 17: 783-805
28. Ünlü H. Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin Mesleki Yeterlikleri ve Sınıf Yönetimi Davranışları, Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2008: 193 [In Turkish]
29. Ünlü H. Sünbül M. ve Aydos L. Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenleri Yeterlik Ölçeği Geçerlilik ve Güvenirlilik Çalışması, Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (KEFAD) 2008; 9: 23-33 [In Turkish]
30. Varış F. Eğitim Bilimine Giriş, Alkım Yayınları, İstanbul, 1998: 33 [In Turkish]
31. Yalız D. Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Programında Alan Bilgisi Derslerinde Amaçların Gerçekleşme Düzeyi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir, 2006: 122 [In Turkish]

