Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Teacher Candidates on Readiness to Teaching Profession at a University in Turkey

AYSUN DOĞUTAŞ[a]

Abstract: This study is focused on teacher candidates' self-efficacy beliefs on readiness to teaching profession. The sample of the study was 3rd and 4th grade teacher candidates of a university in Turkey during 2013-2014 academic years. 441 teacher candidates participated in the study. Teacher candidates are from different departments of education faculty. The data were collected by using a structured questionnaire. The data was analyzed by SPSS. The results showed that teacher candidates at a university in Turkey think that they are individually qualified to teach. Also, teacher candidates at a university in Turkey have strong self-efficacy beliefs that they are ready to teach following the graduation.

Keywords: Teacher, teacher candidates, self-efficacy, teaching profession, belief.

[a] Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü
     adogutas@pau.edu.tr

Türkiye'de Bir Üniversitedeki Öğretmen Adaylarının Öğretmenlik Mesleğine Girişte Öz-yeterlik İnanışları

AYSUN DOĞUTAŞ

Öz: Bu çalışma, öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine girişte öz-yeterlik inanışlarına odaklanmaktadır. Çalışmanın örneklemi 2013-2014 akademik yılında Türkiye'deki bir üniversitenin üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinde oluşmaktadır. 441 öğretmen adayı çalışmaya katılmıştır. Öğretmen adayları eğitim fakültesinin farklı bölümlerindendir. Veriler yapılandırılmış anket kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Veriler SPSS kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar gösterdi ki Türkiye'de bir üniversitedeki öğretmen adayları, kişisel olarak öğretime hazır olduklarını düşünmektedirler. Ayrıca, Türkiye'de bir üniversitedeki öğretmen adayları, mezuniyetten sonra öğretime hazır olduklarını konusunda güçlü öz-yeterlik inanışına sahiptirler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğretmen, öğretmen adayları, öz-yeterlik, öğretmenlik mesleği, inanış.

Introduction

The world is changing quickly and rapidly. To catch up with this changing of the world, countries are competing with each other. The developed countries are succeeding this by education. Education is a fundamental issue for countries' development. Teachers are the most important piece of qualified education. For this, teachers' qualifications are one of the most important effecting points of quality of teaching and learning. Teachers' job is not only giving information to their students but also dealing with problems of students, school and administration. Some of teachers deal with these problems easily, approach problems optimistic and have a good motivation to deal with all the problems they face. Having different teacher approaches to the problems have many causes but one of the most important one is the self-efficacy of teachers (Rimm-Kaufman and Sawyer, 2004). According to Bandura (1977)'s Social Cognitive Theory, people who have high self-efficacy beliefs don't escape from situations that they have to struggle with and make an effort determinedly to solve the problems. In contrast to those people, low level of self-efficacy people always has feeling of tension, stress and infelicity.

Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1977) first introduced the self-efficacy based on his social learning theory and defined it as "a person's belief about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives". There are many definitions of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy can be defined as a person's judgment on confidence on him/herself to be able to success a task given to them (Dembo, 2004). Self-efficacy is not a qualification that can be observed or perceived. However, it is inner belief related to answers given to the question of "what can I do?" with own abilities under some situations (Snyder&Lopez, 2002). Self-efficacy is not a kind of ability perception (Donald, 2003).

Self-efficacy beliefs are crucial to teaching, because they influ-

ence teachers' teaching experiment and teacher-student interaction. According to Bandura (1986) self-efficacy is a qualification which is effective on forming behaviors. In other words, people's beliefs and decisions on themselves related to problems they are going to deal with problems they face with and the level of their success. Teaching efficacy is a belief of teachers on having great success even on students' having problem on learning. This study is devoted to teacher candidates self-efficacy beliefs on teaching. Previous studies showed that "if teacher candidates have high efficacy feelings on teaching methods and classroom management techniques, they would be more successful, determined and powerful after starting to work" (Milner, 2002). Even if their students have problems on learning, they work harder and harder to teach them. They are more persistent on teaching effectively. This kind of teachers is more eager to teach and the chance of their staying on job is high (Woolfolk, 1998).

Teaching self-efficacy beliefs affect the effort teachers invest in teaching, the goals they set, and their level of persistence in working with challenging students. Teachers with a strong sense of teaching self-efficacy tend to exhibit higher levels of planning and organization (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990), experiment with different methods of instruction to a greater degree (Allinder, 1994), and explore new instructional materials (Stein & Wang, 1988).

The concept of "teaching self-efficacy" was first identified when a RAND Corporation study related teachers' behaviors to students' achievement (Armor, Conroy-Oseguera, Cox, King, McDonnell, Pascal, Pauly, & Zellman, 1976). Since then, teaching self-efficacy has been closely associated with teachers' abilities to motivate students (Mosely, Reinke, & Bookout, 2002), to adopt new instructional strategies (Gibson & Dembo, 1984), and to develop innovative teaching styles (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1998).

In literature, it can be seen that studies done on self-efficacy are generally focused on self-efficacy beliefs and academic success and performance (Denise ve O'Neil, 1997; Sewell and George, 2000; Işıksal and Aşkar, 2005; Blake and Lesser, 2006; Schweinle

nd Mims, 2009); and self-efficacy beliefs and computer usage (Campeau and Higgins, 1995; Aşkar and Umay, 2001; Akkoyunlu and Kurbanoğlu, 2003; Igboria and Iivari, 1995; Köseoğlu and et al., 2007).

In recent years, many studies on determining the level of self-efficacy beliefs of teachers and teacher candidates on a special field of teaching or general teaching profession have been done in Turkey. Many of these studies done on specific specialities such as science, maths, chemistry and computer teaching profession teacher candidates' beliefs (Özdemir, 2008), These involve subjects such as, particularly, computer self-efficacy perception (Akkoyunlu & Kurbanoğlu, 2003; Aşkar & Umay, 2001), teachers' and teacher candidates' self-efficacy perception (Arslan, 2008; Baykara, 2011; Çalışkan, Selçuk & Özcan, 2010; Çubukçu & Girmen, 2007; Hevedanlı & Ekici, 2009; Kan & Akbaş, 2006; Özerkan, 2007; Üstüner et al, 2009, Yeşilyurt, 2011), scale development self-efficacy perception (Ekici, 2005; Hancı Yanar & Bümen, 2012; Yılmaz et al, 2004), and examining the self-efficacies in terms of various variables such as gender, branch, school type, education level etc. (Aykaç & Duman, 2007; Bulut & Oral, 2012; Çoşkun, 2010; Odacı & Berber Çelik, 2011), and also the relationship of self-efficacy with academic success (Köseoğlu, 2010) and life satisfaction (Aydıner, 2011).

However, studies done on general teacher self-efficacy are very limited. Results of these studies showed that (Özdemir, 2008; Çapri and Çelikkaleli, 2008) found that teacher candidates' self-efficacy beliefs differ according to sex, program, speciality. On the other hand, Ekici (2008) found that there isn't significance between self-efficacy beliefs of teacher candidates and sex, academic success, and high school graduated from.

Significance of the Study

As it is stated above, there are many studies done on self-efficacy beliefs of teacher candidates. However, these studies mostly focused on specialties of teaching profession and there are a few studies done on self-efficacy beliefs on general teaching qual-

ifications of teacher candidates. Based on teacher candidates' perceptions, the results of this study will help to determine self-efficacy beliefs of teacher candidates who are still studying on education faculties. Additionally, this study will contribute to education faculty officials concerning to professional practices with its results, findings, and recommendations.

Method

In this study, descriptive research methods are used to explore self-efficacy beliefs of teacher candidates on readiness to teaching profession at a university in Turkey. The method section presents the participants, sources of data, the research design, and measurement of the variables used in this study.

During 2013-2014 academic years at a university in Turkey, all the participants (n=441) were teacher candidates enrolled in the teacher education program of the university. Participants were enrolled 3rd and 4th grades of different departments of education faculty. While 217 participants are from 3rd graders (49.2%), 224 participants are from 4th graders (50.8%). Male participants are 252 (58.3%), female participants are 180 (41.7%), and nine participants did not notify their gender. The departments of the participants who continue their education at the university as follows: Psychological counseling and guidance, primary school teaching, art teaching, Turkish language teaching, computer and instructional technologies, social sciences teaching, physical training teaching, mathematical teaching, and science teaching of education faculty.

Sampling intentionally focused on 3rd and 4th grade students of education faculty because first and second graders are not assumed to be a teacher candidate regarding that they are freshmen and sophomores highly absorbed in classes and are not seen as a teacher candidate yet. All students in 3rd and 4th graders as teacher candidates are invited to participate to ensure that the population is adequately represented in the sample for analysis purposes and to improve sampling precision that produces the smallest sampling

error. The data were collected at the university during the spring semester of 2014 between March and May. Before their classes begin, participants completed questionnaire at the classroom setting.

Research Design

This research did not aim to explain why it happens like that, instead, this research will be just exploratory and descriptive. It will investigate self-efficacy beliefs of teacher candidates on readiness to teaching profession at a university in Turkey. The perceptions of teacher candidates are always important to consider since they are the ones who benefit from the education program and will put them into practice following the graduation.

Although previous studies are mostly qualitative, usually based on the perceptions of faculty members and administrators, the current research seeks to determine empirically whether they think or feel that they are ready to teach following their graduation.

The main research question that shaped this study was "What are the self-efficacy beliefs of teacher candidates on readiness to teaching profession?"

Data Analysis and Results

Data was analyzed by using SPSS. Since this study did not aim to explain why teacher candidates think in a certain way, descriptive statistics help us to see what they think in an exploratory study. First, univariate analyses such as frequencies with number and percentages let us know the thinking of teacher candidates on readiness to teaching profession. Second, bivariate analyses such as crosstabs statistics help us to see the relationships between two independent variables.

Univariate Analyses: Frequencies of Independent Variables

Teacher candidates at a university in Turkey think that they are individually qualified to teach. They mostly agree with all the statements on individual qualifications of teacher candidates at

different levels; "be able to create classroom environment for students' attending class activities actively" at 75.1% (n=329) level, "be able to create appropriate environment for students' effective communication with each other" at 74.3% (n=326) level, "be able to identify students' various characteristics (physical, social, psychological, mental, psychomotor)" at 68.1% (n=299) level, "be able to effective communicate with students considered individual, social and psychological characteristics" at 65.4% (n=287) level, "be able to use guidance programs related to students' academic achievement" at 58.5% (n=257) level, "be able to understand individual differences of students and create teaching methods according to these differences" at 58.1% (n=255) level, "be able to use formal and informal evaluation methods effectively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological developments" at 46.4% (n=204) level, "be able to make plans (annual, daily and subject) appropriate to students' interests, levels, and needs" at 43.6% (n=192) level, and "be able to deal with individual and group problems occurred in the classroom" at 36.5% (n=159) level (see Table 1).

Questions on individual qualifications of teacher candidates	Disagree	Don't Know	Agree
Be able to understand individual differences of students and create teaching methods according to these differences	55 (12.5%)	129 (29.4%)	255 (58.1%)
Be able to use formal and informal evaluation methods effectively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological developments	68 (15.5%)	168 (38.2%)	204 (46.4%)
Be able to use guidance programs related to students' academic achievement	42 (9.6%)	140 (31.9%)	257 (58.5%)
Be able to create appropriate environment for students' effective communication with each other	34 (7.7%)	79 (18.0%)	326 (74.3%)

Be able to create classroom environment for students' attending class activities actively	23 (5.3%)	86 (19.6%)	329 (75.1%)
Be able to identify students' various characteristics (physical, social, psychological, mental, psychomotor)	37 (8.4%)	102 (23.2%)	299 (68.1%)
Be able to deal with individual and group problems occurred in the classroom	65 (14.9%)	212 (48.6%)	159 (36.5%)
Be able to effective communicate with students considered individual, social and psychological characteristics	40 (9.1%)	112 (25.5%)	287 (65.4%)
Be able to make plans (annual, daily and subject) appropriate to students' interests, levels, and needs	89 (20.2%)	159 (36.1%)	192 (43.6%)

Table 1: Questions on individual qualifications of teacher candidates

Bivariate Analyses: Crosstabs of Independent Variables With Gender, Class, and Department

For descriptive statistics this study also ran crosstabs to see bivariate relationships in the following steps. Unlike the tables with two rows and two columns, this study selected Chi-square to calculate the Pearson for tables with any number of rows and columns. Since this study uses nominal data, we could select Phi (coefficient) and Cramér's V, Contingency coefficient, Lambda (symmetric and asymmetric lambdas and Goodman and Kruskal's tau), and Uncertainty coefficient. This study selected "contingency coefficient", which is a measure of association based on chi-square. The value ranges between 0 and 1, with 0 indicating no association between the row and column variables and values close to 1 indicating a high degree of association between the variables. The maximum value possible depends on the number of rows and columns in a table.

The relationship between gender and "teachers candidates'

ability to use formal and informal evaluation methods effectively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological developments" is significant based on Pearson chi-square value (.036) with nominal by nominal contingency coefficient value (.123). Most of the teacher candidates, both males and females, agree with that they are able to use formal and informal evaluation methods effectively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological developments. Males agree at 48.8% (n=123) level and disagree at 17.5% (n=44) level while females agree at 43% (n=77) level and disagree at 11.7% (n=21) level (Table 2).

The significant relationship between gender and "teacher candidates' ability to use guidance programs related to students' academic achievement" is based on Pearson chi-square value (.029) with nominal by nominal contingency coefficient value (.127). Most of the teacher candidates, both males and females, agree with that they are able to use guidance programs related to students' academic achievement. Males agree at 61.5% (n=155) level and disagree at 10.7% (n=27) level while females agree at 55.1% (n=98) level and disagree at 6.2% (n=11) level (Table 2).

The relationship between gender and "teacher candidates' ability to create classroom environment for students' attending class activities actively" is significant (p= .004) with nominal by nominal contingency coefficient value (.157 / 15.7%). Most of the teacher candidates, both males and females, agree with that they are able to create classroom environment for students' attending class activities actively. Males agree at 76.6% (n=193) level and disagree at 7.5% (n=19) level while females agree at 74% (n=131) level and disagree at 1.7% (n=3) level (Table 2).

The significant relationship between gender and "teacher candidates' ability to identify students' various characteristics (physical, social, psychological, mental, psychomotor)" is based on Pearson chi-square value (.004) with nominal by nominal contingency coefficient value (.158 / 15.8%). Most of the teacher candidates, both males and females, agree with that they are able to identify students' various characteristics (physical, social, psycho-

logical, mental, and psychomotor). Males agree at 71.4% (n=180) level and disagree at 10.3% (n=26) level while females agree at 63.3% (n=112) level and disagree at 5.6% (n=10) level (Table 2).

The relationship between gender and "teacher candidates' ability to make plans (annual, daily and subject) appropriate to students' interests, levels, and needs" is significant based on Pearson chi-square value (.030) with nominal by nominal contingency coefficient value (.126 / 12.6%) level. Most of the teacher candidates, both males and females, agree with that they are able to make plans (annual, daily and subject) appropriate to students' interests, levels, and needs. Males agree at 45.2% (n=114) level and disagree at 23.4% (n=59) level while females agree at 41.9% (n=75) level and disagree at 15.6% (n=28) level (Table 2).

	Gender	
	Male	Female
Teachers candidates' ability to use formal and informal evaluation methods effectively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological developments		
Disagree	44 (17.5%)	21 (11.7%)
Don't Know	85 (33.7%)	81 (45.3%)
Agree	123 (48.8%)	77 (43.0%)
Total	252 (100.0%)	179 (100.0%)
Teacher candidates' ability to use guidance programs related to students		
Disagree	27 (10.7%)	11 (6.2%)
Don't Know	70 (27.8%)	69 (38.8%)
Agree	155 (61.5%)	98 (55.1%)
Total	252 (100.0%)	178 (100.0%)
Teacher candidates' ability to create classroom environment for students' attending class activities actively		

Disagree	19 (7.5%)	3 (1.7%)
Don't Know	40 (15.9%)	43 (24.3%)
Agree	193 (76.6%)	131 (74.0%)
Total	252 (100.0%)	177 (100.0%)
Teacher candidates' ability to identify students' various characteristics (Physical, social, psychological, mental, psychomotor)		
Disagree	26 (10.3%)	10 (5.6%)
Don't Know	46 (18.3%)	55 (31.1%)
Agree	180 (71.4%)	112 (63.3%)
Total	252 (100.0%)	177 (100.0%)
Teacher candidates' ability to make plans (annual, daily and subject) appropriate to students' interests, levels, and needs		
Disagree	59 (23.4%)	28 (15.6%)
Don't Know	79 (31.3%)	76 (42.5%)
Agree	114 (45.2%)	75 (41.9%)
Total	252 (100.0%)	179 (100.0%)

Table 2: Issues on individual qualifications perceived by teacher candidates as males and females

The relationship between class and "teacher candidates' ability to understand individual differences of students and create teaching methods according to these differences" is significant (p= .053 and nominal by nominal contingency coefficient value=.115 / 11.5%). Most of the both seniors and juniors (4th and 3rd graders) agree with that teacher candidates are able to understand individual differences of students and create teaching methods according to these differences. Seniors agree at 53.4% (n=119) level and disagree at 12.1% (n=27) level while juniors agree at 63% (n=136) level and disagree at 13% (n=28) level (Table 3).

The relationship between class and "teacher candidates' ability to use formal and informal evaluation methods effectively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological develop-

ments" is significant based on Pearson chi-square value (.000) and nominal by nominal contingency coefficient value (.211). Both seniors and juniors (4th and 3rd graders) mostly agree with that they are able to use formal and informal evaluation methods effectively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological developments. Seniors agree at 37.7% (n=84) level and disagree at 13.9% (n=31) level while juniors agree at 55.3% (n=120) level and disagree at 17.1% (n=37) level (Table 3).

The significant relationship between class and "teacher candidates' ability to identify students' various characteristics (physical, social, psychological, mental, and psychomotor)" exists based on Pearson chi-square value (.005) and nominal by nominal contingency coefficient value (.154). Both seniors and juniors (4th and 3rd graders) mostly agree with that teacher candidates are able to identify students' various characteristics (physical, social, psychological, mental, and psychomotor). Seniors agree at 64.3% (n=142) level and disagree only at 6.3% (n=14) level while juniors agree at 72.4% (n=157) level and disagree at 10.6% (n=23) level (Table 3).

The relationship between class and "teacher candidates' ability to make plans (annual, daily and subject) appropriate to students' interests, levels, and needs" is significant (p=.007 and nominal by nominal contingency coefficient value=.148 / 14.8%). Both seniors and juniors (4th and 3rd graders) mostly agree with that teacher candidates are able to make plans (annual, daily and subject) appropriate to students' interests, levels, and needs. Seniors agree at 36.3% (n=81) level and disagree at 22.4% (n=50) level while juniors agree at 51.2% (n=111) level and disagree at 18% (n=39) level (Table 3).

	Class	
	3	4
Teacher candidates' ability to understand individual differences of students and create teaching methods according to these differences		
Disagree	28 (13.0%)	27 (12.1%)
Don't Know	52 (24.1%)	77 (34.5%)
Agree	136 (63.0%)	119 (53.4%)
Total	216 (100.0%)	223 (100.0%)
Teacher candidates' ability to use formal and informal evaluation methods effectively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological developments		
Disagree	37 (17.1%)	31 (13.9%)
Don't Know	60 (27.6%)	108 (48.4%)
Agree	120 (55.3%)	84 (37.7%)
Total	217 (100.0%)	223 (100.0%)
Teacher candidates' ability to identify students' various characteristics (Physical, social, psychological, mental, psychomotor)		
Disagree	23 (10.6%)	14 (6.3%)
Don't Know	37 (17.1%)	65 (29.4%)
Agree	157 (72.4%)	142 (64.3%)
Total	217 (100.0%)	221 (100.0%)
Teacher candidates' ability to make plans (annual, daily and subject) appropriate to students' interests, levels, and needs		
Disagree	39 (18.0%)	50 (22.4%)
Don't Know	67 (30.9%)	92 (41.3%)
Agree	111 (51.2%)	81 (36.3%)
Total	217 (100.0%)	223 (100.0%)

Table 3: Issues on Individual Qualifications perceived by teacher candidates in different classes

The relationship between departments and "teacher candidates' ability to use formal and informal evaluation methods effec-

tively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological developments" is significant based on Pearson chi-square value (.005) and nominal by nominal contingency coefficient value (.270). Most of the teacher candidates from all departments agree with that they are able to use formal and informal evaluation methods effectively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological developments. For example, candidates from the department of primary school teaching agree with that statement at 40.5% (n=66) level and disagree at 13.5% (n=22) level. Another example is that candidates from social studies department agree at 58.2% (n=46) level and disagree at 12.7% (n=10) level (Table 4).

The significant relationship between departments and "teacher candidates' ability to create appropriate environment for students' effective communication with each other" exists based on Pearson chi-square value (.014) and nominal by nominal contingency coefficient value (.257). The teacher candidates from all departments mostly agree with that they are able to create appropriate environment for students' effective communication with each other. For example, candidates from the department of primary school teaching agree with that statement at 80.9% (n=131) level and disagree at 8% (n=13) level. Another example is that candidates from computer department agree at 85.2% (n=23) level and disagree at 3.7% (n=1) level (Table 4).

The relationship between departments and "teacher candidates' ability to deal with individual and group problems occurred in the classroom" " is significant (p=.025 and nominal by nominal contingency coefficient value= .249 / 24.9%). Except the teacher candidates from the department of PCG, candidates from all other departments mostly agree with that they are able to deal with individual and group problems occurred in the classroom. For example, candidates from the department of primary school teaching agree with that statement at 38.5% (n=62) level and disagree at 13% (n=21) level. Another example is that candidates from physical training department agree at 60% (n=21) level and disagree at 8.6% (n=3) level. Also, candidates from the department of social studies agree

at 38% (n=30) level and disagree at 15.2% (n=12) level and candidates from the department of science agree at 37.5% (n=12) level and disagree at 6.3% (n=2) level. However, candidates from the department of PCG mostly disagree at 35.7% (n=10) and agree at 14.3% (n=4) level (Table 4).

The significant relationship between departments and "teacher candidates' ability to effective communicate with students considered individual, social and psychological characteristics" is based on Pearson chi-square value (.017) with nominal by nominal contingency coefficient value (.254 / 25.4%). Teacher candidates from all of the departments mostly agree with that they are able to effective communicate with students considered individual, social and psychological characteristics. For example, most of the candidates from primary school teaching department agree at 63.6% (n=103) level and disagree 11.1% (n=18) level, the candidates from physical training department agree at 80% (n=28) level and disagree only 11.4% (n=4) level, and another example is that most of the candidates from social studies department agree at 73.4% (n=58) and disagree at 5.1% (n=4) level (Table 4).

Departments	PCG	Primary school teaching	Art	Turkish	Computer	Social studies	Physical training	Math	Science
Teacher candidates' ability to use formal and informal evaluation methods effectively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological developments									
Disagree	10 (35.7%)	22 (13.5%)	1 (8.3%)	8 (16.0%)	5 (18.5%)	10 (12.7%)	6 (17.1%)	2 (14.3%)	4 (12.5%)
Don't Know	6 (21.4%)	75 (46.0%)	6 (50.0%)	25 (50.0%)	8 (29.6%)	23 (29.1%)	7 (20.0%)	2 (14.3%)	16 (50.0%)
Agree	12 (42.9%)	66 (40.5%)	5 (41.7%)	17 (34.0%)	14 (51.9%)	46 (58.2%)	22 (62.9%)	10 (71.4%)	12 (37.5%)
Total	28 (100.0%)	163 (100.0%)	12 (100.0%)	50 (100.0%)	27 (100.0%)	79 (100.0%)	35 (100.0%)	14 (100.0%)	32 (100.0%)

Teacher candidates' ability to create appropriate environment for students' effective communication with each other								
Disagree	5 (17.9%)	13 (8.0%)	0 (.0%)	4 (8.0%)	1 (3.7%)	7 (8.9%)	1 (2.9%)	1 (7.1%)	2 (6.3%)
Don't Know	8 (28.6%)	18 (11.1%)	1 (8.3%)	7 (14.0%)	3 (11.1%)	23 (29.1%)	6 (17.1%)	2 (14.3%)	11 (34.4%)
Agree	15 (53.6%)	131 (80.9%)	11 (91.7%)	39 (78.0%)	23 (85.2%)	49 (62.0%)	28 (80.0%)	11 (78.6%)	19 (59.4%)
Total	28 (100.0%)	162 (100.0%)	12 (100.0%)	50 (100.0%)	27 (100.0%)	79 (100.0%)	35 (100.0%)	14 (100.0%)	32 (100.0%)

Teacher candidates' ability to deal with individual and group problems occurred in the classroom								
Disagree	10 (35.7%)	21 (13.0%)	1 (9.1%)	9 (18.4%)	6 (22.2%)	12 (15.2%)	3 (8.6%)	1 (7.1%)	2 (6.3%)
Don't Know	14 (50.0%)	78 (48.4%)	7 (63.6%)	28 (57.1%)	12 (44.4%)	37 (46.8%)	11 (31.4%)	7 (50.0%)	18 (56.3%)
Agree	4 (14.3%)	62 (38.5%)	3 (27.3%)	12 (24.5%)	9 (33.3%)	30 (38.0%)	21 (60.0%)	6 (42.9%)	12 (37.5%)
Total	28 (100.0%)	161 (100.0%)	11 (100.0%)	49 (100.0%)	27 (100.0%)	79 (100.0%)	35 (100.0%)	14 (100.0%)	32 (100.0%)

Teacher candidates' ability to effective communicate with students considered individual, social and psychological characteristics								
Disagree	7 (25.0%)	18 (11.1%)	1 (8.3%)	3 (6.0%)	1 (3.7%)	4 (5.1%)	4 (11.4%)	0 (.0%)	2 (6.3%)
Don't Know	10 (35.7%)	41 (25.3%)	3 (25.0%)	14 (28.0%)	12 (44.4%)	17 (21.5%)	3 (8.6%)	2 (14.3%)	10 (31.3%)
Agree	11 (39.3%)	103 (63.6%)	8 (66.7%)	33 (66.0%)	14 (51.9%)	58 (73.4%)	28 (80.0%)	12 (85.7%)	20 (62.5%)
Total	28 (100.0%)	162 (100.0%)	12 (100.0%)	50 (100.0%)	27 (100.0%)	79 (100.0%)	35 (100.0%)	14 (100.0%)	32 (100.0%)

Table 4: Issues on individual qualifications perceived by teacher candidates in different departments

Conclusion

The perceptions of teacher candidates are always important to consider since they are the ones who benefit from the education program and will put them into practice following the graduation. Although many studies done on self-efficacy beliefs of teacher candidates, these studies mostly focused on specialties of teaching profession. Only a few studies were conducted on self-efficacy beliefs on general teaching qualifications of teacher candidates.

This research is just exploratory and descriptive without trying to explain why it happens like that. It investigates self-efficacy beliefs of teacher candidates on readiness to teaching profession at a university in Turkey. Although previous studies are mostly qualitative, usually based on the perceptions of faculty members and administrators, the current research determines empirically the self-efficacy beliefs of teacher candidates on readiness to teaching profession.

Teacher candidates at a university in Turkey think that they are individually qualified to teach. They mostly agree with all the statements on individual qualifications of teacher candidates at different levels; For example, they think that they are "able to create classroom environment for students' attending class activities actively" at 75.1% (n=329) level, "able to create appropriate environment for students' effective communication with each other" at 74.3% (n=326) level, and they are "able to effective communicate with students considered individual, social and psychological characteristics" at 65.4% (n=287) level.

Based on gender, most of the teacher candidates, both males and females, agree with that they are able to use formal and informal evaluation methods effectively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological developments, they are able to use guidance programs related to students' academic achievement, they are able to create classroom environment for students' attending class activities actively, they are able to identify students' various characteristics (physical, social, psychological, mental, and

psychomotor), and they are able to make plans (annual, daily and subject) appropriate to students' interests, levels, and needs.

Based on teacher candidates' class, both seniors and juniors (4th and 3rd graders) mostly agree with that are able to understand individual differences of students and create teaching methods according to these differences, they are able to use formal and informal evaluation methods effectively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological developments, they are able to identify students' various characteristics (physical, social, psychological, mental, and psychomotor), and they are able to make plans (annual, daily and subject) appropriate to students' interests, levels, and needs.

Finally, based on the departments, most of the teacher candidates from all departments agree with that they are able to use formal and informal evaluation methods effectively to evaluate students' emotional, physical, and psychological developments, they are able to create appropriate environment for students' effective communication with each other, they are able to deal with individual and group problems occurred in the classroom (except the teacher candidates from the department of PCG), and they are able to effective communicate with students considered individual, social and psychological characteristics.

To conclude, teacher candidates at a university in Turkey have strong self-efficacy beliefs that they are ready to teach following the graduation. This result can be interpreted in a couple of ways. First, they may get into a qualified program administered by highly qualified professionals and they are taught by highly qualified instructors. Statistics of the university do not prove that the university has this kind of composition. Therefore, it does not seem to be true. Second, they may not know enough about the difficulties of their profession and they may think that it is so easy to handle. This makes more sense and I think that they know little about the realities of teaching profession; however, it is also good if they are full of energy to teach following graduation.

References

Akkoyunlu, B. & Kurbanoğlu, S. (2003). A study on teacher candidates' perceived information literacy self-efficacy and perceived computer self-efficacy. *H.U. Journal of Education, 24*, 1-10.

Allinder, A. M. (1994). The relationship between efficacy and instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 17*, 86-95.

Armor, D., Conroy-Oseguera, P., Cox, M., King, N., McDonnell, L., Pascal, A., Pauly, E., & Zellman, G. (1976). *Analysis of the school preferred reading programs in selected Los Angeles minority schools.* Report No. R-2007-LAUSD. Santa Monica, Ca: Rand Corporation (ERIC Document # ED130 243).

Arslan, A. (2008). The correlation between attitude and self-efficacy with regard to computer assisted education. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, 7*(24), 101-109.

Aşkar, P. & Umay, A. (2001). Perceived computer self-efficacy of the students in the elementary mathematics teaching programme. *H.U. Journal of Education, 21*, 1-8.

Aydıner, B. B. (2011). *The relationship between sub-dimensions of the life goals with general self-efficacy, life-satisfaction and some variables.* Unpublished Master's Thesis, Sakarya University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Turkey.

Aykaç Duman, B. (2007). *The effects of the self-efficacy beliefs of high school students about*

English on their English performance due to gender, range and grade. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Yıldız Teknik University, Institute of Social Sciences, Turkey.

Baykara, K. (2011). A study on "teacher efficacy perceptions" and "meta-cognitive learning strategies" of prospective teachers. *H.U. Journal of Education,40*, 80-92.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York : W. H. Freeman and Company.

Blake, S. & Lesser, L (2006). Alatorre, S., Cortina, J.L., & Mendez, A.

(Eds.).Exploring the Relationship Between Academic Self-Efficacy and Middle School Students' Performance on a High-Stakes Mathematics Test. Proceedings of the 28th annual meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education. Merida, Mexico. *Universidad Pedagogica Nacional. 2*, 655-656.

Bulut, İ. & Oral, B. (2012). Self-efficacy perceptions regarding teaching profession: The case of faculty of science, letters, theology and fine arts graduates attending pedagogic formation program. *Inonu University Journal of Education, 12*(3), 1-18.

Campeau, D.R. & Higgins, C.A. (1995). Computer self-efficacy: Development of a Measure and Initial Test. *MIS Quarterly, 19*, 189-211.

Coşkun, M. K. (2010). Investigating religious culture & moral knowledge teacher' self-sufficiency perception in terms of various variables. *Gazi Osmanpaşa University Journal of Social Science, 5*(1), 95-109.

Çalışkan, S., Selçuk, G. S. & Özcan, Ö. (2012). Self-efficacy beliefs of physics student teachers': effects of gender, class level and academic achievement. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 18*(2), 449-466.

Çapri, B. & Çelikkaleli, Ö. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenliğe ilişkin tutum ve mesleki yeterlik inançlarının cinsiyet, program ve fakültelerine göre incelenmesi.[Examining teacher candidates' on teaching qualifications and beliefs on teaching profession based on gender, program and faculty]. *İnönü Üniversity Journal of Education, 9*(15), 33-53.

Çubukçu, Z. & Girmen, P. (2007). Determining the social self-efficacy perception of candidate Teachers. *Eskişehir Osmangazi University Journal of Social Sciences, 8*(1), 57-74.

Dembo, M..H. (2004). *Motivation and learning strategies for college success: A self- management approach*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Denise, H. & O'Neil, H. F. (1997). *The Role of Parental Expectation, Effort, and Self-efficacy in the Achievement in the High and Low Track High School Students in Taiwan*. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Donald, M.G. (2003). *Handbook of Self and Identity*. Guilford Pres

Ekici, G. (2008). Sınıf yönetimi dersinin öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen özyeterlik algı düzeyine etkisi.[Effect of classroom management course on teacher candidates' teaching self-efficacy beliefs]. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 35*, 98-110.

Ekici, G. (2005). The validity and reliability of the biology self-efficacy instrument. *H.U. Journal of Education, 29*, 85-94.

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

Hancı Yanar, B. & Bümen, N. T. (2012). Developing a self-efficacy scale for English. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 20*(1), 97-110.

Hevedanlı, M. & Ekici, G. (2009). Analyzing university students' biology self-efficacy levels in the aspect of different variables. *Ege Journal of Education, 10*(1), 24-47.

Igboria, M. & Iivari, J. (1995). The effects of Self-efficacy on Computer Usage. *Omega, 23*(6), 587-605.

Işıksal, M. & Aşkar, P. (2005). The Effect of Spreadsheet and Dynamic Geometry Software on The Achievement and Self-efficacy on 7th-grade Students. *Educational Research, 47*(3), 333-350.

Kan, A. & Akbaş, A. (2006). Affective factors that influence chemistry achievement (attitude and self-efficacy) and the power of these factors to predict chemistry achievement-I. *Journal of Turkish Science Education (TUSED), 3*(1), 76-85.

Köseoğlu, P. (2010). The influence of jigsaw technique-based teaching on academic achievement, self-efficacy and attitudes in biolology education. *H.U. Journal of Education, 39*, 244-254.

Köseoğlu, P.; Yılmaz, M.; Gerçek, C. & Soran, H. (2007). Bilgisayar Kursunun Bilgisayara Yönelik Başarı, Tutum ve Öz-yeterlik İnançları Üzerine Etkisi. [Effect of computer course on success, beliefs, and self efficacy beliefs on computer]. *Hacettepe University Journa of Educationl, 33*, 203-209.

Milner, H. R. (2002). A Case study of an experienced English teacher's self-efficacy and persistence through 'crisis' situations: Theoretical and practical considerations. *High School Journal, 86* (1).

Moseley, C., Reinke, K., & Bookout, V. (2002). The effect of teaching outdoor environmental education on preservice teachers' attitudes toward self-efficacy and outcome expectancy. *The Journal of Environmental Education, 34*(1), 9-15.

Odacı, H. & Berber Çelik, Ç. (2011). *Relationship between unıversity students' problematic internet use and their academic self-efficacy, academic procrastination, and eating attitudes*. 5th International Computer & Instructional Technologies Symposium, Elazığ.

Özdemir, S. M. (2008). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının öğretim sürecine ilişkin özyeterlik inançlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi.[Evaluating primary school teacher candidates' self-efficacy beliefs on teaching process based on diverse variables]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi [Theory and Practice Educational Administration], 14*(54), 277-306.

Özerkan, E. (2007). *The relatıonshıp between the teacher self-effıcacy and the students social studies self-concept*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Trakya University, Institute of Social Sciences, Turkey.

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E. & Sawyer, B. E. (2004). Primary-grade teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes toward teaching and discipline and teaching practice priorities in relation to the responsive classroom approach. *The Elementary School Journal, 104*(4), 321-341.

Schweinle, A & Mims, A.G. (2009). Mathematics self-efficacy: Stereotype Threat Versus Resilience. *Social Psychology of Education*. DOI 10.1007/s11218-009-9094-2.

Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1998). *Self-regulated learning: From teaching to self-reflective practice*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Sewell, A. & George, A. (2000). Developing Efficacy Beliefs in the Classroom. *Journal of Educational Enquiry, 1*(2), 58-71.

Snyder, C. R. & Lopez, S. (2002). *Handbook of Positive Psychology*. Oxford University Press US.

Stein, M., & Wang, M. (1988). Teacher development and school improvement: The process of teacher change. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4*, 171–187.

Üstüner, M., Demirtaş, H., Cömert, M. & Özer, N. (2009). Secondary school teachers' self-efficacy beliefs. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Education Faculty, 9*(17), 1-16.

Woolfolk, A. E. (1998). *Educational Psychology*. Allyn and Bacon Publishing.

Woolfolk, A.E., & Hoy, W.K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*, 81-91.

Yeşilyurt, E. (2011). Teacher candidates' qualification perceptions about teaching profession's general qualifications. *Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences, 9*(1), 71-100.

Yılmaz, M., Köseoğlu, P., Gerçek, C. & Soran, H. (2004). Adaptation of a teacher self-efficacy scale to Turkish. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 27*, 260-267.