

Acil Yardım ve Afet Yönetimi Öğrencilerinin Mesleki Kaygılarının Değerlendirilmesi

Assessment of Occupational Anxiety of Emergency Aid and Disaster Management Students

 Cüneyt ÇALIŞKAN¹,  Kerem KINIK²,

¹ Department of Emergency Aid and Disaster Management, Hamidiye Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Health Sciences, Istanbul, Türkiye, caliskan007@hotmail.com (Sorumlu Yazar)

² Department of Emergency Aid and Disaster Management, Hamidiye Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Health Sciences, Istanbul, Türkiye, kerem.kinik@gmail.com

Geliş tarihi/Received: 27.11.2023

Kabul tarihi/Accepted: 13.06.2024

Yayın tarihi/Online published: 15.06.2024

DOI: 10.54862/pashid.1395951

ÖZET

Amaç: Bu çalışmada bir üniversitenin Acil Yardım ve Afet Yönetimi bölümü öğrencilerinin mesleki kaygı düzeylerinin belirlenmesi amaçlanmaktadır.

Yöntem: Kesitsel tipteki epidemiyolojik çalışmada öğrenci sayısı 114 olup evrenin %83.82'sine ulaşılmıştır. Verilerin toplanmasında herhangi bir örnekleme yöntemi seçilmemiş, veriler 2023 yılı Kasım ayı içerisinde toplanmıştır. Veri toplama aracı araştırmacılar tarafından hazırlanan anket formu ve Mesleki Kaygı Ölçeği ile toplanmıştır. Analizlerde sosyodemografik değişkenler ile mesleki kaygı ölçeği arasında T-Testi, One-Way ANOVA, Mann-Whitney U ve Kruskal-Wallis H analizleri yapılmıştır.

Bulgular: Araştırmaya katılmayı kabul eden 114 kişinin %56.1'i (n=64) kadın, yaş ortalaması (SS) 20.81 (1.78) yıldır. Mesleki kaygı ölçeği puanları ortalaması 58.35±11.87 puandır. İki değişkenli analizlerde kadın değişkeni ile mesleki kaygı ölçeği ve alt boyutları ve 20 yaş ve altı değişkeni ile mesleki kaygı ölçeği ve alt boyutlarından mesleki bilgi, iş sağlığı ve iletişim becerisi arasında daha yüksek bir ilişki bulunmuştur (p<0.05). Çok değişkenli analizlerde mesleki bilgi, iş sağlığı ve iletişim becerisi alt boyutları ile ikinci sınıfların kaygı puanları arasında daha yüksek bir ilişki bulunmuştur (p<0.05) **Sonuç:** Öğrencilerin mesleki kaygı düzeyleri düşük çıkmıştır ve bazı değişkenler ile mesleki kaygı ölçeği puanları arasında bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Anahtar kelimeler: Öğrenci, mesleki kaygı, üniversite, endişe

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğrenci, mesleki kaygı, üniversite, endişe

ABSTRACT

Objective: The purpose of this study is to determine the level of occupational anxiety of students in the emergency aid and disaster management department of a university. **Method:** In this cross-sectional epidemiological study, the number of students was 114 and 83.82% of the population was reached. No sampling method was selected for data collection and the data were collected in November 2023. The data were collected with the questionnaire form prepared by the researchers and the Occupational Anxiety Scale. In the analyses, T-Test, One-Way ANOVA, Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis H analyses were performed between socio-demographic variables and the occupational anxiety scale.

Results: Of the 114 people who agreed to participate in the study, 56.1% (n=64) were female and the mean age (SD) was 20.81 (1.78) years. The mean score on the occupational anxiety scale was 58.35±11.87 points. In bivariate analyses, a higher relationship was found between the female variable and the occupational anxiety scale and its sub-dimensions, and between the variable being 20 years or younger and the occupational anxiety scale and its sub-dimensions of occupational knowledge, occupational health and communication skills (p<0.05). In multivariate analyses, a higher relationship was found between the sub-dimensions of occupational knowledge, occupational health and communication skills and the anxiety scores of the 2nd year students (p<0.05).

Conclusion: The occupational anxiety levels of the students were found to be low and a relationship was found between some variables and vocational anxiety scale scores.

Keywords: Student, occupational anxiety, university, anxiety



INTRODUCTION

Anxiety can be defined as a state of being worried and uncomfortable about a subjective situation because a person does not know how it will happen now or in the future. In other words, anxiety is a mental and physical reaction that occurs because of the discomfort experienced by the person, although there is no concrete danger or threat in the environment (Şahin, 2019). Although anxiety and fear are considered to be semantically similar, the cause of fear is clear and is known to cover a short period of time. Anxiety, on the other hand, is thought to operate on people's assumptions, although its source is not entirely clear (Temel, Çelikkalp, Bilgiç, & Varol, 2020). Anxiety is based on negative emotions such as discomfort, tension, worry and fear that people experience (Gudykunst & Nishida, 2001).

Occupational anxieties about the future of individuals in today's educational life pave the way for the emergence of health problems such as occupational stress, anxiety, depression and cardiovascular disease in the future (Aronsson et al., 2017; Buist-Bouwman, De Graaf, Vollebergh, & Ormel, 2005; Theorell et al., 2015). Anxiety can limit a student's cognitive abilities in the educational environment and negatively affect important decision-making skills and initiative (Ergin, Utku Uzun, & Topaloğlu, 2016; Sevinç Postacı, Uysal, Aytuğ Koşan, & Toraman, 2020). As the educational content and opportunities, working conditions and difficulties of each occupation differ, students' concerns may vary according to the occupation. These concerns are thought to include the inability to find a occupational after graduation, the expectation of

financial return from the occupational, and professional inadequacy (Baltacı, Üngüren, Avsallı, & Demirel, 2012).

Many studies have concluded that there are high levels of professional anxiety among students in the health professions and that this situation has a negative impact on students' lives in many areas, with academic success being the most important (Aronsson et al., 2017; Ergin et al., 2016; Goksin Cihan, Kutlu, & Karademirci, 2017). However, although there are many studies conducted with students studying in health-related schools, there is no study in the literature conducted with Emergency Aid and Disaster Management (EADM) students. In addition, the findings that can be obtained for a group of students whose professional definition (Koçak & Çalışkan, 2017) is just beginning to take shape will form the basis for various studies to be conducted in the future. In this study, the problem question of the study is: What are the occupational anxiety levels of the students of the EADM department of a university? The aim of this study was to assess the level of occupational anxiety among students in the EADM department of a university.

MATERIAL and METHOD

The population of this cross-sectional epidemiological study consisted of the students of the EADM department of a university (N=136). A questionnaire consisting of 39 questions in two parts was administered to 114 (83.82%) students who agreed to participate in the study in November 2023, during compulsory teaching hours during compulsory course time, under the supervision of the lecturer and the researchers. The data collection tool consists of variables determining some socio-demographic characteristics of the participant and a scale of occupational anxiety.

The dependent variable consists of the students' scores on the occupational anxiety scale. The occupational anxiety scale consists of 32 items and five factors developed by Çelebi et al. (2023). The Cronbach alpha value of the scale is 0.84 for the total scale and is not given for the factors. The scale consists of a total of 32 items, including 11 items for the occupational factor, 4 items for the work factor, 5 items for the occupational health factor, 7 items for the social status factor and 5 items for the communication skills factor. Each item is scored as "not anxious-1 point, undecided-2 points, and anxious-3 points". The higher the score on the scale, the more anxious the participant is. A

minimum of 32 points and a maximum of 96 points can be obtained from the scale. There is no reverse item on the Occupational Anxiety Scale.

SPSS 25.0 Statistical Package Programme was used for data entry and $p < 0.05$ was accepted. Descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, median, mode, min-max) for the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants were presented.

For inferential analyses, the range of skewness and kurtosis values ± 2.0 between the distributions of the independent variables and the scores of the occupational anxiety scale and sub-dimensions was accepted as normal distribution. (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Among the two-category variables suitable for normal distribution, t-test from parametric tests and Man Whitney U from non-parametric tests, and among the multi-category

variables, One-way Anova from parametric tests and Kruskal-Wallis H from nonparametric tests were performed. In order to determine the relationship between the subcategories among the multi-categorised variables with a relationship, Tukey was used in the One-Way ANOVA test and Mann-Whitney U was used in the Kruskal-Wallis H test. In addition, the Cronbach alpha value was analysed in the scale and its sub-dimensions. In statistical relations, $p < 0.05$ was considered significant.

The research was approved by the Health Sciences University Hamidiye Scientific Research Ethics Committee (Date: 03.11.2023; Number: 2023/19/3), and permission to administer the questionnaire was obtained from the head of the EADM department and the students in the form of verbal consent.

RESULTS

Of those who agreed to participate in the study (114 individuals), 56.1% (n=64) were female and the mean age (SD) was 20.81 (1.78) years. 28.9% (n=33) of the participants were in the fourth grade, 78.9% (n=90) had a middle income and 85.1% (n=97) had a nuclear family type. 71.1% (n=81) of the students reported that they felt successful and 75.4% (n=86) reported that they came to the department voluntarily.

The mean score on the Occupational Anxiety Scale of the 114 students in the study is 58.35 ± 11.87 points. The total actual score range of the scale is

between the lowest 34 and the highest 89 points. In the sub-dimensions of the Occupational Anxiety Scale, the highest mean belongs to the working life sub-dimension with 2.45 ± 0.58 and the lowest mean belongs to the communication skills sub-dimension with 1.33 ± 0.47 . The item mean of the occupational anxiety scale is 1.82 ± 0.37 points (Table 1). The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions of the scale ranged from 0.764 to 0.841 and the alpha reliability coefficient of all items was found to be 0.895.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Occupational Anxiety Scale and Subscale Items (n=114).

Sub-dimensions	Mean (SD)	Range	Total mean (SD)	Range
Occupational Knowledge	1.69 (0.47)	1-3	18.56 (5.16)	11-33
Working Life	2.45 (0.58) ^a	1-3	9.80 (2.33)	4-12
Occupational Health	1.91 (0.63)	1-3	9.55 (3.15)	5-15
Social Status	1.97 (0.53)	1-3	13.76 (3.69)	7-21
Communication Skills	1.33 (0.47) ^b	1-3	6.68 (2.36)	5-15
Occupational Anxiety Scale	1.82 (0.37)	1-3	58.35 (11.87)	32-96

a: The item with the most points. b: The item with the least points.

A t-test was carried out between the occupational anxiety scale and its sub-dimensions occupational knowledge, working life, occupational health and social status and the variables gender, age, feeling successful and requesting the section. The Mann-Whitney U test was applied between the communication skills sub-dimension and gender, age, feeling successful and requesting the section. In the analyses, a statistical relationship was found between the occupational anxiety scale and its sub-dimensions and gender ($p<0.05$). The mean scores of women were higher than those of men. A statistical relationship was found between the occupational anxiety scale and its sub-dimensions professional knowledge, occupational health and communication skills and the age variable ($p<0.05$). The mean scores of those aged 20 and under are higher than those of those aged 21 and over. No relationship was found between the variables 'feeling successful' and 'requesting the section' and the occupational anxiety scale and its sub-dimensions ($p>0.05$) (Table 2).

One-way ANOVA test was performed between the occupational anxiety scale and its sub-dimensions of working life, occupational health and social status, and classroom, income and family variables. One-way ANOVA test was performed between the occupational knowledge sub-dimensions and the classroom and income variables and Kruskal-Wallis test was performed with the family variable. A Kruskal-Wallis H test was performed between the communication skills sub-dimension and the variables of gender, classroom, income, family, feeling successful and requesting the section. In multivariate analyses, a statistical relationship was found between the occupational anxiety scale, occupational knowledge, occupational health and communication skills sub-dimensions and the classroom variable ($p<0.05$). As a result of the post-hoc test to find out from which subcategory the relationship between multiple variables originated, a statistical relationship was found between occupational knowledge and 1st (Mean(SD): 17.13(5.66)) and 2nd (Mean(SD): 20.73(5.66)) grades, 2nd (Mean(SD): 20.73(5.66)) and 4th (Mean(SD): 19.32(5.02)) grades; occupational health and 2nd (Mean(SD): 10.80(3.02)) and 4th

(Mean(SD): 8.51(3.27)) grades; and communication skills and 2nd (Mean Rank: 67.40) and 4th (Mean Rank: 44.76) grades ($p<0.05$). In multiple relationships, the means and ranks of 2nd grades were found to be higher. No significant result was found in the post-hoc tests between the Occupational Anxiety Scale and the classroom variable. No statistical relationship was found between income and family variables and the Occupational Anxiety Scale and its sub-dimensions ($p>0.05$) (Table 2).

Table 2. Relationship Analysis Between Occupational Health and Its Sub-Dimensions and Some Variables

	Occupational Anxiety Scale Total			Occupational Knowledge			Working Life			Occupational Health			Social Status			Communication Skills																								
	n	Mean(SD)	T-test	Mean(SD)	T-test	Mean(SD)	T-test	Mean(SD)	T-test	Mean(SD)	T-test	Mean(SD)	T-test	Mean(SD)	T-test	Mean Rank	MWU																							
Gender	Male	50	52.74(8.90)	F:5.179	F:5.381	8.94(2.31)	F:1.384	8.24(2.71)	F:2.516	12.94(3.51)	F:0.146	47.57	U:1103.500	Woman	64	62.73(12.10)	t:-5.080	t:-4.104	10.47(2.12)	t:-3.666	14.41(3.71)	t:-2.141	65.26	Z:-2.988																
				p:0.000	p:0.000	p:0.000	p:0.000	p:0.000	p:0.000	p:0.000	p:0.034																													
Age	20 and below	49	60.96(12.67)	F:0.755	20.02(5.75)	F:2.795	9.59(2.50)	F:3.094	10.35(2.79)	F:2.161	13.71(3.67)	F:0.005	68.77	U:1040.500	21 and above	65	56.38(10.91)	t:2.067	17.46(4.39)	t:2.694	9.53(2.20)	t:-0.821	13.80(3.73)	t:-0.122	49.01	Z:-3.329														
				p:0.041	p:0.008	p:0.008	p:0.414	p:0.019	p:0.019	p:0.019	p:0.903																													
Classroom	1	23	54.13(13.67)	F:4.208	17.13(5.66)	F:3.939	8.78(2.45)	F:2.305	8.65(2.53)	F:4.066	12.87(4.19)	F:2.431	60.54	K:8.755	2	30	62.10(11.48)	p:0.007	20.73(5.36)	p:0.010	9.77(2.57)	p:0.081	10.80(3.02)	p:0.009	13.50(3.40)	p:0.069	67.40	p:0.033												
Classroom	3	28	62.04(9.72)	Tukey: -	19.32(5.00)	Tukey: 10.43(1.77)	10.18(3.10)	10.18(3.10)	Tukey: 15.32(2.92)	10.18(3.10)	Tukey: 2-4	59.41	MWU:2-4	4	33	54.76(10.69)	Tukey: -	16.94(5.16)	1-2, 2-4	10.00(2.29)	8.51(3.27)	2-4	44.76	MWU:2-4																
Income	Bad	17	54.59(10.88)	F:1.007	16.23(4.04)	F:2.256	9.47(2.18)	F:0.707	8.76(3.11)	F:0.684	13.94(3.76)	F:0.156	47.76	K:2.408	Centre	90	58.99(12.28)	p:0.369	19.06(5.39)	p:0.110	9.79(2.42)	p:0.495	9.72(3.19)	p:0.507	13.68(3.78)	p:0.856	58.59	p:0.300												
Family	Good	8	59.29(7.11)	Tukey: -	17.86(2.61)	10.71(1.11)	10.71(1.11)	10.71(1.11)	9.29(2.75)	14.43(3.69)	60.69	Feeling successful	Core	97	58.25(12.00)	F:0.049	57.30	K:0.065	9.88(2.26)	F:1.106	9.46(3.21)	F:0.932	13.69(3.69)	F:0.125	57.09	K:0.121	Fragmented	9	58.33(12.57)	p:0.952	60.17	p:0.968	10.00(2.40)	p:0.034	9.22(2.44)	p:0.397	14.22(4.18)	p:0.882	59.06	p:0.941
Family	Extensive	8	59.63(11.87)	Tukey: -	56.94	8.63(2.33)	11.00(2.98)	11.00(2.98)	11.00(2.98)	14.13(3.69)	60.69	Feeling successful	Yes	81	57.39(11.45)	F:0.313	18.10(5.07)	F:0.020	9.57(2.43)	F:3.179	9.67(2.98)	F:2.924	13.49(3.68)	F:0.156	55.71	U:1191.500	No	33	60.70(12.71)	t:-1.352	19.70(5.26)	t:-1.509	10.36(1.98)	t:-1.668	14.42(3.67)	t:-1.225	61.89	Z:-0.955		
Requesting the section	Yes	86	57.90(11.42)	F:0.617	18.55(5.09)	F:0.342	9.70(2.39)	F:0.110	9.40(3.11)	F:0.189	13.64(3.63)	F:0.662	56.37	U:1106.500	No	28	59.75(13.28)	t:-0.717	18.61(5.45)	t:-0.054	10.11(2.15)	t:-0.807	10.00(3.29)	t:-0.865	14.14(3.89)	t:-0.626	60.98	Z:-0.676												
Requesting the section				p:0.475	p:0.957	p:0.421	p:0.389	p:0.547	p:0.223	p:0.340	p:0.549																													

MWU: Mann-Whitney U; KW:Kruskal-Wallis H; OWA: One-Way Anova



DISCUSSION

The fact that people have concerns about their future careers shows that they need to be better understood in the current period. It is important to address the occupational anxiety of EADM students, whose occupational definition studies continue, in order to increase their knowledge and skills for search and rescue, medical intervention and incident management studies related to disaster and emergency events. However, there are no studies in the literature on the occupational anxiety of EADM students.

The mean total score of the occupational anxiety scale obtained in this study was 58.35 ± 11.87 . It is seen that different levels of scores are obtained in different occupational groups for different occupational anxiety scales (Aycan & Üzüm, 2019; Çelik & Şengül, 2017; Pepe & Aydın, 2022). However, as the occupational anxiety scale used is new, it has only been used once in the literature and the total score is not included in this study (Aktepe Coşar, Bingöl, & Demirağ, 2023). In addition, since the scale does not have a cut-off point, 64 points can be defined as the midpoint since it is equidistant from both the lowest (32 points) and the highest score (96 points). For this reason, it is seen that the average occupational anxiety of the students in the study is lower than the midpoint. This may indicate that students have less concern about the factors of professional knowledge, working life, occupational health, social status and communication skills in the field for their four-year education.

The mean scores of female students on the Occupational Anxiety Scale and its sub-dimensions were found to be higher than those of male students (Aktepe Coşar et al., 2023). Similarly, in the study by Aktepe Coşar et al. (2023) using the same scale, the scores of female students were higher. It is known that the same conclusion has been reached in different studies (Arslan, Tunca Güçlü, & Alkin Şahin, 2023; Quek et al., 2019). Here it can be said that women have higher scores for various reasons, such as being more emotional or wanting to secure their future. However, there is one study in the literature that shows that male students have higher levels of career anxiety (Sun et al., 2020). This may be due to differences in the students' fields of study, the use of different scales although they serve the same purpose, or cultural differences.

The study found that those who were older had less occupational anxiety. Younger people in particular

may have high levels of occupational anxiety for reasons such as problems adapting to the profession, not being involved in institutional practices such as internships, and just starting university life. Similarly, although there are studies that are compatible with the literature (Aktepe Coşar et al., 2023; Özçelik Kaynak & Öztuna, 2020) there are studies that show that anxiety increases with increasing age (Uzundağ, Urgan, & Özer, 2020).

Occupational anxiety scale scores of the students were found to be higher in the second grades. This situation can be attributed to the fact that especially the second year students went to hospital practices for the first time.

This is because the theoretical knowledge they have learned has begun to be applied to real patients outside the laboratory, within the framework of an institution. Although there are similar findings in the literature (Aktepe Coşar et al., 2023; Tektaş, 2014) there are also studies that show that professional anxiety increases as the year progresses (Aydın & Tiryaki, 2017; Evgin, Çalışkan, & Caner, 2017). In particular, as graduation approaches, students' levels of occupational anxiety may have increased.

The study found no relationship between income status and occupational anxiety and its sub-dimensions. A similar conclusion is reached in the study by Aktepe Coşar et al. (2023). However, Dilmaç (2010) states that the lack of material needs can increase the feeling of insecurity in the individual. Similar to this statement, there are also studies in which participants' anxiety scores are related to economic status (Othman, Ahmad, El Morr, & Ritvo, 2019). Similarly (Aktepe Coşar et al., 2023), the lack of a relationship between income and occupational anxiety in this study may be due to the fact that there are too many middle income students. It can be seen that there is no relationship between students' voluntary choice of field of study and their level of anxiety. However, some studies have found that the anxiety levels of students who did not voluntarily choose their major were high (Aktepe Coşar et al., 2023; Temel, Çelikkalp, Bilgiç, & Varol Saraçoğlu, 2020). This may be related to the fact that the student's success, motivation and self-confidence are positively influenced by the student's choice of subject.

The study did not find a relationship between family type and feelings of success and career anxiety. Family support in particular can help students to choose the right career. It might also be expected that a student who is motivated by his or her career would be more successful at school. However, the existence of such a relationship was not found in the study.

The results of this study should be considered in the context of the following issues. Firstly, the results

are based on the personal self-reports of the students. Therefore, they may have provided desirable ratings. Secondly, as the scale used is new, there are few studies in the literature. This makes it difficult to write a strong discussion and provides information on fewer variables to explore socio-demographic relationships. For example, future studies could look for a relationship with different variables such as satisfaction with the department, perceived adequacy of education, and parental education.

CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, female students were found to have higher levels of anxiety in occupational anxiety scale and its sub-dimensions; students aged 20 years and younger were found to have higher levels of anxiety in occupational anxiety scale, occupational knowledge, occupational health and communication skills sub-dimensions; and second year students were found to have higher levels of anxiety in occupational knowledge, occupational

health and communication skills sub-dimensions. It may be suggested that students should receive information training, especially under the factors indicating their anxiety within the framework of related variables. These results point the way for future studies to explore possible ways to reduce occupational anxiety among students with occupational definition gaps.

REFERENCES

- Aktepe Coşar, D., Bingöl, N., & Demirağ, H. (2023). Determination of vocational anxiety levels of health services vocational school students. *Journal of Paramedic and Emergency Health Services*, 4(2), 66–75.
- Aronsson, G., Theorell, T., Grape, T., Hammarström, A., Hogstedt, C., Marteinsdottir, I., ... Hall, C. (2017). A systematic review including meta-analysis of work environment and burnout symptoms. *BMC Public Health*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4153-7>
- Arslan, R., Tunca Güçlü, N., & Alkın Şahin, S. (2023). Öğretmen Adaylarının Mesleki Kaygı Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 12(1), 161–171. <https://doi.org/10.33206/mjss.1158406>
- Aycan, A., & Üzüm, H. (2019). Occupational anxiety of physical education teacher candidates. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(3), 745–752. <https://doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2019.19.49440-571174>
- Aydın, A., & Tiryaki, S. (2017). A study on the determination of the factors affecting the anxiety level of university students (KTU sample). *Kastamonu Üniversitesi Orman Fakültesi Dergisi*, 715–722. <https://doi.org/10.17475/kastorman.282559>
- Baltacı, F., Üngüren, E., Avsallı, H., & Demirel, O. N. (2012). A Study to Determine Tourism Students' Perspective on Educational Satisfaction and Future. *International Journal of Alanya Faculty of Business*, 4(1), 17–25.
- Buist-Bouwman, M. A., De Graaf, R., Vollebergh, W. A. M., & Ormel, J. (2005). Comorbidity of physical and mental disorders and the effect on work-loss days. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 111(6), 436–443. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.2005.00513.x>
- Çelebi, İ., Şemeret, N., Alkaş, G., Keleş, A., & Şen, E. (2023). Validity and Reliability Study of the Occupational Anxiety Scale for Health Services Students: Validity Study. *Türkiye Klinikleri Journal of Health Sciences*, 8(1), 134–144. <https://doi.org/10.5336/healthsci.2022-92994>
- Çelik, M., & Şengül, M. (2017). Türkçe Öğretmeni Adaylarının Kişilik Özellikleri ve Mesleki Kaygı Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi Sayı*, 6(4), 2597–2615.
- Dilmaç, O. (2010). Görsel sanatlar öğretmeni adaylarının kaygı düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 24, 49–65. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ataunigsed>
- Ergin, A., Utku Uzun, S., & Topaloğlu, S. (2016). Future Occupational Anxiety and Trait Anxiety Levels of 5 th And 6 th Year Medical Students at



- Pamukkale University and Their Contributing Factors. *Medical Journal of Mugla Sıtkı Kocman University*, 3(3), 16–21.
- Evgin, D., Çalışkan, Z., & Caner, N. (2017). Sağlık Yüksekokulu Hemşirelik Bölümü Öğrencilerinin Klinik Uygulama Öncesi Kaygı Düzeyleri ve Stresle Başa Çıkma Tarzları. *SDÜ Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*.
<https://doi.org/10.22312/sdusbed.280540>
- Goksin Cihan, F., Kutlu, R., & Karademirci, M. M. (2017). Occupational Future Concerns and Stress Management Conditions of Intern Doctors. *Journal of Academic Research in Medicine*, 7(3), 122–127.
<https://doi.org/10.5152/jarem.2017.1321>
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (2001). Anxiety, uncertainty, and perceived effectiveness of communication across relationships and cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25(1), 55–71.
- Koçak, H., & Çalışkan, C. (2017). İlk ve acil yardım (paramedik) lisans eğitimi tartışmaları ve acil yardım ve afet yönetimi eğitimi. *Nisan*, 2(1), 63–66. Retrieved from <http://ebs.comu.edu.tr/default.aspx>
- Othman, N., Ahmad, F., El Morr, C., & Ritvo, P. (2019). Perceived impact of contextual determinants on depression, anxiety and stress: a survey with university students. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, 13(1), 17.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13033-019-0275-x>
- Özçelik Kaynak, K., & Öztuna, B. (2020). Unemployment anxiety and hopelessness towards unemployment in university students: a research on students of Dokuz Eylül University Vocational Health School. *Journal of Yasar University*, 15(60), 953–970.
- Pepe, B., & Aydın, A. D. (2022). Spor Yöneticiliği Bölümlerinde Okuyan Öğrencilerin Mesleki Kaygılarının İncelenmesi. *Düzce University Journal of Sports Science*, 2(1), 26–31.
- Quek, Tam, Tran, Zhang, Zhang, Ho, & Ho. (2019). The Global Prevalence of Anxiety Among Medical Students: A Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(15), 2735.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16152735>
- Şahin, M. (2019). Korku, kaygı ve kaygı (anksiyete) bozuklukları. *Eurasian Journal of Researches in Social and Economics (EJRSE)*, 6(10), 117–135. Retrieved from www.asead.com
- Sevinç Postacı, E., Uysal, İ., Aytuğ Koşan, A. M., & Toraman, Ç. (2020). Developing an Occupational Anxiety Scale for Emergency Medical Service Professionals. *Tıp Eğitimi Dünyası*, 19(58), 102–115. <https://doi.org/10.25282/ted.689108>
- Sun, Y., Wang, D., Han, Z., Gao, J., Zhu, S., & Zhang, H. (2020). Disease Prevention Knowledge, Anxiety, and Professional Identity during COVID-19 Pandemic in Nursing Students in Zhengzhou, China. *Journal of Korean Academy of Nursing*, 50(4), 533.
<https://doi.org/10.4040/jkan.20125>
- Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2013). *Fidell Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Tektaş, N. (2014). Üniversite mezunlarının kaygı düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Selcuk University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences Dr. Mehmet YILDIZ Special Edition*, 243–253. Retrieved from www.tuik.gov.tr
- Temel, M., Çelikkalp, Ü., Bilgiç, Ş., & Varol, G. (2020). Hemşirelik Öğrencilerinin Mezuniyet Sonrasına Yönelik Mesleki Kaygıları ve Ekileyen Faktörler. *Journal of Anatolia Nursing and Health Sciences*, 23(1), 23–34.
<https://doi.org/10.17049/ataunihem.478072>
- Temel, M., Çelikkalp, Ü., Bilgiç, Ş., & Varol Saraçoğlu, G. (2020). Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin mezuniyet sonrasına yönelik mesleki kaygıları ve etkileyen faktörler. *Journal of Anatolia Nursing and Health Sciences*, 23(1), 23–34.
<https://doi.org/10.17049/ataunihem.478072>
- Theorell, T., Hammarström, A., Aronsson, G., Träskman Bendz, L., Grape, T., Hogstedt, C., ... Hall, C. (2015, August 1). A systematic review including meta-analysis of work environment and depressive symptoms. *BMC Public Health*, Vol. 15. BioMed Central Ltd.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-1954-4>
- Uzundağ, H. İ., Urgan, S., & Özer, E. (2020). Analysis of the occupational anxiety status of physical education and sports teachers. *Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1(3), 119–129.