

T.C
ABANT İZZET BAYSAL UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE
INSTRUCTORS REGARDING TEACHER SELF- EFFICACY AND
TEACHER STRESS

DUYGU DOĞAN

JULY-2014

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ'NE,

Duygu DOĞAN'a ait "A Comparative Study of English Language Instructors Regarding Their Teacher Self-Efficacy and Teacher Stress" adlı çalışma, jürimiz tarafından İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı'nda YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ olarak kabul edilmiştir. (23 Temmuz 2014)

Akademik Unvan ve Adı Soyadı

Üye (Tez Danışmanı): Doç. Dr. A. Amanda YEŞİLBURSA



Üye : Doç. Dr. Raşit ÖZEN

Üye : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Anıl RAKICIOĞLU SÖYLEMEZ



Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsünün Onayı

Doç. Dr. Türkan ARGON
Enstitü Müdürü

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Duygu DOĞAN

ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS REGARDING TEACHER SELF- EFFICACY AND TEACHER STRESS

Duygu DOĞAN

Master's Thesis

Program of English Language Teaching

Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Amanda YEŞİLBURSA

July, 2014; xii + 89 Pages

This study aimed at investigating the level of stress and self efficacy levels of English instructors who work at the English Preparatory Schools of Universities in provincial and metropolitan universities. Two scales which consist of a demographic inventory; *Stress Factors Questionnaire for English Language Instructors* (Petek, 2008), English Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (ETSES) (Chaco'n, 2005) were used. This data gathering instrument was implemented on 151 English instructors working at 7 universities in Turkey. Data gathered from 35 English instructors from Bülent Ecevit University, 10 English instructors from Abant İzzet Baysal University .17 English instructors from Karabük University; 15 English instructors from Düzce University, 22 English instructors from Ege University, 32 English instructors from Yıldız Technical University, 20 English instructors from Gazi University. In analyzing the data SPSS.19 was used to find descriptive statistics and frequency, percent, average, and standard deviation, and inferential statistics. The results of the study revealed no significant differences in stress and self efficacy levels between instructors working at the English preparatory schools of Turkish state universities according to their gender, education level, or whether these universities are in metropolitan or provincial cities.

Keywords: teacher stress, field-specific stress factors, organizational stress factors, teacher self efficacy, efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, efficacy in classroom management.

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCE OKUTMANLARININ STRES VE ÖZ YETERLİKLERİ ÜZERİNE KARŞILAŞTIRMALI BİR ARAŞTIRMA

Duygu DOĞAN

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Yabancı Diller Ana Bilim Dalı

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Ayşegül Amanda YEŞİLBURSA

Temmuz, 2014 - xii + 89 Sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı metropolitan ve kırsal kesimlerde devlet üniversitelerinin İngilizce Hazırlık Okullarında çalışan İngilizce okutmanlarının stres ve öz yeterlik düzeylerini araştırmaktır. Veri toplamak için katılımcıların stres ve öz yeterlik düzeylerini belirleyen iki anket; İngilizce dili okutmanları için stres faktörleri (Petek, 2008), İngilizce öğretmenlerinin öz yeterlik ölçeği kullanılmıştır (Chaco'n, 2005). Bu veri toplama araçları Türkiye'de Üniversitelerde çalışan 151 okutmana uygunlanmıştır. Veriler Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesinden 35, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesinden 10, Karabük Üniversitesinden 17; Düzce Üniversitesinden 15, Ege Üniversitesinden 22, Yıldız teknik Üniversitesinden 32, Gazi Üniversitesinden 20 İngilizce okutmanından toplanmıştır. Veri analizi için betimsel istatistik olarak sıklık, yüzde, ortalama ve standart sapma, çıkarımsal istatistik olarak SPSS 19. kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın sonucu metropolitan ve kırsal kesimlerde devlet üniversitelerinin İngilizce Hazırlık Okullarında çalışan İngilizce okutmanlarının stres ve öz yeterlilik düzeyleri arasında cinsiyete, eğitim düzeyine, çalıştığı üniversitenin metropolitan yada kırsal kesime göre önemli bir fark bulunmadığını ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: öğretmen stresi, alanla ilgili stres sebepleri, kurumla ilgili stres sebepleri, öğretmen öz yeterlik, öğrenci katılımını sağlamada öz yeterlik, öğretimsel stratejilerde öz yeterlik, sınıf yönetiminde öz yeterlik.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Amanda YEŞİLBURSA. I appreciate her vast knowledge and skill in many areas and her assistance in writing this thesis. It was through her, persistence, understanding and kindness that I completed my M.A degree. I would like to thank to my committee members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Raşit Özen for his helpful suggestions, and Assist. Prof. Dr. Anıl Rakıcıoğlu for her constructive feedback, useful suggestions. I also wish to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Altay Eren for his statistical help in the survey data analysis stage. I would also like to thank my family for the support they provided me through my entire life and in particular, I must acknowledge my husband and my son without whose love, encouragement, I would not have finished this thesis. A special thanks to my sister Duysal for her generous encouragement and inspiration and standing by my side when times get hard.

To my parents, my husband and dear son

TABLE OF CONTENT

ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZET	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
DEDICATION	vii
TABLE OF CONTENT.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
 CHAPTER I	 1
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.1.1. The importance of English as a second language in Turkish education system.	1
1.1.2. Being an English teacher in Turkey	2
1.2. The Purpose of the Study	4
1.3. Significance of the Study	4
1.4. Research Questions	5
1.5. Limitations of the Study	5
1.6. Definition of the Terms	6
 CHAPTER II.....	 8
2. Literature Review	8
2.1. What is Self-Efficacy?.....	8
2.1.1. Teacher self-efficacy.....	9
2.1.2. Self-efficacy and teaching effectiveness.....	10
2.1.3. Sources of self-efficacy	12
2.1.4. Measurement of self-efficacy beliefs.....	14
2.1.5. Teacher self-efficacy studies in turkey	16

2.2. What is Stress?	20
2.2.1. Sources of work stress	22
2.2.2. What is teacher stress?.....	25
2.2.3. Sources of teacher stress	27
2.2.4. Effects of workplace stress	29
2.2.5. Relationship between teachers' sense of efficacy and teacher stress	32
CHAPTER III	33
3. The Research Methodology.....	33
3.1. Research Design.....	33
3.2. Participants	33
3.3. Data Collection Instruments.....	34
3.4. Data Collection Procedures	35
3.5. Validitation of the Instruments.....	36
3.5.1. Confirmatory factor analysis for Stress Factors Questionnaire for English Language Instructors	36
3.5.2. Confirmatory factor analysis for English Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (ETSES)	36
CHAPTER IV	38
4. The Results of Data Analysis	38
4.1. Results Related to Research Question 1.....	38
4.2. Results Related to Research Question 2.....	39
4.3. Results Related to Research Question 3.....	40
4.4. Results Related to Research Question 4.....	42
4.5. Results Related to Research Question 5.....	44
4.6. Results Related to Research Question 6.....	45
4.7. Results Related to Research Question 7.....	46
4.8. Results Related to Research Question 8.....	47
4.9. Results Related to Research Question 9.....	48

CHAPTER V	50
5. Discussion and Conclusions	50
5.1. Discussion of Results Related to Research Question 1.....	50
5.2. Discussion of Results Related to Research Question 2.....	51
5.3. Discussion of Results Related to Research Question 3.....	51
5.4. Discussion of Results Related to Research Question 4.....	52
5.5. Discussion of Results Related to Research Question 5.....	52
5.6. Discussion of Results Related to Research Question 6.....	52
5.7. Discussion of Results Related to Research Question 7.....	53
5.8. Discussion of Results Related to Research Question 8.....	53
5.9. Discussion of Results Related to Research Question 9.....	54
5.10. Conclusion.....	54
5.11. Pedagogical Implications	56
5.12. Directions for Future Research	58
REFERENCES.....	59
APPENDICES.....	81
APPENDIX A	82
APPENDIX B	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1. .Frequency table of instructors according to universities	34
Table 4-1. Teacher self efficacy levels	39
Table 4-2. Descriptive statistics for self efficacy levels according to gender.....	39
Table 4-3. ANOVA results for self-efficacy levels according to gender.....	40
Table 4-4. Descriptive statistics for self-efficacy levels according to level of education .	41
Table 4-5. ANOVA results for self efficacy levels according to education level.....	41
Table 4-6. Post Hoc Scheffe Results of Teacher Self Efficacy Subscales.....	42
Table 4-7. Descriptive statistics on self-efficacy levels in metropolitan and provincial cities.....	43
Table 4-8. ANOVA results for self-efficacy levels in metropolitan and provincial universities.....	44
Table 4-9. Teacher stress levels of English language instructors	44
Table 4-10. Descriptive table of English instructors' stress level according to their gender	45
Table 4-11. ANOVA Results- Gender and stress levels of English Instructors	45
Table 4-12. Descriptive table of English instructors according to their education level	46
Table 4-13. ANOVA Results- Education level and stress levels of English Instructors	47
Table 4-14. Descriptive table of self-efficacy levels of English instructors	47
Table 4-15. ANOVA Results- Stress levels of English instructors in provincial and metropolitan universities.	48
Table 4-16. Correlation between teacher stress factors and self-efficacy.....	49

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1. Teacher self efficacy scales.....	16
Figure 2-2. Effects of stress on individuals and organisations.....	31

CHAPTER I

1. Introduction

1.1. Background Of The Study

1.1.1. The importance of English as a second language in Turkish education system.

The world is becoming more global where people are communicating among and between multiple cultures each day and in such a world , English has become a mean of achieving a state or condition in various aspects of life such as world of knowledge, commerce, and culture, higher level of education. Hence, there has never been a greater demand for language classes to learn English as a second language in both private courses and state schools. Moreover, a staggering majority of higher study programs are conducted in the English language which gives students access to academic life.

As Crystal (1997) pointed out, a language becomes an international language when every country in the world recognizes its special role. This recognition is reflected in the education policy of a country as the priority given to English as a foreign language increases. Taking Kachru's (1992) three circles model into consideration, 21st century Turkey is in the expanding circle countries where English is used for specific purposes such as business, tourism, education and communication. In addition, English has reached a higher significance than ever before and it is currently the medium of instruction used widely in many Turkish private schools in particular, from early age to university life (Çopur, 2008).

Aktuna (1998) claimed that the most important reason for the rapid spread of English in Turkey was to keep up with the worldwide technological development and to be qualified in international communication. Petek (2008) indicated that the growing number of public and private universities that have been established within the last ten years has also increased the importance given to English, because these universities give high importance to the knowledge of English as a foreign language (hereafter, EFL). There are considerable reasons for this reality. Petek (2008) also stated that English is the language of international business, the Internet, international commercial aviation, international maritime activities, the language in which international scientific and technological reports are written, the leading diplomatic language, and the common language whenever a group of people from different countries need to communicate. Similarly, Aktuna (1998) stated that English language was taught and learned in Turkey to gain international communication skills to interact with mostly non-native English speakers, for personal and national development. Influenced by this fact, almost all universities established one-year English language preparatory programs in Turkey. The importance that English language learning and teaching has gained in recent years has led to the increased demand for English instructors and thus, has increased responsibilities that are attributed to English instructors (Çopur, 2008; Önkol, 2002).

1.1.2. Being an English teacher in Turkey

Although being a teacher was once a very prestigious job respected by the community, teachers have never been awarded with substantial salaries or good working conditions (Broadfoot, 1990). More recently, Esteve (2000) claimed that teachers were generally judged and valued negatively. All things considered, societal perceptions of the profession affect teachers' perceptions of their job and in that case may influence the teachers' attitudes towards their job. As for the situation in English language teaching (hereafter, ELT), although there are some advantages of being an English language teacher such as feeling pleasure and satisfaction of being with young people (Mullock, 2009), communicating internationally and multiculturally and the possibility of creating your own style; being an English language teacher has not always been seen as a good job. One reason is that English language teachers are paid

inadequately and they are not recognized enough in society (Pennington, 1995). Furthermore, Wilkerson (2000) reported that by the end of the fifth year of teaching, English language teachers tended to quit their job mostly due to not being able to anticipate and adapt themselves to real workplace conditions.

Specific to the context of the current study, English language instructors working in the preparatory classes in Turkey are aware that there is no opportunity to get an academic promotion, in contrast to other academic departments. According to the Higher Education law 2547(1981), there are four groups of academic staff at Turkish universities: members of the academic staff members (professors, associate professors, and assistant professors), lecturers, instructors and educational assistants (research assistants, experts, translators, curriculum and instruction programmers). The Higher Education Law 2547(1981) defines instructors as follows: “instructors are academic staff members who instruct or perform common compulsory courses in various training programs during education”. Thus, the extra workload taken on by instructors apart from teaching is not appreciated or rewarded with a chance of promotion or extra income. In turn, the work itself, one of the important intrinsic motivation factor affecting teacher job satisfaction, may be a source dissatisfaction for the English language instructors.

Working conditions, teacher-supervision relationships, co-workers, teacher-student relationships, rewards and the workload of English language teachers working in Turkish state universities show differences throughout the country (Demircan, 1988). For example, English language instructors who work in the state universities of smaller and provincial cities may be affected negatively by insufficient workplace conditions (Coşkuner, 2001). On the other hand, those in metropolitan universities enjoy good working conditions, comparatively more successful students, and the chances to develop their content knowledge and teaching ability (Bayraktar, 1996. Cited in Coşkuner, 2001: 3). Similarly, teachers in some provincial areas appeared to face severe problems with attracting a salary sufficient for their needs, and reported excessive workloads of up to 30 hours per week (Mullock, 2009). Furthermore, lack of sufficient linguistic knowledge in the applied literature causes stress and diminishes English

language teachers' motivation (Kassabgy, Boraie, & Schmidt, 2001). Although this may be true for English instructors working at preparatory classes, LaLopa (1997) claimed that a high and positive attitude towards the job should positively affect job satisfaction and commitment towards job. This in turn should increase their commitment towards the university and their classes (Malik, Nawab, Naeem & Danish, 2010), and this as a result should increase the success of the students and the preparatory programmes.

1.2. The Purpose Of The Study

This study aims to investigate the sources of stress, the level of teacher self-efficacy beliefs among English instructors who work at the state universities in Turkey. The universities chosen for data collection are Zonguldak Karaelmas University in Zonguldak, Abant İzzet Baysal University in Bolu, Karabük University in Karabük and Ege University in İzmir, Yıldız Technical University in Istanbul, Gazi University in Ankara, and Selçuk University in Konya.

1.3. Significance of the Study

By investigating English language instructors' sense of efficacy in teaching English and the stress factors in relation to other selected factors, the current study may contribute to expanding the current state of knowledge in the ELT field in Turkish state universities. Although many educational researchers have reported the strong impacts of teachers' sense of efficacy and the stress levels on various student and teacher aspects in teaching and learning (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy & Hoy, 1998), only a few studies have studied it in the ELT field. Moreover, there are only few studies about the English language instructors' sense of efficacy and the stress levels in the university context. In addition, this study provides a general picture of the current status of Turkish state universities preparatory schools from the instructors' perspective.

1.4. Research Questions

1. What are the current Teacher Self-Efficacy levels of English language instructors working at the preparatory classes at universities?
2. Is there a gender difference in teacher self-efficacy levels between the English language instructors working at the preparatory classes at universities?
3. Is there a difference in teacher self-efficacy levels between the English language instructors who have a bachelor's degree, master's degree and Ph.D. degree working at the preparatory classes at universities?
4. Is there a difference in self-efficacy levels among English instructors working at preparatory schools of metropolitan and provincial Turkish State universities?
5. What are the current teacher stress levels of English language instructors working at the preparatory classes at universities?
6. Is there a gender difference in teacher stress levels between the English language instructors working at the preparatory classes at universities?
7. Is there a difference in teacher stress levels between the English language instructors who have a bachelor's degree, master's degree and Ph.D. degree working at the preparatory classes at universities?
8. Is there a difference in teacher stress levels among English instructors working at preparatory schools of metropolitan and provincial Turkish State universities?
9. What are the correlation between teacher stress factors and teacher self-efficacy?

1.5. Limitations of the Study

1. Seven universities are being used to measure teacher self-efficacy beliefs and teacher stress factors which limit the generalizability of this study. This

study could be conducted with a much larger sample size, which would allow the findings to be more easily generalized to the field at large.

2. This research is limited to the academic year of 2011-2012.
3. This study is limited to data gathered from Stress Factors Questionnaire for English Language Instructors, English Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale and the analysis of the data is limited to the statistical methods used.
4. Further studies should include qualitative tools such as focus group interviews, think-aloud protocols, and diaries which might help provide further insight into concept of teacher self-efficacy beliefs and teacher stress factors.

1.6. Definition Of The Terms

Self-Efficacy: “belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997.p.3).

Teacher Self-Efficacy: “a teacher’s judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated” (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

Stress: “a system which orchestrates the responses that brain and body give to the environment” (De Kloet, 2004).

Teacher Stress: “the experience by a teacher of unpleasant, negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, tension, frustration or depression, resulting from some aspect of their work as a teacher” (Kyriacou, 2001).

Provincial city: “Provincial cities are where the face-to-face relations relatively are more common, living conditions are shaped by largely traditions and customs, and technological, economic, social and cultural development is relatively slower therefore these cities fall behind in development” (TC. Premiership, 1994)

Metropolitan city: “A metropolitan cities which is sometimes referred to as a metro area or metro, are regions consisting of a densely populated urban core and its less-populated surrounding territories, sharing industry, infrastructure, and housing” (Squires, 2002)

CHAPTER II

2. Literature Review

2.1. What is Self-Efficacy?

The key concept of social learning theory “self-efficacy beliefs” was developed by Albert Bandura (1997) which emphasizes the role of the development and exercise of human agency that people may have some influence over what they do. Bandura(1986:391) defined self-efficacy as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances”. Bandura (1995) and Ormrod (2006) also indicated that these judgments were affected by former successes and failures as a whole group or individually which have a significant role in determining people’s choices, goals, effort, and persistence. Bandura (2006:170) stated that:

“Among the mechanisms of human agency, none is more central or pervasive than belief of personal efficacy. This core belief is the foundation of human agency. Unless people believe they can produce desired effects by their actions, they have little incentive to act, or to persevere in the face of difficulties. Whatever other factors serve as guides and motivators, they are rooted in the core belief that one has the power to effect changes by one’s actions.”

Schunk and Meece (2006) maintained that “self-efficacy beliefs are sensitive to differences in contextual factors (e.g., changing environmental conditions) , personal factors (e.g., level of motivation, affective states) and influences associated with each of these social contexts may have profound effects on adolescents’ beliefs about their capabilities” Bong and Clark (1991) defined “self-efficacy” as individuals’ mental

assessments of their own competence based on a set of requirements they must meet. Self-efficacy is defined as the people's perception of their competence rather than the true proficiency level. This is an important distinction, because people may underestimate or exaggerate their true capabilities and this unrealistic situation may affect how they use their talents (Aliş, 2008). Dunning and Kruger (1999) also mentioned that unskilled individuals may suffer from illusory superiority, mistakenly rating their ability much higher than is accurate and this may be due to the fact that they don't know enough detail to realize they are wrong.

2.1.1. Teacher Self-Efficacy

The term "self-efficacy" has gained an important role in both in determining the level of productiveness and motivation of teacher and learners as well as defining the theoretical background and the qualification criteria in the field of teaching (Külekçi, 2011). Bandura (1986) believed that what people think, believe, and feel affects how they behave. A teacher's sense of efficacy has an impact on teacher's emotions and emotions provide the affective component to motivation, positive or negative (Ashton & Webb, 1986). Chaco'n (2005) also believed the importance of teacher self-efficacy beliefs resulting increased student and teacher outcomes. The concept of teacher's self-efficacy may be defined as teachers' beliefs in their abilities to affect students' learning and success positively (Denzine, Cooney & McKenzie, 2005). Teacher self-efficacy refers to "individual teachers' beliefs in their own ability to plan, organize, and carry out activities those are required to attain given educational goals" (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010:1059). Self-efficacy reflects the individuals' own perceptions of their effectiveness rather than their actual level of ability (Woolfolk-Hoy & Burke-Spero, 2005). Teacher self-efficacy is teachers' beliefs in their capacity for producing a desired result or effect even if there are some problematic and unmotivated students in the class (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001). Brouwers and Tomic (2003) pointed out that teacher self-efficacy is related to the teachers' beliefs in their effectiveness to affect students' performance and motivation. Dembo and Gibson (1985) also pointed out that teachers with high levels of self-efficacy tended to demonstrate a sincere interest in their professional development. Tschannen-Moran,

Woolfolk-Hoy (1998:233) conceptualised the term as ‘the teacher’s belief in his or her capability to organize and execute courses of action required to accomplish a specific teaching task successfully in a particular context’. Studies have indicated the possible relationship between teacher turnover and teachers’ perceived self-efficacy in classroom management as low self-efficacy beliefs can cause teacher burnout (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Chwalisz, Altmaier & Russell, 1992; Emmer & Hickman, 1991).

2.1.2. Self-Efficacy and Teaching Effectiveness

In light of so many different definitions of teachers’ self efficacy ,literature suggested that there is a strong relationship between teacher self efficacy and teachers teachers' competence and commitment to teaching (Ross ,1998; Goddard et al. ,2000; Labone ,2004; Wheatley ,2005)

Teachers’ sense of efficacy and student achievement

Teacher self-efficacy has also been related to students’ academic success (Ashton and Webb, 1986; Caprara, Barbranelli, Gerbinoand Pastorelli, 2006), motivation (Guskey and Passaro, 1994, Midgley, Feldlaufer, & Eccles, 1989) and student’s self-efficacy (Anderson, Greene, & Loewen, 1988). Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007) pointed out that there was a relationship between the teachers’ beliefs about their capability to impact students’ motivation, which was defined as “teacher self-efficacy”, and academic success of the students. It was reported that there were important differences in terms of students’ academic success between the teachers with high or low efficacy beliefs. Teachers with high efficacy beliefs was found to be more competent in teaching process compared to teachers with low efficacy beliefs by using the time efficiently, using innovative techniques and providing gentle correction using effective strategies towards students’ mistakes (Gibson & Dembo, 1984).

Teachers' sense of efficacy and teachers' commitment

Similarly, the literature supports that teachers' sense of efficacy beliefs affect teachers' commitment to teaching profession (Coladarci, 1992, Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Social cognitive theory indicated that if the teachers do not have strong beliefs of the possibility of their students' success then they possibly would not put effort to overcome that problem even if they have the capability of doing it (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). Studies have supported Bandura's (1977) theory that teachers' self-efficacy beliefs have been associated with the effort teachers showed in teaching context, their ambitions for teaching and their determination to deal with the problems and their ability to recover from difficulties (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy & Hoy, 1998). Coladarci (1992) indicated a strong relationship between teacher self-efficacy and teachers' commitment by highlighting the importance of teachers' high self-efficacy beliefs' impact on taking responsibility for students success. Bandura (1993) also mentioned that teachers with high self-efficacy devote themselves to raise the standard of education and adjust themselves to the needs and aims of the students.

Teachers' sense of efficacy and innovation

A growing body of research showed that teachers with a strong sense of efficacy tend to be innovative and apply new methods to meet the needs of their students better (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008; Ghaith & Yaghi, 1997; Guskey, 1988; Milner, 2002; Stein & Wang, 1988;). Moreover, teachers' efficacy beliefs have been found to be related to teachers' behaviour in the classroom, and have an influence on the level of teacher stress and burnout and their enthusiasm to be innovative (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Similarly, Hsiao, Chang, Tu and Chen (2011) suggested that teachers with strong self efficacy beliefs seem to be more prepared to experiment with and later also to implement new educational practices, also their study results revealed that teachers with higher self-efficacy exhibit higher levels of innovative behaviour at their workplaces.

Teachers' sense of efficacy and experience

The studies showed that to increase the teacher self-efficacy, teacher training programme and teaching supervision at the university are essential (Prieto, Yamokoski, & Meyers, 2007). Because teacher self-efficacy beliefs are believed to develop at the early stages of teaching and it is difficult to change these beliefs thereafter (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Similarly, Bandura (1997) highlighted the importance of developing teacher self-efficacy early in the teaching career. Soodak and Podell (1997) supported that experienced teachers' self-efficacy beliefs are stable and difficult to change. Vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological arousal have been assumed to be more influential on novice teachers as they are not experienced enough to show teaching performance (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). Housego (1992) asserted that through experience, teachers' self-efficacy beliefs could increase, while this period may result in lower self-efficacy beliefs.

Teachers' sense of efficacy and classroom management

Bandura, Caprara, Barbaranelli, Gerbino, and Pastorelli (2003) maintained that high self-efficacy have a positive impact on individuals' social interactions with each other. Teachers with a high self-efficacy are more likely to be well organized and well planned (Allinder, 1994). Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) claimed that teachers with high efficacy were more optimistic towards students and they focused on their capacity to overcome hardship and controlled the classroom in a less authoritarian way.

2.1.3. Sources of Self-Efficacy

Social cognitive theory has assumed that some possible sources of teachers' sense of efficacy. Bandura (1986, 1997) maintained four sources for self-efficacy: "mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological arousal", with mastery experiences was claimed to have great influence. Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) also used these sources to construct the "Teacher Self-Efficacy Model".

Mastery Experiences

Mastery experience was asserted to be most powerful source of self-efficacy Bandura (1997). Successes and failures that people experienced during carrying out a task constituted the self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997). The self-perception of the teachers' own teaching performances have a strong impact on their efficacy beliefs (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). In other words, successful teaching experiences strengthen personal efficacy beliefs; ineffective teaching experiences damage one's sense of efficacy (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998)

Verbal Persuasion

Bandura (1997) proposed that other people's set of beliefs about one's capability also have an impact on people's self-efficacy, in other words, positive feedback (Bandura, 1997, Mills, 2011) from people all around has been associated with strengthening the people's self-efficacy beliefs. In teaching context, evaluative feedback from teacher supervisors, colleagues, or students is positively related to teacher success, whereas the opposite may undermine the teaching performance (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007).

Vicarious Experiences

Individuals' comparing their own performance with others may contribute to the individuals' self-efficacy (Chacon, 2005). However, the effect of observing and comparing process on the individual is associated with how much observers relate themselves to the model (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). Many studies have documented that teachers' beliefs about language learning and teaching are mostly affected by their vicarious experiences (Freeman, 1993; Johnson, 1994).

Physiological Arousal

Chacon (2005) has indicated that “affective states”, which can be defined as peoples’ “desires, likes, dislikes, drives, preferences, pleasures, pains, values, ideals, attitudes, concerns, interests, moods, intentions, etc.,(Ortony,2002)”,have an impact of people performance.Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007) and Mills (2011) suggested that positive feelings aroused from a successful teaching experience would possibly increase the level of self-efficacy, whereas feeling of worry, nervousness, or unease during a teaching experience may diminish teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs.

Labone (2004) summarized the four important sources of self-efficacy as the following;

“Enactive mastery experience refers to efficacy information gained from an individual’s performance on a particular task. Vicarious experience refers to efficacy information gained from observing models perform a particular task including self-modelling. Verbal persuasion refers to efficacy information gained from positive talk about an individual’s capability to perform a particular task. Physiological and affective states refer to efficacy information gained from physiological and emotive reactions to a particular task (p. 343).”

2.1.4. Measurement of Self-Efficacy Beliefs

The study of measurement of the teacher efficacy has a long history started with research of RAND organization on student learning and teachers’ characteristics in 1976 (Guskey & Passaro, 1994). “The RAND Corporation is a non-profit institution that helps improve policy and decision-making through research and analysis” (2012). RAND researchers developed just two items to measure the teacher self-efficacy, the items were:

Item 1: “When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can’t do much because most of a student’s motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment.”

Item 2: “If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.”

These two items guided most researchers in the history of measurement of self-efficacy beliefs. Some of the most important measurement scales that have been developed and used in the study of teacher self-efficacy can be listed as the following,

1. Rand Studies by RAND organization (1976)
2. Responsibility For Student Achievement Scale by Guskey(1981)
3. Teacher Locus of Control, by Rose and Medway(1981),
4. Web Scale, by Ashton, et al., (1982) (cited in Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 205).
5. Teacher Efficacy Scale by Gibson and Dembo (1984),
6. Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument by Riggs and Enochs (1990),
7. Bandura’s Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (2001)
8. Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001),
9. Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale by Schmitz and Schwarzer (2005).
10. Teachers’ Efficacy Beliefs System—Self Form (TEBS-Self) (Dellinger, Bobbett, Olivier & Ellett, 2007).

Those scales mentioned above differ in type of rating, number of the items used in the scales and subscales. Measurement scale-characteristics were summarized in the Figure 2-1. below.

	Type of rating scale	Number of Items	Sub-scales
RAND studies(1976)	5-Point Likert Scale	2	1. 2 items on teacher self-efficacy
Guskey(1981)	2 choice	30	1. Responsibility for students' success 2. Responsibility for students' failure
Rose and Medway(1981)	Forced choice	28	1. 14 item on students' success 2. 14 item on students' failure
Ashton, et al (1982)	Forced choice	7	
Gibson & Dembo (1984)	6-Point Likert Scale	30	1. Personal teaching efficacy 2. Teaching efficacy
Riggs & Enochs (1990)	5-Point Likert Scale	25	1. Personal science teaching efficacy belief 2. Science teaching outcome expectancy
Bandura (2001)	9-Point Likert Scale	30	1. Efficacy to influence decision making, 2. Efficacy to influence school resources, 3. Instructional efficacy, 4. Disciplinary efficacy, 5. Efficacy to enlist parental involvement, 6. Efficacy to enlist community involvement, 7. Efficacy to create a positive school climate.
Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy (2001)	9- Point Likert Scale	24 items in the long form, 12 items in the short form.	1. Efficacy for student engagement (ESE), 2. Efficacy for instructional strategies (EIS), 3. Efficacy for classroom management (ECM).
Schmitz and Schwarzer (2005)	4- Point Likert Scale	27	
Dellinger, Bobbett, Olivier & Ellett (2007)	4-Point Response Scale	30	1. Communication/clarification, 2. Management/climate, 3. Accommodating individual differences, 4. Motivation of students, 5. Managing learning routines, 6. Higher order thinking skills

Figure 2-1. Teacher self efficacy scales.

2.1.5. Teacher Self-Efficacy Studies in Turkey

There a lot teacher self efficacy studies were conducted in the field of mathematics and science and social sciences such as Atılboz, 2007; Ercan, 2007; Şahinkaya, 2008. However, there is very limited number of self-efficacy studies on English language teachers and most of these studies aimed to investigate the teacher self efficacy level of pre service English teachers such as Rakicioglu,2005; Külekçi, 2011, Topkaya,2010. Moreover there are only a few studies on self efficacy such as Aliş (2008), on English language instructors working at the universities. Some of the studies from Turkey on teacher self efficacy are presented below;

Çakıroğlu and Işıksal (2009) investigated the effect of gender and grade level on attitudes and self-efficacy beliefs of pre-service teachers toward mathematics. 358 elementary and middle school mathematics teachers enrolled in an undergraduate program at two public universities in Ankara participated in the study. The study revealed there was a significant effect of gender as males scored significantly higher than females in their mathematics self-efficacy and there was a significant effect of grade level as senior pre-service teachers had the highest and sophomore had the lowest mathematics self-efficacy scores.

Gerçek, Yılmaz, Köseoglu, Soran (2006) aimed to look into the level of biology teaching self-efficacy beliefs of the teacher candidates. 159 teacher candidates from the Division of Biology Education in Hacettepe University Faculty of Education in 2003-2004 academic year participated in the study. The study revealed that biology teacher candidates had high the self-efficacy beliefs. They also found that there was a huge difference in the level of belief self-efficacy of teacher candidates between different classes and by reason of job choose. However, there was no significant difference in the level of belief self-efficacy of teacher candidates between gender, age, academic success, the high school graduated, the place of the high school graduated, and the family monthly income.

Yılmaz and Çokluk-Bökeoğlu (2008) aimed to determine efficacy beliefs of primary school teachers. 250 teachers who work in primary schools in Ankara city centre took part in the study. They reported that there was no significant difference between their views on “Teaching Efficacy” according to teachers’ gender, field of study, educational background, seniority, age and the number of students to per teacher. As for “Personal Efficacy”, they found a significant difference according to gender, field of study, educational background, seniority, and age; there was a significant one according to educational background, and number of students to per teacher.

Şahin-Taşkın and Hacıömeroğlu (2010) examined elementary pre-service teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs. Data were collected from 122 final year pre-service teachers in Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Faculty of Education. The study

discovered that pre-service teachers' self-efficacy towards teaching profession was not high. They also found that there were no differences amongst pre-service teachers' self-efficacy towards teaching regarding gender and achievement.

Kaner (2010) investigated the self-efficacy beliefs teachers who work with students with and without special needs in terms of some demographic. 234 teachers working with students with and without special needs participated in the study. She found that teachers' self-efficacy beliefs do not differ according to the type of student they work with, the teachers' gender, teaching context and teaching experience as well.

Saracaloglu and Yenice (2009) aimed to identify how the level of the primary school science and elementary teachers' self-efficacy beliefs changed in terms of some variables such as branch, gender, seniority, weekly lesson hours, in-service training, satisfaction with her/his job, socio-economic level of the school, and satisfaction with the working environment. 58 science and 74 elementary teachers working in the primary schools in Aydın participated in the study. The findings of study displayed that teachers' perception of self-efficacy does not differentiate in respect to gender, seniority, number of the lessons they give, having in-service training and being satisfied with the working conditions; it differentiated in respect to the branches and the job satisfaction. They found negative and low level relations between the number of the courses they give, science self-efficacy belief and science teaching outcome expectancy and they assumed that the more the number of the lessons they give increases, the more science self-efficacy beliefs decrease.

Azar (2010) compared the levels of pre-service and in-service secondary science teachers' self-efficacy beliefs relating to science teaching and to analyse the change of these beliefs according to their demographic characteristics such as gender, the graduate school type, teaching experience and major. 50 pre-service secondary science teachers and 75 secondary science teachers took part in the study. He found that there was no significant difference between in-service and pre-service secondary science teachers' personal self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations about science teaching. He also found that these self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations did not

changed relating to their gender, teaching experience, but they changed relating to their graduate school type and major.

Karakuş and Akbulut(2010) analysed effect of secondary school mathematics teachers' preparation program on the pre-service teachers' self-efficacy. 108 freshmen, junior and senior pre-service teachers enrolled in secondary school mathematics teachers' education program at Karadeniz Technical University participated in the study. The findings of the study indicated that junior pre-service teachers taking only mathematical content knowledge have higher self-efficacy beliefs than freshmen and senior pre-service teachers. In addition, there was no significant difference between freshmen pre-service mathematics teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and senior pre-service mathematics' self-efficacy beliefs.

Rakıcıoğlu (2005) investigated the epistemological beliefs, the teacher-efficacy beliefs and the relationship between these beliefs held by a group of English language teaching (ELT) trainees at different universities. Four hundred and fifty six English as a Foreign Language (EFL) pre-service teachers from different universities participated in her study. The study revealed that EFL pre-service teachers appear to perceive themselves not ready for teaching profession. The EFL pre-service teachers' sense of efficacy and personal epistemology were found to effect their perceptions either positively or negatively.

Aliş (2008) examined the effects of professional experiences and English self-efficacy beliefs on communicative language teaching attitudes of instructors of Yıldız Technical University School of Foreign Languages. 48 instructors of Yıldız Technical University School of Foreign Languages took part in her study. The findings of the study showed that there is no significant relationship between instructors' attitudes towards communicative language teaching and English self-efficacy beliefs and their professional experiences

Ortaçtepe (2006) investigated the relationship between English language teachers' self-efficacy and their self-reported practice of Communicative Language

Teaching (CLT) and the impact of an in-service teacher education program aiming at improving participating teachers' knowledge and skills in CLT on English language teacher self-efficacy and their self-reported and actual practice of CLT. 50 English language teachers working in eight foundations schools in Istanbul took part in the study. The study indicated no significant relationship between English language teachers' self-efficacy and their self-reported practice of CLT but it was found that there are significant correlations were found with the dimensions of teachers' self-efficacy and teachers' practice of CLT.

Tercanlıoğlu (2005) examined the relationship between teacher self-efficacy beliefs in five important areas (language aptitude, the difficulty of language learning, the nature of language learning, learning and communication strategies, motivations and expectations) and gender. 118-university pre-service English language teachers participated in the study. The results of the study showed that there was no significant relationship between teacher self-efficacy beliefs and gender however there was a significant relationship between the subscales of the self-efficacy beliefs.

2.2. What Is Stress?

The concept of stress was suggested for the first time by endocrinologist Hans Selye in the 1930s. Selye (1936) defined stress as “the reaction of the body to adapt crisis”. According to him, the basis of stress is the strain of an external factor, the disruption of the balance of the body as it spreads, and as a result, it becomes an internal factor (AIS, 2012). “Stress” is a term derived from Latin and before it was used to describe the situations related to human and living creatures, the word “stress” was used in physics and engineering sciences. (Baltaş & Baltaş, 1999). By 1955, the concept of stress was started to be used in many fields of psychology (Baltaş & Baltaş, 1999).

Although the term “stress” has been commonly used for a long time, an adequate and single definition of it couldn't be made (Tarakçoğlu, 2004). The word “stress” has various meanings and uses, and this might explain the fact that for each

person stress leads to many kinds of things and signifies several meanings (Balci, 2000). Nelson and Quick (1994) highlighted that stress was open to several possible meanings or interpretations; there was no common agreement on its definition. Similarly, Rees and Redfern (2000) stated that stress does not have a single definition accepted by everyone.

On the other hand, the term “stress” acquires positive and negative associations. The positive stress is named as “Eustress” (pleasant stress) and it occurs when there is a refreshing experience; “Distress” (unpleasant stress) is negative as it influences the individual in a destructive way by destabilizing and disrupting the homeostasis – a term that means the state of balance in the body (Selye, 1976:74). French, Kast, and Rosenzweig (1985:707) have acknowledged the same definition by stating, “The term *stress* can be considered neutral with the words *distress* and *eustress* used for designating bad and good effects.”

Good stress can inspire a person to achieve a goal, become more confident thus perform better (Bland, 1999) and “bad” stress cause physiological, cognitive, emotional and behavioural problems. Stress is usually seen negative or threatening in people’s lives, however, it may be stimulating at the same time. Because a healthy stress can help people to improve their performance, on the contrary extreme stress can lead to low performance and can result in serious health problems (Ünal, 1999:365).

The term “stress” is known to be a significant element in an individual’s behaviour; because it has slowly gained acceptance in human’s living about health and life (Viner, 1999). Stress is an effort that an individual makes beyond its psychological limits due to the discordant physical and social conditions that comes from the environment (Cüceloğlu, 1993:321). When a type of pressure continues for a long time and rises, it becomes uncontrollable for an individual to overcome the problem, and this situation is specified as a response syndrome of negative effects for the term “stress” (Kyriacou, 1978). Stress is generally regarded to be the impact or a reply to a stimulus (Jenkins & Calhoun 1991). Joseph (2000: 15) stated that stress is “an excess of demand made upon the adaptive capabilities of the mind and body” and is seen in the form of a

physical demand, a mental demand or both".The term "stress" is defined as the promiscuous or biological reply of the person's body to any kinds of demands (Güçlü, 2001). It was studied as an impartial physiologic phenomenon and also she stated that it can be positive or negative and stimulus or danger (Güçlü 2001). Ornelas and Kleiner (2003) defended that stress is attempting or accomplishing to balance workplace challenges and family life in the modern world. In another definition stress was described as the body's reaction to the situations and events, which impose burden on the body both physically and spiritually and cause reaction (Losyk, 2006:26). Topper (2007) asserted that stress was people's psychological and physiological reactions to the demands and challenges of life.

In general, stress literature indicates that stress is a feeling, created by perceptions (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Rafferty & Griffin, 2006). Arnold and Feldman (1986: 459) defined stress as "the reactions of individuals to new or threatening factors in their work environment." Williams and Huber (1986: 243) stated that stress was "a psychological and physical reaction to prolonged internal and/or environmental conditions in which an individual's adaptive capabilities are overextended."

Gmelch (1993) categorizes "stress" in two ways. The first one is short-term stress. It means the body's positive reaction against stress. If a danger or threat occurs, the brain gives the essential signals and precautions to be taken by the body immediately and then the body does the appropriate things. When the problem goes away, it becomes normal again. The second one is the long-term stress. It is the dangerous reply of the body to the prolonged stress. Namely, short-term stress has served a useful and critical role during emergency situations. On the contrary, long-term stress, stress causes the body's immune system to work well below its efficiency (Collingwood, 2007).

2.2.1. Sources of Work Stress

The reason of stress mainly depends on so-called stressors (the causes of stress) which are physical or psychological demands in the surrounding of the individual.

Stressors occur when a person feels that he/she cannot find the capacity to cope with them (Hellriegel& Slocum, 2009).

Davis and Newstrom (1993; 461) defined the typical causes of stress on the job as the following;

- Work overload
- Time pressures
- Poor quality of supervision
- Insecure political climate
- Inadequate authority to match responsibilities
- Role conflict and ambiguity
- Differences between company and employee values
- Change of any type, especially when it is major or unusual
- Frustration

Hellriegel et al (1995;241) proposed a similar list of stressors, the common causes were; “workload, role conflict and ambiguity, conflict between work and other roles”. Apart from these, it was also mentioned that “career development, interpersonal relations in the organizations, job conditions” might be sources for work stress. It was also highlighted that internal factors such as perception, past experience, social support and individual differences may affect the how much individuals experience stress.

Baltaş and Baltaş (1999)’s list of stressor at work include; low salary, long working hours, over workload, gossiping, too much responsibility, security concerns, physical insecurity at work, hierarchical structures on the work. Kristensen (1999) maintained that the lack of individuals’ control over their work speed or workplace design, social support from colleagues, skill developing assignments; long working days, unfair rewarding and high demands of work causes stress at work.

In addition, Buchanan and Huczynski (2004) have documented some common causes of stress at work as poor working conditions, repetitive and mechanistic tasks, poor leadership, poor relationships, uncertain future and poor commitment. Tehrani

(2002) claimed that unsupportive managers and unfriendly policies, lack of communication between managers and employees, not involving in decision-making, unwarranted or invalid criticism, adaptation problems to changes at work, not having required resources, unclear work definitions, and monotonous nature of the job cause stress at work.

Kirkcaldy, Trimpoo and Williams (2002) mentioned that the causes of stress involves lack of guidance and support from administrators, inadequate consultation and communication, lack of encouraging and supportive attitude from superiors, isolation, discrimination and insufficient training/management development.

Role conflict and ambiguity are accepted as the main causes of stress at work (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1990). Hellriegel et al (1995: 243) defined role conflict as “different expectations of or demands on person’s role at work”, and role ambiguity as “employee’s uncertainty about assigned job duties and responsibilities”. The job must define its expectations well and provide an official model on which the individuals depend (Davis & Newstrom, 1993). Ivancevich and Matteson (1990) highlighted that employee should know their rights, advantages they have and the things they must do for their job, otherwise they feel confused and stressed.

Poor interpersonal relationships are also a common source of stress in organizations. Arnold and Feldman (1986) documented three types of interpersonal relationships that can cause people experience stress:

- 1) too much prolonged contact with other people,
- 2) too much contact with people from other departments,
- 3) an unfriendly or hostile organizational climate.

The responsibilities people have for their job may also be source of stress. Ivancevich and Matteson (1990) contended that there is a distinction between responsibility for people and for things, if the individual’s job requires responsibility for people, then a high level of stress is expected, on the other hand if the individuals have responsibilities for thing in his job, the lower level of stress has been indicated.

Having too many things to do or not having enough time to complete the task cause stress (Davis & Newstrom, 1993). Moreover, individual may feel that they are not capable of completing the given task or the task needs high performance to do it (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1990). On the other hand, Hellriegel et al (1995) suggested that having too little work to do also may cause stress as it may make a day boring.

Poor working conditions such as loud noise, temperature extremes, crowd, air pollution, radiation, dirt, poor equipment, fire, traffic , (Baltaş ve Baltaş, 1999), too much lightening, the distance between work and home may also cause stress (Hellriegel et al., 2009). Ivancevich and Matteson (1990) mentioned that building good relationships and creating a bond of trust between you and your colleagues let you reduce stress in your workplace. Moreover, if people cannot get enough help from their superiors and co-workers and if they have very few authorities on their jobs, it becomes more difficult for them to overcome stress (Leka, Griffiths & Cox, 2003). Participation (or non-participation) in decision-making also may be source of stress (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1990). When there is deficiency or uncoordinated things in work arrangement and poor management, it may also result with stress (Leka, Griffiths & Cox, 2003).

2.2.2. What Is Teacher Stress?

The model of stress that Lazarus and co-workers presented and how Kyriacou and Sutcliffe adopted it to an educational setting can be accepted as the essence of “teacher stress” (Dick & Wagner, 2001). Kyriacou (2001:2) defined teacher stress as “the experience by a teacher of unpleasant, negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, tension, frustration or depression, resulting from some aspect of their work as a teacher”. Teacher stress is chiefly accepted as a negative effect with various psychological (e.g. job dissatisfaction), physiological (e.g. high blood pressure) and behavioural (e.g. absenteeism) connections (Van Dick & Wagner 2001).

Some of the studies have demonstrated that teacher stress might lead to negative results in teachers’ jobs; for instance, they get low performance, their attitude and character change because of stress (Larchick & Chance, 2004). “Prolonged occupational

stress” does not affect teachers individually. Because it may affect the way of teaching and learning substantially at schools, it is really important to take the issue of teacher stress account and it must be accepted seriously (Murray, 2007). On the contrary, Corsgrove (2000) proposed that the term teacher stress had a positive meaning like excitement, challenge and inspiration. Corsgrove (2000) believed that if people were able to cope with stress, it gives people the energy to throw themselves into something where they want to make some contribution, and also it makes life worthwhile, and they could to stand up for his or her rights.

Many of the teachers think that teaching is a very stressful job (Borg, 1990). When it is compared with other job professions, teachers feel much more stress (Travers and Cooper, 1993). Wide range of research have documented that when teachers are placed a burden of work, they feel stress and force. A considerable amount of teachers suffers from severe stress and exhaustion (Boyle, Borg, Falzon, & Baglioni, 1995; Capel, 1991; Friesen & Sarros, 1989). It has been presented according to some surveys done in this field that the work of teaching is regarded as difficult and a low-paid job in public (Jarvis, 2002). Joseph (2000) stated that teachers are the ones who suffer from increasing stress besides linguists, social workers and service members at the beginning of the new millennium. It is supported by the Health, Safety Executive that teaching is one of the most stressful jobs, and some teachers feel too much stress in their jobs (Smith, Brice, Collins, Matthews, & McNamara, 2000).

Teaching is regarded as an honourable work especially for parents about their children’s education and evolution of their character and this situation can also create stress for teachers (Ravichandran & Rajendran, 2007). According to Hock (1988), the degree of stress is highly about the attitude of teachers towards the situation including possible threats like insufficiency to answer the needs of the students and inadequacy to handle. Workplace stress causes a great anxiety for teachers and its effect in teaching profession is increasing. (Brown, Davis, & Johnson, 2002; Jarvis, 2002).

In language learning process, it is important for language teachers to consider their own feelings and state of minds as well as students’ feelings (Horwitz & Young,

1991). Stress has been mentioned as one of the most essential variable among the individual affective factors and it has prevailed in English language Teaching. (Jepson & Forrest, 2006). Medgyes (1992) believed that the teacher is the most important tool for the learner to achieve his/her goal. It is important for teachers to understand and learn about teacher stress because it becomes easier for them to overcome the difficulties not only in their daily lives but also in their jobs (Claxton, 1989).

2.2.3. Sources of Teacher Stress

It is a fact that the resources of stress change everywhere according to the educational system, teachers' and schools' special conditions and also superior beliefs about schools and teachers in that society (Kyriacou, 2001).

The British Columbia Teachers' Federation in Canada (cited in Naylor, 2001) listed the top five causes of teacher stress as:

- unmet needs of students,
- class composition,
- size of workload,
- attitudes of provincial government,
- the inclusion of students with special needs (Naylor, 2001, p.3).

Common stressors teachers experience can be listed as:

- Lack of adequate instructional materials and teaching resources (Swick, 1989.Cited in Tural, 1994:7),
- Poor classroom working conditions (small room, many students) (Swick, 1989.Cited in Tural, 1994:7).
- Lack of proper facilities within a school (heating/cooling, lighting, media facilities, noise, room structure), conflict between amount of time to teach and curriculum, low salaries (Kyriacou, 2001).
- Job security , decreased job mobility, little opportunity for promotions, interruptions during teaching time, teachers roles: teacher, mother/father, coach, counsellor, heavy workload gives teachers no time to relax within a

day, teachers bring work home daily – no time to finish at work, high-Stakes assessment testing, physical and mental abuse by students (Swick & Hanley, 1980).

In addition to some of the sources above, Adams (2001) and Jenkins and Calhoun (1991) also mentioned that teachers feel stressed if they not provided with idea whether they are successful or not, if they have poor relationships with colleagues, if there are students' behaviour problems, if their families' needs are not met and the family members do not enjoy their life together.

Role ambiguity and having too much work to do was seen the most powerful factors causing stress for teachers (Kyriacou 2001; Austin et al 2005). Time pressures (Barnes, Agago & Coombs, 1998; Smith et al., 1995; Thompson & Dey, 1998) and teachers' low or bad self-expectations also lead to stress (Smith et al., 1995). Özdemir (2003) proposed that not having a certain degree of standardization in education system, not being able to develop and apply intercultural and international communication practices in crowded classrooms, not being supported and time pressures are among the sources of teacher stress. Joseph (2000) and Adams (2001) suggested that students' not coming to class on time, not doing their homework, disrespectful behaviour, and absenteeism can also cause stress for teachers.

In English language teacher's context, main sources of teacher stress were found be lack of time and not having good and close relations with colleagues (Bress, 2006). Having to deal with multicultural and multilingual classes, student coming from variety of socioeconomic status, stuents have a stunning variety of learning styles and learning abilities, students' misbehaviours put a burden on teachers and create stress (Forlin, 1998).

Non-native English teachers feel stressed as they may feel that people consider non-native people not qualified enough to teach English, and this lead teachers to feel stressed (Horwitz 1996). Besides the occupational responsibilities, non-native teachers have to carry the burden of operating their classes in a language that is not their own

(Canessa, 2006). Kim (2004) stated that most non-native English teachers do not feel confident enough to overcome the language challenges even they are capable of it. Tudor (1993) also pointed out that methods like communicative language teaching where topics and ideas that are encoded in linguistic messages are not predictable, may cause stress for non-native English teachers. Also the use of the target language may turn out to be a stress factor in the language classrooms where students and teachers share a common language, resulting in teachers' code-switching between students' native language (L1) and the target language (L2) (Chang, 2006). Non-native English Teachers themselves reported that factors such as workload, initiative overload, a target-driven culture, and pupils' behaviour and discipline, relate significantly to their desire to leave the profession (Brown & Rodgers, 2002).

2.2.4. Effects of Workplace Stress

Literature on stress supported that stress has a negative effect on employees' mental and physical health (Myrtek et al., 1999). Stress can cause physical, psychological, and behavioural problems (Aksoy & Kutluca, 2006). As most of the people spend their most of time at work, work conditions play an important role on their health and also health education professionals have presented that job stress has turned out to be a serious problem at workplace (Sharif, 2000). Similarly, Christo and Pienaar (2006) suggested that occupational stress significantly affects the physical and psychological being of an individual, which may be resulted in important health problems such as heart diseases, hypertension, peptic ulcers, sickness, alcoholism, depression, suicidal tendencies, anxiety and mental disorders.

Work stress is thought to affect individuals' psychological good or poor mental health (Smith, Sulsky, & Uggerslev, 2002). For example, LeDoux (1998) claimed that stress causes brain loss of ability to store memories in long-term and damages the individuals' thinking ability.

Many studies documented that there is a correlation between the level of employee' stress and job satisfaction (Elangovan, 2001) and ,in the same way, low level

of job satisfaction may lead to decreased commitment and increased turnover (Elangovan, 2001; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Chen, Silverthorne and Hung (2006) also pointed out that there is a strong relationship between stress and job commitment.

High level of stress cause employee burnout and this lead to a rapid decline in productivity (Eren, 2000) increased work stress and job dissatisfaction may result in absenteeism, high turnover and workplace accidents rates (Ertekin, 1993; Vecchio, 1995; Eroglu, 2000; South, 2001; Fang, 2001).

Schabracq and Cooper (2000) as well as Murphy (1995) noted that workplace stress could lead to low motivation, low performance, turnover, sick leave, low job satisfaction, poor colleague relationships and incompatibility. Christo and Pienaar (2006) indicated similar findings by adding that these problems could be overcome by good stress management strategies.

Aksoy and Kutluca (2006) mentioned that employees under extreme stress could cause serious damages to organizations such as showing poor performance, increased employee turnover, and increased work-related accidents, absenteeism, turnover, alienation.

Williams and Huber (1986:246) reported a list included a large scope of the symptoms of stress:

Constant fatigue, low energy level, recurring headaches, gastrointestinal disorders, chronically bad breath, sweaty hands or feet, dizziness, high blood pressure, pounding heart, constant inner tension, inability to sleep, temper outbursts, hyperventilation, moodiness, irritability and restlessness, inability to concentrate, increased aggression, compulsive eating, chronic worrying, anxiety or apprehensiveness, inability to relax, growing feelings of inadequacy, increase in defensiveness, dependence on tranquilizers, excessive use of alcohol, and excessive smoking.

Physiological, cognitive, emotional and behavioural effects of stress can be summarized under two headings in Figure 2-2. (Braham, 1993; Baltaş & Baltaş, 1999; Russell, 2000, Rosch, 2012).

<i>Effects on individuals</i>
1. Aggressive, territorial behaviour.
2. Burnout
3. Feeling of insecurity
4. Reduced memory
5. Increased errors
6. Become unable to relax or concentrate ,easily distracted
7. Speech problems
8. Low performance
9. Have difficulty thinking logically and making decisions
10. Reduced concentration/ability to think rationally
11. Enjoy their work less and feel less committed to it, less enthusiasm
12. Feel tired, depressed, anxious, isolated
13. Have difficulty in sleeping, lower energy levels
14. Reduced self-esteem
15. Poor judgement
16. Loss of sense of humour
17. Excessive dreaming
18. Change in personality; not talking to people much
19. Organization and planning deteriorate
20. Experience serious physical problems, such as a. Heart disease b. Headache c. Indigestion and nausea d. Eating disorders e. Increases in blood pressure f. Muscular-skeletal disorders(such as low back pain and upper limb disorders) g. Palpitations and chest discomfort
<i>Effects on organisations:</i>
1. Job dissatisfaction
2. Cynicism about work role
3. Distrust in peers, supervisors and management
4. Poor time management
5. Loss of work motivation
6. Increased absenteeism or tardiness.
7. Decreasing commitment to work
8. Increasing staff turn-over
9. Impairing performance and productivity
10. Damaging the organisation's image both among its workers and externally.

Figure 2-2. Effects of stress on individuals and organisations

In conclusion, stress, for whatever reason, has adverse effects on the organization such as; poor performance, job dissatisfaction, low morale and low productivity (Işıkhan, 2001). In teaching context, prolonged stress can lead to burnout in teachers, and this feeling can result in health problems or quitting the job (Burke, Greenglass & Schwarzer, 1996).

2.2.5. Relationship between Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Teacher Stress

Self efficacy is proven to have strong affect on the way people think, feel, and act therefore self-efficacy, low self-esteem and pessimism as well as insecurity have been asserted to have a powerful influence on psychological job stress (Bandura, 1982; 1993; 1997). Coladarci (1992) asserted that teacher self-efficacy affected the level of teacher commitment. Smylie (1988) also highlighted that there was a relationship between teacher self –efficacy beliefs and the level of stress experienced in teaching. it has been assumed that teacher stress is associated with teacher self-efficacy, in other words, teachers with low self-efficacy beliefs experience more stress than their colleagues (Betoret, 2006; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007).

Researchers in education have documented that teachers' sense of efficacy and teacher stress has strong impacts on various aspects of teaching and learning. The present study, by adopting the notion of teachers' sense of efficacy and teacher stress as the theoretical framework, has explored the self efficacy and teacher stress level of English language instructors working at the universities. Furthermore, their English teaching efficacy and stress levels have been examined in relation to gender, education level and the place of the university.

CHAPTER III

3. The Research Methodology

This chapter presents the research methodology of the study. The method, participants, data collection instruments, data collection procedures, validation research questions, participants' demographic information are mentioned in detail, respectively.

3.1. Research Design

This study is based on the survey method, which aims to describe certain characteristics of a given population by investigating a sample of the group. Questionnaires are generally the most frequent method of data collection in this method (Dörnyei, 2007). Specifically, the current study is designed to investigate the self-efficacy levels and stress factors of English language instructors working at preparatory classes at universities.

3.2. Participants

260 instructors working at the English preparatory schools of metropolitan and provincial Turkish state universities were asked to participate in the present study. Of these, 151 questionnaires were returned (58.08% return rate). As a result, 35 English instructors from Bülent Ecevit University, 10 English instructors from Abant İzzet Baysal University, 17 English instructors from Karabük University, 15 English instructors from Düzce University, 22 English instructors from Ege University, 32 English instructors from Yıldız Technical University, 20 English instructors from Gazi University formed the sample of the study.

Table 3-1. .Frequency table of instructors according to universities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	BEÜ	35	23.2	23.2	23.2
	Bolu	10	6.6	6.6	29.8
	KB.	17	11.3	11.3	41.1
	DZ	15	9.9	9.9	51.0
	YTÜ	32	21.2	21.2	72.2
	Ege	22	14.6	14.6	86.8
	Gazi	20	13.2	13,2	100.0
	Total	151	100.0	100.0	

Note: Abbreviation for the universities;

Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University (BEÜ), Abant İzzet Baysal University (Bolu), Karabük University (KB), Düzce University (DZ), Ege University (Ege), Yıldız Technical University (YTÜ) , Gazi University (Gazi).

Among the 151 participants, 79.5% (n=120) were females, whereas 20.5% (n=31) were males. The latest education level of the participants was as the following; 72.2% (n=109) of the English instructors stated that they have bachelor's degree, 23.8% (n=36) of them had a master's degree in the related field. The remaining 4.0% (n=6) stated that they have doctoral degree.

3.3. Data Collection Instruments

In the current study, the findings related to teachers' stress level and the level of self-efficacy beliefs have been obtained through questionnaires. Data collection instruments used in the study were; *Stress Factors Questionnaire for English Language Instructors* (Petek, 2008) (See Appendix A), English Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (ETSES) (Chacón, 2005)(See Appendix B)

There are 42 items in the Stress Factors Questionnaire for English Language Instructors. The items were 5-point Likert-type, ranging from "Strongly Agree" (5) to "Strongly Disagree" (1). The higher the score, the more stressed the teachers feel. There are two subscales of the questionnaire; Field-Specific Stress Factors (1-21). (i.e.: item 6. Students'unwillingness to do research and investigation to improve their English, item 8. Teaching a language (English) which is not your (as an instructor)

mother tongue.,Organizational Stress Factors(22-42).(i.e. :item 30; Lack of flexibility in the institutional practices (attending meetings, ceremonies, deadlines of reports and so forth, item 40; Too much homework load to read).

Meanwhile there are 12 items in the English Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (ETSES). There are three subscales including efficacy for engagement, efficacy for management, and efficacy for instructional strategies use a 9-point scale, ranging from (9) A great Deal to (1) Nothing .The higher the score the more self efficacious the teacher feel about the subject area. The items measuring “how much an individual can do” in regards to efficacy in student Engagement (ESE): Items 2, 3, 4, 11, (i.e. item 11; To what extent can you craft good questions for your students? , efficacy in Instructional Strategies (EIS): Items 5, 9, 10, 12, (i.e. item 10; 10. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when your English students are confused? Efficacy in Classroom Management (ECM): Items 1, 6, 7, 8. (i.e. item 6. How much can you do to get students follow classroom rules in your English classroom?

3.4. Data Collection Procedures

The study included 77 participants from 4 provincial universities (Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Karabük University, Düzce University) and 74 participants from 3 metropolitan universities (Ege University, Yıldız Technical University, Gazi University).

Institutional permission to conduct the data collection instruments for the research has been obtained from the administrations. After obtaining the institutional permission, questionnaires were sent to colleagues who work in Karabük University Ege University, Gazi University, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Düzce University. The completed questionnaires were sent to me in 2 weeks. I distributed the questionnaires in Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University and collected the responses in 3 weeks. I distribute

the questionnaires on my own in Yıldız Technical University in their meeting time and collect them after 1 hour.

3.5. Validation of the instruments

3.5.1. Confirmatory factor analysis for Stress Factors Questionnaire for English Language Instructors

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used to determine the construct validity of the data collection instruments with the current set of data (see, e.g. DiStefano & Hess, 2005; Ullman, 2007). To start, items 1 – 7, 16 and 17 were excluded because their communalities were below the acceptable level of .30. An initial CFA resulted in low fit indices, which could be accounted for by the fact that the model had a low number of factors with a high number of items. Moreover, modification indices suggested that there were a number of overlapping items (40-41, 27-41, 20-21, 12-13, 8-9, 34-35, and 27-35). Hence, it was decided to approach a further CFA using item parcelling, in which the best representatives of a factor are chosen. From the current data set, items 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15 and 19 were chosen for the first factor (field-related stress factors); and items 24, 26, 27, 32, 33, 40 and 41 for the second factor (organisational stress factors). The fit indices for this model were as follows: $\chi^2(74)=130.90$ ($p \leq .001$), RMSEA=.07, CFI=.94, TLI=.92, IFI=.94, which suggest good fit to the data (Byrne, 2001). Cronbach alpha values for the field-related stress factor, organisational-related stress factor and the whole scale were .86, .84, and .85, suggesting that the scale had high internal reliability.

3.5.2. Confirmatory factor analysis for English Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (ETSES)

A CFA was run with the current data set to investigate the construct validity of the TSES. The fit indices for the 3-factor model were $\chi^2(51)=95.60$, RMSEA=.08, CFI=.94, TLI=.92, IFI=.94, which suggested a good fit (Byrne, 2001). Cronbach alpha

for the student engagement factor was .63, for the classroom management factor .87, and for the instructional strategies factor .72. Because the value .63 is just beyond the acceptable level, it was decided to investigate whether removal of any of the items would increase the internal reliability of the scale. As a result, it was found that removal of item 4 increased the internal reliability of the student engagement factor to .81. Cronbach alpha for the whole scale minus item 4 was .86. Thus, it was shown that the scale had high internal reliability.

CHAPTER IV

4. The Results of Data Analysis

This part reports research findings relevant to research questions. First, the descriptive statistics related to self-efficacy are presented in response to the 1,2,3,4 research questions. Second, the descriptive statistics related to teacher stress are presented, thus answering the 5,6,7,8 research questions. Then, the results of the correlative statistics are presented, thereby providing a response to the 9. Research question finally, a comparative result of the study is presented in response to 10.research question.

4.1. Results related to research question 1.

“What are the current Teacher Self-Efficacy levels of English language instructors working at the preparatory classes at universities?”

The means of the three subscales in are presented in Table 4-1. The results indicate that the English language instructors working at preparatory classes at universities in Turkey rated themselves in the dimensions of Instructional Strategies, Classroom Management, and Student, Engagement. The instructors rated themselves as more efficacious in classroom management strategies ($M=7.27$) than in instructional strategies and ($M = 7.16$) and student engagement strategies ($M=5.91$)

Table 4-1. Teacher Self Efficacy Levels

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Student Engagement	150	2.50	9.00	5.91	1.15	1.34
Classroom Manag.	150	3.50	9.00	7.27	1.12	1.27
Instructional Stra.	150	4.75	9.00	7.16	.94	.89
Valid N (listwise)	150					

The level of teacher efficacy in this study was defined in three categories; Efficacy in Student Engagement (ESE), Efficacy in Instructional Strategies (EIS) and Efficacy in Classroom Management (ECM). The participants had a high level of efficacy in classroom management strategies ($M= 7.27$). However, compared with the high level of efficacy in using classroom management strategies, the participants reported to feel less capable in student engagement strategies ($M=5.91$).

4.2. Results related to research question 2.

“Is there a gender difference in teacher self-efficacy levels between the English language instructors working at the preparatory classes at universities?”

In the current study, it was aimed to explore whether the level of self-efficacy levels differ according to the instructors' gender. The descriptive statistics revealing the mean scores of groups and the interpretation of the results are presented in Table 4-2.

Table 4-2. Descriptive statistics for self efficacy levels according to gender.

	N	Mean	SD
Efficacy in Student Engagement			
Female	119	5.93	1.15
Male	31	5.83	1.171
Total	150	5.91	1.15
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies			
Female	119	7.15	.89
Male	31	7.21	1.13
Total	150	7.16	.94
Efficacy in Classroom Management			
Female	119	7.32	1.11
Male	31	7.07	1.16
Total	150	7.27	1.12

As can be seen in Table 4-2, the mean score of females related to self-efficacy level of Student, Engagement is higher ($M = 5.93$) than males with a standard deviation of 1.15.) In addition to this, the mean score of females related to self-efficacy level of Classroom Management, is slightly higher ($M = 7.32$) with a standard deviation of 1.11. On the other hand, the mean score of females regarding the self-efficacy level of using Instructional Strategies is relatively lower than males ($M = 7.15$) with a standard deviation of .89.

ANOVA was also conducted (Table 4-3) in order to determine whether the teachers' self-self-efficacy levels were statistically different depending on gender. ANOVA results showed that none of the values in the sig. Column are less than .05, so there were no significant gender differences among English instructors in the subscales.

Table 4-3. ANOVA results for self-efficacy levels according to gender

		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Between groups	.227	1	.227	.168	.682
	Within groups	199.876	148	1.351		
	Total	200.104	149			
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Between groups	1.628	1	1.628	1.282	.259
	Within groups	187.891	148	1.270		
	Total	189.518	149			
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Between groups	.095	1	.095	.106	.745
	Within groups	132.842	148	.898		
	Total	132.937	149			

4.3. Results related to research question 3.

“Is there a difference in teacher self-efficacy levels between the English language instructors who have a bachelor's degree, master's degree and Ph.D. degree working at the preparatory classes at universities?”

The descriptive statistics on education level of self-efficacy levels of instructors working at the preparatory classes at universities are presented in Table 4-4.

According to the mean scores of factors under three headings of the questionnaires in Table 4-4, the English instructors who have master's degree reported the highest level of self-efficacy of all the subscales; Efficacy in Student Engagement ($M=6.34$), Efficacy in Instructional Strategies ($M=7.34$), Efficacy in Classroom Management (7.46).

Table 4-4. Descriptive statistics for self-efficacy levels according to level of education

Efficacy in Student Engagement	N	Mean	SD
Bachelor's Degree	108	5.82	1.10
Master's Degree	36	6.34	1.26
Ph.D. Degree	6	5.00	.52
Total	150	5.91	1.15
Efficacy In Instructional Strategies			
Bachelor's Degree	108	7.10	.91
Master's Degree	36	7.34	1.01
Ph.D. Degree	6	7.20	1.04
Total	150	7.16	.94
Efficacy In Classroom Management			
Bachelor's Degree	108	7.21	1.09
Master's Degree	36	7.46	1.26
Ph.D. Degree	6	7.16	.88
Total	150	7.27	1.12

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the self efficacy level and the level of education. The independent variable included three groups: bachelor's degree, master's degree and Ph.D. degree. The ANOVA results were presented in table 4-5.

Table 4-5. ANOVA results for self efficacy levels according to education level

		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Between groups	12.688	2	6.344	4.976	.008
	Within groups	187.416	147	1.275		
	Total	200.104	149			
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Between groups	1.701	2	.851	.666	.515
	Within groups	187.817	147	1.278		
	Total	189.518	149			
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Between groups	1.457	2	.728	.814	.445
	Within groups	132.480	147	.894		
	Total	132.937	149			

The only significant results was found is for Efficacy in Student Engagement ($p<.01$). It was shown in Table 4-5 that the means of Efficacy in Student Engagement are BA ($M= 5.82$), MA ($M= 6.34$), and PhD ($M=5.00$). A post hoc Scheffe test was conducted to explore the differences among means to provide specific information on which means are significantly different from each other.

The results for Efficacy in Student Engagement showed that there is a borderline significant difference ($p=.057$) between English instructors who have Bachelor degree and master's degree. Since the MA mean is greater, it can be said that the MA graduates feel more efficacious in student engagement than BA graduates. There is also a significant difference between English instructors who have MA and PhD ($p<.05$), and looking at the means, it would suggest that MA graduates also report themselves as being more efficacious in student engagement than PhD graduates.

Table 4-6. Post Hoc Scheffe Results of Teacher Self Efficacy Subscales

Dependent Variable	(I)D3	(J)D3	Mean differences (I-J)	Sd. Error	Sig.
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	-.52546	.21730	.057
		Ph.D. Degree	.82176	.47360	.225
	Master's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	.52546	.21730	.057
		Ph.D. Degree	1.34722*	.49790	.028
	Ph.D. Degree	Bachelor's Degree	-.82176	.47360	.225
		Master's Degree	-1.34722*	.49790	.028
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	-.24537	.21753	.531
		Ph.D. Degree	.29861	.47410	.994
	Master's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	.24537	.21753	.531
		Ph.D. Degree	.29861	.49843	.836
	Ph.D. Degree	Bachelor's Degree	-.05324	.47410	.994
		Master's Degree	-.29861	.49843	.836
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	-.23148	.18201	.447
		Ph.D. Degree	-.09954	.39668	.969
	Master's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	.23148	.18201	.447
		Ph.D. Degree	.13194	.41703	.951
	Ph.D. Degree	Bachelor's Degree	.09954	.39668	.969
		Master's Degree	-.13194	.41703	.951

4.4. Results related to research question 4.

“Is there a difference in self-efficacy levels among English instructors working at preparatory schools of metropolitan and provincial Turkish State universities?”

Descriptive statistics on self-efficacy levels of instructors working at the preparatory classes at universities in metropolitan and provincial cities are presented in Table 4-7.

Table 4-7. Descriptive statistics on self-efficacy levels in metropolitan and provincial cities

		N	Mean	Std.D	Std. Error
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Provincial	77	5.84	1.14	.13
	Metropolitan	73	5.98	1.18	.13
	Total	150	5.91	1.15	.09
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Provincial	77	7.25	1.08	.12
	metropolitan	73	7.30	1.17	1.13
	Total	150	7.27	1.12	.09
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Provincial	77	7.05	.90	.10
	metropolitan	73	7.28	.97	.11
	Total	150	7.16	.94	.07

According to the mean scores of factors under three headings of the questionnaires in Table 4-7, the English instructors who are working in metropolitan universities reported slightly higher level of self-efficacy of all the subscales; Efficacy in Student Engagement ($M=5.98$), Efficacy in Classroom Management (7.30). Efficacy in Instructional Strategies ($M=7.28$).

A one-way analysis of variance indicated that since none of the values is less than .05, there are no significant differences between the sub-scales in terms of working in metropolitan or provincial universities. In other words, it can be said that instructors working at provincial universities feel that they are more/less efficacious than those working at metropolitan universities. ANOVA results were presented in Table 4-8.

TABLE 4-8. ANOVA results for self-efficacy levels in metropolitan and provincial universities

		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Between groups	.794	1	.794	.590	.444
	Within groups	199.310	148	1.347		
	Total	200.104	149			
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Between groups	.113	1	.113	.088	.767
	Within groups	189.406	148	1.280		
	Total	189.518	149			
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Between groups	1.911	1	1.911	2.158	.144
	Within groups	131.026	148	.885		
	Total	132.937	149			

4.5. Results related to research question 5.

“What are the current teacher stress levels of English language instructors working at the preparatory classes at universities?”

The means of the two subscales in Table 4-9 indicate that the English language instructors working at preparatory classes at universities in Turkey rated themselves in the dimensions of field-specific stress factors and organizational stress factors. The instructors rated themselves as they feel more stressed about organizational factors ($M=2.84$) than field-specific factors ($M = 2.05$).

Table 4-9. Teacher stress levels of English language instructors

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Field_mean	151	1.00	4.14	2.05	.70	.50
Org_Mean	151	1.00	4.86	2.84	.88	.78
Valid N (listwise)	150					

Results show that the participants reported they experienced field-specific stress factors to a medium degree ($M=2.05$) and organizational stress factors at a medium level of 2.84.

4.6. Results related to research question 6.

“Is there a gender difference in teacher stress levels between the English language instructors working at the preparatory classes at universities?”

It was aimed to explore whether the level of Teacher stress levels change according to the instructors gender. Descriptive statistics revealing the mean scores of groups and the interpretation of the results are presented in Table 4-10.

Table 4-10. Descriptive table of English instructors stres level according to their gender

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
field-specific stress factors	Female	120	2.03	.70
	Male	31	2.11	.73
	Total	151	2.05	.70
organizational stress factors.	Female	120	2.85	.92
	Male	31	2.80	.76
	Total	151	2.84	.88

As can be seen in Table 4-10, the mean score of females related to field-specific stress factors is lower ($M = 2.03$) than males with a standard deviation of .70) In addition to this, the mean score of females related to organizational stress factors is slightly higher ($M = 2.85$) with a standard deviation of .92.

ANOVA was also conducted (Table 4-11) in order to determine whether the teachers' stress levels were statistically different depending on gender. ANOVA results showed that none of the values in the sig. Column are less than .05, so there were no significant gender differences among English instructors in the subscales.

Table 4-11. ANOVA Results- Gender and stress levels of English Instructors

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Field_mean	Between Groups	.125	1	.125	.248	.619
	Within Groups	75.334	149	.506		
	Total	75.459	150			
Org_Mean	Between Groups	.082	1	.082	.103	.748
	Within Groups	118.231	149	.793		
	Total	118.313	150			

4.7. Results related to research question 7.

“Is there a difference in teacher stress levels between the English language instructors who have a bachelor’s degree, master’s degree and Ph.D. degree working at the preparatory classes at universities?”

Descriptive statistics on education level of stress levels of instructors working at the preparatory classes at universities are presented in Table 4-12.

Table 4-12. Descriptive table of English instructors according to their education level

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Field_mean	bachelors deg	109	2,06	.67
	univ master	36	1.96	.78
	ph.d	6	2.28	.91
	Total	151	2.05	.70
Org_Mean	bachelors deg	109	2.88	.89
	univ master	36	2.63	.85
	ph.d	6	3.42	.62
	Total	151	2.84	.88

According to the mean scores of factors under two headings of the questionnaires in Table 4-11. The English instructors who have Ph.Degree reported the highest level of stress both in field-specific factors($M=2.28$) and in organizational factors($M=3.42$)

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the perceived level of stress and the level of education. The independent variable included three groups: bachelor’s degree, master’s degree and Ph.Degree. The ANOVA results were presented in table 4-13.

Table 4-13. ANOVA Results- Education level and stress levels of English Instructors

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Field_mean	Between Groups	.613	2	.306	.606	.547
	Within Groups	74.846	148	.506		
	Total	75.459	150			
Org_Mean	Between Groups	3.887	2	1.943	2.513	.084
	Within Groups	114.426	148	.773		
	Total	118.313	150			

Columns are less than .05, so there were no significant gender differences among English instructors in the subscales.

4.8. Results related to research question 8.

“Is there a difference in teacher stress levels among English instructors working at preparatory schools of metropolitan and provincial Turkish State universities?”

Descriptive statistics on teacher stress levels of instructors working at the preparatory classes at universities are presented in Table 4-14.

Table 4-14. Descriptive table of self-efficacy levels of English instructors

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Field-specific stress factors	Provincial	77	2.08	.66	.075
	Metropolitan	74	2.02	.75	.087
	Total	151	2.05	.70	.057
Organizational stress factors.	Provincial	77	2.82	.87	.099
	Metropolitan	74	2.86	.90	.105
	Total	151	2.84	.88	.072

According to the mean scores of factors under two headings of the questionnaires in Table 4-14, the English instructors who are working in provincial universities reported slightly higher level of stress in field-specific factors ($M=2.08$) than instructors who are working in metropolitan universities. However, English instructors who are working in metropolitan universities reported slightly higher level of stress in organizational stress factors ($M=2.86$) than instructors who are working in provincial universities.

A one-way analysis of variance indicated that since none of the values is less than .05, there are no significant differences between the sub-scales in terms of working in metropolitan or provincial universities. In other words, it can be said that instructors working at provincial universities experience more/less stress than those working at metropolitan universities. ANOVA results were presented in Table 4-15.

Table 4-15. ANOVA Results- Stress levels of English instructors in provincial and metropolitan universities.

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Field_mean	Between Groups	.137	1	.137	.272	.603
	Within Groups	75.322	149	.506		
	Total	75.459	150			
Org_Mean	Between Groups	.053	1	.053	.067	.796
	Within Groups	118.260	149	.794		
	Total	118.313	150			

4.9. Results related to research question 9.

“What are the correlation between teacher stress factors and self-efficacy?”

Pearson correlation coefficient was used to find out if there is any statistical relationship between all the variables in the current study. The results are given in Table 4-16.

The self-efficacy level of English language instructors in student engagement showed a statistically high significant correlation of a medium level with self-efficacy level in classroom management (.409, $p < .01$) and again with self-efficacy levels in using instructional strategies(.373, $p < .01$). However, there was a highly significant but small and negative relation between student engagement and field specific stress factors (-.215, $p < .01$), and a significant but small and negative relationship with organizational stress factors(-.174, $p < .05$).

Table 4-16. Correlation between teacher stress factors and self-efficacy

	1	2	3	4	5
1.Student engagement	1	.409**	.373**	-.215**	-.174*
		.000	.000	.008	.033
		150	150	150	150
2.Classroom management		1	.506**	-.132	-.222**
			.000	.107	.006
			150	150	150
3.Instructional Strategies			1	-.071	-.222**
				.391	.006
				150	150
4.Field specific stress factors				1	.303**
					.000
					151
5.Organizational stress factors					1

*p<.05. **p<.01

The self-efficacy levels of English language instructors in classroom management had a strong positive and highly significant relationship with the level of self-efficacy in instructional strategies (.506 $p<.01$); and a small but highly significant negative relationship with organizational stress factors (-.222, $p<.01$), however it did not have a significant relationship with field specific stress factors (.132).

A highly significant but small and negative correlation was found between the self-efficacy levels of English language instructors in using instructional strategies and organizational stress factors (-.222, $p<.01$). Moreover there was a highly significant medium and positive relationship between field specific stress factors and organizational stress factors (.303, $p<.01$).

CHAPTER V

5. Discussion and Conclusions

This chapter provides an overview of most noticeable or important research findings spreading out from the research. Previous chapters the results of the questionnaires were analyzed statistically and now in order to discuss findings for each of the research questions ,comparison are drawn with previous literature on teacher self efficacy and teacher stress factors. Finally, some recommendations and implications for further research studies will be proposed before the delimitations and limitations of the study are presented.

5.1. Discussion of results related to research question 1.

The results of the present study showed that the participants had a high level of efficacy in classroom management strategies ($M= 7.27$). However, compared with the high level of efficacy in using classroom management strategies, the participants reported to feel less capable in student engagement strategies ($M=5.91$). This finding may indicate that the English language instructors feel more efficacious in establishing a classroom management system with each group of students through getting the students follow classroom rules in their classroom and dealing with the behavioral problems of the students. This may depend upon their old whole education life in which the teacher is the authority; the English language instructors in this study may therefore be familiar with the old disciplinary methods. Rakıcıoğlu (2005) also reported a similar result that EFL pre-service teachers are not so comfortable for their own efficacy since they depend on authority in their learning process. Another finding revealed that English language instructors feel less capable in student engagement, this may be

resulted from that many students may have spent their whole education career being told what to do all the time, constantly presented with work that has included minimal elements of choice. Moreover, in communicative approach where the students have a voice on what to learn and how to learn, the students may have difficulty in adapting themselves to this approach. Kırkgöz (2009) also suggested that with curriculum reform in 1997, the changes in Turkish Foreign language education system and the recent policies created a need to give importance on teacher development opportunities for practicing teachers so as to raise teaching efficiency, and to ensure that teachers can adequately implement the curriculum objectives.

5.2. Discussion of results related to research question 2.

The results of the present study indicate that the mean score of females related to self-efficacy level of Student Engagement is higher ($M = 5.93$) than males. In addition to this, the mean score of females related to self-efficacy level of Classroom Management, is slightly higher ($M = 7.32$). However, ANOVA results indicate that there were no significant gender differences among English instructors. This finding was in line with Külekçi (2011). Çakır (2005) also reported that there was no significant difference between gender and self-efficacy perceptions. Several studies also indicate that efficacy beliefs do not differential according to gender (Akbaş & Çelikkaleli, 2006; Akbulut, 2006) and it also contradicts the findings of some studies (Morgil et al, 2004; Çapri & Çelikkaleli, 2008). Although Akkoyulu and Orhan (2003) found no significant relationship between gender and self efficacy levels, when descriptive statistics were considered, male students' self efficacy scores were higher than females.

5.3 Discussion of results related to research question 3.

Descriptive analyses of the study showed that the English instructors who have master's degree reported the highest level of self-efficacy of all the subscales (Efficacy in Student Engagement, Efficacy in Instructional Strategies, Efficacy in Classroom

Management) and ANOVA results also indicate that MA graduates report themselves as being more efficacious in student engagement than PhD graduates. However, this result cannot be generalized because the limited number of participants who have a doctoral degree.

5.4. Discussion of results related to research question 4.

According to the mean scores of factors under three headings of the questionnaires, the English instructors who are working in metropolitan universities reported slightly higher level of self-efficacy of all the subscales; Efficacy in Student Engagement ($M=5.98$), Efficacy in Classroom Management (7.30). Efficacy in Instructional Strategies ($M=7.28$). This may be due to the fact that English language instructors who work at metropolitan universities take the advantage of the good working conditions and more facilities and they have a chance to develop their content knowledge and teaching ability.

5.5. Discussion of results related to research question 5.

The instructors rated themselves as they feel more stressed about organizational factors ($M=2.84$) than field-specific factors ($M = 2.05$). The organizational stress factors can be listed such as long working hours, role conflict, the assessment of written and oral performance, inadequate services, too much paperwork, inadequate physical conditions, overcrowded classes which are mostly set up by the institution or administrators and thus are beyond the control of English language teachers.

5.6. Discussion of results related to research question 6.

When the English instructors' total stress scores and genders were considered, the mean score of females related to field-specific stress factors is lower than males.

However, the mean score of females related to organizational stress factors is slightly higher than males. However, ANOVA results showed that there were no significant gender differences among English instructors in the subscales. Şenyüz (1999) reported that there was differences between male and females depending on the job itself. Kumaş (2008) in his study found a significant difference ($p \leq 0.05$), females teachers experienced more stress than males. However, the fact that the number of participants in each gender group is not evenly distributed in this study made it impossible to make any generalization.

5.7. Discussion of results related to research question 7.

Descriptive statistics showed that English instructors who have a doctoral degree reported the highest level of stress both in field-specific factors and in organizational factors. However ANOVA results indicated no significant differences between education levels. Other research showed a slightly different pattern. In a study by Kumaş (2008), teachers who have bachelor degree found to have less stress levels than others, however teachers who have master's degree showed a higher level of stress than others. By extension, the English language instructors who have a doctoral degree may experience more stress as they specialize in their field their expectations also increase so they feel more stressed compared to other participants. Moreover, this may resulted from that the instructors who have PhD are most likely engaged in their work

5.8. Discussion of results related to research question 8.

The present study indicates that the English instructors who are working in provincial universities reported slightly higher level of stress in field-specific factors ($M=2.08$) than instructors who are working in metropolitan universities. The English language instructors may experience more stress caused by field specific factors because the students at provincial universities generally do not get the responsibility if their own learning such as lack of systematic study habits, bringing no materials to the

classroom, the teachers therefore do the learning. However, English instructors who are working in metropolitan universities reported slightly higher level of stress in organizational stress factors ($M=2.86$) than instructors who are working in provincial universities. This may be because of the universities' requirements for the instructors such as seminar, conferences, too much paperwork.

5.9. Discussion of results related to research question 9.

Stress and self efficacy level of teachers have been investigated much but more separately. In this study regarding the relationship between English instructors 'stress levels and self efficacy levels, the analyses only exhibited significant but small and negative relation between the self efficacy levels in student engagement and field specific stress factors ($-.215, p<.01$), and a significant but small and negative relationship with organizational stress factors ($-.174, p<.05$) and the self efficacy levels in student engagement. In a study done by Schwarzer and Hallum (2008) findings showed that there was a negative relationship between self efficacy of teaching and stress. Several studies also indicate that self efficacy is related to stress (Jex&Gudanowski, 1992); Dijk, 2009). Teachers with low self-efficacy beliefs experience more stress than their colleagues (Betoret, 2006; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007).

5.11 Conclusion

This research study aimed to understand and examine better teacher self efficacy and stress levels of ESL instructors who work at the state universities. Another purpose of this study was to evaluate the influence of some variable such as; gender, education level on self efficacy and stress, and the differences between teacher self efficacy and stress levels of ESL instructors who work at the state universities.

The scales used in the study were; Stress Factors Questionnaire for English Language Instructors (Petek, 2008), English Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (ETSES) (Chaco'n, 2005). The sample size of the research was 151 English instructors who at Turkish state universities in Zonguldak, Bolu, Karabük, İzmir, Istanbul, and Ankara took part in this study.

In order to analyze quantitative data, SPSS 19.0 (Statistical Package of Social Sciences) was used. Then the results were presented under three factors; gender, education level and working in metropolitan or provincial universities .The correlation between stress level and self efficacy levels of English instructors working at Turkish state universities and the differences between self efficacy and stress levels in terms of working in metropolitan or provincial universities were also interpreted and presented.

The results showed that when the current teacher self-efficacy levels of English language instructors working at the preparatory classes at universities considered, the instructors rated themselves as more efficacious in classroom management strategies than in instructional strategies and student engagement strategies Moreover, the study also revealed that English instructors who have master's degree had a higher level of self efficacy in student engagement than who have Bachelor degree. On the other hand, there were no significant differences either in gender or working in metropolitan or provincial universities among English instructors in the subscales.

The English language instructors working at preparatory classes at universities in Turkey rated themselves more stressful about organizational stress factors than field-specific stress factors. The study showed that there were no significant education level or gender differences among English instructors in the subscales. In the same way, there were no significant differences between the sub-scales in terms of working in metropolitan or provincial universities.

The results of the study also revealed that the instructors who scored higher in student engagement subscale also scored higher in classroom management and using instructional strategies subscales. And, it also lowers the stress levels caused by

organizational factors; however it has no impact on stress level related field specific factors.

The current study also showed that the instructors who scored higher in classroom management also scored higher in and using instructional strategies. Moreover, having higher self-efficacy in classroom management also lowers the stress levels caused by organizational factors; however it has no impact on stress level related field specific factors.

The stress levels of English language instructors caused by field specific stress factors and organizational stress factors reduced as the self efficacy levels of English language instructors in using instructional strategies increased. Moreover the stress levels of English language instructors caused by field specific stress factors and organizational stress factors were affected each other positively.

5.12. Pedagogical Implications

In the light of Bandura's (1977) theory, this study on self efficacy is important because teachers' judgments about their teaching competence influence English language teachers' pedagogical success. The relationship between teacher self-efficacy and English language proficiency highlights the importance of preparing teachers who are competent across language skills.

As research suggests that TSE beliefs develop early in the teaching career and are resistant to change thereafter (Tschannen- Moran et al., 1998), the importance of teaching education programs in universities should be highlighted. Furthermore, because research suggests that teacher self efficacy increases with ongoing teaching supervision (Prieto et al., 2007), departments may wish to provide further supervision beyond the standard required 1 year for the senior students and may lengthen this compulsory internship. This could provide young teachers with an opportunity to have teaching experience are worthwhile addition to a teacher education program.

A highly self-efficacious English instructor is likely to start working with positive beliefs and possibly will more easily overlook a one-time problem and stay engaged for a long time. For such reasons, coordinators and faculty may need to place more focused attention on developing self efficacy beliefs for the English language teachers by providing psychiatrists or psychologists in the content area. Having professional people to talk to about how you're doing and what problems you're facing is helpful ,they can also help teachers figure out how to deal with problems that come up because of stress or low self efficacy level and a professional team work with teachers to deal with the problems different angles can help teachers. Moreover exploiting and developing courses for English language teachers, focusing on teachers' knowledge base may help increase teacher self efficacy levels.

According to the results of this study, some of the major sources of stress for teachers of English language were similar to those mentioned in the literature for other groups of teachers, namely issues such as student's low motivation, students' misbehavior (Kyriacou 2001; Jenkins & Calhoun 1991; Fimian 1987), unsupportive parents and competitive atmosphere among colleagues (Wootton 1993). This can also again highlight the important role of pre-service teacher training courses in identifying and addressing the issue of stress, and also in preparing special programs to focus on those areas that are more exclusive to English language teachers. Special counseling and support can further be given to English language teachers to address those areas that are of more concern to English language teachers.

In order to cope with stress factors and minimize the results of it, university departments may organize in-service training programs for the English language instructors and ensure regular participation in these kinds of activities. Also the university departments can use the services of professionals like counselors to identify the symptoms of stress in teachers well in advance.

In order to overcome the stress factors caused from organizational factors, the administrators should be chosen among more experienced and competent teachers. Because the administrations play an important role in creating a supportive atmosphere

among workers and also the supervisors should engage them in group works to maintain close relationships and open communications and ensure the employees stay connected this will lead to less level of stress and higher level of self efficacy.

Physical conditions of workplace are a source of stress. Working conditions are important not only for the employees' comfort and convenience but also for the good job performance so administrators may wish to provide good working conditions.

There is need for employees to be involved in decision-making process of their organization. This will make them feel that they are not only part of the organization, but their contributions are also vital to organizational success thus English language teachers will feel less stressed and lower stress levels may increase their self efficacy levels.

5.13. Directions for future research

As mentioned in the introduction of this dissertation, there are a number of limitations to the current study, each one of which provides an opportunity for future studies. First, the sample size of this study was limited to the English Preparatory Schools of seven universities in Turkey, further studies, involving larger sample sizes would be more representative about the stress and self efficacy levels of all English instructors. Second, because this study based on a quantitative method, it is not possible to make conclusion about an insider perspective. Hence, more qualitative studies may be needed to sharpen and broaden our knowledge about teacher self-efficacy and stress factors. Future research should continue deeper examinations of the specifics of teacher self-efficacy and stress factors in different contexts. Finally, the current study was based on cross-sectional data: however, the constructs that form the central core of dissertation are open to change in the course of time. Thus, it would be advisable conduct longitudinal studies that would trace any changes in the self efficacy and stress factors among the English instructors who work at the preparatory classes of universities.

REFERENCES

- A.R. Elangovan (2001), Causal ordering of stress, satisfaction and commitment, and intention to quit: a structural equations analysis. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(4), 159-165.
- Adams, E. 2001. 'A proposed causal model of vocational teacher stress. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 53/2: 223-246.
- Akat, İ., Budak, G.ve Budak, G. (1994). *İşletme yönetimi*.(1st.ed.) İstanbul: Beta
- Akbaş, A. and Çelikkaleli, Ö. (2006). Sınıf Öğretmenliği Adaylarının Fen Öğretimi Öz-Yeterlik İnançlarının Cinsiyet, Öğretim Türü ve Üniversitelere Göre İncelenmesi. *Mersin Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2 (1), 98-110.
- Akbulut, E. (2006). Müzik Öğretmeni Adaylarının Mesleklerine İlişkin Öz-Yeterlik İnançları. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3 (2), 24-33.
- Akkoyunlu, B. ve Orhan, F. (2003). "Bilgisayar ve Öğretim Teknolojileri Eğitimi (BÖTE) Bölümü Öğrencilerinin Bilgisayar Kullanma Öz Yeterlik inancı ile Demografik Özellikleri Arasındaki ilişki". *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 2 (3), 86-93.
- Aksoy, A., Kutluca, F. (2006). "Çalışma Hayatında Stres Kaynakları, Stres Belirtileri ve Stres Sonuçlarının İncelenmesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma". Retrived from <http://www.iudergi.com/tr/index.php/sosyalsiyaset/article/viewfile/473/429> on 15.02.12.
- Aktuna, S. D. (1998). The Spread of English in Turkey and its Current Sociolinguistic Profile. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 19(1),24-39.

- Aliş, E. (2008). *Yıldız teknik üniversitesi yabancı diller yüksek okulu temel ingilizce bölümü öğretim elemanlarının mesleki deneyimlerinin ve ingilizce öz yeterlik inançlarının iletişimsel dil öğretimine karşı tutumlarına etkisi*. İstanbul; Yıldız Teknik University, Institute of Social Sciences, Educational Programs and Teaching Programs, M.A thesis.
- Allinder, R. M. (1994). The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 17, 86–95.
- Anderson, R., Greene, M., & Loewen, P. (1988). Relationships among teachers' and students' thinking skills, sense of efficacy, and student achievement. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 34, 148-165.
- Arnold, H. J., and Feldman. (1986.) *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Ashton, P. & Webb, R. (1986). *Making a difference: Teacher's sense of efficacy and student achievement*. Longman, Inc.: White Plains, NY.)
- Atılboz, N. G. (2007). *Öğrenme halkası modelinin biyoloji öğretmen adaylarının difüzyon ve osmoz konularını öğrenmeleri, biyoloji öğretimine yönelik özyeterlik inançları ve tutumları üzerine etkileri*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Austin, V., Shah, S. & S. Muncer. 2005. 'Teacher stress and coping strategies used to reduce stress.' *Occupational Therapy International*, 12/2, 63-80.
- Azar A. (2010). In-service and pre-service secondary science teachers' self-efficacy beliefs about science teaching. *Educational Research and Reviews* .Vol. 5(4), pp. 175-188.
- Balcı, A. (2000). *İş stresi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın, Dağıtım.

- Baltaş, A.ve Baltaş Z. (1999). *Stres ve başa çıkma yolları*. (19.edt.) İstanbul: Remzi.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice- Hall, Inc.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development. Vol. 6*. Six theories of child development (pp. 1-60). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28 (2), 117-148).
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: the exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 1(2), 164-180.
- Bandura, A., Caprara, G.V., Barbaranelli, C., Gerbino, M. & Pastorelli, C. (2003). Role of Affective Self-Regulatory Efficacy in Diverse Spheres of Psychosocial Functioning. *Child Development*, 74(3), 769-782.
- Barnes, B.L., Agago, M.O., & Coombs, W. T. (1998). Effects of job related stress on faculty intension to leave academic. *Research in Higher Education*.
- Betoret, F. D. (2006). Stressors, self-efficacy, coping resources, and burnout among secondary school teachers in Spain. *Educational Psychology*, 26, 519–539.
- Betoret, F. D. (2006). Stressors, self-efficacy, coping resources, and burnout among secondary school teachers in Spain. *Educational Psychology*, 26, 519–539.

- Bland, J. M. (1999), A New Approach to Management of Stress, *Journal of Industrial and Commercial Training*, 31(2): 44-48.
- Bong, M., & Clark, R. (1999). Comparison between self-concept and self-efficacy in academic motivation research. *Educational Psychologist*, 34, 139-153.
- Borg, M. G. (1990). Occupational stress in British educational settings: A review. *Educational Psychology*, 10, 103–126.
- Boyle, G. J., Borg, M. G., Falzon, J. M., & Baglioni, A. J. (1995). A structural model of the dimensions of teacher stress. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, (65), 49-67.
- Braham, B. J (1998). *Stres yönetimi*. (Çev, Vedat Diker) İstanbul: Hayat
- Bress, P. (2006). Beating stress: Creating happiness and well-being in in TEFL. *Modern English Teacher*, 15/ 3, 5-13.
- Broadfoot, P.(1990). Research on teachers: Towards A comparative methodology. *Comparative Education*, 26, No. 2/3, 165-169.
- Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 239–253.
- Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2003). A test of the factorial validity of the Teacher Efficacy Scale. *Research in Education*, 69, 67-80
- Brown, J. D., & Rodgers, T. S. (2002). *Doing second language research*. Oxford (England), New York: Oxford University Pres.
- Brown, J., Davis, S., & Johnson, F. (2002). *Teachers on teaching – A survey of the teaching profession*. UK: Market & Opinion Research International.

- Buchanan, D. and Huczynski, A. (2004), *Organizational Behaviour: An Introductory Text* (5th ed.), Pearson Education Ltd, Harlow.
- Burke, R. J., Greenglass, E. R., & Schwarzer, R. (1996). Predicting teacher burnout over time: Effects of work stress, social support, and self-doubt on burnout and its consequences. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping. An International Journal*, 9 (3).
- Çakır, Ö. (2005). Anadolu Üniversitesi Açık Öğretim Fakültesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği Lisans Programı ve Eğitim Fakülteleri İngilizce Öğretmenliği Lisans Programı Öğrencilerinin Mesleğe Yönelik Tutumları ve Mesleki Yeterlik Algıları. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitimi Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6 (9), 27-42.
- Çakıroğlu E. & Işıksal M. (2009). Preservice Elementary Teachers' Attitudes and Self-efficacy Beliefs toward Mathematics. *Education and Science*. Vol. 34, No 151.132-139.
- Canessa, L. (2006). Foreign language anxiety: A close look at nonnative foreign language teachers. In Schwarzer, D., Bloom, M. & Shono, S. (Eds), *Research as a Tool for Empowerment: Theory Informing Practice*, 3–29. Greenwich, Conn.: Information Age.
- Capel, S. A. (1991). A longitudinal study of burnout in teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, (61), 36-45.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Borgogni, L., & Steca, P. (2003). Efficacy beliefs as determinants of teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, 821–832.
- Caprara, G.V., Barbranelli, C., Steca, P., Malone, P.S. (2006). Teachers' Self-Efficacy Beliefs as Determinants of Job Satisfaction and Students' Academic Achievement: A Study at the School Level. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44 (6), 473-490.

- Çapri, A., Çelikkaleli, Ö. (2008). Öğretmen Adaylarının Öğretmenliğe İlişkin Tutum ve Mesleki Yeterlik İnançlarının Cinsiyet, Program ve Fakültelerine Göre İncelenmesi. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 9 (15), 33-53.
- Chaco'n, C. T. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teacher in middle schools in Venezuela. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(3), 257-272.
- Chang, C. (2006). Foreign language classroom: Voices from nonnative teachers. In Schwarzer, D., Bloom, M. & Shono, S. (Eds), *Research as a tool for empowerment: Theory informing practice*, 31–52. Greenwich, Conn.: Information Age Pub.
- Chen, JC, Silverthorne, C., Hung, JY. (2006), Organization communication, job stress, organizational commitment, and job performance of accounting professionals in Taiwan and America, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27 (4), 242-249
- Christo, B. and Pienaar, J. (2006), South Africa Correctional Official Occupational Stress: The Role of Psychological Strengths, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(1): 73-84.
- Chwalisz, K. D., Altmaier, E. M., & Russell, D. W. (1992). Causal attributions, self-efficacy cognitions, and coping with stress. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 11, 377–400.
- Claxton, G. (1989). *Being a teacher: A positive approach to change and stress*. London: Cassell Educational Limited.
- Cohen, J. and Single, L. E. (2001), An Examination of the Perceived Impact of Flexible Work Arrangement on Professional Opportunities in Public Accounting, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 32(4): 317-9.

- Coladarci, T. (1992). Teachers' sense of efficacy and commitment to teaching. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 60(4), 323–337.
- Collingwood, J. (2007). The Physical Effects of Long-Term Stress. Psych Central. Retrieved on February 15, 2012, from <http://psychcentral.com/lib/2007/the-physical-effects-of-long-term-stress/>.
- Cooper, C., U. Rout and B. Faragher. 1989. "Mental Health, Job Satisfaction, and Job Stress Among General Practitioners", *B Medical Journal*, 298,366-370.
- Çopur , D. Ş. (2008). *Teacher effectiveness in initial years of service: A case study on the graduates of METU foreign language education program*. Ph.D. Thesis. Ankara : Middle East Technical University Social Sciences.
- Coşkuner, M. (2001). *Turkish provincial state university teachers' perceptions of English language teaching as a career*. Unpublished M.A thesis. Ankara: Bilkent University.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. London: Sage Publications.
- Crystal , D. (1997). *English As A Global Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cüceloğlu, D. (1993). *İnsan ve davranış*. (4th .ed.) İstanbul: Remzi
- Cummins R.C. 1990. "Job stress and the buffering effort of supervisory support", *Group and Organizational Studies*, 15(1), pp.92-104.
- Dellinger, A. B., Bobbettb, J.J., Olivier, D.F., & Chad D. E.(2007). Measuring teacher self-efficacy beliefs: Development and use of the TEBS-Self. *Teaching and Teacher Education*

- Dembo, M. & Gibson, S. (1985). Teachers' sense of efficacy: An important factor in school improvement. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86 (2), 173-184.
- Demircan, Ö. (1998). *Dünden bugüne Türkiye'de yabancı dil*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitapevi.
- Demirel, M. & Akkoyunlu, B. (2010). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin öz-yeterlik inançları ve tutumları. Uluslararası Öğretmen Yetistirme Politikaları ve Sorunları Sempozyumu II Bildiriler Kitabı, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Beytepe. Ankara, 16-18 Mayıs.
- Denzine, G. M., Cooney, J. B., & McKenzie, R. (2005). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Teacher Efficacy Scale for prospective teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 689-708.
- Dick, R. V. & Wagner, U. (2001). Stress and strain in teaching: A structural equation approach. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 71, 243- 259
- DiStefano, C., Hess, B. (2006). Using confirmatory factor analysis for construct validation: an empirical review. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 23, 225-241. doi: 10.1177/073428290502300303
- Emmer & Hickman, (1991). Teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 51, 755-765.
- Ercan, S. (2007). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin bilimsel süreç beceri düzeyleri ile fen bilgisi öz yeterlik düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması (Uşak ili örneği)*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyonkarahisar.
- Eren, E., (2000), *Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi*, (6th .ed.) Beta, İstanbul.
- Ertekin, Y, (1993), *Stres ve Yönetim*, TODAİE Yayınları No:253; Ankara.

- Eslami, Z. R. and Fatahi, A. (2008). Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy, English Proficiency, and Instructional Strategies: A Study of Nonnative English language Teachers in Iran. *TESL-EJ*, 11 (4)
- Esteve, J. M. (2000). The transformation of the teachers' role at the end of the twentieth century: New challenges for the future. *Educational Review*, 52, 197-207.
- Fang, Y. (2001), "Turnover propensity and its causes among Singapore nurses: an empirical study", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12 (5), 859-871.
- Fletcher, J.B., & Payne, R. 1980). "Stress and Work: A Review and Theoretical Framework", 1, *Personnel Review*, 9, 1-20.
- Forlin, C. (1997). Teachers' perceptions of the stress associated with inclusive education and their methods of coping. Paper presented in the 21st National Conference of the Australian Association of Special Education. Brisbane, 25-28 September.
- Freeman, D. (1993). Renaming experience/reconstructing practice: Developing new understandings of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9(5/6), 485–497.
- Friesen, D., & Sarros, J. C. (1989). Sources of burnout among educators. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 10, 179-188.
- Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. London: Casell Ed.Ltd.
- Gerçek C, Yılmaz M, Köseoglu P, Soran H.(2006). Biology Teaching Self-Efficacy Beliefs of the Teacher Candidates. *Ankara University, Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, vol: 39, no: 1 , 57-73.
- Ghaith, G., & Yaghi, H. (1997). Relationships among experience, teacher efficacy, and attitudes towards the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14, 451–458.

- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: a construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(4), 569–582.
- Gmelch, W. H. (1993). *Coping with faculty stress*. California: Sage Publications.
- Goddard, R. G., Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 479–508.
- Güçlü, N. (2001). Stres yönetimi. *G. Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21(1), 91-109.
- Güney, S., (2001), Yönetim ve Organizasyon, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
- Guskey, T. R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4, 63–69.
- Guskey, T.R and Passaro, P.D. (1994). Teacher Efficacy: A study of Construct Dimensions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31 (3). (Autumn), 627-643.
- Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J W, Jr. (2009). Principles of Organizational Behavior.7, Workplace Stress And Aggresion.546,186-220.
- Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J W, Jr., Woodman, R.W.(1995).*Organizational Behaviour*. St.Paul: West publishing company.8,235-262
- Hock, R. R.(1988). Professional burnout among public school teachers.*Public Personnel Management*, 17/2,167-189
- Horwitz, E. K., & Young, D. J. (Eds.). (1991). *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Housego, B.E.J. (1991). Monitoring student teachers' feelings of preparedness to teach, personal teaching efficacy and teaching efficacy in a new secondary teacher education program. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 38 (1), 49-64.)
- Hsiao H.C, Chang, J.C, Tu Y.L, Chen S.C (2011) The Influence of Teachers' Self-efficacy on Innovative Work Behavior. International Conference on Social Science and Humanity IPEDR vol.5 (2011) IACSIT Press, Singapore
- Işıkhan, V. (2001). Çalışma hayatında stres olgusu ve başa çıkma yolları. *İşveren Dergisi*, 39, 27-30.
- Ivancevich, J., & Matteson, M. (1990). *Organizational behaviour and management*. Boston:BPI/Irwin. 6,218-247
- Jarvis, M. (2002). Teacher stress: A critical review of recent findings and suggestions for future research directions. *Stress News: The UK Journal of the International Stress Management Association*, 14(1), 12–16.
- Jenkins, S. & J. Calhoun. 1991. 'Teacher stress: issues and intervention'. *Psychology in the Schools*, 28: 60 - 70.
- Jepson, E., & Forrest, S. (2006). Individual contributory factors in teacher stress: The role of achievement striving and occupational commitment. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 183–197.
- Jex, S., & Gudanowski, D. (1992). Efficacy beliefs and work stress: an exploratory study. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 13, 509-517.
- John P. Meyer., Natalie J. Allen (1991), A three component conceptualization of organizaitonal commitment.*Human Resource Management Review*, 1 (1), 61-89.

- Johnson, K. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10, 439–452.
- Joseph, R. (2000). *Stress Free Teaching, A Practical Guide to Tackling Stress in Teaching, Lecturing and Tutoring*. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*, University of Illinois Press; 2nd edition.
- Kaner S.(2010).Examining Teachers’ Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Students With and Without Special Needs. *Ankara University, Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*. vol: 43, no: 1, 193-217
- Karakuş F. and Akbulut Ö. E.(2010).The Effect Of Secondary School Teachers’ Preparation Program On The Pre-service Teachers’ Self-efficacy Beliefs. *Necatibey Faculty of Education Electronic Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*. Vol. 4, Issue 2,110-129.
- Kassabgy, O., Boraie, D., & Schmidt, R. (2001). Values, rewards and job satisfactions in ESL/English language . In Z. Dornyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (Technical Report no. 23, pp. 213–237). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai’i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Centre.
- Kim, S. (2004). ‘When and how to resolve language issues of non-native-English-speaking teachers- in-preparation in TESOL programs’. *NNEST Newsletter, TESOL* 6/2.
- Kirkcaldy B. D., Trimpoo R. M. and Williams S. (2002), Occupational Stress and Healthy Outcomes Among British and German Managers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*,17(6): 491-505.

- Kızıltepe, Z. (2007). Teacher occupational stress in İstanbul. In Gates, G. (ed), Emerging thought and research on student, teacher, and administrator stress and coping (131- 142). Greenwich: Information Age Pub.
- Klassen, et al., (2009). Exploring the validity of a teachers' self-efficacy scale in five countries, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 34, 67–76.
- Kristensen, T. S. (1999). Challenges for research and prevention in relation to work and cardiovascular diseases. *Scandinavian Journal of Work Environment Health*, 25, 550-557.
- Kruger J, & Dunning D (1999). Unskilled and unaware of it: how difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessments. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 77 (6), 1121-34 PMID: 10626367
- Külekçi, G.(2011). A Study on Pre-service English Teachers' Self - efficacy Beliefs Depending on Some Variables. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(1), 245-260
- Kumaş, V. (2008). *Öğretmenlerin iş doyum düzeyleri ile stres düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki*. M.A Thesis. Yeditepe University Social Sciences. İstanbul.
- Kyriacou, C. (1987). Teacher stress and burnout: an international review. *Educational Research*, 29, 2, 146-152.
- Kyriacou, C. (2001). 'Teacher stress: directions for future research.' *Educational Review*, 53/1: 27–35.
- Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. (1978). A model of teacher stress. *Educational Studies*, 4(1), 1–6.
- Labone, E. (2004). Teacher efficacy: Maturing the construct through research in alternative paradigms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 341–359.

- Labone, E. (2004). Teacher efficacy: Maturing the construct through research in alternative paradigms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 341-359.
- LaLopa, J.M. (1997) The prediction of organizational commitment and turnover in resort jobs, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 21, 2, 11-26.
- Larchick, R., & Chance, E. W. (2004). Teacher Performance And Personal Life Stressors: Implications For Urban School Administrators. *National Forum Of Teacher Education Journal, Electronic Volume*, 14e, Number 3. 19-30
- Lazarus, R., & Folkman, R. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping*. New York: Springer.
- LeDoux, J. E. (1998). *The Emotional Brain: the mysterious underpinnings of emotional life*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Leka, S., Griffiths, A., & Cox, T.(2003). Systematic problem approaches for employers, managers and trade union representatives. Work Organisation and Stress Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Losyk, B. (2006). Stresle başa çıkma yolları.(Çev, G.Engin). İstanbul: MESS YayınNo:506.
- Malik, M. E. Nawab, S., Naeem, B. & Danish, R. Q. (2010). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of University Teachers in Public Sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(6), 17-26.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who is worth more? *ELT Journal*, 46 (4): 340- 349.
- Midgley, C., Feldlaufer, H., & Eccles, J. (1989). Change in teacher efficacy and student self-and task-related beliefs in mathematics during the transition to junior high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81, 247–258.

- Mills, N. A. (2011). Teaching assistants' self-efficacy in teaching literature: Sources, personal assessments, and consequences. *Modern Language Journal* , 95, i.61-80.
- Milner, H. R. (2002). A case study of an experienced teacher's self-efficacy and persistence through crisis situations: Theoretical and practical considerations. *The High School Journal*, 86, 28–35.
- Morgil, İ ., Seçken, N. and Yücel, A.S. (2004). Kimya Öğretmeni Adaylarının Öz-Yeterlik İnançlarının Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. BAÜ, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi, 6 (1), 62-72.
- Mullock, B. (2009). Motivations and rewards in teaching English overseas : a portrait of expatriate TEFL teachers in South-East Asia, *Prospect*, v.24, no.2, 4-19.
- Murphy, L. R. (1995), Occupational Stress Management: Current Status and Future Directions, in Cooper, C. L., Rousseau, D. M. (Eds.), *Trends in Organisational Behaviour*, 1-14, John Wiley, Chichester.
- Murray, N. (2007), Irish Examiner Monday. 'Stress levels rising' among teachers. Retrieved from <http://archives.tcm.ie/irishexaminer/2007/04/09/story29945.asp>. On 10.02.2012.
- Myrtek, M., Fiehlert, A., Strittmatter, M., Brügger, G., (1999), "Stress and Strain of Blue and White collar Workers During Work and Leisure Time: Results of Psychophysiological and Behavioral Monitoring", *Applied Ergonomics*, (30), 341 - 351.
- Naylor, C. (2001). *Teacher workload and stress: An international perspective on human costs and systemic failure*. BCTF Research Report.
- Nelson and Quick (1994). *Organisational Behaviour Foundations: Realities and Challenges*, West Publishing Company, St. Paul, MN.

- Newstrom, John W. & Davis, Keith (1993). *Organizational Behavior: Human Behavior at Work*. New York: McGraw-Hill. 20,456-483
- Önkol, P. E. (2002). *Organizational stress factors of English instructors working at preparatory schools of public and private universities in Turkey*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Graduate School of Social Sciences. Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Ormrod, J. E. (2006). *Educational Psychology*. (5th Ed.) Pearson Prentice Hall: New Jersey.
- Ornelas, S. and Kleiner, B. H. (2003), New Development in Managing Job Related Stress. *Journal of Equal Opportunities International*,2(5): 64-70.
- Ortaçtepe, D. (2006). *The relationship between teacher efficacy and professional development within the scope of an in-service teacher education program*. M.A thesis. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Social Sciences.
- Ortony, A. (2002). On making believable emotional agents believable. In Trappl, R., Petta, P., and Payr, S., editors, *Emotions in Humans and Artifacts*, 189–211. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Özdemir, Y. (2003). *The role of classroom management efficacy, marital status, gender and teaching experience in predicting teacher burnout*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Graduate School of Social Sciences. Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Pajares, F. (2002). *Overview of social cognitive theory and of self-efficacy*. Retrieved 01.2012, from <http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/eff.html>
- Pennington, M. C. (1995). *Work satisfaction, motivation, and commitment in teaching English as a second language*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Luton, UK.

- Pennington, M.C., & Riley, V. (1991). A survey of job satisfaction in ESL: TESOL members respond to the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL*, 10(1), 37-55.
- Petek, E. (2008). *An investigation on stress factors and coping strategies of English instructors working at the English preparatory schools of METU and Ankara University*. M.A Thesis. Ankara: Middle East Technical University Social Sciences.
- Poston B. (2009).An Exercise in Personal Exploration: Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. *The Surgical Technologist*. August, 347-353.
- Prieto, L. R., Yamokoski, C. A., & Meyers, S. A. (2007). Teaching assistant training and supervision: An examination of optimal delivery modes and skill emphases. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 21, 33-43.
- Rafferty, A.E. & Griffin, M.A. (2006). Perceptions of organizational change: A stress and coping perspective. *Journal of applied psychology*, 91(5), 1154-1162.
- Rakıcioğlu, A.Ş (2005). *The Relationship between Epistemological Beliefs and Teacher-Efficacy Beliefs of English Language Teaching Trainees*. Abant İzzet Baysal University Institute Of Social Sciences, Bolu
- Rand (2012).Retrieved from <http://www.rand.org/about/history.html> on 10.09.2011.
- Ravichandran R. and Rajendran, R. (2007).Perceived Sources of Stress among the Teachers.*Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, January (33), No.1, 133-136.
- Rees, C. J. and Redfern, D. (2000), Recognizing the Perceived Causes of Stress. A Training and Development Perspective, *Journal of Industrial and Commercial Training*, 32(4): 120-127.

- Rosch P. J (2012). The American Institute of Stress (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.stress.org/topic-definition-stress.htm> on 02.02.2012.
- Ross, J. A. (1998). The antecedents and consequences of teacher efficacy. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching* (Vol. 7, pp. 49–73). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Russell, J. (2000). *Stress Free Teaching, A Practical Guide to Tackling Stress in Teaching, Lecturing and Tutoring*. London: Kogan Page Limited
- Şahinkaya, N. (2008). Türkiye-Finlandiya sınıf öğretmenliği matematik öğretimi programları, sınıf öğretmeni adayları ile öğretmenlerin öz-yetkinlik ve öğrenme-öğretme süreçleri açısından karşılaştırılması. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Şahin-Taşkın Ç. and Hacıömeroğlu G. (2010). Examining Elementary Preservice Teachers' Self-Efficacy Beliefs: Combination of Quantitative and Qualitative Methods. *Inonu University Journal Of The Faculty Of Education*. Volume. 11, Issue. 1, 21-40.
- Saracaloglu A. S. and Yenice N. (2009). Investigating The Self-Efficacy Beliefs Of Science and Elementary Teachers With Respect To Some Variables. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 5 (2):244-260.
- Schabracq, M. J. and Cooper, C. L. (2000), The Changing Nature of Work and Stress, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(3): 227-42.
- Schunk, D. H., & Meece, J. L. (2006). Self-efficacy development in adolescence. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents*, 71-96, Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

- Schwarzer, R. & Schmitz, G.S. (2005). *Perceived self-efficacy and teacher burnout: a longitudinal study in ten schools*. Research paper. Freie Universitat Berlin, Germany.
- Schwarzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: mediation analyses. *Applied Psychology: an international review*, 57, 152-171.
- Selye, H.(1976).*Stress in Health and Disease*. Reading (Mass.): Butterworths.
- Şenyüz, A. (1999). *Feminin ve maskulin mesleklerde algılanan iş doyum ve stres düzeylerinin cinsiyetler açısından incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Sharif, B. ,A. (2000).Understanding and Managing Job Stress: A Vital Dimension of Workplace Violence Prevention. *The International Electronic Journal of Health Education*, 2000; 3(2):107-116.
- Sheena J., Cary C., Sue C., Ian D., Paul T., Clare M. 2005. “The experience of work-related stress across occupations”, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(2), 178-187.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99, 611–625.
- Smith, A., Brice, C., Collins, A., Matthews, V., & McNamara, R. (2000). The scale of occupational stress: A further analysis of the impact of demographic factors and type of job (Contract Research Report 3.11/2000). Sudbury: Health and Safety Executive. HSE Books.

- Smith, C.S., Sulsky, L.M., & Uggerslev, K. L. (2002). Effects of job stress on mental and physical health. In J.C. Thomas & M. Hersen (Eds.). *Handbook of Mental Health in the Workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications).
- Smith, E., Anderson, J. L., & Lovrich, N. P. (1995). The multiple sources of workplace stress among land-grant university faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 36, 261-282.
- Smylie, M. A. (1988). The enhancement function of staff development: Organizational and psychological antecedents to individual teacher change. *American Educational Research Journal*, 25, 1–30.
- Soodak, L. C., & Podell, D. M. (1997). Efficacy and experience: perceptions of efficacy among preservice and practicing teachers. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 30(4), 214–221.
- Squires, G. Ed. Urban Sprawl: Causes, Consequences, & Policy Responses. The Urban Institute Press (2002)
- Stein, M. K., & Wang, M. C. (1988). Teacher development and school improvement: The process of teacher change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4, 171–187.
- Swick, K. J., & Hanley, P. E(1980). *Stress and the Classroom Teacher*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Tarakçıoğlu, S. (2004). Bursa yöresindeki konaklama işletmesi yöneticilerinin stress nedenleri üzerine bir araştırma. *Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 2, 183-201
- TC Başbakanlık, DPT. (1994).Yedinci beş yıllık kalkınma planı özel ihtisas komisyonu raporu, “kırsal sanayi” Ankara. p.19

- Tehrani, N. (2002), *Managing Organisational Stress*, CIPD. Retrieved on February 14, 2012, from www.cipd.co.uk.
- Tercanlioğlu, L. 2005. Pre-Service English language Teachers' Beliefs about Foreign Language Learning and How They Relate to Gender. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*. 5/1, 145-162.
- The Law on Higher Education (1981). Law No 2547.
- Thompson, C. J., & Dey, E. L. (1998). Pushed to the margins: Sources of stress for African American college and university faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 69, 324-345.
- Topper, E. F. (2007), Stress in the Library, *Journal of New Library*, 108(11/12): 561-564.
- Travers, C. J., & Cooper, C. L. (1993). Mental health, job satisfaction and occupational stress among UK teachers. *Work & Stress*, 7(3), 203–219.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 944-956.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A.W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783-805.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202-248.
- Tudor, I. (1993). 'Teacher roles in the learner- centered classroom'. *ELT Journal* 47/1: 22-31.
- Ullman, J.B. (2007). Structural equation modelling. In Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L. Using multivariate statistics. 5th edition. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

- Ünal, S. (1999). Okullardaki stres kaynakları verimlilik ilişkisi. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 11, 365-372
- Vecchio, R. P. (1988). *Organizational behaviour*. New York: Dryden Press.
- Viner, R. (1999). An international review of research in the social dimensions of science and technology. *Social Studies of Science*, 29(3), 391–399.
- Wheatley, K. F. (2005). The case for reconceptualizing teacher efficacy research. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 747–766.
- Wilkerson, C. (2000). Attrition of foreign language teachers: workplace realities. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33, 31-35.
- Williams, J. C., and Huber, G. P. (1986). *Human Behavior in Organizations*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing.
- Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 81–91.
- Woolfolk-Hoy, A., & Burke-Spero, R. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(4), 343-356.
- Yılmaz K. Çokluk-Bökeoğlu Ö. (2008). Primary School Teachers' Belief of Efficacy Ankara University, *Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*. vol: 41, no: 2, 143-167.
- Yükseköğretim Kanunu (1981). 2547. Resmi Gazete. 17506,5/21,3.
- Zehir Topkaya, Ece and Yavuz, Aysun (2011) "Democratic Values and Teacher Self-Efficacy Perceptions: A Case of Pre-Service English Language Teachers in Turkey," *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*: Vol. 36: Iss. 8, Article 3. Available at: <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol36/iss8/3>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Dear Colleague,

My name is Duygu Doğan, I am an English instructor at Zonguldak Karaelmas University and I'm an M.A student at Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Institute Of Education Sciences English Language Teaching Program.

The purpose of the present Master Thesis is to study, analyse and compare the current level of teacher efficacy, and teacher stress factors among English language instructors working at the English preparatory schools in different parts of Turkey. With this aim, you will be introduced to two questionnaires and a demographic inventory in this study. It will take approximately 20 minutes to answer the questions in all three parts. The findings will be used only for the purpose of academic study and will not be given to third persons. Thank you in advance for your assistance. The success of this study depends on your sincere responses. If you have any questions or concerns while completing this survey, please feel free to contact me.

DuyguDoğan

0530 327 6526

duyguttn@hotmail.com

ZonguldakKaraelmas University

Compulsory Foreign Language

Preparatory

School/İncirharmanıCampus,Kozlu

0 372 266 58 85/124

DEMOGRAPHIC INVENTORY

1. Gender:

- a) Female

2. You are a

- a) Native speaker of English b) Nonnative speaker of English

3. Education: (please indicate the final degree you gained)

- a) Bachelor's degree b) University Master's degree c) Ph.D. Degree

4. The name of the university you graduated from:

5. Department:

- a) **English Linguistics**
- b) **English Language And Literature**
- c) **English Language Teaching**
- d) Translation and Interpreting
- e) American Culture And Literature

6. Please mark the alternative that applies to you.

- I'm currently involved in a Master's program.
- I'm currently involved in a Ph.D. Program.
- I'm not involved in a postgraduate program.
- I'm not involved in a postgraduate program, but I'm planning to in the future.

7. Age:

- a) 20-25 d) 36-40 g) 51-60
b) 25-30 e) 41-45
c) 31-35 f) 46-50

8. Have you ever been in an *English-speaking* country? How long?

- a) Yes,...year/s;month/s,week/s,day/s b) No

9. For how many years have you been working as an English instructor?

- a) 0-5 years c) 11-15 years e) 21-30 years
b) 6-10 years d) 16-20 years

10. How long have you been working as an English instructor at your present institution?

- a) 0-5 years c) 11-15 years e) 21-30 years
b) 6-10 years d) 16-20 years

11. Your total teaching hours in a week

- a) 0-5
b) 6-10
c) 11-15
d) 16-20
e) 21 and above

STRESS FACTORS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ENGLISH INSTRUCTORS

The Field-Specific And The Organizational Stress Factors Questionnaire

In this part of the inventory, there are statements about the field-specific and the organizational stress factors that English instructors may face throughout their professional lives. **Please read each statement and decide how much stress each statement creates in you. Indicate your response on the scale by putting a tick in the related column.** Please do not leave any blank statements.

Explanation of scale:

1 – None 2 - Little 3 – Average 4 - Much 5 - Very much

		1	2	3	4	5
1	Students' unattendance problems due to the negative attitude towards English					
2	Students' lack of interest in the lessons due to the negative attitude towards English					
3	Students' reflection of personal problems (problems related to family, depression, and so forth) to the class					
4	The difficulty of motivating students to learn a foreign language					
5	Students' lack of systematic study habits					
6	Students' unwillingness to do research and investigation to improve their English					
7	Students' coming to class without the necessary class materials or not taking the English lesson seriously					
8	Teaching a language (English) which is not your (as an instructor) mother tongue					
9	Not having been in the country of the target language before (as an instructor)					
10	Having pronunciation difficulties as a non-native speaker of English					
11	Unexpected questions about vocabulary which are irrelevant to the lesson or/and which you are not familiar with as the teacher					
12	Unexpected questions about grammar structures which are irrelevant to the lesson					
13	Unexpected questions about grammar structures which you haven't prepared the lesson for as the teacher					
14	Always having to find meaningful context for vocabulary teaching					
15	Having students in the class who have been in the target culture before					
16	Students' lack of awareness of the importance of learning English					
17	Difficulty to motivate students to speak in English and students' insistent tendency to speak in Turkish					

18	Conflict between your beliefs about language teaching and your practice in the classroom					
19	Always having to prepare authentic and up to date materials in English					
20	The assessment of written performance					
21	The assessment of oral performance					
22	Role conflict (the conflict between the personality and various roles in the institution)					
23	Not receiving announcements about related professional development (national and international seminars, workshops, courses etc) on time.					
24	Administrators' ignorance of instructors' problems related to teaching and students.					
25	Too much workload in terms of course hours per week					
26	Inadequate services (photocopying, secretarial, and so forth)					
27	Too much paperwork (marking the exams, filling in the reports)					
28	Inadequate physical conditions (heating, lightning, and so forth)					
29	Overcrowded classes					
30	Lack of flexibility in the institutional practices (attending meetings, ceremonies, deadlines of reports and so forth)					
31	Varied type of courses to prepare and teach (e.g. reading, writing, grammar)					
32	Being obliged to attend frequent department meetings					
33	Not being supported enough for personal efforts on professional development.					
34	Inadequate instructional equipment/materials (technological tools, board, board marker and so forth)					
35	Insufficient in-service training opportunities					
36	Lack of social and cultural facilities at the university (sports centre, library, and so forth)					
37	Vague role definitions of instructors					
38	Lack of harmony among colleagues					
39	Lack of adequate salary					
40	Too much homework load to read					
41	The examination assessment overload					
42	Insufficient financial support for attending conferences related to the profession					

If there are any other organizational or field-specific stress factors, which you believe are not covered in this inventory, please write them in the space provided below.

.....

.....

In general how stressful do you find being an English instructor? Please tick the appropriate alternative.

- a) None
- b) Little
- c) Average
- d) Much
- e) very much

APPENDIX B

ENGLISH TEACHERS' SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE

This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.

(1) Nothing (3) Very little (5) Some Influence (7) Quite a bit (9) A great Deal

1. How much can you do to motivate the students who show low interest in learning English?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

2. How much can you do to get the students believe they can do well in English?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

3. How much can you do to help your students value learning English?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

4. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

5. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

6. How much can you do to get students follow classroom rules in your English classroom?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

7. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy in your English class?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

8. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

9. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies in your English class?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

10. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when your English students are confused?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

12. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your English classroom?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9