Education Quarterly Reviews

Aydın, R., & Kurt, S. (2022). Examination of Teachers' Perceptions of Self-Efficiency and Program Literacy. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 5(1), 90-117.

ISSN 2621-5799

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1993.05.01.422

The online version of this article can be found at:
https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/

Published by:
The Asian Institute of Research

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research, and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.

ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide

ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide

The Asian Institute of Research
Education Quarterly Reviews
Vol.5, No.1, 2022: 90-117
ISSN 2621-5799

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1993.05.01.422

Examination of Teachers' Perceptions of Self-Efficiency and Program Literacy

Rafet Aydın[1], Sümeyye Kurt[2]

[1] Ass. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences. Burdur / Turkey. Tel: 05332493043. e-mail: raydin@mehmetakifersoy.edu.tr ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7613-3198
[2] Teacher and Burdur Mehmet Akif. Ersoy University Institute of Education Sciences Department of Educational Sciences Graduate Student. Burdur/Turkey. Tel: 05053977894. e-mail: sumeyyekurt1507@ gmail.com ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7249-5821

Abstract
The purpose of this research; It consists of determining teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and curriculum literacy and examining whether there is a relationship between them. In this study, the relational survey model, one of the scientific research models, was used. The universe of this research consists of a total of 900 teachers working in the Bucak district of Burdur province. The sample is; consisted of 352 teachers, 133 male and 219 female. The data of the research collected with "Personal Information Form," "Teacher Self-Efficacy Perception Scale" and "Curriculum Literacy Scale." The collected data were analyzed with computer package programs. In this study, it was seen that teachers' self-efficacy perceptions were at a high level and these self-efficacy perceptions were the least in the dimension of student motivation and the most in the classroom management dimension. Teachers' self efficacy perceptions; It was concluded that there was no significant difference according to gender, age, educational status and graduated higher education institutions. It was concluded that the curriculum literacy of the teachers, the other dimension of this research, is at a high level. In other words, it was concluded that the teachers had a high level of program literacy. Program literacy of teachers; While there is no significant difference according to gender and graduated higher education institutions; differed significantly according to the educational institutions they worked in. It has been revealed that there is a positive, positive and moderate colleration between teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and their curriculum literacy.

Keywords: Perception, Teacher, Self-efficacy, Program, Program literacy

1. Introduction

Education; expected acculturation studies that progress with programmed steps and include learning-teaching practices whose objectives are determined by passing through certain filters (Bolat, 2014). Education is the process of creating a deliberate and expected change in an individual's behavior through his/her own life (Ertürk, 1985). In this process, teachers provide individuals with a set of knowledge, skills, interests and attitudes.

Teaching is a profession whose subject is human, and it is known that it is important to have competencies related to positive human relations and problem-solving skills as well as field knowledge in this profession. As schools

are institutions that have the important mission of preparing individuals for life, enabling them to integrate with the society, raising well-equipped individuals who have the knowledge and competencies needed by the society as a result of educational activities (Alev, 2019). Teachers' ability to raise individuals who can research, solve problems, question, access information and have self-confidence depends on teachers' self-efficacy and being aware of it. Since teachers' self-efficacy beliefs affect students' motivation, these beliefs ensure that students' attitudes are positive and their academic success increases significantly. In addition, it is known that teachers with strong self-efficacy beliefs tend to make good planning and strive to teach better (Eker, 2014). It can be said that teacher self-efficacy is an important factor that directly affects the quality of education (Şahin, C. & Şahin, 2017). For this reason, the programs of teacher training institutions are constantly updated according to these competencies and features that teachers are expected to gain (Şişman, 2009). The ability of the updated programs to achieve the desired result depends on the teachers' having certain qualifications, and one of these competence areas is self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy, one of the basic concepts of Bandura's (1988) social learning theory; It is an individual's belief in his or her own capacity to bring learning and behavior to the required levels. Self-efficacy is the person's thinking about what the person is capable of doing. . In other words, self-efficacy is not a function of an individual's skills, but a result of the individual's judgments about what the person can do by using his/her skills. According to Bandura (1998), self-efficacy is the individual's belief in his/her ability to cope with different situations and to achieve a certain activity, and this belief of the individual depends on his/her belief on his/her abilities. This belief is also necessary to organize a certain behavior to achieve certain goals and to realize it (as cited in Azar, 2010). Self-efficacy belief includes the psychological-cognitive processes that are effective in acquiring a behavior, creating a change in this behavior or ending the behavior, and these psychological processes are effective on the expectations of individuals regarding the perception of efficacy. In this regard, self-efficacy relates to the strength of one's belief in one's own effectiveness. A high level of belief reflects the individual's ability to cope with difficult situations (Bandura, 1977; 1997, cited in Duru & Arslan, 2021). Individuals set certain goals that they believe they can achieve in their lives. Perception of self-efficacy enables individuals to realize how much effort they need to spend to achieve these goals and how they can cope with the difficulties they face. Individuals can develop some strategies to overcome the difficulties they face. Their beliefs about whether they can use these strategies effectively and whether they will be successful are related to their self-efficacy perceptions (Pajares & Schunk, 2001).

According to Arslan (2008), there are four main sources of self-efficacy perception. The first of these is exact and true lives. This is the most effective way to develop a strong sense of self-efficacy. While successes increase the perception of self-efficacy, failures harm the perception of self-efficacy. This harm occurs especially if it occurs before the sense of self-efficacy is completely established. If people only experience easy successes, they become more discouraged by failure. The second way to create and strengthen the perception of self-efficacy is to have indirect experiences through social models. Seeing people who are similar to their own traits succeed by making constant efforts increases their self-efficacy perceptions. Again, according to Arslan (2008); Social persuasion is the third way to strengthen the perception of self-efficacy. Verbally persuaded people, when faced with a problem, make great efforts to solve it. Finally, the mood of the person affects the perception of self-efficacy. The way to achieve this is to get people away from stress and to get rid of negative emotions.

Self-efficacy perceptions are not the skills of individuals, but the perceptions of competence related to their skills and can affect the outcome of a job, behavior or situation regardless of whether individuals have the qualities that will enable them to perform a job, behavior or situation (Zimmerman, 1995). The fact that individuals have a high self-efficacy perception about a particular job means that individuals will insist on achieving the job in question, will be self-confident and will be less affected by failures in general (Bandura, 1997). On the other hand, if individuals have low self-efficacy perceptions about a particular job, it means that individuals will spend less effort in achieving the job in question, do not trust their own skills enough, and may give up immediately in the face of failures (Bandura, 1997).

Teacher self-efficacy is; It expresses the belief of the teacher regarding the capacity and ability of the students to create the desired learning outcomes, as well as a strong structure related to the student outcomes related to success,

motivation and competence (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, AW. & Hoy, 1998). 2021). According to Alev (2019), it has been determined that teachers' self-efficacy perceptions have an important role in the effective execution and planning of educational activities, in coping with the difficulties encountered, and on student success. Teacher self-efficacy perception is one of the most important concepts related to the concept of self-efficacy. Teacher self-efficacy perceptions are defined as teachers' perceptions of their ability to display the necessary behaviors to successfully fulfill their duties and their capacity to influence students' performance (Aston, 1984; Ekici, 2008). Teachers' individual beliefs about the extent to which they can use their teaching situations in a given situation are defined as teacher self-efficacy (Gavora, 2011). In other words, teacher self-efficacy is the judgment of teachers that they have the ability to ensure the success and learning of all students, including low motivation and difficult students (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk, 2001; Yılmaz & Çimen; 2008). Teachers with a high sense of self-efficacy are more open to new ideas, as well as being willing to try new methods to better the needs of their students (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). According to Bandura (1994); Teachers with a high perception of self-efficacy support their students to reach their goals, spend more effort so that their students can learn, and encourage their students to be successful in their work.

Along with the teachers' self-efficacy perceptions, it is necessary to examine and measure their skills such as curriculum literacy. Such studies and their results will make important contributions to the determination of qualifications, gaining them and shedding light on practices, as well as determining new policies during the training process of teachers.

Educational programs are a guide to the teacher in the education-teaching process. What kind of an individual education systems aim to raise and what kind of content they need to achieve these goals, what kind of path will be followed in the process and at what level the outputs of the system reach the goals are determined through education programs (Çetinkaya & Tabak, 2019). Educational program; explaining to students what, how, when and why they will learn. Educational programs, which are a legal educational tool, try to realize government policies and various social demands while achieving important learning outcomes for students. The basic economic, social and cultural problems of the society can be solved with this tool. The education program that provides social and social agreement, which is used to convey the points that the society cares about, is a technical document (Sarıgöz & Özkartal, 2016). According to Varış (1988); The education program is all of the activities that national education institutions provide for students to achieve their goals.

The implementation of these training programs starts in schools after trial processes. Teachers have an important role in the effective and efficient implementation of the programs (Özdemir, 2012). It is informed through the training programs that what, why and how to teach the teacher; as for the manager, what physical facilities will be needed; to the inspector what and how to evaluate; the student what he will learn and what is expected of him; which finished product to buy for the employer (Doğan, 1997). According to Özer and Acar (2011), it shows that in which level the educational programs guide teachers in order to realize planned education reach their goals. Whether the implemented training program is successful or not depends on the intelligibility of that training program. Teachers are expected to be well literate in the curriculum so that they can understand the curriculum (Kasapoğlu, 2020). Curriculum literacy is a field of competence that enables the evaluation of education and training programs after they are understood and implemented, and the skills it includes are having program knowledge, understanding the program correctly, designing the implementation processes and evaluating the learning-teaching process. Program literacy of teachers is defined as having the skills related to understanding, applying and evaluating the program at a minimum level (Akyıldız, 2020).

Curriculum literacy can be said to be beneficial in understanding and interpreting educational programs, as well as guiding teachers in the preparation and implementation of programs and in the development of a new program. Determining the curriculum literacy levels of teachers in terms of learning-teaching processes and determining what kind of situations this literacy is affected by are considered important in terms of contributing to both teachers and the literature. When the literature on teacher self-efficacy and curriculum literacy is examined, there are no studies that directly examine these two elements and the relationship between them. It is seen that some of the researches are related to teacher self-efficacy and some of them are related to curriculum literacy.

Some of the researches on teacher self-efficacy; Woolfolk-Hoy and Spero (2005), Arslan (2008), Üstüner, Demirtaş, Cömert and Özer (2009), Er and Gürgan (2011), Telef (2011), Korkut and Babaoğlan (2012), Yeşilyurt (2013), Singh and Arora (2014), Molding, Stewart and Dunmeyer (2014) Gun and Steel (2013), Eker (2014), Tuluk (2015), Buluç and Demir (2015), Toy and Duru (2016), Yurdakul and Bostancı (2016)), Dolapcı and Demirtaş (2016), Deniz and Tican (2017), Ocak, G., Ocak and Kalender (2017), Döş and Özşahin (2019), Akbulut and Aküzüm (2020), Öktem and Kul (2020), Ellez (2020) and Duru and Arslan (2021). Regarding the curriculum literacy of teachers, which is the second dimension of this research; Jiayi and Ling (2012), Singh (2013), Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2014), Grissom, Loeb and Nakashima (2014), Shilingford and Karlin (2014), Sarigöz and Bolat (2018). Research by Aslan and Gürlen (2019), Akyıldız (2020), Kahramanoğlu (2019), Çetinkaya and Tabak (2019), Kasapoğlu (2020), Boncuk (2021), Güneş Şinego and Çakmak (2021), and Sarıca (2021) can be counted.

1.2. Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research; The purpose of this study is to determine the self-efficacy perceptions of the teachers working in the Bucak district of Burdur province and their curriculum literacy and to examine whether there is a relationship between them.

1.3. The Problem of Research

The problem of the research is how are teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and curriculum literacy?

1.3.1. Sub-Problems of the Research

The research sought answers to the following sub-problems:
1. What are the teachers' self-efficacy perception levels?
2. Teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy; Does it show a significant difference according to gender, age, education level, branch, education level, graduated higher education/faculty and satisfaction with the school?
3. What is the literacy level of the teachers in the curriculum?
4. Curriculum literacy levels; Does it show a significant difference according to gender, age, education level, branch, education level, graduated higher education/faculty and satisfaction with the school?
5. Is there a significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy perception levels and curriculum literacy levels?

1.4. Importance of Research

This research, which aims to determine the self-efficacy perceptions and curriculum literacy of the teachers working in the Bucak district of Burdur province, and to examine the relationship between them comparatively, is important in terms of first examining the teachers' self-efficacy and curriculum literacy separately and then examining the relationship between them. Because teachers' self-efficacy perceptions are high or low will show their willingness to fulfill their professional duties. It can be said that this degree of desire also affects the professional performance of teachers. Likewise, it can be said that it is valid for the curriculum literacy of teachers.

The determination of these two elements and the examination of their effects on the profession of teachers will add a special importance to the research. It is thought that new suggestions will be brought as a result of the research, which will add a special importance to the research.

2. Method

2.1. Model of the Research

In this study, which aims to examine the self-efficacy perceptions of teachers working in the Bucak district of Burdur province and their curriculum literacy, and to determine whether there is a significant relationship between them, the relational survey model, one of the scientific research models, was used. Survey models are research

models that aim to describe a past or present situation in its current form (Karasar, 2012). In the relational survey model, which is included in the general survey method, it tries to determine whether there is a change in the variables or not (Karasar, 2012).

2.2. Universe and Sample

The universe of this research consists of all teachers working in Bucak district of Burdur province. The universe can be defined as the group whose results will be valid and interpreted as a result of the analysis of the data to be collected in the research (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2018).

The sample of the study consisted of teachers determined by simple random sampling method from the universe. The reason why the teachers forming the sample were determined by the simple random sampling method was that there were programs for each level and branch.

The sample can be defined as the limited part of the population selected to collect information about the population (Büyüköztürk et al., 2018). In the simple random sampling method, each unit in the universe has an equal and independent probability of being selected for sampling. In other words, all individuals have the same probability of being selected, and the choice of one individual does not affect the choice of another individual. The valid and best way to select a representative sample is random sampling (Balcı, 2018; Büyüköztürk et al, 2018).

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Teachers Constituting the Sample of the Study

Variables / *Category*		***Frequency***	***Percent (%)***
Gender	Male	*133*	*37,8*
	Female	*219*	*62,2*
	Total	*352*	*100,0*
Age	20-29	28	8,0
	30-39	161	45,7
	40-49	119	33,8
	50 and over	44	12,5
	Total	352	100,0
Graduated Educational Status	Bachelor's Degree	306	86,9
	Post-graduated	46	13,1
	Total	352	100,0
Branch	Preschool Teacher	68	19,3
	Class Teacher	110	31,3
	History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies Teacher	29	8,2
	Mathematics Teacher	24	6,8
	English Teacher	25	7,1
	Vocational High School Religion C. Computer System Teacher	33	9,4
	Turkish Teacher	24	6,8
	Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Science Teacher	23	6,5
	Visual Art, Music, Physical Education Teacher	16	4,5
	Total	352	100,0
Teaching institution	Primary School	141	40,1
	Secondary School	103	29,3
	High School	78	22,2
	Preschool	30	8,5
	Total	352	100,0
Graduated Higher Education	Faculty of Education	291	82,7
	Science and Literature	23	6,5

	School of Education /Institute	20	5,7
	Faculty of Vocational Education	18	5,1
	Total	352	100,0
Place of Duty Satisfaction	No	5	1,4
	Partly	73	20,7
	Yes	274	77,8
	Total	352	100,0

As seen in Table 1, 219 (62.2%) of the 352 teachers who made up the sample were female and 133 (37.8%) were male. According to this, it is seen that the teachers who make up the sample are mostly women of the sample; 28 (8.0%) were 20-29 years old, 161 (45.7%) were 30-39 years old, 119 (33.8%) were 40-49 years old and 44 (12.5%) were 50 consists of teachers who are aged and above. In other words, it is seen that there are mostly teachers aged 30-39. Looking at the graduations of the teachers, 306 (86.99%) are undergraduates, while 46 (13.1%) have graduate degrees. 31.3% Classroom Teachers, 29 (8.2%) History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies Teachers, 24 (6.8%) Mathematics Teachers, 25 (7.1%) English Teachers, 33 (% 9.4% were Vocational High School, Religion C., Computer Systems Teachers, 24 (6.8%) Turkish, 23 (6.5%) Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Science Teachers and 16 (4%) ,5% of them were Visual Arts, Music and Physical Education Teachers Distribution of the teachers according to the educational institutions they work in: 141 (40.1%) primary school, 103 (29.3%) secondary school, 78 (22%) 2) of them are in high school and 30 (8.5%) of them are in pre-school education institutions.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

In the research; "Personal Information Form" prepared by the researcher for teachers' personal information, and the "Teacher Self-Efficacy Perception Scale", first developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (1998) and then edited by Köse (2007) to determine their self-efficacy perceptions" scale was used.

"Teacher Self-Efficacy Perception Scale"; It consists of 3 dimensions and 24 items, 8 in the dimension of Student Motivation, 8 in the dimension of Classroom Management, and 8 in the dimension of Instructional Strategies. Scale; It is a five-point Likert type scale as "Never", "Rarely", "Sometimes", "Often" and "Always". Information on the reliability of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale, which was revealed by the application of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale to the research group, is given in Table 2.

Table 2: Reliability of Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale Regarding the Research Sample Applied

Dimension	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	KS	Cronbach's Alpha
Student Motivation	352	4.23	.50	.076	.872
Classroom Management	352	4.30	.50	.101	.893
Instructional Strategies	352	4.29	.50	.089	.876
Scale	352	4.28	.47	.063	.951

As seen in Table 2, first of all, the reliability of the data was examined in order to carry out statistical analyzes in accordance with the final version of the teacher self-efficacy scale applied to the research group. According to Özdamar (2015), a Cronbach's Alpha value between .70 and .90 indicates that the scale has high reliability, and a value between .60 and .70 indicates that the scale has sufficient reliability. Accordingly, as a result of the Cronbach's Alpha analysis, 872 (high) in Student Motivation, 893 (high) in Classroom Management, 876 (high) in Instructional Strategies, and 951 (high) in the Overall Scale were found to be appropriate for the study.

In the research, the "Curriculum Literacy Scale" developed by Bolat (2017) was used to measure the curriculum literacy of teachers. The "Curriculum Literacy Scale" consists of 2 dimensions, 15 in the Reading dimension and 14 in the Writing dimension, and 29 items (Bolat, 2017). Expressions of skills in the scale; It is a 5-point Likert type, which is "I totally disagree", "I agree little", "I agree at a moderate level", "I agree a lot", "I totally agree". Information on the reliability of the Curriculum Literacy Scale, which was revealed by the application of the Curriculum Literacy Scale to the research group, is given in Table 3.

Table 3: The Reliability of the Teachers' Curriculum Literacy Scale in the Sample

Dimension	N	$\bar{X}$	ss	KS	Cronbach's Alpha
Reading	**352**	4.27	.59	.114	.961
Writing	**352**	4.05	.69	.088	.965
Scale	**352**	4.17	.61	.089	.976

First of all, the reliability of the data was examined in order to carry out statistical analyzes in accordance with the final version of the Curriculum Literacy Scale applied to the research group. According to Özdamar (2015), Cronbach's Alpha value. with 70. A value between 90 indicates that the scale has high reliability, with .60. A value between 70 indicates that the scale has sufficient reliability. Accordingly, as a result of the Cronbach's Alpha analysis performed, it was seen that the reliability was appropriate for the study to be 961 (high) in the Reading Dimension, 965 (high) in the Writing Dimension and .976 (high) in the Overall Scale.

2.4. Analysis of Data

The data collected with the relevant scale were coded and analyzed using computer package programs. Calculations such as frequency (f) and percentage (%) were made. In Likert type items, the same ranges from positive to negative were taken as reference. The "Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale" was applied to the research group and the data were collected. In order to make appropriate statistical analyzes of the data obtained from the scale, the skewness coefficient, arithmetic mean, median and mode were checked, and then (K-S) Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test was performed since the number of participants in the research group was more than 50. When the skewness and kurtosis values of the "Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale" are examined; Skewness .589, Kurtosis .697 in the dimension of 'Student Motivation'; Skewness in Classroom Management Dimension .762, Kurtosis .996; The Skewness in the Dimension of Instructional Strategies was .626, the Kurtosis was .634, the Skewness was .653, the Kurtosis was .920 in the range of ± 1, and the significance value was p=.00 (p<.05) as a result of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. The fact that the skewness and kurtosis values are in the range of ± 1 is interpreted as the scores do not deviate significantly from the normal distribution (Büyüköztürk, 2009, Özdamar, 2015). Therefore, it was decided to use parametric statistical tests in the analysis of the data.

Due to the normal distribution of the data obtained from the scale, in the sub-problems of the research; Unrelated t-test was used to test whether the data obtained from two unrelated samples differed significantly from each other, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test whether the data obtained from more than two unrelated samples differed significantly from each other. If there is a significant difference between the groups as a result of this test, first of all, the homogeneity of the variances was examined. It was observed that the variances were homogeneous in all sub-problems in which the data obtained from two or more samples were included. Therefore, the LSD test, which is one of the tests used in homogeneous variance distributions, was applied to determine between which variables the difference was. The obtained data were interpreted by making tables, and the difference between independent variables was tested at the p=.05 level (Büyüköztürk, 2009).

The value ranges in Table 4 were taken into account in the interpretation of the mean values of the scores obtained by the teachers from the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale.

Table 4: Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale Evaluation Score Ranges

Range	Value	Comment
1.00-1.79	Never	Negative
1.80-2.59	Rarely	Negative
2.60-3.39	Sometimes	Negative
3.40-4.19	Mostly	Positive
4.20-5.00	Always	Positive

As seen in Table 4; Range 1.00-1.79 Never negative, range 1.80-2.59 Rarely negative, range 2.60-3.39 Sometimes negative, range 3.40-4.19 Most often positive, and range 4.20-5.00 Always positive.

3. Findings and Comment

In the research, "What Level Are Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions?" The findings related to the question are given in Table 5.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics on Teachers' Perceptions of Self-Efficacy

Dimension	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss
Student motivation	352	4.23	.50
Classroom management	352	4.30	.50
Instructional strategies	352	4.29	.50
Scale	352	4.28	.47

As can be seen in Table 5, the arithmetic mean of the total scores of the teachers constituting the sample group obtained from the scale of self-efficacy perceptions ($\bar{X}$=4.28); standard deviation (Ss=.47) was calculated. The arithmetic mean of student motivation dimension scores ($\bar{X}$=4.23), standard deviation (Ss=.50), arithmetic mean of classroom management dimension scores ($\bar{X}$=4.30) standard deviation (Ss=.50), arithmetic mean of teaching strategies dimension scores ($\bar{X}$=. 4.29) was calculated as the standard deviation (Ss=.50). From these results, it can be said that teachers' self-efficacy perceptions are at a high level ($\bar{X}$=4.28). Teachers have the least self-efficacy perception in student motivation ($\bar{X}$=4.23) and the most in Classroom Management ($\bar{X}$=4.30).

3.1. Findings and Interpretation on the Sub-Problem of the Research

In order to examine whether the teachers' self-efficacy perceptions differ according to their gender status, an independent t-test was conducted, and the analysis findings are given in Table 6.

Table 6: Statistical Distribution of Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions by Gender

Dimension	**Gender**	**N**	**$\bar{X}$**	**Ss**	**sd**	**t**	**p**
Student Mootivation	Male	133	4,1805	,56311	1,663	350	,097
	Female	219	4,2717	,45571			
Classroom Management	Male	133	4,2998	,57672	,272	350	,786
	Female	219	4,3151	,46576			
Instructional Strategies	Male	133	4,2914	,54805	,067	350	,947
	Female	219	4,2951	,48505			
Scale	Male	133	4,2572	,51944	,710	350	,478
	Female	219	4,2939	,43814			

As can be understood from the examination of Table 6, it is seen that there is no significant difference in teachers' self-efficacy perceptions according to the gender variable. According to the results of the independent t-test conducted in the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy, in the Dimension of Student Motivation [t(350)=1.663, p>.05], in the Dimension of Classroom Management [t(350)=.272, p>.05], in the Dimension of Instructional Strategies [t(350)=.067, p>.05] and [t(350)=.478, p>.05] there is no significant difference across the scale.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was conducted in order to examine whether the teachers' self-efficacy perceptions differ according to their age, descriptive statistics are given in Table 7 and analysis findings are given in Table 8.

Table 7: Statistical Distribution of Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions by Age

Dimension	Age	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss
Student motivation	20-29	28	4,2813	,41335
	30-39	161	4,2166	,45495
	40-49	119	4,2195	,55377
	50 and over	44	4,3324	,55703
Classroom management	20-29	28	4,3080	,43632
	30-39	161	4,2570	,49415
	40-49	119	4,3309	,56668
	50 and over	44	4,4432	,42663
Instructional strategies	20-29	28	4,2946	,49326
	30-39	161	4,2679	,44958
	40-49	119	4,2742	,57127
	50 and over	44	4,4403	,53747
Scale	20-29	28	4,2946	,41169
	30-39	161	4,2472	,42660
	40-49	119	4,2749	,53200
	50 and over	44	4,4053	,47280

Table 8: Statistical Analysis of Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions by Age

Dimension	Source of variation	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	P
Student motivation	Between groups	,558	3	,186	,742	,527
	Within groups	87,259	348	,251		
	Total	87,817	351			
Classroom Management	Between groups	1,285	3	,428	1,657	,176
	Within groups	89,930	348	,258		
	Total	91,215	351			
Instructional strategies	Between groups	1,099	3	,366	1,419	,237
	Within groups	89,839	348	,258		
	Total	90,938	351			
Scale	Between groups	,874	3	,291	1,321	,267
	Within groups	76,704	348	,220		
	Total	77,578	351			

When Table 8 is examined, teachers' self-efficacy perceptions according to their age are in the Student Motivation Dimension [F (3-348)=,742, p>.05], in the Classroom Management dimension [F(3-348)=1.659, p>.05], It is seen that there is no significant difference in the Dimension of Instructional Strategies [F (3-348) =1.419, p>.05] and in the Scale-General [F (3-348) = 1,321, p>.05].

In order to examine whether the teachers' self-efficacy perceptions differ according to their educational status, an independent t-test was conducted, and the analysis findings are given in Table 9.

Table 9: Statistical Distribution of Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions by Educational Status

dimension	Education Status	N	X̄	ss	sd	t	p
Student motivation	Bachelor's degree	306	4,2373	,50631	350	,012	,991
	Master degree	46	4,2364	,46265			
Classroom Management	Bachelor's degree	306	4,3068	,51702	350	,239	,811
	Master degree	46	4,3261	,46359			
Instructional strategies	Bachelor's degree	306	4,2864	,52064	350	,696	,487
	Master degree	46	4,3424	,42527			
Scale	Bachelor's degree	306	4,2768	,47730	350	,333	,739
	Master degree	46	4,3016	,42348			

When Table 9 is examined, teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy according to their educational status are in Student Motivation Dimension [t(350)=,012, p>.05], Classroom Management Dimension [t(350)=.239, p>.05], Instructional Strategies Dimension [t(350)=.669, p>.05] and overall scale [t(350)=.333, p>.05] there is no significant difference.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was conducted in order to examine whether the teachers' self-efficacy perceptions differ according to their branch status, descriptive statistics are given in Table 10 and analysis findings are given in Table 11.

Table 10: Statistical Distribution of Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions by Branch Status

Dimension	Branch	N	X̄	Ss
Student Motivation	Pre-school Teacher (1)	68	4,3805	,48553
	Classroom teacher (2)	110	4,3705	,42090
	History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies Teacher (3)	29	4,2112	,51115
	Mathematics Teacher (4)	24	3,9010	,62007
	English Teacher (5)	25	4,0200	,53116
	Vocational High School, Computer System Teacher (6)	33	4,1402	,44935
	Turkish Teacher(7)	24	4,1354	,23578
	Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Science Teacher (8)	23	4,0761	,57621
	Visual art, Music, Physical Education Teacher (9)	16	4,1875	,64711
Classroom Management	Pre-school Teacher (1)	68	4,2923	,50215
	Classroom teacher (2)	110	4,3977	,52248
	History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies Teacher (3)	29	4,2888	,45452
	Mathematics Teacher (4)	24	4,1771	,62437
	English Teacher (5)	25	4,2050	,52152
	Vocational High School, Computer System Teacher (6)	33	4,3333	,43037
	Turkish Teacher(7)	24	4,3438	,31331
	Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Science Teacher (8)	23	4,1141	,61111

	Visual art, Music, Physical Education Teacher (9)	16	4,3516	,53855
Instructional Strategies	Pre-school Teacher (1)	68	4,3713	,55398
	Classroom teacher (2)	110	4,3807	,45446
	History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies Teacher (3)	29	4,2629	,46212
	Mathematics Teacher (4)	24	4,0833	,69711
	English Teacher (5)	25	4,2200	,44820
	Vocational High School, Computer System Teacher (6)	33	4,2311	,44647
	Turkish Teacher(7)	24	4,1927	,35734
	Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Science Teacher (8)	23	4,1522	,57524
	Visual art, Music, Physical Education Teacher (9)	16	4,3359	,63034
Scale	Pre-school Teacher (1)	68	4,3480	,48258
	Classroom teacher (2)	110	4,3830	,42310
	History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies Teacher (3)	29	4,2543	,44255
	Mathematics Teacher (4)	24	4,0538	,61538
	English Teacher (5)	25	4,1483	,48264
	Vocational High School, Computer System Teacher (6)	33	4,2348	,41337
	Turkish Teacher(7)	24	4,2240	,24008
	Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Science Teacher (8)	23	4,1141	,57368
	Visual art, Music, Physical Education Teacher (9)	16	4,2917	,56005

Table 11: Statistical Analysis of Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions According to Their Branches

Dimension	Source of variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	P	Significant difference
Student Motivation	Between groups	8,457	8	1,057	4,569	,000	1 / 4-5-6-7-8
	Withing groups	79,361	343	,231			2 / 4-5-6-7-8
	Total	87,817	351				3/4
Classroom Management	Between groups	2,536	8	,317	1,226	,283	
	Withing groups	88,679	343	,259			
	Total	91,215	351				
Instructional Strategies	Between groups	3,331	8	,416	1,630	,115	
	Withing groups	87,607	343	,255			
	Total	90,938	351				
Scale	Between groups	3,939	8	,492	2,293	,021	1/ 4-8
	Withing groups	73,639	343	,215			2/ 4-5-8
	Total	77,578	351				

When Table 11 is examined, there is no significant difference between teachers' self-efficacy perceptions in Classroom Management Dimension [F (8-343)=1,226, p>.05] and Teaching Strategies Dimension [F (8-343)=1,630, p>.05] according to their branch status. ; There was a significant difference in Student Motivation Dimension [F (8-343)=4.569, p<.05] and Overall Scale [F (3-348)=2.293, p<.05]. The homogeneity of the variances was checked to determine which groups had the differences and it was seen that they were homogeneous. As a result of the LSD test performed; In the dimension of student motivation, preschool teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.38) are more than Mathematics teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.90), English teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.02), Vocational High School teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.14), Turkish teachers ($\bar{X}$=4). ,13), from the Science Group teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.07); Classroom teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.37) Mathematics teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.90), English teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.02), Vocational High School teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.14), Turkish teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.13), From the Science Group teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.07); History, History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.21) have higher self-efficacy than Mathematics teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.90). Preschool teachers across the scale ($\bar{X}$=4.34); Mathematics ($\bar{X}$=4.05) and Science Group teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.11), Classroom teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.38); Mathematics ($\bar{X}$=4.05), English ($\bar{X}$=4.14) and Science Group teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.11) have higher self-efficacy.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was conducted in order to examine whether the teachers' self-efficacy perceptions differ according to the educational institution they work in. Descriptive statistics are given in Table 12 and analysis findings are given in Table 13.

Table 12: Statistical Distribution of Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions by Educational Institutions

Dimension	Educational institution	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss
Student motivation	Primary school(1)	141	4,3493	,44584
	Secondary school (2)	103	4,1189	,50408
	High school(3)	78	4,0978	,56359
	Pre school (4)	30	4,4792	,32840
Classroom management	Primary school (1)	141	4,3475	,51735
	Secondary school (2)	103	4,2561	,52492
	High school (3)	78	4,2612	,50572
	Pre school (4)	30	4,4375	,40571
Instructional strategies	Primary school (1)	141	4,3617	,47802
	Secondary school (2)	103	4,2112	,52307
	High school (3)	78	4,2003	,53994
	Pre school (4)	30	4,5000	,42675
Scale	Primary school (1)	141	4,3528	,44016
	Secondary school (2)	103	4,1954	,49228
	High school (3)	78	4,1864	,49714
	Pre school (4)	30	4,4722	,34382

Table 13: Statistical Analysis of Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions by Educational Institutions

Dimension	Source of variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	p	Significant difference
Student motivation	Between groups	6,485	3	2,162	9,250	,000	1/2
	Within groups	81,332	348	,234			1/3 2/4
	Toplam	87,817	351				3/4
Classroom management	Between groups	1,171	3	,390	1,509	,212	
	Withing groups	90,044	348	,259			
	Total	91,215	351				
Instructional strategies	Between groups	3,311	3	1,104	4,383	,005	1/2
	Within groups	87,627	348	,252			1/3 2/4
	Total	90,938	351				3/4

	Between groups	3,277	3	1,092	5,116	,002	1/2
Scale	Within groups	74,301	348	,214			1/3 2/4
	Total	77,578	351				3/4

When Table 13 is examined, there is no significant difference in the Classroom Management Dimension [F (3-348) =1.509, p>.05] according to the teachers' self-efficacy perceptions according to the educational institutions they work in; Student Motivation Dimension [F (3-348) =9,250, p<.05], Instructional Strategies Dimension [F (3-348) =4.383, p<.05] and Overall Scale [F (3-348) =5,116, p<.05] revealed a significant difference. The homogeneity of the variances was checked to determine which groups had the differences and it was seen that the variances were homogeneous. As a result of the LSD test performed; In the dimension of student motivation, teachers working in primary schools ($\bar{X}$=4.34) compared to teachers working in secondary schools ($\bar{X}$=4.11) and teachers working in high schools ($\bar{X}$=4.09); Teachers working in pre-school education institutions ($\bar{X}$=4.47) have higher self-efficacy than teachers working in secondary schools ($\bar{X}$=4.11) and teachers working in high schools ($\bar{X}$=4.09).

In the Dimension of Instructional Strategies, teachers working in primary schools ($\bar{X}$=4.36) are among the teachers working in secondary schools ($\bar{X}$=4.21) and teachers working in high schools ($\bar{X}$=4.20); Teachers working in pre-school education institutions ($\bar{X}$=4.50) have higher self-efficacy than teachers working in secondary schools ($\bar{X}$=4.21) and teachers working in high schools ($\bar{X}$=4.20).

Across the scale, teachers working in primary schools ($\bar{X}$=4.35) compared to teachers working in secondary schools ($\bar{X}$=4.19) and teachers working in high schools ($\bar{X}$=4.18); Teachers working in pre-school education institutions ($\bar{X}$=4.47) have higher self-efficacy than teachers working in secondary schools ($\bar{X}$=4.19) and teachers working in high schools ($\bar{X}$=4.18).

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was conducted to examine whether the teachers' self-efficacy perceptions differ according to the type of higher education institution they graduated from. Descriptive statistics are given in Table 14 and analysis findings are given in Table 15.

Table 14: The Distribution of Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions by the Status of the Higher Education Institution they graduated from

Dimension	Graduated Higher Education Institution	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss
Student Motivation	Faculty of Education	291	4,2247	,51061
	faculty of science and literature	23	4,4130	,46837
	School of Education/Institute	20	4,3063	,43201
	Faculty of Vocational Education	18	4,1389	,40649
Classroom Management	Faculty of Education	291	4,2955	,52622
	faculty of science and literature	23	4,4783	,40880
	School of Education/Institute	20	4,3688	,43956
	Faculty of Vocational Education	18	4,2500	,39991
Instructional Strategies	Faculty of Education	291	4,2732	,51245
	faculty of science and literature	23	4,5000	,47374
	School of Education/Institute	20	4,4625	,38066

	Faculty of Vocational Education	18	4,1736	,55097
Scale	Faculty of Education	291	4,2645	,48223
	faculty of science and literature	23	4,4638	,39535
	School of Education/Institute	20	4,3792	,38353
	Faculty of Vocational Education	18	4,1875	,39921

Table 15: Statistical Analysis of Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions According to the Status of the Higher Education Institution they graduated from

Dimension	Source of variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	p
Student Motivation	Between groups	1,026	3	,342	1,372	,251
	Within groups	86,791	348	,249		
	Total	87,817	351			
Classroom Motivation	Between groups	,846	3	,282	1,086	,355
	Within groups	90,369	348	,260		
	Total	91,215	351			
Instructional Strategies	Between groups	1,931	3	,644	2,516	,058
	Gruplar içi	89,007	348	,256		
	Toplam	90,938	351			
Scale	Between groups	1,198	3	,399	1,819	,143
	Within groups	76,380	348	,219		
	Total	77,578	351			

When Table 15 is examined, teachers' self-efficacy perceptions are in Student Motivation Dimension [F (3-348) =1.372, p>.05], Classroom Management Dimension [F(3-348)=1.086, p>.05] according to the status of the higher education institution they graduated from. ; It was found that there was no significant difference in the Dimension of Instructional Strategies [F(3-348)=2,516, p>.05] and [F(3-348)=1.819, p>.05] in the Scale-General.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was conducted in order to examine whether the teachers' self-efficacy perceptions differ according to their job satisfaction, descriptive statistics are given in Table 16 and analysis findings are given in Table 17.

Table 16: The Distribution of Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions by Job Satisfaction Status

Dimension	Place of Duty Satisfaction	N	$\bar{X}$	ss
Student Motivation	No (1)	5	4,4250	,47269
	Partly(2)	73	4,1182	,54282
	Yes (3)	274	4,2655	,48523
Classroom Management	No (1)	5	4,5500	,43839
	Partly (2)	73	4,1729	,54031
	Yes (3)	274	4,3412	,49725
Instructional Strategies	No(1)	5	4,4250	,52738
	Partly (2)	73	4,1318	,58143
	Evet (3)	274	4,3344	,48051
Scale	No (1)	5	4,4667	,45682

Partly (2)	73	4,1410	,52721
Yes(3)	274	4,3137	,44817

Table 17: Statistical Analysis of Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions According to Job Satisfaction

Dimension	Source of variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	p	Significant difference
Student Motivation	Between groups	1,431	2	,715	2,890	,057	-
	Within groups	86,387	349	,248			
	Total	87,817	351				
Classroom Management	Between groups	1,926	2	,963	3,765	,024	2/3
	Within groups	89,289	349	,256			
	Total	91,215	351				
Instructional Strategies	Between groups	2,452	2	1,226	4,836	,008	2/3
	Within groups	88,486	349	,254			
	Total	90,938	351				
Scale	Between groups	1,897	2	,948	4,373	,013	2/3
	Within groups	75,681	349	,217			
	Total	77,578	351				

When Table 17 is examined, it has been revealed that there is no significant difference in Student Motivation Dimension [F (3-349) =2.890, p>.05] according to teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and job satisfaction. Classroom Management Dimension [F (3-349) =3,765, p<.05], Instructional Strategies Dimension [F (3-349) =4.836, p<.05] and Overall Scale [F (3-349) =4.373, p<.05] revealed a significant difference. The homogeneity of the variances was checked to determine which groups had the differences and it was seen that the variances were not homogeneous. As a result of the LSD test performed; In the classroom management dimension, teachers who are satisfied with their workplace ($\bar{X}$=4.34) have a higher level of self-efficacy than teachers who are partially satisfied ($\bar{X}$=4.17). Teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.33) who are satisfied with the dimension of teaching strategies have a higher level of self-efficacy than teachers who are partially satisfied ($\bar{X}$=4.13). Teachers who are satisfied with their place of work ($\bar{X}$=4.31) in the scale have higher self-efficacy than teachers who are partially satisfied ($\bar{X}$=4.14).

The findings regarding the curriculum literacy of the teachers who constitute the sample in the study are given below. The findings regarding the level of curriculum literacy of the teachers are given in Table 18.

Table 18: Descriptive Statistics on Teachers' Education Program Literacy Levels

Dimension	**N**	$\bar{X}$	ss
Reading	**352**	4.27	.59
Writing	**352**	4.05	.69
Scale	**352**	4.17	.61

When Table 18. is examined, it is seen that the curriculum literacy of the teachers is in Reading ($\bar{X}$=4.27), Writing ($\bar{X}$=4.05) and overall scale ($\bar{X}$=4.17). From these results, it can be said that the curriculum literacy of the teachers is at a high level ($\bar{X}$=4.17). Teachers have the least program literacy in the writing dimension ($\bar{X}$=4.05) and the most in the Reading dimension ($\bar{X}$=4.27).

An independent test was conducted to examine whether the curriculum literacy of the teachers differed according to their gender status, and the analysis findings are given in Table 19.

Table 19: Statistical Analysis of Teachers' Program Literacy by Gender

Dimension	Gender	N	X̄	ss	sd	t	p
Reading	Male	133	4,2291	,69551	1,134	350	,258
	Female	219	4,3038	,53284			
Writing	Male	133	4,0559	,75947	,050	350	,960
	Female	219	4,0597	,65779			
Scale	Male	133	4,1454	,69659	,599	350	,550
	Female	219	4,1860	,56042			

When Table 19 is examined, the curriculum literacy of the teachers according to the gender variable is in the Reading Dimension [t(350)= 1.134, p>.05], in the Writing Dimension [t(350)= .050, p>.05] and in the Overall Scale [t(350)= .599, p>.05], there is no significant difference.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was conducted in order to examine whether the curriculum literacy of the teachers differed according to their age, descriptive statistics are given in Table 20 and analysis findings are given in Table 21.

Table 20: Distribution of Teachers' Program Literacy by Age

Dimension	Age	N	X̄	Ss
Reading	20-29	28	4,1286	,62904
	30-39	161	4,3031	,55075
	40-49	119	4,1989	,66247
	50 and over	44	4,4758	,52858
Writing	20-29	28	3,9949	,70441
	30-39	161	4,1025	,66862
	40-49	119	3,9640	,74364
	50 and over	44	4,1916	,64732
Scale	20-29	28	4,0640	,62716
	30-39	161	4,2063	,57877
	40-49	119	4,0855	,66524
	50 and over	44	4,3386	,56216

Table 21: Statistical Analysis of Teachers' Program Literacy by Age

Dimension	Source of variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	p
Reading	Between groups	3,190	3	1,063	3,008	,030
	Withing groups	123,017	348	,353		
	Total	126,208	351			
Writing	Between groups	2,267	3	,756	1,563	,198
	Withing groups	168,198	348	,483		
	Total	170,464	351			
Scale	Between groups	2,626	3	,875	2,343	,073
	Withing groups	130,027	348	,374		
	Total	132,653	351			

When Table 21 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference in the Writing Dimension [F (3-348) =1.563, p>.05] and the Scale-General [F (3-348) =2.343, p>.05] according to the curriculum literacy and age status of the teachers. There was a significant difference in Reading Dimension [F (3-348) =3,008, p<.05]. The

homogeneity of the variances was checked to determine which groups had the differences and it was seen that the variances were not homogeneous. As a result of the LSD test, teachers in the age group of 50 and over ($\bar{X}$=4.47) have higher levels of program literacy than teachers in the 20-29 age group ($\bar{X}$=4.12) and teachers in the 40-49 age group ($\bar{X}$=4.19) has.

An independent test was conducted to examine whether the curriculum literacy of the teachers differed according to the type of higher education institution they graduated from, and the analysis findings are given in Table 22.

Table 22: Distribution of Program Literacy of Teachers by Educational Status

Dimension	Education status	N	$\bar{X}$	ss	sd	t	p
Reading	Bachelor's degree	306	4,2806	,60570	,406	350	,685
	Postgraduate	46	4,2420	,56277			
Writing	Bachelor's degree	306	4,0521	,69651	,429	350	,668
	Postgraduate	46	4,0994	,70574			
Scale	Bachelor's degree	306	4,1703	,61757	,030	350	,976
	Postgraduate	46	4,1732	,60239			

When Table 22 is examined, according to the variable of the curriculum literacy of the teachers, in the reading dimension [t(350)=,406, p>.05], in the writing dimension [t(350)=.429, p>.05] and in the scale [t(350)= .030, p>.05] it is seen that there is no significant difference.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was conducted in order to examine whether the curriculum literacy of the teachers differed according to their branch status, descriptive statistics are given in Table 23 and analysis findings are given in Table 24.

Table 23: Statistical Distribution of Teachers' Program Literacy by Branches

Dimension	Branch	N	$\bar{X}$	ss
Reading	Pre-school Teacher (1)	68	4,3912	,53407
	Classroom teacher (2)	110	4,3467	,59995
	History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies Teacher (3)	29	4,1609	,62119
	Mathematics Teacher (4)	24	4,1639	,79999
	English Teacher (5)	25	4,2267	,61524
	Vocational High School, Computer System Teacher (6)	33	4,0747	,48125
	Turkish Teacher(7)	24	4,3306	,40930
	Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Science Teacher (8)	23	4,1304	,71731
	Visual art, Music, Physical Education Teacher (9)	16	4,2875	,66208
Writing	Pre-school Teacher (1)	68	4,2910	,57492
	Classroom Teacher (2)	110	4,1455	,62284

	History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies Teacher (3)	29	3,8473	,84854
	Mathematics Teacher (4)	24	3,8304	,97866
	English Teacher(5)	25	3,8486	,61801
	Vocational High School, Computer System Teacher (6)	33	4,0649	,55050
	Turkish Teacher (7)	24	3,8423	,68154
	Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Science Teacher (8)	23	4,0435	,74441
	Visual art, Music, Physical Education Teacher (9)	16	3,8527	,89991
Scale	Pre-school Teacher (1)	68	4,3428	,53774
	Classroom Teacher (2)	110	4,2495	,57857
	History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies Teacher (3)	29	4,0095	,70228
	Mathematics Teacher(4)	24	4,0029	,86029
	English Teacher (5)	25	4,0441	,58870
	Vocational High School, Computer System Teacher (6)	33	4,0700	,47847
	Turkish Teacher (7)	24	4,0948	,51511
	Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Science Teacher (8)	23	4,0885	,71056
	Visual art, Music, Physical Education Teacher (9)	16	4,0776	,72162

Table 24: Statistical Analysis of Teachers' Program Literacy by Branches

Dimension	Source of variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	p	Significant difference
Reading	Between groups	4,095	8	,512	1,438	,179	
	Within groups	122,112	343	,356			
	Total	126,208	351				
Writing	Between groups	9,958	8	1,245	2,660	,008	1/ 3 1/4
	Within groups	160,507	343	,468			1/5 1/7 1/9
	Total	170,464	351				2/3 2/4 2/7
Scale	Between groups	5,294	8	,662	1,782	,079	
	Within groups	127,358	343	,371			
	Total	132,653	351				

When Table 24 is examined, it has been revealed that there is no significant difference in Reading Dimension [F (8-343) =1.438, p>.05] and Overall Scale [F (8-343)=1,782, p>.05] according to teachers' curriculum literacy branch status. There was a significant difference in the Writing Dimension [F (8-343) =2.660, p<.05]. The homogeneity of the variances was checked to determine which groups had the differences and it was seen that the variances were not homogeneous. As a result of the LSD test, pre-school teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.29); History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies Teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.84), Mathematics Teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.83, English Teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.84), Turkish Teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.84) and Visual Arts, Music has a higher writing level than Physical Education Teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.85). Classroom Teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.14) have a higher writing level than History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies Teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.84), Mathematics Teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.83) and Turkish Teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.84).

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was conducted in order to examine whether the curriculum literacy of the teachers differs according to the educational institution they work in. Descriptive statistics are given in Table 25 and analysis findings are given in Table 26.

Table 25: Statistical Distribution of Program Literacy of Teachers by Educational Institution Status

Dimension	Educational institution	N	$\bar{X}$	ss
Reading	Primary school (1)	141	4,3418	,57048
	Secondary school(2)	103	4,1618	,64159
	High school (3)	78	4,2316	,60031
	Pre-school(4)	30	4,4689	,51476
Writing	Primary school (1)	141	4,1444	,59989
	Secondary school (2)	103	3,9147	,76866
	High school (3)	78	3,9560	,73533
	Pre-school(4)	30	4,4119	,60017
Scale	Primary school (1)	141	4,2465	,55177
	Secondary school (2)	103	4,0425	,66790
	High school (3)	78	4,0986	,63422
	Pre-school(4)	30	4,4414	,53981

Table 26: Statistical Analysis of Program Literacy of Teachers by Educational Institution Status

Dimension	Source of variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	p	Significant difference
Reading	Between groups	3,224	3	1,075	3,041	,029	1/2 1/4
	Within groups	122,984	348	,353			
	Total	126,208	351				
Writing	Between groups	7,735	3	2,578	5,514	,001	1/2 1/4
	Within groups	162,729	348	,468			3/4
	Total	170,464	351				
Scale	Between groups	5,106	3	1,702	4,644	,003	1/2 1/4
	Within groups	127,546	348	,367			3/4
	Total	132,653	351				

When Table 26 is examined, the curriculum literacy of the teachers in the Reading Dimension [F (3-348) =3,041, p<.05], in the Writing Dimension [F (3-348)=5.514, p<.05] and in the Overall Scale [F (3-348)=4.644, p<.05] revealed a significant difference. In order to determine which groups these differences were, the homogeneity of the variances was examined and it was seen that the variances were not homogeneous. As a result of the LSD test, teachers working in primary school ($\bar{X}$=4.34) in Reading dimension compared to teachers working in secondary

school ($\bar{X}$=4.16); Teachers working in preschool ($\bar{X}$=4.46) have a higher reading level than teachers working in primary school ($\bar{X}$=4.34). In the writing dimension, teachers working in primary school ($\bar{X}$=4.14) were compared to teachers working in secondary schools ($\bar{X}$=3.91); Preschool teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.41) have a higher writing level than primary school teachers ($\bar{X}$=4.14) and high school teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.95). In the scale, teachers working in primary school ($\bar{X}$=4.24) are among teachers working in secondary schools ($\bar{X}$=4.04); Teachers working in preschool ($\bar{X}$=4.44) have a higher program literacy level than teachers working in primary school ($\bar{X}$=4.24) and teachers working in high schools ($\bar{X}$=4.09).

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was conducted in order to examine whether the curriculum literacy of the teachers differed according to the type of higher education institution they graduated from, descriptive statistics are given in Table 27 and analysis findings are given in Table 28.

Table 27: The Distribution of Teachers' Program Literacy of the Status of the Higher Education Institution they graduated from

Dimension	Graduated Higher Education Institution	N	$\bar{X}$	ss
Reading	Faculty of Education	291	4,2639	,61478
	faculty of science and literature	23	4,5188	,46491
	School of Education/Institute	20	4,2667	,60292
	Faculty of Vocational Education	18	4,1630	,44116
Writing	Faculty of Education	291	4,0729	,70790
	faculty of science and literature	23	4,0932	,69900
	School of Education/Institute	20	3,9321	,66016
	Faculty of Vocational Education	18	3,9167	,56042
Scale	Faculty of Education	291	4,1717	,62933
	faculty of science and literature	23	4,3133	,54173
	School of Education/Institute	20	4,1052	,59804
	Faculty of Vocational Education	18	4,0441	,46667

Table 28: Statistical Analysis of Teachers' Program Literacy According to the Status of the Higher Education Institution they graduated from

Dimension	Source of variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	p
Reading	Between groups	1,630	3	,543	1,518	,209
	Within groups	124,577	348	,358		
	Total	126,208	351			
Writing	Between groups	,769	3	,256	,526	,665
	Within groups	169,695	348	,488		
	Total	170,464	351			
Scale	Between groups	,843	3	,281	,742	,528
	Within groups	131,810	348	,379		
	Total	132,653	351			

When Table 28 is examined, the curriculum literacy of the teachers is in the Reading Dimension [F (3-348) =1.518, p>.05], in the Writing Dimension [F (3-348)=,526, p>.05] according to the status of the higher education institution they graduated from. and there was no significant difference across the scale [F (3-348) =,742, p>.05].

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was conducted to examine whether the curriculum literacy of the teachers differed according to their job satisfaction, descriptive statistics are given in Table 29 and analysis findings are given in Table 30.

Table 29: Statistical Distribution of Teachers' Program Literacy by Job Satisfaction Status

Dimension	Place of Duty Satisfaction	N	$\bar{X}$	ss
Reading	No (1)	5	4,3467	,65727
	Partly(2)	73	4,1005	,71812
	Yes (3)	274	4,3209	,55642
Writing	No (1)	5	3,9286	,64484
	Partly (2)	73	3,9051	,73502
	Yes(3)	274	4,1014	,68365
Scale	No (1)	5	4,1448	,64943
	Partly (2)	73	4,0061	,68702
	Yes (3)	274	4,2150	,58824

Table 30: Statistical Analysis of Teachers' Program Literacy by Job Satisfaction Status

Dimension	Source of variance	Sum of squares	Sd	Mean of squares	F	p	Significant difference
Reading	Between groups	2,827	2	1,414	3,999	,019	
	Within groups	123,380	349	,354			-
	Total	126,208	351				
Writing	Between groups	2,307	2	1,153	2,394	,093	
	Within groups	168,157	349	,482			2/3
	Total	170,464	351				
Scale	Between groups	2,517	2	1,258	3,375	,035	
	Within groups	130,136	349	,373			2/3
	Total	132,653	351				

When Table 30 is examined, there is no significant difference in Reading Dimension [F (2-349) =3,999, p>.05] according to teachers' curriculum literacy and satisfaction with the educational institution they work for; There was a significant difference in the Writing Dimension [F (2-349) =2.394, p<.05] and the Scale-General [F (2-349)=3.375, p<05]. The homogeneity of the variances was checked to determine which groups had the differences and it was seen that the variances were not homogeneous. As a result of the LSD test, teachers who are satisfied with their job ($\bar{X}$=4.10) in the writing dimension have a higher writing level than teachers who are partially satisfied ($\bar{X}$=3.90). Teachers who are satisfied with their job ($\bar{X}$=4.21) in general have a higher curriculum literacy level than teachers who are partially satisfied ($\bar{X}$=4.00).

Table 31: Pearson Correlation Analysis Results of the Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Self-Efficacy and Program Literacy

	Self-efficacy	Self-efficacy Motivating the Student	Self-efficacy classroom management	Self-efficacy Instructional strategy

Program literacy	Pearson Correlation	***,707*****	,682**	,610**	,678**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	352	352	352	352
prgreading	Pearson Correlation	,698**	,659**	,614**	,671**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	352	352	352	352
prgwriting	Pearson Correlation	,649**	,638**	,549**	,621**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	352	352	352	352

As seen in Table 31, there is a positive, moderate and moderate relationship between teachers' curriculum literacy and self-efficacy (Pearson r=,707, p<.01). From this result, it can be said that as the curriculum literacy of the teacher's increases, their self-efficacy also increases positively or as the teachers' self-efficacy perceptions increase, the curriculum literacy levels increase positively.

4. Conclusion and Discussion

The following results were reached in this research, which aims to examine teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and curriculum literacy.

1. In this study, it was concluded that teachers' self-efficacy perceptions were at a high level. It has been seen that the self-efficacy perceptions of the teachers are the least in the dimension of student motivation and the most in the classroom management dimension. This result coincides with the research results of Swan, Wolf and Cano (2011), Buluç and Demir (2015), Toy and Duru (2016), Döş and Özşahin (2019), Ellez (2020) and Akbulut and Aküzüm (2020). . Again, when this result is compared with the self-efficacy levels of the pre-service teachers and the results of the research; Arslan (2008), Yeşilyurt (2013) and Tabancalı and Çelik (2013) seem to overlap. Because, in the aforementioned studies, it was concluded that teachers and teacher candidates have a high level of self-efficacy. On the other hand, this result, Üstüner, Demirtaş, Cömert and Özer (2009), Eker (2014), Reilly, Dhingra and Boduszek (2014) and Ocak, G., Ocak, İ. and Kalender (2017) research results. Because the results of this research revealed that teachers' self-efficacy levels are at a medium level.

2. Teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy; It was concluded that there was no significant difference according to gender, age, educational status and graduated higher education institution. This result, Üstüner, Demirtaş, Cömert, M. and Özer (2009), Telef (2011), Tabancalı and Çelik (2013), Reilly, Dhingra and Boduszek (2014), Öktem and Kul (2020), Ellez (2020) and It coincides with the research results of Akbulut and Aküzüm (2020). Because in these studies, no difference was found in self-efficacy according to gender and educational status. In the results of the research, it was concluded that the self-efficacy levels of women differ in favor of women, that is, the self-efficacy levels of women are higher than men. Again, this result, Korkut and Babaoğlan (2012). It also does not coincide with the research results of Yeşilyurt (2013), Dolapcı and Demirtaş (2016), and Deniz and Tican (2017). According to the results of this research, it was seen that male teachers and teacher candidates have higher self-efficacy than females.

3. Self-efficacy perceptions of teachers according to their branches; It was found that there was no significant difference in the dimensions of classroom management and teaching strategies, but there was a significant difference in the dimension of student motivation and overall scale. This difference; in the dimension of student motivation; Preschool teachers, Mathematics, English, Vocational High School, Turkish and Science group teachers, Classroom teachers; It was concluded that mathematics, English, Vocational High School, Turkish and Science group teachers had higher levels of self-efficacy. Again, History, Guidance, Geography and Social Studies teachers have higher self-efficacy than Mathematics teachers. In general, Preschool Teachers; Compared to the Mathematics and Science group teachers, Classroom Teachers have a higher level of self-efficacy than the Mathematics, English and Science group teachers. This result is similar to the research results of Yeşilyurt (2013) and Tabancalı and Çelik (2013). The results of the research conducted by Yeşilyurt (2013) and Tabancalı and Çelik (2013) on the self-efficacy of teacher candidates differed according to the departments they studied. In

Yeşilyurt's (2013) research, it was determined that the self-efficacy perception levels of teacher candidates studying in mathematics teaching were lower than those studying in other programs. In the study of Tabancalı and Çelik (2013), it was concluded that the candidates studying in the fields of social sciences had higher self-efficacy than the candidates in the fields of science-mathematics and foreign language. On the other hand, this result of the research does not coincide with the results of Üstüner, Demirtaş, Cömert, and Özer (2009) and Ellez (2020. Because, in the results of Üstüner, Demirtaş, Cömert and Özer (2009), it was seen that teachers' self-efficacy did not differ according to branches.

4. Self-efficacy perceptions of teachers according to the type of educational institution they work; It was concluded that there was no significant difference in the dimension of classroom management, but there was a significant difference in the dimensions of student motivation, teaching strategies and overall scale. This difference; In the dimensions of student motivation and instructional strategies, that is, in both dimensions; Teachers working in primary school, middle school and high school teachers; Teachers working in pre-school education institution; It has been found that teachers working in secondary and high schools have a higher level of self-efficacy. A similar result is seen in Üstüner Demirtaş, Cömert and Özer (2009). In the said study, it was concluded that teachers' self-efficacy differs in the student participation sub-dimension according to the type of school they work in, and teachers working in Anatolian and Science High Schools have higher self-efficacy than teachers working in General High Schools and Vocational Technical High Schools.

5. Teachers' self-efficacy perceptions according to job satisfaction; It has been revealed that there is no significant difference in the dimension of Student Motivation, but there is a significant difference in the dimensions of Classroom Management, Instructional Strategies and the Scale. Teachers who are satisfied with classroom management, instructional strategies, and place of work across the scale have higher levels of self-efficacy than teachers who are partially satisfied.

6. Program literacy of teachers, which is the other dimension of this research; It was concluded that the scale was at a high level in the dimensions of reading and writing in general. In other words, it can be said that teachers have a high level of program literacy. This result coincides with the research results of Çetinkaya and Tabak (2019), Aslan and Gürlen (2019), Güneş Şinego and Çakmak (2021), Boncuk (2021) and Sarıca (2021). Because in these studies, the curriculum literacy of the teachers was found to be high and sufficient. On the other hand, it was concluded that it partially overlaps with the research results of Kahramanoğlu (2019) because the curriculum literacy of the teachers is at a moderate level in the research.

7. Program literacy of teachers; It was concluded that there was no significant difference according to gender and graduated higher education institutions. This result coincides with the research results of Aslan and Gürlen (2019), Güneş Şinego and Çakmak (2021), Boncuk (2021) and Sarıca (2021). However, it does not coincide with the research results of Sarıgöz and Bolat (2018) and Kahramanoğlu (2019). Because, in the research results of Kahramanoğlu (2019), there was a significant difference according to gender and this difference was found in favor of female teachers.

8. Program literacy of teachers according to their age; It was found that there was no significant difference in the Writing Dimension and the Scale-General, while there was a significant difference in the Reading Dimension. Teachers aged 50 and over have higher levels of program literacy than teachers aged 20-29 and 40-49. This result coincides with the research results of Sarıca (2021). Because, in Sarıca's (2021) study, teachers' curriculum literacy differed significantly according to age, and teachers in the 51 and over age range had the highest average score.

9. It was revealed that there was no significant difference in the Reading Dimension and Scale-General, but there was a significant difference in the Writing Dimension, according to the branch status of the curriculum literacy of the teachers. Preschool teachers of these differences; Has a higher writing level than History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies, Mathematics, English, Turkish and Visual Arts, Music, Physical Education Teachers. Class Teachers; He has a higher writing level than History, Guidance, Geography, Social Studies, Mathematics and Turkish Teachers. This result is similar to the research results of Sarıgöz and Bolat (2018) and Çetinkaya and Tabak (2019) conducted with pre-service teachers. In the said study, it was seen that the teacher candidates differ

according to the departments they study. On the other hand, this result does not coincide with the results of Kahramanoğlu (2019), Güneş Şinego and Çakmak (2021), and Aslan and Gürlen (2019). Because in these studies, there was no difference in the curriculum literacy of the teachers according to their branches.

10. Program literacy of teachers according to the educational institution they work in; It was concluded that there was a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of the scale and in the overall scale. These differences are; teachers working in primary school, teachers working in secondary school; Teachers working in preschool have a higher reading level than teachers working in primary school. In the writing dimension, teachers working in primary school are among the teachers working in secondary schools; Teachers working in preschool have a higher writing level than teachers working in primary and high schools. Teachers working in primary school throughout the scale; Among the teachers working in secondary school, teachers working in pre-school; have a higher program literacy level than teachers working in primary and high schools. This result is similar to the research results of Kahramanoğlu (2019) and Sarıca (2021).

11. Program literacy of teachers according to the satisfaction of the educational institution they work; It was found that there was no significant difference in the reading dimension, but there was a significant difference in the writing dimension and overall scale. Teachers who are satisfied with their position in the writing dimension and across the scale have a higher level of writing and program literacy than teachers who are partially satisfied.

12. There is a positive and moderate relationship between teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and their curriculum literacy. From this result, it can be said that as the teachers' self-efficacy perceptions increase, their curriculum literacy increases positively or as their curriculum literacy increases, their self-efficacy also increases positively.

5. Suggestions

It is possible to make some suggestions for both practitioners and researchers regarding the results of the research.

1. Program literacy of teachers according to the satisfaction of the educational institution they work; It was found that there was no significant difference in the reading dimension, but there was a significant difference in the writing dimension and overall scale. Teachers who are satisfied with their position in the writing dimension and across the scale have a higher level of writing and program literacy than teachers who are partially satisfied.

2. The characteristics of teachers are decisive in increasing the quality of education and training. For this reason, studies should be carried out to support teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and increase their curriculum literacy levels, taking into account the differences such as gender, age and seniority of teachers.

3. This research is limited to teachers working in a district. For this reason, it is necessary to conduct new studies with larger samples in order to generalize to a larger population.

4. In this study, teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and curriculum literacy scores in education were found to be high. In order to increase teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and curriculum literacy and make them sustainable, it is important to provide environments and opportunities where they can use their knowledge, skills and competencies effectively, as well as to remove obstacles that may reduce this. In addition, various measures should be taken to increase teachers' competencies, to enable them to develop themselves and to encourage their professional development.

5. Self-efficacy perceptions and curriculum literacy of teachers according to their branches; It was found that there was a significant difference in general scales and some sub-dimensions. This research was conducted with the survey model. Further research should be done with quantitative and qualitative methods.

6. It was concluded that teachers' self-efficacy perceptions differ according to the type of educational institution they work in. The reasons for this difference should be revealed by other studies and necessary precautions should be taken.

7. Teachers' self-efficacy perceptions differed according to their job satisfaction in the overall scale and in some sub-dimensions. It was revealed that those who are satisfied with the job position have higher self-efficacy. The causes of job dissatisfaction should be investigated and studies should be carried out to eliminate these dissatisfaction situations.

8. It has been revealed that the curriculum literacy of the teachers differs according to the educational institutions where they work. Teachers working in preschool education institutions have a higher program literacy level than teachers working in primary and high schools. The reasons for this difference should be investigated and the curriculum literacy status of teachers working in educational institutions at all levels should be increased.

5.1. Limitation of the Research

The most important limitation of the study is that the research sample was selected by convenient sampling. The relatively low number of teachers forming the sample also reduces the generalizability of the findings. In this study, it can be said that the data obtained may be subjective since the use of data collection tools, self-efficacy belief and curriculum literacy scales are directed towards teachers' reflection of their own feelings.

5.2. Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

5.3. About the Authors

Dr. Instructor Member Rafet Aydın, works as a faculty member in Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Burdur/Turkey. Education, Educational Sciences
Sümeyye Kurt, is a teacher and a graduate student with thesis at Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences, Burdur/Turkey.

References

Akbulut, E., & Aküzüm, C. (2020). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öz yeterlilik algıları ile kaynaştırma eğitimine yönelik tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of the relationship between primary school teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and their attitudes towards inclusive education]. *Journal of Dicle University Ziya Gökalp Faculty of Education/ Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* (39), 74-91.

Akyıldız, S. (2020). Eğitim programı okuryazarlığı kavramının kavramsal yönden analizi: Bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması [Conceptual analysis of curriculum literacy concept: A scale development study]. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences/Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *19*(73), 315-332.

Alev, S. (2019). Öğretmenlerin öz yeterlilik kavramına ilişkin algıları: Bir olgubilim araştırması [Teachers' perceptions of the concept of self-efficacy: A phenomenological study]. *OPUS International Journal of Society Studies/OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *14* (20), 956-981.

Arslan, A. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının bilgisayar destekli eğitim yapmaya yönelik tutumları ile öz yeterlik algıları arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between pre-service teachers' attitudes towards computer assisted education and their self-efficacy perceptions.]. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences/ Eletronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi,* www.esosder.org info@esosder.org ISSN:1304–0278, 7(24), 101-109.

Aslan, S., & Gürlen, E. (2019) Üç boyutlu sanal öğrenme ortamında 5. sınıf düzeyinde kesirlerin öğretimi: Second life örneği[Teaching fractions at the 5th grade level in a three-dimensional virtual learning environment: Second life example]. *Kırşehir Education Faculty Journal/ Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(1), 171-186.

Aston, P. T. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A motivational paradigm for effective teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 35 (5), 28–32.

Aşkar, P. ve Umay, A. (2002). İlköğretim matematik öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin bilgisayarla ilgili öz-yeterlik algısı [Computer-related self-efficacy perceptions of primary school mathematics teacher students.]. *Hacettepe University Faculty of Education Journal/ Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21, 1–8.

Azar, A. (2010). Ortaöğretim fen bilimleri ve matematik öğretmeni adaylarının öz yeterlilik inançları[Self-efficacy beliefs of secondary school science and mathematics teacher candidates]. *ZKU Journal of Social Sciences/ZKÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(12), 235–252

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84, 191–215.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. encyclopedia of human behaviour. (Ed. Ramachaudran, V.S.). New York: Academic Press. Vol. 4, 71–81.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman

Bolat, Y. (2017). Eğitim programı okuryazarlığı kavramı ve eğitim programı okuryazarlığı ölçeği [The concept of curriculum literacy and curriculum literacy scale]. *International periodical for the languages, literature and history of Turkish or Turkic,* 12(18), 121-138.

Bolat, Y. (2017). Öğrenci gözüyle sınıfın örtük programı[The hidden curriculum of the class from the student's point of view.]. *Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences/Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7* (18), 510-536.

Boncuk, A. (2021). Öğretmenlerin program okuryazarlıkları ile öğretim programına bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [Examining the relationship between teachers' curriculum literacy and their commitment to the curriculum]. *Anadolu Türk Eğitim Dergisi*, 3(1), 88-108.

Buluç, B., & Demir, S. (2015). İlk ve ortaokul öğretmenlerinin öz-yeterlik algıları ile iş doyumları arasındaki ilişki[The relationship between primary and secondary school teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and job satisfaction] . *Ahi Evran University Journal of Kirsehir Education Faculty/ Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *16* (1), 289-308.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2009). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı: İstatistik, araştırma deseni SPSS uygulamaları ve yorum [*Data analysis handbook for social sciences: Statistics, research design SPSS applications and interpretation]. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2018). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (24. Baskı)[Scientific research methods (24th Edition)]. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Çetinkaya, S. , & Tabak, S. (2019). Öğretmen adaylarının eğitim programı okuryazarlık yeterlilikleri [Education program literacy competencies of teacher candidates*]. Ondokuz Mayıs University Journal of the Faculty of Education/Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 38(1), 296-309. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7822/omuefd.535482

Deniz, S. , & Tican, C. (2017). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen öz-yeterlik inançları ile mesleki kaygılarına yönelik görüşlerinin incelenmesi [Examination of pre-service teachers' views on teacher self-efficacy beliefs and professional concerns]. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of the Faculty of Education/Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17 (4), 1838-1859.

Doğan, H. (1997). *Eğitimde program ve öğretim tasarımı [*Data analysis handbook for social sciences: Statistics, research design SPSS applications and interpretation]. Ankara; Önder Matbaacılık

Dolapcı, S., & Demirtaş, V. Y. (2016). Öğretmen adaylarının öz-yeterlilik algıları ve kaynaştırma eğitimine bakış açıları [Self-efficacy perceptions of teacher candidates and their perspectives on inclusive education]. *Western Anatolian Journal of Educational Sciences/Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *7*(13), 141-160.

Döş, B., & Özşahin, C. (2019). Öğretmenlerin sosyal medya bağımlılığı, öğretmenlik öz-yeterlilikleri ve motivasyonları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [Western Anatolian Journal of Educational Sciences]. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences/Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *18*(71), 1397-1408.

Duru, F., & Arslan, A. (2021). İlkokul öğretmenlerinin öğretmen olma motivasyonu, öz yeterlilik inançları ve yenilikçilik algılarının iş memnuniyetine etkisi[The effect of primary school teachers' motivation to be a teacher, self-efficacy beliefs and innovativeness perceptions on job satisfaction] Turkish Studies - Education, 16(4), 1877-1893. https://dx.doi.org/10.47423/TurkishStudies.50105.

Eker, C. (2014). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öz-yeterlilik inanç düzeyleri üzerine bir araştırma [A research on the self-efficacy belief levels of classroom teachers]. *Uşak University Journal of Social Sciences/ Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7*(1), 162-178.

Ekici, G. (2008). Sınıf yönetimi dersinin öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen öz-yeterlik algı düzeyine etkisi [The effect of classroom management course on teacher candidates' self-efficacy perception level]. *Hacettepe University Faculty of Education Journal/Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 35*, 98–110.

Ellez, M. A. (2020). Self-efficacy beliefs of students of primary school teaching department regarding mathematics and teaching mathematics. *African Educational Research Journal*, 8(4): 747-753.

Er, K. O., & Gürgan, U. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının öz-yeterlilik algıları ve kopya çekmeye ilişkin tutumları arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between pre-service teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and their attitudes towards cheating]. *Balıkesir University Journal of Social Sciences Institute/ Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *14*(26), 1-18.

Ertürk, S. (1985). *Eğitimde program geliştirme* [Curriculum development in education], Ankara: Meteksan Yayını.

Gavora, P. (2011). Measuring the self-efficacy of in-service teachers in slovakia. *Orbıs Scholae*, 5(2), 79–94.

Grissom, J. A., Loeb, S., & Nakashima, N. A. (2014). Strategic involuntary teacher transfers and teacher performance: Examining equity and efficiency. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *33*(1), 112-140.

Güneş Şınego, S., & Çakmak, M. (2021). Öğretmenlerin eğitim programı okuryazarlık düzeylerinin incelenmesi [Examination of teachers' educational program literacy levels]. *Section Academy Journal/ Kesit Akademi Dergisi*, 7 (27), 233-256.

Jiayi, W., & Ling, C. (2012). Reviewing teacher evaluation of rewards and punishments: the overview of Chinese teacher evaluation research. Education Research International,1-16. doi:10.1155/2012/184640

Kahramanoğlu, R. (2019). Öğretmenlerin öğretim programı okuryazarlığına yönelik yeterlik düzeyleri üzerine bir inceleme [An investigation on the proficiency levels of teachers for curriculum literacy]. International Journal of Social Research/ *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, *12* (65).826-840.

Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi (24. bs*.)[Scientific research method (24th ed.]. *Ankara: Nobel.*

Kasapoğlu, K. (2020). Öğretmenlere yönelik algılanan eğitim programı okuryazarlığı ölçeği: Bir ölçek geliştirme ve geçerleme çalışması [Perceived curriculum literacy scale for teachers: A scale development and validation study]. *İnönü University Faculty of Education/ İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* 21(2), 963-977. DOI: 10.17679/inuefd.709688

Korkut, K. , & Babaoğlan, E. (2012). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öz yeterlik inançları [Self-efficacy beliefs of classroom teachers]. *International Journal of Management, Economics and Business/Uluslararası Yönetim İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi, 8*(16), 269-281.

Köse, İ. A. (2007) *Öğretmen öz-yeterlik algısı ölçeğinin farklı gruplarda yapı geçerliğinin sınanması*[Testing the construct validity of the teacher self-efficacy perception scale in different groups][Unpublished Master's Thesis] .Ankara University Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Moulding, L. R., Stewart, P. W., & Dunmeyer, M. L. (2014). Pre-service teachers' sense of efficacy: Relationship to academic ability, student teaching placement characteristics, and mentor support. *Teaching and teacher education*, *41*, 60-66.

Ocak, G. Ocak, İ. , & Kalender, M. D. K. (2017). Öğretmenlerin öz-yeterlik algıları ile öğretme-öğrenme anlayışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [xamining the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and their teaching-learning understanding.]. *Kastamonu Journal of Education/ Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 25* (5), 1851-1864.

Öktem, T., & Kul, M. (2020). Examining the relationship between self-efficacy and aggression levels of students interested in weightlifting sports. African Educational Research Journal, 8(4): 681-688

Özdamar, K. (2015). *Paket programlar ile istatistiksel veri analizi (cilt-1*) [Statistical data analysis with package programs (vol-1)]. Eskişehir: Nisan Kitabevi.

Özdemir, S. M. (2012). Eğitim programı kavramına ilişkin öğretmen adaylarının metaforik algıları [Metaphorical perceptions of prospective teachers about the concept of curriculum]. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Sciences/ Kuramsal Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(3), 369-393.

Özder, H. (2011). Self-efficacy beliefs of novice teachers and their performance in the classroom. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(5), 1-15.

Özer, Y., & Acar, M. (2011). Öğretmenlik mesleği genel yeterlikleri üzerine ikili karşılaştırma yöntemiyle bir ölçekleme çalışması [A scaling study on the general competencies of the teaching profession with the pairwise comparison method]. *Journal of Çukurova University Faculty of Education/ Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 3(40), 89-101

Pajares, F., & Schunk, D. H. (2001). Self-beliefs and school success: Self-efficacy, self-concept, and school achievement. *Perception*, *11*(2), 239-266.

Reilly, E., Dhingra, K., & Boduszek, D. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, self-esteem, and job stress as determinants of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Management*. 28(4), 365-378.

Sarıca, R. (2021). Öğretmenlerin eğitim programı okuryazarlıkları üzerine bir çalışma[A study on teachers' curriculum literacy]. *Journal of Kirsehir Education Faculty/ Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22(1), 132-170.

Sarıgöz, O., & Özkartal, Z. (2016). Examination of preservice teachers'views onimplicit learning in terms of some variables. *Journal of International Social Research*, *9*(44), 951-960.

Sarıgöz, O. & Bolat, Y. (2018). Examination of the competencies of the pre-service teachers studying at the education faculties about the educational program literacy. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, *10*(9), 103-110.

Shillingford, S., & Karlin, N. (2014). Preservice teachers' self efficacy and knowledge of emotional and behavioural disorders. *Emotional and behavioural difficulties*, *19*(2), 176-194.

Singh, G., & Arora P. (2014). Self-efficacy and emotional intelligence as redictors of alienation among graduates. *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development.* 3(8), 258-262.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy: Relations with teacher engagement, job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion. *Psychological reports*, *114*(1), 68-77.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2019). Teacher self-efficacy and collective teacher efficacy: relations with perceived job resources and job demands, feeling of belonging, and teacher engagement. *Creative Education, 10*(07), 1400-1424.

Swan, B. G., Wolf, K. J., & Cano, J. (2011). Changes in teacher self-efficacy from the student teaching experience through the third year of teaching. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, *52*(2), 128-139.

Şahin, C., & Şahin, S. (2017). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine karşı tutumları, öz-yeterlik inançları ve öğrenciyi tanıma düzeyleri [The attitudes of teacher candidates towards the teaching profession, their self-efficacy beliefs and their level of knowing the student]. *Turkish Journal of Educational Sciences/ Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *15*(2), 224-238.

Şişman, M. (2009). Öğretmen yeterlilikleri: Modern bir söylem ve retorik [Teacher competencies: A modern discourse and rhetoric]. *İnönü University, Journal of the Faculty of Education/İnönü Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 10*(3), 63-82.

Tabancalı, E., & Çelik, K. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının akademik öz-yeterlikleri ile öğretmen öz-yeterlilikleri arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between teacher candidates' academic self-efficacy and teacher self-efficacy]. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, *10*(1), 1167-1184.

Telef, B. B. (2011). Öğretmenlerin öz-yeterlikleri, iş doyumları, yaşam doyumları ve tükenmişliklerinin incelenmesi [Examining teachers' self-efficacy, job satisfaction, life satisfaction and burnout]. Elementary Education Online, 10(1), 91-108, 2011/ İlköğretim Online, 10(1), 91-108, 2011. [Online]: http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr.

Toy, S. N., & Duru, S. (2016). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğretmen öz yeterlikleri ile kaynaştırma eğitimine ilişkin yeterlik inançlarının karşılaştırılması [Comparison of primary school teachers' teacher self-efficacy and efficacy beliefs about inclusive education]. *Aegean Education Journal/ Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, *17*(1), 146-173.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, AW., & Hoy, WK (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, *68* (2), 202-248

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk, H. A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing and elusive construel. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783–805.

Tuluk, G. (2015). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen öz-yeterlilikleri üzerine bir inceleme[An investigation on teacher candidates' teacher self-efficacy]. *Uşak University Journal of Educational Research/ Uşak Üniversitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *1*(1), 1-15.

Üstüner, M., Demirtaş, H., Cömert, M., & Özer, N. (2009). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin öz-yeterlik algıları [Self-efficacy perceptions of secondary school teachers]. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of the Faculty of Education/ Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *9*(17), 1-16.

Varış, F. (1988). Eğitim fakültelerinde programlar ve öğretim[Programs and teaching in education faculties]. *Journal of Ankara University Faculty of Educational Sciences/ Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi. 21*(1), 223-230.

Yeşilyurt, E. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen öz-yeterlik algıları [Teacher candidates' perceptions of teacher self-efficacy]. *Electronic journal of social sciences/ Elektronik sosyal bilimler dergisi*, *12*(45), 88-104.

Yılmaz, M., & Çimen, O. (2008). Biyoloji eğitimi tezsiz yüksek lisans öğrencilerinin biyoloji öğretimi öz-yeterlik inanç düzeyleri [Biology teaching self-efficacy belief levels of non-thesis master's students in biology education]. *Yüzüncü Yıl University, Journal of the Faculty of Education/ Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 5*(1), 20–29.

Yurdakul, A., & Bostancı, A. B. (2016). Öğretmenlerin okulların örgütsel narsizm düzeylerine yönelik görüşleri ile öz yeterlilik algıları arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between teachers' views on the organizational narcissism levels of schools and their self-efficacy perceptions*]. Kırıkkale University Journal of Social Sciences/ Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *6*(1), 109-126.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Self-efficacy and educational development. A. Bandura (Ed.), Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies (pp.. 202–231). New York: Cambridge University.

Woolfolk-Hoy, A. W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and teacher education*, *21*(4), 343-356.