

## Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Paid Teachers in Turkey<sup>1</sup>

<sup>2</sup>Selma Saydam

<sup>3</sup>Fatih Yılmaz

### *Abstract*

*In brief, paid teaching is the recruitment of teachers for a temporary period. Teacher self-efficacy, on the other hand, is thought to be important in order to maximize the expected benefit from the educational system. The purpose of this research is to reveal the self-efficacy beliefs of paid teachers in Turkey. The participants consist of 906 paid teachers, from various branches and regions of Turkey, determined using the convenient sampling method. The findings indicate that there are statistically significant differences in some factors according to many of the variables. The self-efficacy beliefs of the participants statistically differ according to gender in the intellectual self-efficacy factor and in the whole scale. There are also statistically significant differences between senior paid teachers and inexperienced paid teachers in all factors of the self-efficacy belief scale in favor of paid teachers as far as teaching in the public sector variable is concerned. While some of the participants have positive expectations from the 2023 educational vision, others are completely hopeless. At the end of the research, taking the research findings into account, some recommendations have also been made.*

**Keywords:** *Educational Administration; Self-efficacy Belief; Teacher Training*

---

<sup>1</sup>This study was presented as a paper at VIII. International Turkcess Congress 2022.

<sup>2</sup>Selma Saydam, Teacher, PhD Student, Turkey

Email: selsay.edu@gmail.com Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5097-9208>

<sup>3</sup>Fatih Yılmaz, PhD, Teacher, Ministry of National Education, Turkey

Email: yilmazoglu@gmail.com Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7852-6756>

**Recommended Citation:** Saydam, S. & Yılmaz, F. (2023). *Self efficacy beliefs of paid teachers in Turkey, Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, 7(2)*

## Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Paid Teachers in Turkey

### Introduction

Teacher training and employment are important issues emphasized worldwide (Çinkır & Kurum, 2017, p. 10), and are always on the agenda. Providing the necessary educational materials, all kinds of teaching equipment, and teacher appointments are among the primary responsibilities of governments. However, sometimes, some governments choose to meet the need for teachers in a cheap and quick way. Paid teaching, called by different names over time and is currently called as paid teaching, can be described as the recruitment of teachers in order to temporarily eliminate the need for teachers from all kinds of branches; and a paid teacher is a person who is recruited temporarily, in the required branch in order to meet the need for teachers, by the district directorates of national education.

In paid teaching practice, if a teacher from the relevant branch cannot be found, teachers from different branches can also be recruited as paid teachers for the required field. In addition, if a teacher for the required branch cannot be found, sometimes, even undergraduate students studying in the department of the needed branch can also be recruited as paid teachers. It seems that with this type of employment, the Ministry of National Education solves the need for teachers inexpensively without appointing a full-time teacher. Similarly, some researchers also think that this method of employment is a kind of cheap labor in education (Öğülmüş et al., 2013, p. 1088). Although the need for teachers seems to be met in the short term, this practice, a kind of dressing treatment, also brings many problems. To be more precise, these teachers, who cannot get enough PPSE (Public Personnel Selection Examination) scores, and are recruited as paid teachers, face various financial, sociological, and moral problems (Bayar & Çelik, 2020; Yılmaz, 2018). For instance, since paid teachers have already graduated from a university but cannot get enough exam scores to be appointed, by society, they are thought of as individuals who have not been able to get a job. Moreover, after graduating from the undergraduate program, teachers working as paid teachers have to adapt to social life, too. However, unfortunately, although they have already reached the age of approximately more than 20, they do not have a full-time job yet. It will probably take a long time for an individual who has graduated from the teaching program to acquire another profession after this age. On the other side, the individual already has a profession which is teaching. For this reason, teacher candidates who have graduated from the teaching programs but have not been appointed tend to become paid teachers.

Considering the literature, one can come across that paid teaching practice is not an employment method specific to Turkey, it is also practiced in various countries of the world (Polat, 2013, p. 68). According to the statistics got from the governorships of 79 provinces in Turkey, in 2021-2022 educational years, 85513 paid teachers worked in public schools (Türk Eğitim-Sen, 2022). Meanwhile, on the other hand, self-efficacy is based on Bandura's social cognitive theory, and there has been a growing interest in teachers' self-efficacy (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007, p. 1059). Bandura (1977) defined self-efficacy as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (As cited in Henson, 2001, p. 5). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs are considered important in getting the desired efficiency both from

the teachers and the educational system. The literature shows that teacher self-efficacy is important in educational contexts, from dealing with disruptive behaviors, improving academic performance, professional commitment, being open to new ideas and developments, having a positive attitude, and having problem-solving skills (Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012, p. 483).

The literature mainly indicates that teacher efficacy focuses on the teacher's perception of his or her own competence, and on the ability of teaching as a professional discipline (Friedman & Kass, 2002, p. 675) since human performance is thought to be a major resource to organizations including schools. Therefore, as Peterson and Arnn (2005) suggest self-efficacy becomes the foundation of human performance (p. 5).

Research shows that teachers with a high level of self-efficacy are expected to work harder to help all students to reach their potential. On the other side, teachers with a low level of self-efficacy are less likely to work hard to reach the learning needs of their students (Pendergast et al., 2011, p. 46). Although there are various studies in the literature studying teacher self-efficacy and self-efficacy levels of teacher candidates in terms of different variables, there are limited researchers studying the self-efficacy belief levels of paid teachers. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to reveal the self-efficacy beliefs of paid teachers. For this purpose, it seeks answers to the following questions.

- What are the self-efficacy belief levels of paid teachers?
- Do their self-efficacy belief levels differ according to some demographic variables?
- Do their self-efficacy belief levels differ according to the factors of the teacher's self-efficacy belief scale?

## Method

### The Research Model

In this research, the survey method, one of the quantitative research methods, has been adopted. The data were collected by becoming a member of the groups created by paid teachers on social media, and the group members were asked to contribute to the research. For this purpose, paid teachers from various branches, who were working as paid teachers all over Turkey or who had worked as a paid teacher at any time in the past, were asked to fill out the teacher self-efficacy scale developed by Çolak et al. (2017).

### Participants

Sampling is really important for the generalizability of empirical research, and the best way to do it is to take a random sample from the population (Leiner, 2016, p. 369). Additionally, sampling has great effect on the quality of inferences, too. However, in this research, it is not possible to determine the exact population. Therefore, the participants of this study consisted of 906 teachers who were working or had worked as a paid teacher anywhere in Turkey. To determine the participants, the convenient sampling method, one of the purposeful sampling methods, was adopted. Although convenience sampling has some generalizability problems (Farrokhi & Mahmoudi-Hamidabad, 2012), it is frequently adopted in social sciences (Leiner, 2016, p. 370). Convenience sampling is briefly described as choosing participants who are conveniently available and willing to participate (Collins et al., 2006). Accordingly, the demographic information of the participants is given in Table 1 below.

**Table 1**

*Demographic information of the participants*

Variables	Category	f	%
Paid Teaching in Public Sector (Years)	0-4	243	26.8
	5-9	357	39.4
	10-14	228	25.2
	15 or more	78	8.6
Type of Institution	State	716	79
	Private	38	38
	Do not work	152	16.8
Geographical Region	The Marmara Region	280	30.9
	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	169	18.7
	The Central Anatolia Region	100	11
	The Eastern Anatolia Region	98	10.8
	The Mediterranean Region	109	12
	The Black Sea Region	74	8.2
	The Aegean Region	76	8.4
Gender	Female	664	73.3
	Male	242	26.7
Age	20-25	48	5.3
	26-35	364	40.2
	36-45	442	48.8
	46 or older	52	5.7
Marital Status	Married	552	60.9
	Single	354	39.1
Number of Children	None	413	45.6
	1-2	411	45.4
	3	64	7.1
	4 or more	18	2
The Highest PPSE score	Less than 50	26	2.9
	50-59	269	29.7
	60-65	198	21.9
	66-75	302	33.3
	76 or more	111	12.3
Opinions on the Paid Teaching Policy	Conditions must be improved	343	37.9
	Must be recruited considering certain criteria	126	13.9

	Should be abolished	404	44.6
	No idea	33	3.6
Opinions on the 2023 Educational Vision	Promising	205	22.6
	Not much would change	269	29.7
	I am hopeless	412	45.5
	No idea	20	2.2
Total		906	100

## The Data Collection Tool and Data Collection

### *Teacher Self-efficacy Beliefs Scale*

The scale was developed by Çolak et al. (2017), consists of four factors called Academic Self-Efficacy (items 1,2,3,4,5;  $\alpha=75$ ), Professional Self-Efficacy (items 6,7,8,9,10,11,12;  $\alpha=86$ ), Social Self-Efficacy (items 13,14,15, 16, 17,18,19, 20;  $\alpha=88$ ) and Intellectual Self-Efficacy (items 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27;  $\alpha=87$ ) and 27 items. Cronbach’s alpha is .93 for the whole scale.

The developers of the scale studied the construct validity of the scale by means of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses; and to find out the reliability level, item-total correlation, Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, and item averages of the lower and upper 27% groups were studied. The scale was developed as a five-point Likert scale with response options ranging from “Disagree to Agree”. Moreover, it has no reverse-coded items.

### Findings

In any research, choosing the right test is the first step for the right deduction or inferences (Kitchen, 2009). The researchers tend to use parametric tests since they are easier to interpret and they are more powerful than non-parametric tests (Hoskin, 2012). In order to be able to decide on the right statistical test, the researchers checked whether the data were normally distributed. The results of the Shapiro-Wilk test showed that none of the factors or the whole scale were normally distributed ( $p<0,05$ ). Therefore, there is no option but to go on with non-parametric tests when the distributional requirements of parametric methods cannot be met (Altman & Bland, 2009; Anderson, 1961). That’s why, in the analysis of the data such techniques as arithmetic mean, percentages, Mann-Whitney U test, and Kruskal-Wallis tests have been used. For the interpretation of arithmetic mean intervals Table 2 below can be the reference.

**Table 2**

### *Arithmetic mean intervals*

Intervals	Interpretation
1.00-1.80	Very Low
1.81-2.60	Low
2.61-3.40	Moderate
3.41-4.20	High
4.21-5.00	Very High

**Table 3**

*Self-efficacy Belief Levels of Participants*

	$\bar{x}$	Std.
Academic Self-Efficacy	4.30	.71
Professional Self-Efficacy	4.66	.44
Social Self-Efficacy	4.54	.54
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	4.16	.66
Total Self-Efficacy	4.43	.46

Considering the means from the self-efficacy beliefs scale and its factors, according to the arithmetic means intervals in Table 3 above, it is high in intellectual self-efficacy and very high in academic self-efficacy, professional self-efficacy, social self-efficacy factors, and the whole scale. In order to determine whether the participants' self-efficacy beliefs differ according to gender, the researchers did the Mann-Whitney U test, and the results are given in Table 4 below.

**Table 4**

*Participants' Self-efficacy Beliefs According to Gender*

	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Academic Self-Efficacy	Female	664	447.45	297109.00	76329.00	.24
	Male	242	470.09	113762.00		
Professional Self-Efficacy	Female	664	452.89	300720.50	79940.50	.90
	Male	242	455.17	110150.50		
Social Self-Efficacy	Female	664	455.18	302239.50	79228.50	.74
	Male	242	448.89	108631.50		
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	Female	664	431.28	286372.50	65592.50	.00
	Male	242	514.46	124498.50		
Total Self-Efficacy	Female	664	442.12	293564.50	72784.50	.03
	Male	242	484.74	117306.50		

According to the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, it was found that the self-efficacy belief levels of the participants differed significantly in favor of male teachers in the whole of the teacher self-efficacy beliefs scale, and in the intellectual self-efficacy factor. In order to determine whether the self-efficacy beliefs of the participants differ according to paid teaching in the public sector variable, the Kruskal-Wallis test was done, and the results are given in Table 5 below.

**Table 5**

*Participants' Self-efficacy Beliefs According to Paid Teaching in Public Sector*

	Paid Teaching in Public Sector	N	Mean Rank	df	$\chi^2$	p
Academic Self-Efficacy	0-4 years	243	415.97	3	15.23	.00
	5-9 years	357	441.75			
	10-14 years	228	504.02			

	15 years or more	78	476.52			
Professional Self-Efficacy	0-4 years	243	391.73	3	27.18	.00
	5-9 years	357	454.18			
	10-14 years	228	507.85			
	15 years or more	78	483.93			
Social Self-Efficacy	0-4 years	243	381.28	3	28.30	.00
	5-9 years	357	471.97			
	10-14 years	228	498.11			
	15 years or more	78	463.57			
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	0-4 years	243	408.99	3	17.96	.00
	5-9 years	357	448.28			
	10-14 years	228	510.08			
	15 years or more	78	450.67			
Total Self-Efficacy	0-4 years	243	384.91	3	31.36	.00
	5-9 years	357	454.01			
	10-14 years	228	518.64			
	15 years or more	78	474.44			

According to the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test, done to determine the differences in the participants' self-efficacy beliefs, statistically significant differences were found in all of the factors, and in the whole of the teacher self-efficacy beliefs scale. Tamhane's T2 test was used to determine the source of the differences and the results are given in Table 6 below.

**Table 6**

*Tamhane's T2 Test Results According to Paid Teaching in Public Sector*

	Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	p	Difference
Academic Self-Efficacy	10-14 years	.25	.00	0-4 years
	10-14 years	.15	.03	5-9 years
Professional Self-Efficacy	5-9 years	.13	.00	0-4 years
	10-14 years	.23	.00	0-4 years
	15 years or more	.16	.02	0-4 years
Social Self-Efficacy	5-9 years	.20	.00	0-4 years
	10-14 years	.25	.00	0-4 years
	15 years or more	.23	.00	0-4 years
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	10-14 years	.26	.00	0-4 years
	10-14 years	.15	.01	5-9 years
Total Self-Efficacy	5-9 years	.14	.00	0-4 years
	10-14 years	.25	.00	0-4 years
	15 years or more	.17	.03	0-4 years

Taking Tamhane's T2 test results into account, it can be concluded that there are statistically significant differences between senior and inexperienced paid teachers in favor of senior paid teachers. The Kruskal-Wallis test was done to find out whether the participants' self-efficacy beliefs differ according to the type of institution they worked at, and the results are given in Table 7 below.

**Table 7**

*Participants' Self-efficacy Beliefs According to the Type of Institution They Work at*

	Type of Institution	N	Mean Rank	df	$\chi^2$	p
Academic Self-Efficacy	State	716	451.82	2	.55	.75
	Private	38	483.91			
	Do not work	152	453.82			
Professional Self-Efficacy	State	716	445.91	2	3.98	.13
	Private	38	513.99			
	Do not work	152	474.13			
Social Self-Efficacy	State	716	446.39	2	3.14	.20
	Private	38	506.76			
	Do not work	152	473.65			
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	State	716	446.67	2	2.42	.29
	Private	38	490.08			
	Do not work	152	476.51			
Total Self-Efficacy	State	716	445.71	2	3.70	.15
	Private	38	513.89			
	Do not work	152	475.12			

According to Table 7 above, it is clear that teachers' self-efficacy beliefs do not differ according to the type of institution they work at. In order to determine whether the teachers' self-efficacy beliefs differ according to the geographical region, the Kruskal Wallis test was done and the results are given in Table 8 below.

**Table 8**

*Participants' Self-efficacy Beliefs According to the Geographical Region*

	Geographical Region	N	Mean Rank	df	$\chi^2$	p
Academic Self-Efficacy	The Marmara Region	280	427.62	6	19.11	.00
	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	169	500.29			
	The Central Anatolia Region	100	409.43			



	The Eastern Anatolia Region	98	481.00			
	The Mediterranean Region	109	502.94			
	The Black Sea Region	74	405.01			
	The Aegean Region	76	443.62			
	The Marmara Region	280	420.63			
	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	169	499.86			
	The Central Anatolia Region	100	449.66			
Professional Self-Efficacy	The Eastern Anatolia Region	98	472.43	6	18.89	.00
	The Mediterranean Region	109	469.61			
	The Black Sea Region	74	388.18			
	The Aegean Region	76	492.64			
	The Marmara Region	280	420.32			
	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	169	509.53			
	The Central Anatolia Region	100	457.77			
Social Self-Efficacy	The Eastern Anatolia Region	98	498.51	6	25.05	.00
	The Mediterranean Region	109	448.86			
	The Black Sea Region	74	367.24			
	The Aegean Region	76	478.14			
	The Marmara Region	280	430.54			
	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	169	519.11			
	The Central Anatolia Region	100	439.96			
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	The Eastern Anatolia Region	98	512.51	6	37.13	.00
	The Mediterranean Region	109	467.68			
	The Black Sea Region	74	323.20			

	The Aegean Region	76	440.44			
	The Marmara Region	280	417.01			
	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	169	529.19			
	The Central Anatolia Region	100	431.88			
Total Self-Efficacy	The Eastern Anatolia Region	98	502.97	6	38.30	.00
	The Mediterranean Region	109	474.80			
	The Black Sea Region	74	341.06			
	The Aegean Region	76	463.20			

According to the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test, done to determine the differences in the participants' self-efficacy beliefs, statistically significant differences were found in all of the factors, and in the whole of the teacher self-efficacy beliefs scale. Tamhane's T2 test was used to determine the source of the differences, and the results are given in Table 9 below.

**Table 9**  
*Tamhane's T2 Test Results According to Geographical Region*

	Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	P	Difference
Academic Self-Efficacy	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	.21	.01	The Marmara Region
	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	.14	.02	The Marmara Region
Professional Self-Efficacy	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	.19	.04	The Black Sea Region
	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	.17	.01	The Marmara Region
Social Self-Efficacy	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	.29	.02	The Black Sea Region
	The Eastern Anatolia Region	.29	.04	The Black Sea Region
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	.21	.01	The Marmara Region
	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	.45	.00	The Black Sea Region
	The Eastern Anatolia Region	.43	.00	The Black Sea Region

	The Mediterranean Region	.34	.00	The Black Sea Region
	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	.18	.00	The Marmara Region
Total	The South Eastern Anatolia Region	.31	.00	The Black Sea Region
Self-Efficacy	The Eastern Anatolia Region	.28	.00	The Black Sea Region
	The Mediterranean Region	.24	.01	The Black Sea Region

According to Tamhane's T2 test results, done to determine between which groups the differences were, there were generally differences between The Black Sea Region, The Marmara Region and The Southeastern Anatolia Region, The Eastern Anatolia Region, The Mediterranean Region in favor of the paid teachers working in The Southeast Anatolia Region, The Eastern Anatolia Region, and The Mediterranean Region. Readers are advised to refer to Table 9 above for detailed information about the differences between groups.

**Table 10**

*Participants' Self-efficacy Beliefs According to Age*

	Age Range	N	Mean Rank	df	$\chi^2$	p
Academic Self-Efficacy	20-25	48	427.08	3	8.80	.03
	26-35	364	443.99			
	36-45	442	452.44			
	46 or more	52	553.51			
Professional Self-Efficacy	20-25	48	340.48	3	15.60	.00
	26-35	364	444.53			
	36-45	442	464.81			
	46 or more	52	524.42			
Social Self-Efficacy	20-25	48	348.70	3	13.12	.00
	26-35	364	437.52			
	36-45	442	475.56			
	46 or more	52	474.58			
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	20-25	48	413.22	3	8.52	.03
	26-35	364	450.96			
	36-45	442	448.56			
	46 or more	52	550.46			
Total Self-Efficacy	20-25	48	371.39	3	11.91	.00
	26-35	364	441.81			
	36-45	442	461.56			
	46 or more	52	542.61			

According to the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test, done to determine the differences in the participants' self-efficacy beliefs, statistically significant differences were found in all of the factors, and in the whole of the teacher self-efficacy beliefs scale. Tamhane's T2 test was used to determine the source of the differences and the results are given in Table 11 below.

**Table 11**

*Tamhane's T2 Test Results According to Age*

	Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	p	Difference
Professional Self-Efficacy	36-45	.24	.01	20-25
	46 or more	.34	.01	20-25
	46 or more	.16	.01	26-35
Social Self-Efficacy	36-45	.32	.00	20-25
	36-45	.10	.02	26-35
Total Self-Efficacy	46 or more	.31	.01	20-25

As a result of Tamhane's T2 test, done to determine the source of the difference between the groups, it came out that there were differences in favor of relatively older paid teachers in professional self-efficacy and social self-efficacy factors, and in total self-efficacy beliefs. The statistically significant differences found as a result of the Kruskal Wallis test in the intellectual self-efficacy and academic self-efficacy factors were not found to be significant as a result of Tamhane's T2 test. In order to determine whether the participants' self-efficacy beliefs differ according to their marital status, the researchers did the Mann-Whitney U test, and the results are given in Table 12 below.

**Table 12**

*Participants' Self-efficacy Beliefs According to Marital Status*

	Marital Status	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Academic Self-Efficacy	Married	552	453.67	250427.50	97608.50	.98
	Single	354	453.23	160443.50		
Professional Self-Efficacy	Married	552	470.72	259839.00	88197.00	.00
	Single	354	426.64	151032.00		
Social Self-Efficacy	Married	552	469.98	259428.00	88608.00	.01
	Single	354	427.81	151443.00		
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	Married	552	443.64	244892.00	92264.00	.15
	Single	354	468.87	165979.00		
Total Self-Efficacy	Married	552	459.61	253705.00	94331.00	.38
	Single	354	443.97	157166.00		

According to the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, it was found that the self-efficacy beliefs of the participants differed significantly in favor of married teachers in professional self-efficacy and social self-efficacy factors. In order to determine whether the self-efficacy beliefs of the participants differ according to the number of children they have, the Kruskal Wallis test was done, and the results are given in Table 13 below.

**Table 13**

*Participants' Self-efficacy Beliefs According to the Number of Children They Have*

	Number of Children	N	Mean Rank	df	$\chi^2$	p
Academic Self-Efficacy	None	413	457.51	3	3.06	.38
	1-2	411	452.31			
	3	64	414.34			
	4 or more	18	527.69			
Professional Self-Efficacy	None	413	424.07	3	13.91	.00
	1-2	411	482.58			
	3	64	433.27			
	4 or more	18	536.78			
Social Self-Efficacy	None	413	427.58	3	13.24	.00
	1-2	411	476.05			
	3	64	436.16			
	4 or more	18	594.97			
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	None	413	466.67	3	3.53	.31
	1-2	411	444.17			
	3	64	415.27			
	4 or more	18	500.33			
Total Self-Efficacy	None	413	443.22	3	5.08	.16
	1-2	411	462.82			
	3	64	428.33			
	4 or more	18	566.06			

According to the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test, done to determine the differences in the participants' self-efficacy beliefs, statistically significant differences were found in professional self-efficacy and social self-efficacy factors. Tamhane's T2 test was used to determine the source of the differences, and the results are given in Table 14 below.

**Table 14**

*Tamhane's T2 Test Results According to the Number of Children the Participants Have*

	Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	p	Difference
Professional Self-Efficacy	1-2	.11	.00	None
Social Self-Efficacy	1-2	.13	.00	None
	4 or more	.33	.01	None

As a result of Tamhane’s T2 test done to find out the source of the difference between the groups, a statistically significant difference was determined in the professional self-efficacy factor between teachers having 1 or 2 children and teachers having no children in favor of teachers having 1 or 2 children. Additionally, in the social self-efficacy factor, there was a statistically significant difference between teachers having 1 or 2 children and teachers having 4 or more children and teachers having no children in favor of teachers having 1 or 2 children and teachers having 4 or more children. In order to determine whether the self-efficacy beliefs of the participants differ according to the highest PPSE score they got, the Kruskal-Wallis test was done, and the results are given in Table 15 below.

**Table 15**

*Participants’ Self-efficacy Beliefs According to the Highest PPSE Score They Got*

	The Highest PPSE Score	N	Mean Rank	df	$\chi^2$	p
Academic Self-Efficacy	Less than 50	26	452.00	4	12.48	.01
	50-59	269	498.59			
	60-65	198	430.05			
	66-75	302	429.34			
	76 or more	111	452.12			
Professional Self-Efficacy	Less than 50	26	503.50	4	11.11	.02
	50-59	269	490.42			
	60-65	198	447.26			
	66-75	302	430.94			
	76 or more	111	424.83			
Social Self-Efficacy	Less than 50	26	446.73	4	11.14	.02
	50-59	269	494.95			
	60-65	198	438.87			
	66-75	302	441.57			
	76 or more	111	413.20			
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	Less than 50	26	409.98	4	9.24	.05
	50-59	269	454.30			
	60-65	198	413.60			
	66-75	302	466.65			
	76 or more	111	497.16			
Total Self-Efficacy	Less than 50	26	440.37	4	8.75	.06
	50-59	269	491.11			
	60-65	198	423.68			
	66-75	302	442.98			
	76 or more	111	447.23			

As a result of the Kruskal Wallis analysis, it came out that the participants' self-efficacy beliefs differed significantly according to the highest PPSE score the participants got in the factors of the teacher self-efficacy beliefs scale. Tamhane's T2 test was used to determine the source of the differences, and the results are given in Table 16 below.

**Table 16**

*Tamhane's T2 Test Results According to the Highest PPSE Score the Participants Got*

	Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	p	Difference
Academic Self-Efficacy	50-59	.18	.01	66-75
Professional Self-Efficacy	50-59	.13	.00	66-75

As a result of Tamhane's T2 test, a statistically significant difference was determined between the participants' self-efficacy beliefs who scored 50-59 and 66-75 in PPSE, in favor of the ones who scored 50-59 in academic self-efficacy and professional self-efficacy factors. The significant difference in the social self-efficacy and intellectual self-efficacy factors that were found as a result of the Kruskal Wallis analysis could not be found as a result of Tamhane's T2 test. In order to determine whether the self-efficacy beliefs of the participants differ according to the participants' opinions on the paid teaching policy, the Kruskal-Wallis test was done, and the results are given in Table 17 below.

**Table 17**

*Participants' Self-efficacy Beliefs According to the Opinions on the Paid Teaching Policy*

	Opinions on the paid teaching policy	N	Mean Rank	df	$\chi^2$	p
Academic Self-Efficacy	Conditions must be improved	343	410.76	3	16.28	.00
	Should be appointed considering certain criteria	126	501.08			
	Should be abolished	404	473.94			
	No idea	33	465.77			
Professional Self-Efficacy	Conditions must be improved	343	410.76	3	18.97	.00
	Should be appointed considering certain criteria	126	501.08			
	Should be abolished	404	473.94			
	No idea	33	465.77			
Social Self-Efficacy	Conditions must be improved	343	410.76	3	11.66	.00
	Should be appointed considering certain criteria	126	501.08			
	Should be abolished	404	473.94			
	No idea	33	465.77			
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	Conditions must be improved	343	410.76	3.	19.34	.00
	Should be appointed considering certain criteria	126	501.08			

	Should be abolished	404	473.94			
	No idea	33	465.77			
	Conditions must be improved	343	410.76			
Total	Should be appointed considering certain criteria	126	501.08	3	24.53	.00
Self-Efficacy	Should be abolished	404	473.94			
	No idea	33	465.77			

According to the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test, done to determine the differences in the participants' self-efficacy beliefs, statistically significant differences were found in all of the factors, and in the whole of the teacher self-efficacy scale. Tamhane's T2 test was used to determine the source of the differences, and the results are given in Table 18 below.

**Table 18**

*Tamhane's T2 Test Results According to the Opinions on the Paid Teaching Policy*

	Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	p	Difference
Academic Self-Efficacy	Should be appointed considering certain criteria	.24	.00	Conditions must be improved
	Should be abolished	.17	.00	Conditions must be improved
Professional Self-Efficacy	Should be appointed considering certain criteria	.17	.00	Conditions must be improved
	Should be abolished	.10	.00	Conditions must be improved
Social Self-Efficacy	Should be appointed considering certain criteria	.18	.00	Conditions must be improved
	Should be abolished	.13	.00	Conditions must be improved
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	Should be appointed considering certain criteria	.29	.00	Conditions must be improved
	Should be abolished	.14	.02	Conditions must be improved
Total Self-Efficacy	Should be appointed considering certain criteria	.22	.00	Conditions must be improved
	Should be abolished	.13	.00	Conditions must be improved

As a result of Tamhane's T2 test, in all the factors and in the total of the scale, statistically significant differences were determined between the participants' self-efficacy beliefs who thought that paid teachers should be appointed considering certain criteria and who thought that paid teaching conditions must be improved, in favor of the ones who thought that paid teachers should



be appointed considering certain criteria. Similarly, in all the factors and in the total of the scale, statistically significant differences were determined between the participants' self-efficacy beliefs who thought that paid teaching should be abolished and who thought that paid teaching conditions must be improved, in favor of the ones who thought that paid teaching should be abolished. In order to determine whether the self-efficacy beliefs of the participants differ according to the opinions on 2023 Educational Vision the Kruskal-Wallis test was done, and the results are given in Table 19 below.

**Table 19**  
*Participants' Opinions on 2023 Educational Vision*

	2023 Educational Vision	N	Mean Rank	df	$\chi^2$	p
Academic Self-Efficacy	Promising	205	467.10	3	20.05	.00
	Not much would change	269	395.21			
	I am hopeless	412	483.42			
	No idea	20	481.80			
Professional Self-Efficacy	Promising	205	468.94	3	17.78	.00
	Not much would change	269	400.48			
	I am hopeless	412	479.89			
	No idea	20	464.82			
Social Self-Efficacy	Promising	205	462.62	3	15.37	.00
	Not much would change	269	406.22			
	I am hopeless	412	482.21			
	No idea	20	404.60			
Intellectual Self-Efficacy	Promising	205	464.54	3	17.59	.00
	Not much would change	269	399.86			
	I am hopeless	412	479.18			
	No idea	20	532.83			
Total Self-Efficacy	Promising	205	472.58	3	21.72	.00
	Not much would change	269	391.53			
	I am hopeless	412	489.39			
	No idea	20	475.80			

According to the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test, done to determine the differences in the participants' self-efficacy beliefs according to the opinions on 2023 educational vision variable, statistically, significant differences were found in all of the factors and in the whole of the teacher self-efficacy beliefs scale. Tamhane's T2 test was used to determine the source of the differences, and the results are given in Table 20 below.

**Table 20**

*Tamhane's T2 Test Results According to the Opinions on 2023 Educational Vision*

	Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	p	Difference
Academic Self-Efficacy	Promising	.19	.02	Not much would change
	I am hopeless	.21	.00	Not much would change
	Promising	.13	.00	Not much would change
	I am hopeless	.14	.00	Not much would change
Professional Self-Efficacy	Promising	.16	.00	Not much would change
	I am hopeless	.17	.00	Not much would change
	Promising	.18	.01	Not much would change
	I am hopeless	.22	.00	Not much would change
Social Self-Efficacy	Promising	.16	.00	Not much would change
	I am hopeless	.18	.00	Not much would change

As a result of Tamhane's T2 test, in terms of opinions on 2023 educational vision, statistically, significant differences were determined between the "promising" and "not much would change" groups in favor of the "promising" group. Similarly, statistically significant differences were determined between the "I am hopeless" and "not much would change" groups in favor of "I am hopeless" group.

### Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper, the practice of paid teaching, a solution practiced by the Ministry of National Education, with the help of district directorates of national education, to meet the need for teachers, which is one of Turkey's employment problems, is studied. A total of 906 paid teachers working in various provinces of Turkey participated in this research. Taking the data on paid teaching in the public sector into consideration, it can be assumed that paid teachers think of finding a job that will provide them with a better income after graduating from the undergraduate program. In terms of the type of institution the participants worked at, it came out that the majority of the participants were working or had worked as paid teachers in the public sector. This finding can indicate that the need for teachers in the public sector is higher than it is in the private sector.

Considering the geographical region where the participants work, it can be inferred that the need for teachers is mostly in the Marmara region, and a considerable part of the participants are female paid teachers. Based on these findings, it can be thought that especially male teacher candidates do not prefer paid teaching if they cannot be appointed after graduation; they either prefer other professions or they prefer to get prepared for the PPSE to be held in the following years. The number of children the participants have, their age distribution, and paid teaching in the public sector are in parallel. The parallelism between the age distribution of the participants, and their marital status draws attention. Although even if the participants cannot be appointed to the teaching profession after graduation, they need to adapt to life and have children as they get older. When the opinions of the participants in terms of paid teaching policy are taken into consideration, the majority of the participants think that the practice of paid teaching should be abolished, while a

significant number of them stated that the conditions of paid teachers should be improved. Moreover, regarding the opinions on the 2023 educational vision, most of the participants stated that they were hopeless.

The self-efficacy beliefs of the participants were high in the intellectual self-efficacy factor and very high in the academic self-efficacy, professional self-efficacy, social self-efficacy factors, and in the total scale. The high self-efficacy beliefs of paid teachers are considered important since it can be inferred that teachers with high beliefs of their own self-efficacy will also be very helpful and productive for their students; and will also have high job satisfaction (Buluç & Demir, 2015; Dağlı & Kalkan, 2021; Kurt, 2012; Telef, 2011). Therefore, it may be inferred that if teachers' job satisfaction decreases, the quality in education will decrease as well. That's why, the factors negatively affecting teachers' job satisfaction should be eliminated as much as possible (Filiz, 2014; Kıvılcım, 2014; Türk, 2008).

As a result of the analysis, it came out that the self-efficacy beliefs of the participants differed statistically in favor of male teachers in the intellectual self-efficacy factor and in the whole scale. Similarly, Yeşilyurt (2013) found that the self-efficacy perceptions of teacher candidates differed in favor of male teachers. However, Toy and Duru (2016) determined that self-efficacy perceptions of classroom teachers differed in favor of female teachers. Aslan and Kalkan (2018), Kavrayıcı and Bayrak (2016), on the other hand, determined that teachers' self-efficacy perceptions did not differ depending on gender. Consequently, it can be concluded that research findings on teacher self-efficacy vary in terms of gender in the literature.

In terms of paid teaching in the public sector, statistically significant differences were found in all factors of the self-efficacy beliefs scale, and in the total scale between senior paid teachers and inexperienced paid teachers in favor of senior paid teachers. This finding implies that self-efficacy belief increases as people gain experience. Aslan and Kalkan (2018) determined a statistically significant difference between teachers having more professional seniority and teachers having less professional seniority in various factors of the self-efficacy scale in favor of teachers having more professional seniority. On the other hand, Yılmaz and Çokluk-Bökeoğlu (2008) stated that there was no significant difference in the factors of the teacher efficacy scale in terms of professional seniority. Similarly, Üstüner et al. (2009) revealed that secondary school teachers' self-efficacy perceptions did not differ as far as professional seniority was concerned; in the same way, Ekici (2006) revealed that vocational high school teachers' self-efficacy perceptions did not differ according to professional seniority. Accordingly, it can be concluded that teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy may vary either depending on the characteristics of the participants or even the number of participants in the research. It can also be concluded that the self-efficacy perceptions of paid teachers are in parallel with the increase in their teaching experience.

While the self-efficacy beliefs of paid teachers do not vary according to the type of institution they work at, some statistically significant differences were found between various regions in terms of the geographical region where the participants work. It is obvious that the differences generally concentrate on the Southeastern Anatolia Region and the Marmara Region in favor of the paid teachers working in the Southeastern Anatolia Region. It is thought that these differences may be due to crowded classrooms in various geographical regions, more than one paid teacher working

in the same school, more than one paid teacher teaching the same class or course, or parents' expectations from the teachers. In terms of age, the self-efficacy beliefs of paid teachers in the whole of the self-efficacy beliefs scale, and in the of professional self-efficacy and social self-efficacy factors show a statistically significant difference between older and younger paid teachers in favor of older teachers in general, as in paid teaching in public sector variable. Regarding this finding, similar inferences can be made as in paid teaching in public sector variable. As the participants get older their social circle, naturally, expands and changes, their teaching experience increases, and in turn, their self-efficacy beliefs increase (Aslan & Kalkan, 2018; Çolak, 2019).

The self-efficacy beliefs of the participants show a statistically significant difference in favor of married paid teachers in terms of professional self-efficacy and social self-efficacy as far as their marital status is concerned. Benzer (2011) also found similar findings in his research. Furthermore, the findings of our research show that there is a statistically significant difference between the teachers having children and the teachers not having children, in favor of the teachers having children, in terms of professional self-efficacy and social self-efficacy factors according to the number of children variable. It is thought that marital status and the number of children are closely related to age and professional seniority variables. As may be recalled, statistically significant differences were found in terms of age in professional self-efficacy, social self-efficacy factors, and in the whole of the self-efficacy beliefs scale; and in terms of paid teaching in public sector variable, statistically significant differences were found in all of the factors and in the whole of the scale. Therefore, it is not surprising that the differences found in terms of marital status and number of children were also found in terms of age and teaching in public sector (in terms of years) variables.

The anxiety about being appointed to teaching profession is one of the primary concerns that worry prospective teachers after graduation. In terms of the highest PPSE score, it came out that the participants' self-efficacy beliefs differed between the participants who scored 50-59 points in the academic self-efficacy and professional self-efficacy factors and the participants who scored 66-75 points; in favor of the participants who scored between 50-59 points. First of all, one should keep in mind that as Hodges (2008) puts forward self-efficacy beliefs are context-specific. Therefore, when making inferences one should always be careful as situations change (p. 7). In fact, it was hypothesized that there was no relationship between PPSE scores and self-efficacy beliefs of paid teachers, but when the research results are taken into consideration, it can be inferred that the fact that teachers with lower PPSE scores have higher self-efficacy beliefs may be related to the courses taught by the participants or the grade levels they taught. Another reason leading to this inference may be related to the personal characteristics of the participants, or it may be that teachers with low PPSE scores may have higher motivation levels than teachers with high PPSE scores.

In terms of the opinions on the paid teaching policy, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference between the ones thinking that “paid teachers should be appointed considering certain criteria and paid teaching should be abolished” and “paid teaching conditions must be improved” in favor of the ones “paid teachers should be appointed considering certain criteria and paid teaching should be abolished” in all factors of the self-efficacy scale and in the whole scale. In practice, paid teachers do the same job as full-time teachers. There is no difference

between what is expected of a paid teacher teaching a subject and a full-time teacher. Moreover, the duties and responsibilities of paid teachers are very similar to those of full-time teachers. However, they do not have equal rights in terms of personal and financial rights. That's why, it is possible to say that this situation sometimes causes unrest between full-time teachers and paid teachers (Bayram, 2009). The research done by Ayna and Deniz (2022) can be a good reference here. In their research, in terms of professional reputation, the participants used negative metaphors for paid teachers owing to the thought that "paid teacher" expression implies a negative connotation, paid teachers are not taken seriously, they are regarded as temporary and inadequate, and as a result, all those impressions cause serious problems in their professional self-confidence (p. 67).

Additionally, paid teachers can be discharged for some reason, and cannot receive equal payment even if they have the same course load as full-time teachers. Therefore, the problems they experience in terms of wages and personal rights affect them negatively (Gökçe, 2014; Öğülmüş et al. 2013). This, in turn, causes paid teachers not to develop a sense of commitment to the organization since they are aware that they are working in the organization for a temporary period (Demirdağ, 2017; Doğan et al. 2013; Tunç & Gülseven Taner, 2020; Yılmaz, 2018). These problems are faced as a result of the fact that education faculties give more graduates than the Ministry of National Education can employ (Kiraz & Kurul, 2018).

For the reasons explained above, paid teachers do paid teaching for a temporary period until they are appointed. Since paid teaching remains an option for teacher candidates who cannot be appointed as a full-time teacher despite graduating from the faculty of education, it is thought that they do not start another job. For this reason, they want to be appointed to full-time positions or want to quit paid teaching.

The 2023 educational vision document can be considered as a declaration sharing the innovations in the education system with the public on the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Republic of Turkey (2023 Eğitim Vizyonu, n.d.). The document in question has brought about various expectations in public education, and in this study, the expectations of paid teachers from the content of the document in question have been studied. In terms of the 2023 educational vision, statistically significant differences were found in all factors of the teacher self-efficacy scale and in the total scale between the options "promising" and "not much would change" and the options "I am hopeless" and "not much would change" in favor of the participants stating "promising" and "I am hopeless". Based on the findings, while some of the participants have some positive expectations about the 2023 educational vision, some of them are completely hopeless about it. Consideringly, it can be concluded that the 2023 educational vision declaration does not actually meet the expectations of the participants.

## Recommendations

- Some improvements should be made in the employment and working conditions of paid teachers.
- Contracts between the paid teachers and district directorates of national education for predetermined periods of time should be signed so that paid teachers do not have to worry about being discharged at any time.

- The need for teachers should be met by appointing full-time teachers rather than recruiting paid teachers.
- In future studies, the difference between the self-efficacy beliefs of full-time teachers and paid teachers can be studied.

## References

- 2023 Eğitim Vizyonu. (n.d.).  
[https://www.gmka.gov.tr/dokumanlar/yayinlar/2023\\_E%C4%9Fitim%20Vizyonu.pdf](https://www.gmka.gov.tr/dokumanlar/yayinlar/2023_E%C4%9Fitim%20Vizyonu.pdf)
- Altman, D. G. & Bland, J. M. (2009). Parametric v non-parametric methods for data analysis. *Bmj*, 338. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a3167>
- Anderson, N. H. (1961). Scales and statistics: Parametric and nonparametric. *Psychological Bulletin*, 58(4), 305-316. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0042576>
- Aslan, M. & Kalkan, H. (2018). Öğretmenlerin özyeterlik algılarının analizi. *Bingöl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 8(16), 477-493. <https://doi.org/10.29029/busbed.434926>
- Ayna, Y. & Deniz, L. (2022). Ücretli öğretmenlik: Bir metafor çalışması. *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Ereğli Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(1), 53-71. <https://doi.org/10.51119/ereegf.2022.22>
- Bayar, A. & Çelik, K. (2020). Ücretli öğretmenlerin karşılaştıkları sorunlar ve çözüm yolları. *Academic Social Resources Journal*, 5(16), 361-371. <https://doi.org/10.31569/ASRJOURNAL.87>
- Bayram, G. (2009). Öğretmenlerin istihdam biçimi farklılıkları ve yarattığı sorunlar: Ankara'da çalışan sözleşmeli ve ücretli öğretmenlerin görüşlerine dayalı bir araştırma. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ankara University.
- Benzer, F. (2011). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim kurumlarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin öz yeterlik algılarının analizi. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Selçuk University.
- Buluç, B. & Demir, S. (2015). İlk ve ortaokul öğretmenlerinin öz-yeterlik algıları ile iş doyumları arasındaki ilişki. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(1), 289-308.
- Collins, K. M., Onwuegbuzie, A. J. & Jiao, Q. G. (2006). Prevalence of mixed-methods sampling designs in social science research. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 19(2), 83-101. <https://doi.org/10.2167/eri421.0>

- Çinkır, Ş. & Kurum, G. (2017). To be appointed or not to be appointed: The problems of paid-teachers. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 5(3), 9-35. <https://doi.org/10.14689/issn.2148-2624.1.5c3s1m>
- Çolak, G. (2019). Öğretmenlerin özyeterlik algıları ile iş stresleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Kastamonu University, Kastamonu, Turkey.
- Çolak, İ., Yorulmaz, Y. İ. & Altinkurt, Y. (2017). Öğretmen özyeterlik inancı ölçeği geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(1), 20-32. <https://doi.org/10.21666/muefd.319209>
- Dağlı, E., & Kalkan, F. (2021). Okul müdürlerinin güçlendirici liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin öz yeterlik algıları ve iş doyumu düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 46(208). <https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2021.10083>
- Demirdağ, S. (2017). Ücretli öğretmen algılarına göre ilköğretim yöneticilerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel güven ve yildırma davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(1), 132-153. <https://doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2017.17.28551-304626>
- Doğan, S., Beşir Demir, S. & Turan, N. (2013). Ücretli öğretmenlik uygulamasının değerlendirilmesi. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 8(12), 371-390. <https://doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.5850>
- Ekici, G. (2006). Meslek lisesi öğretmenlerinin öğretmen öz-yeterlik inançları üzerine bir araştırma. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER)*, (24), 87-96.
- Farrokhi, F. & Mahmoudi-Hamidabad, A. (2012). Rethinking convenience sampling: Defining quality criteria. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 2(4), 784-792. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.4.784-792>
- Filiz, Z. (2014). Öğretmenlerin iş doyumu ve tükenmişlik düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Yönetim İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi*, 10(23), 157-172. <https://doi.org/10.17130/ijmeb.2014.10.23.437>
- Friedman, I. A. & Kass, E. (2002). Teacher self-efficacy: A classroom-organization conceptualization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(6), 675-686. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(02\)00027-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(02)00027-6)
- Gökçe, A. T. (2014). Atanamama nedeniyle farklı bir mesleğe yönelen işsiz aday öğretmenler üzerine bir çalışma. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(1), 191-208. <https://doi.org/10.16992/ASOS.64>

- Henson, R. K. (2001, January). *Teacher self-efficacy: Substantive implication and measurement dilemmas*. Paper presented as an invited keynote address given at the annual meeting of the Educational Research Exchange, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.
- Hodges, C. B. (2008). Self-efficacy in the context of online learning environments: A review of the literature and directions for research. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 20(3-4), 7-25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/piq.20001>
- Hoskin, T. (2012). Parametric and nonparametric: Demystifying the terms. In *Mayo Clinic* (Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1-5).
- Kavrayıcı, C. & Bayrak, C. (2016). Öğretmen adaylarının öz-yeterlik algıları. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 8(23), 623-658. <https://doi.org/10.14520/adyusbd.70805>
- Kıvılcım, P. (2014). Öğretmenlerde iş doyumunu, öz-yeterlik inancı ve yaşam doyumunu ilişkisinin karşılaştırılması. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Toros University.
- Kiraz, Z. & Kurul, N. (2018). Türkiye’de öğretmen işsizliği ve ataması yapılmayan öğretmenler hareketi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14 (1), 270-302. <https://doi.org/10.17860/mersinefd.344474>
- Kitchen C. M. (2009). Nonparametric vs parametric tests of location in biomedical research. *American Journal of Ophthalmology*, 147(4), 571-572. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2008.06.031>
- Kurt, T. (2012). Öğretmenlerin öz yeterlik ve kolektif yeterlik algıları. *Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, 10(2), 195-227.
- Leiner, D. J. (2016). Our research’s breadth lives on convenience samples: A case study of the online respondent pool “SoSci Panel”. *SCM Studies in Communication and Media*, 5(4), 367-396. <https://doi.org/10.5771/2192-4007-2016-4-367>
- Mojavezi, A. & Tamiz, M. P. (2012). The Impact of teacher self-efficacy on the students' motivation and achievement. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 2(3), 483-491. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tppls.2.3.483-491>
- Öğülmüş, K., Yıldırım, N., & Aslan, G. (2013). Ücretli öğretmenlerin görevlerini yaparken karşılaştıkları sorunlar ve ücretli öğretmenlik uygulamasının okul yöneticilerince değerlendirilmesi. *İlköğretim Online*, 12(4), 1086-1099.



- Pendergast, D., Garvis, S. & Keogh, J. (2011). Pre-service student-teacher self-efficacy beliefs: An insight into the making of teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(12), 46-57. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2011v36n12.6>
- Peterson, T. O. & Arnn, R. B. (2005). Self-efficacy: The foundation of human performance. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 18(2), 5-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-8327.2005.tb00330.x>
- Polat, S. (2013). Ücretli öğretmenlik istihdamının yarattığı sorunlar üzerine nitel bir araştırma. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(28), 67-88.
- Skaalvik, E. M. & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(3), 611-625. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.611>
- Telef, B. B. (2011). Öğretmenlerin öz-yeterlikleri, iş doyumları, yaşam doyumları ve tükenmişliklerinin incelenmesi. *İlköğretim Online*, 10(1), 91-108.
- Toy, S. N. & Duru, S. (2016). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğretmen öz yeterlikleri ile kaynaştırma eğitimine ilişkin yeterlik inançlarının karşılaştırılması. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 17(1), 146-173. <https://doi.org/10.12984/eed.00332>
- Tunç, B. & Gülseven Taner, S. (2020). Kamusal eğitim ve eğitim hakkı bağlamında ücretli öğretmenlik uygulamasının değerlendirilmesi. *Journal of Advanced Education Studies*, 2(1), 22-44.
- Türk, Ö. (2008). İlköğretim sınıf öğretmenlerinin özyeterlikleri ve mesleki doyumlarının incelenmesi. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Yeditepe University.
- Türk Eğitim-Sen. (2022). Ücretli öğretmen sayısı zirve yaptı. <https://turkegitimsen.org.tr/ucretli-ogretmen-sayisi-zirve-yapti>
- Üstüner, M., Demirtaş, H., Cömert, M. & Özer, N. (2009). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin öz-yeterlik algıları. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(17), 1-16.
- Yeşilyurt, E. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen öz-yeterlik algıları. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(45), 88-104.
- Yılmaz, M. (2018). Ücretli öğretmenlerin karşılaştıkları sorunlar. *Akdeniz Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 12(25), 102-116. <https://doi.org/10.29329/mjer.2018.153.6>
- Yılmaz, K. & Çokluk-Bökeoğlu, Ö. (2008). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin yeterlik inançları. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 41(2), 143-167.