



Gündüz, Y. (2022). The correlation between teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and tolerance and psychological well-being. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 9(3), 1307-1327.

Received : 09.03.2022  
Revised version received : 13.05.2022  
Accepted : 15.05.2022

## **THE CORRELATION BETWEEN TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY PERCEPTIONS AND TOLERANCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING**

Yüksel Gündüz  (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4710-8444>).

Department of Educational Sciences, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Turkey.

E-mail: [yukselgunduz0735@gmail.com](mailto:yukselgunduz0735@gmail.com)

### **Biodata:**

Yüksel Gündüz works as a lecturer in the Department of Educational Administration at Ondokuz Mayıs University, Department of Educational Sciences. His area of interest is educational administration and supervision.

*Copyright © 2014 by International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET). ISSN: 2148-225X.*

*Material published and so copyrighted may not be published elsewhere without written permission of IOJET.*

# THE CORRELATION BETWEEN TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY PERCEPTIONS AND TOLERANCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

Yüksel Gündüz

[yukselgunduz0735@gmail.com](mailto:yukselgunduz0735@gmail.com)

## Abstract

Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, tolerance, and psychological well-being are all examined in this research. In this research, a survey model based on correlation was applied. In the 2021-2022 academic year, there are 11578 teachers working in public schools in İlkadm, Canik, Atakum, Bafra, and Çarşamba districts of Samsun province. As a result, the study's sample size is 678 instructors drawn from the general community using simple random sampling. The Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale, the Tolerance Scale, and the Psychological Well-Being Scale were used to collect data for the study. Analyzing data required the use of a variety of statistical procedures, including the t test, ANOVA, Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient, and multiple linear regression. Teachers' self-efficacy perceptions tend to be in the form of "mainly suitable for me," according to the findings of this study. For the most part, teachers' tolerance levels are characterized by "disagreement" and "poor." In general, teachers' psychological well-being is rated at the "agree" level and above the average. A statistically positive association between teachers' self-efficacy and psychological well-being was observed, but no statistically significant correlation was identified with tolerance. However, teachers' self-efficacy is one of the most important indicators of their psychological well-being even though it is not a strong predictor of their tolerance.

*Keywords:* Teacher, Self-Efficacy, Tolerance, Psychological Well-Being.

## 1. Introduction

Teachers are one of the most important variables of the education system that have no alternative. There is a strong correlation between the success level of educational organizations and teacher qualifications. Here, the teacher has an important function that affects the entire educational process. When viewed from this aspect, teaching as a profession is seen as a complex profession that fulfills education and training services and many related tasks. Teachers who have such a profession are also expected to have the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and equipment to fulfill the requirements of the profession. It is considered important that teachers' professional self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being are at a high level to fulfill the requirements of the teaching profession correctly and in accordance with the purpose. Because teachers' professional self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being have a significant impact on educational activities they do, themselves, their students, and their colleagues. When evaluated from this aspect, teachers' professional self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being should be at a sufficient level or should be brought to a sufficient level. The importance of teachers' self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being is highlighted here. Teachers' self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being can be explained in this context.

### Self-efficacy

The teaching profession is a profession that requires multidimensional professionalism like social, cultural, science, and technology (Alkan, 2000). In this sense, teachers should

have some professional qualifications. Qualification is the level of knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to play any role. (Balci, 2016). Self-efficacy, as for that, is the individual's personal opinion about the activities he/she has carried out to achieve a certain performance in a certain area (Bandura, 1997). Accordingly, self-efficacy is the individual's beliefs about what he/she can do with his current capacity under certain conditions. In another definition, self-efficacy is expressed as the self-confidence that an individual needs to perform a specific task that requires effort and persistence (Kinzie, Delcourt, and Powers, 1994). Self-confidence has an important place in the successful use of their knowledge and skills in their work. Accordingly, self-confidence has an important function for self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is an individual's belief that he/she can do work (Zimmerman, 1995). In this sense, self-efficacy is a situation related to self-belief, not competence in one's abilities (Tschannen Moren and Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001). Self-efficacy affects individuals' preferences, goals, and the effort they will make to overcome difficulties (Lunenborg, 2011). Therefore, self-efficacy also acts as a psychological mechanism (Stajkovic and Luthans, 2002) that motivates individuals.

Teacher self-efficacy is defined as teachers' beliefs about their capacity to achieve specified educational goals (Ruble, Usher, and McGrew, 2011). From this point, to achieve a successful outcome, teachers must recognize their capacity and be prepared to turn it into action. In another definition, teacher self-efficacy can be expressed as the extent to which a teacher can place the learning skill/behavior in the student and his/her belief about the professional background he/she has (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001). Here, teachers have a very high power to directly or indirectly affect the behavior and decisions taken in the classroom. Besides, self-efficacy also acts as a mechanism (Ventura, Salanova, Llorens, 2015) that controls the level of events and actions that individuals encounter.

Teachers with high self-efficacy show the behavior of performing a more effective education and training, better motivating students (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, and Hoy, 1998), being more willing to put into practice modern teaching methods (Czerniak and Lumpe, 1996), using various methods and tools in teaching (Henson, 2001), supporting students' learning even in difficult conditions, being highly motivated, showing effort and patience, influencing student success (Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2017; Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy, 2007), doing studies to increase the quality of in-class education and training (Abu-Tineh, Khasawneh, and Khalaileh, 2011; Harrel-Williams, Sorto, Pierce, Lesser and Murphy, 2014). Besides, those with high self-efficacy continue to increase their efforts to overcome the work without giving up in the face of failure (Bandura, 1986). While self-efficacy expectation acts as a protective factor against occupational stress, it causes teachers to show more orientation towards their profession and to have higher satisfaction (Schmitz, 2000). According to Pajares and Schunk (2001), individuals with positive self-efficacy are stronger and more persistent in the face of difficult situations, and they see difficulties not as works to be avoided but as works to be tackled.

Teachers with low self-efficacy perceptions have the feature of tends to magnify potential problems and threats, the ability to falter in difficult conditions, to show effort and patience, failing to fulfill the requirements of the profession (Bruce, Esmonde, Ross, Dookie and Beatty, 2010; Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2017), having a series of problems in classroom management, determining their goals (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001), perceiving the environment and conditions in which they live more negatively (Battersby and Cave, 2014), seeing themselves as worthless, not contributing to student success, experiencing burnout (Shoji, Cieslak, Smoktunowicz, Rogala, Benight, Luszczynska, 2015), perceiving the situations they face as more difficult than they really are, experiencing anxiety, stress, depression, and having a narrow view on solving problems (Bandura, 1986). Besides,

studies have found that teachers with negative self-efficacy perceptions have negative professional performances and negative perceptions of the school (Kahyaoğlu and Yangın, 2007; Karabacak, 2014; Yılmaz, Köseoğlu, Gerçek and Soran, 2004).

In the studies conducted, it has been concluded that teachers' self-efficacy perceptions are generally at a high level (Aslan and Kalkan, 2018; Aytaç, 2018; Cansoy, Parlar, Kılınç, 2017; Çakır- Kasımoğlu, 2018; Çetinkaya, 2019; Emre, 2017; Receptoğlu, Receptoğlu, 2020). Teachers' high self-efficacy helps them to participate more willingly and consciously in education and training activities, thus helping the quality of education and the academic development of students.

### **Tolerance**

Tolerance is derived from the Latin word *tolerare*, which gives the basic meaning of enduring something (Yılmaz, 2017). In a broader sense, tolerance comes from the Latin word "talao," which means endurance, survival, patience, and it also means the state of not objecting to something negatively evaluated and a willingness to tolerate it (Pleckaitis, 1998). Tolerance is, above all, respecting the universal human rights and freedoms of others and being compatible with differences (UNESCO, 1995). In other words, it is the state of enduring the life, thought, and belief values that are against the individual's own lifestyle, thoughts, and belief values. In this sense, tolerance means deliberately refraining from using force against what is wrong or bad (Hançerlioğlu, 2000). Accordingly, tolerance means to endure events or situations, to excuse, to connive events, to endure, to understand, to allow, and toleration (Aslan, 2001). At the same time, tolerance is a stance against the disapproval or nonrejection of something. Here, it can be said that expressions such as tolerance, connivance, and endurance (Ayverdi, 2006) correspond to tolerance.

Under normal conditions, an individual cannot tolerate an event to which he/she is insensitive or disapproved. Nevertheless, a person who says that he/she acts tolerant does not want to do this, although he/she has the power to prohibit and prevent the event that he tolerates (Gray, 1999). Cohen (2014) argues that for tolerance to occur, situations that we do not want, dislike and see as negative must have occurred, and we must refrain from interfering with them. The nature of tolerance requires seeing an undesirable situation as normal. This situation means the acceptance of the other party's mistakes and many differences.

It is not right to expect individuals to be tolerant in all situations. Because tolerance has a limit, even if the expression of any thought, including intolerance, is tolerated, when the application process is entered, situations that violate the rights, freedoms, and thoughts of the person should not be tolerated (Nicholson, 1985). In such a situation, the restriction of the freedom offered to the intolerant is also normal (Rawls, 2017). It is necessary to show greater tolerance for cultural and ethnic differences and to act with zero tolerance for intolerant ones (Forst, 2004). When viewed from this aspect, the boundary of tolerance should be drawn correctly. Otherwise, the expected benefit from the tolerant approach may not be achieved. Knowing where, when, how much and how to give tolerance helps to use the tolerance correctly. Thus, tolerance applications serve their purpose.

The idea of freedom was born out of tolerance because the tolerant communities wanted the freedom restrictions against them to be lifted. Therefore, the understanding of freedom necessitated tolerance in society (Kors, 2003). It doesn't mean anything if anyone is forced by other people to be tolerant because showing tolerance or being tolerant cannot be done by force. Tolerance made by forcing ceases to be tolerance. In other words, no one can be made tolerant by oppression, and where there is oppression, one cannot speak of tolerance because

oppression restricts the freedom of the tolerant (Nicholson, 1985). There is a certain difference between a person's willingness to tolerate this request without being subjected to pressure or coercion and reluctant toleration of coercion and pressure from others (Cohen, 2014). It can be said that the tolerance shown willingly is more meaningful here.

Teachers have to be together with individuals with very different characters, personalities, learning abilities, and intelligence levels, communicate and interact with them due to their profession. It requires that teachers who coexist with these differences have a high level of tolerance. This necessity makes itself felt in many ways. While teachers' tolerant behavior helps to create a democratic environment, it also ensures the academic development of students. While some of the studies on this subject have revealed that the tolerance levels of teachers (Gül, Alimbekov, 2020; Gündüz, 2019; Muhammed, 2019) are at a partially high level, some (Çağırğa, 2020; Ersanlı and Dicle, 2011) are at a low level.

### **Psychological Well-Being**

There are two types of well-being: subjective and psychological. When it comes to subjective well-being, Diener (2000) defined it as an individual's subjective assessment of his or her own existence. A person's psychological well-being is defined as his or her ability to cope successfully with various challenges in his or her life. As a result, psychological well-being is characterized by an individual's positive appraisals of his/her life, a sense of continual growth, and high-quality connections with others (Ryff and Singer, 1996). To be psychologically healthy, one must be concerned with one's overall well-being and steer clear of unwelcome emotions. One of the most important aspects of happiness is the individual's ability to persevere through unpleasant situations in order to reach their goal and get happiness (Waterman, 1984). Psychologists should work not only with those who have difficulties, but also with those who have no problems and assist them uncover their strengths, according to Seligman (2000). How well an individual is aware of his or her own strength and aspirations and how well he or she leads a qualified life in relation to the people around him or her is a measure of psychological well-being (Ryff and Keyes, 1995). A person's mental health is strongly linked to this component of psychological well-being, and it is the source of many of the difficulties that arise in their lives (Sezer, 2013).

The fulfillment of a person's basic needs has a direct impact on his or her mental wellbeing. People's desires are strongly tied to their psychological wellbeing (Yapci, 2007). The satisfaction of spiritual needs, independence, autonomy, forgiveness, productivity, and strong relationships with individuals are all examples of psychological well-being (Güleç, 2016). Based on this, psychological well-being is defined as an individual's positive self-perception, self-satisfaction, the ability to act autonomously and freely, and the ability to make this life worthwhile (Ryff and Keyes, 1995).

Personal well-being is merely one factor in determining an individual's psychological well-being (Telef, Uzman, and Ergün, 2013). Individual development, self-acceptance, past life experiences, economic standing, social support, positive-negative affect, and life satisfaction might be listed as some of these.

There are six fundamental components to the model of psychological well-being. Included in this list are self-acceptance, good relationships with others, environmental awareness, personal agency, a sense of direction in life, and progress toward one's goals (Ryff, 1989; Ryff and Singer, 1996). For mental wellness, self-acceptance is essential. Self-actualization, on the other hand, has been defined as maturity. The most critical aspect of having self-acceptance is having a good outlook on life in general. Self-actualized individuals with a high feeling of empathy, care, love, sincerity, and identification with others are often considered to

have strong positive associations. The ability to create and pick an environment that is ideal for oneself is known as "environmental mastery." An individual's sense of self-determination, freedom, and self-governance are all expressions used to describe the concept of autonomy. People who are free to pursue their dreams without the interference of others are known as autonomous. One way to describe the meaning of life is to say that it is filled with a feeling of purpose and direction. The capacity to develop oneself further is what we mean when we talk about personal growth. When it comes to self-improvement, it's important to keep moving forward, rather than stumbling backwards.

Individuals who have high levels of psychological well-being have greater physical health, a higher standard of life, and better psychological status than those who do not (Keyes, Dhingra, and Simoes, 2010). Psychological well-being is also linked to increased productivity at work and a longer life expectancy, as well as higher differences and immunological systems and better connections with other people (Diener, King, and Lyubomirsky, 2005). On the other hand, they accept that life has a meaning and purpose, establish a healthier and more stable correlation with other people, know the environment and its possibilities well and benefit from them sufficiently.

In studies conducted on teachers' psychological well-being, it has been observed that the psychological well-being of teachers is generally at a good level (Ağaçbacak, 2019; Aydoğan, 2019; Erözyürek, 2019; Köylü, 2018; Genç, Durmuş, 2020; Yakut and Yakut, 2018). Teachers' psychological well-being is generally at a good level, which is a positive and desired result. Because psychological well-being shows that teachers have high characteristics such as benevolence, pleasure, success, harmony, and self-direction (Telef, Uzman and Ergün, 2013). At the same time, this shows that teachers are in an accepted position in terms of making life meaningful, autonomy, self-esteem, valuing personal development, dominating the environment, and positive communication with people (Ryff, 1995).

While it is possible to come across studies on teachers' self-efficacy (Aslan and Kalkan, 2018; Aytac, 2018; Cansoy, Parlar, Kılınç, 2017; Çakır Kasımoğlu, 2018; Çetinkaya, 2019; Receptoğlu, Receptoğlu, 2020), tolerance (Çağırğa, 2020; Gül, Alimbekov, 2020; Gündüz, 2019; Muhammed, 2019) and psychological well-being (Ağaçbacak, 2019; Aydoğan, 2019; Erözyürek, 2019; Genç, Durmuş, 2020; Köylü, 2018; Yakut and Yakut, 2018) when the literature is examined, studies on determining the correlation between teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and tolerance and psychological well-being levels could not be found, at least in the author's studies. Therefore, it is thought that such a study will contribute to the literature.

The study conducted in this sense aims to reveal the correlation between teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and their tolerance and psychological well-being levels. Within this scope, answers to the following questions were sought.

1-What is the level of teachers' self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being?

2-Do teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being show a significant difference according to gender, education level, professional seniority, and branch variable?

3-Is there a correlation between teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and tolerance and psychological well-being?

4-Is teachers' self-efficacy perceptions a significant predictor of tolerance and psychological well-being?

## **2. Method**

### **2.1. Study Model**

Since the study aims to reveal the correlation between teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and tolerance and psychological well-being perception levels, the relational survey model was used in the study. The relational screening model is applied in studies with two or more variables. Relational screening models are the research models aiming to determine the presence and/or level of change between two or more variables (Karasar, 2006).

### **2.2. Population and Sample**

In the 2021-2022 academic year, there are 11578 teachers working in public schools in İlkadım, Canik, Atakum, Bafra, and Çarşamba districts of Samsun province. As a result, the study's sample size is 678 instructors drawn from the general community using simple random sampling. According to Anderson (1990; Aktaran Balç, 2004), 277 samples from a population of 10,000 are sufficient for this study. Each unit in the universe has an equal chance of being included in a simple random sampling process. For the sake of this definition, independent units have an equal chance of being chosen. It is  $n/N$  for each unit in the population to be selected when the population size is  $N$  and  $n$  samples are taken from the population at random.

Of the teachers participating in the study, 60.9% are female, 39.1% are male, 74.9% are undergraduate, 23.7% are graduate, 1.3% are associate degree graduates, 17.3% have 1-5 years, 26.3% have 6-10 years, 21.7% have 11-15 years, 18.7% have 21 years or more seniority, 51.6% are branch teachers, 41.2% are classroom teachers and 7.2% are pre-school teachers.

### **2.3. Data Collection Tools**

The data for the study was gathered using four different data collection tools. A personal information form, as well as assessments measuring self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being, would be required. Gender, educational status, professional seniority and branch are among the characteristics on the personal information form

#### **2.3.1. Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale**

The scale was developed by Schmitz and Schwarzer (2000) in Germany. Yılmaz, Köseoğlu, Gerçek, and Soran made the Turkish translation of the scale, which was originally German (2004). There were .81 and .76 reliability alpha values for the scale at different points in time. Coping strategies and inventive activity were identified as two variables in a study conducted during the process of adapting to Turkish. The original Likert-type scale included 10 items, but the Turkish scale only had 8, leading to the discovery. Agreement levels are 1-Not Suitable for Me, 2- Rarely Suitable for Me, 3- Mostly Suitable for Me, 4- Completely Suitable for Me. The reliability of the adapted scale was calculated with Cronbach's alpha, and the alpha value for the whole was determined as .79. The Cronbach's alpha value in the adaptation study of the scale was found to be .78. Within the scope of this study, the validity and reliability analysis of the scale was tested once again, and the Cronbach alpha value was found to be .78. In the item analysis study, item remainder values were found to be a maximum of 604 and a minimum of 370. The scale has two sub-dimensions, coping styles and innovative behavior. The Cronbach's alpha of the coping styles sub-dimension was found to be .66, and that of the innovative behavior sub-dimension was found to be .78.

### 2.3.2. Tolerance Scale

The scale developed by Ersanlı (2014) is a one-dimensional scale with 11 items. The scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale. The levels of agreement consist of 1-Strongly Agree, 2-Agree, 3-Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4-Disagree, 5-Strongly Disagree. There is only one reverse-scored item in the scale (the third item). The scale was found to have a single factor in the exploratory factor analysis, and the confirmatory factor analysis confirmed that finding that the single factor structure provided a strong fit. When the fit index values of the tolerance scale were examined, it was found that RMSEA=0.047, NFI=0.97, CFI=0.98, GFI=0.97. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale is .84. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha value of the scale was retested, and it was found that this value was 0.75 according to the test result.

### 2.3.3. Psychological Well-Being Scale

Diener et al. came up with the scale (2009-2010). Telef created a Turkish rendition of the metric system (2013). A one-dimensional scale with eight items was used for the validity-reliability research and adaption. The exploratory factor analysis shows that 42% of the variance is fully explained. The factor loads of the scale items were calculated between .54 and .76. It was stated that the variance described in the original scale was 53%, and the scale factor loads varied between .61 and .77. When the fit indices were examined in consequence of the confirmatory factor analysis, it was seen that the ratio of the chi-square value to the degree of freedom ( $92.90/20=4.645$ ) was below 5. Other fit indices were found as RMSEA= 0.08, SRMR= 0.04, GFI= 0.96, NFI= 0.94, RFI= 0.92, CFI= 0.95 and IFI=0.95. It was determined that the item-total correlations of the scale varied between .41 and .63, and the t-values were significant ( $p < .001$ ). The total internal consistency coefficient of the scale was calculated as .80. The levels of agreement consist of 1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Somewhat Disagree, 4-Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5-Somewhat Agree, 6-Agree, 7-Strongly Agree options. In this study, the reliability of the psychological well-being scale was repeated and found to be .89. Item reliability coefficients varied between .75 and .60 with the item remainder method.

## 2.4.Data Collection

For the 2021-2022 academic year, after obtaining permission from the university's ethics committee and the province's directorate of national education, the scales were applied to teachers in Samsun province's İlkadm, Canik, Atakum, Bafra, and Çarşamba schools in the sample group and necessary explanations were given to the teachers. Scales were completed in a reasonable amount of time. The researcher went through each scale one by one, canceling those that weren't filled out correctly in the initial stage. With 678 scales deemed valid, research was carried out on them.

### 2.4.1. Data Analysis

Corrections were made in the data set before to the analysis to ensure that the data was error-free. First, the data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (e.g., percentage, frequency). Then, the data was evaluated for normalcy. A normal distribution of scores and homogeneity (equal) variances are required for parametric statistical testing of the data's applicability (Akbulut, 2010; Büyüköztürk, 2012). To this goal, the normalcy distribution of the data set's skewness and kurtosis values were evaluated, and it was discovered that the values ranged from -1.96 to +1.96. Statistical parametric approaches were used to analyze the data in this study since it was generally agreed that the data had a normal distribution (Can, 2013). Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and Multiple Regression Analysis in assessing predictor variables were utilized to determine correlations between variables. The

overall scale scores were used for the analysis of the data gathered from the scales. Three scales were employed in the study: The Self-Efficacy Scale, the Tolerance Scale and the Psychological Well-Being Scale. The SPSS 14.0 program was used to conduct all of the study's statistical analyses.

### 3. Results

Analyses pertaining to each of the study's sub-problems are given in this section. Teachers' perspectives on self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being judgments, as well as the discrepancies between their views based on demographic characteristics, were examined in this study.

The conclusions regarding the teachers' self-efficacy perceptions are given in Table 1.

Table 1. *Conclusions on Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perception Levels*

Scale	n	$\bar{x}$	SD
Total	678	3.10	.64

The teachers' self-efficacy perception levels were generally at the level of "mostly suitable for me" with a mean of  $\bar{x}=3.10$ . Therefore, teachers' self-efficacy has a value above the average.

The conclusions regarding the teachers' tolerance levels are given in Table 2.

Table 2. *Conclusions on Teachers' Tolerance Perception Levels*

Scale	n	$\bar{x}$	SD
Total	678	2.04	1.03

The tolerance perception levels of the teachers are generally at the level of "disagree" with an average of  $\bar{x}=2.04$ . A low score from the scale indicates intolerance, while high scores indicate a high level of tolerance. Accordingly, teachers' tolerance levels are low.

The conclusions of teachers' psychological well-being are given in Table 3.

Table 3. *Conclusions on Teachers' Psychological Well-Being Levels*

Scale	n	$\bar{x}$	SD
Total	678	5.57	1.90

Teachers' perception levels of psychological well-being are generally at the level of "agree" with an average of  $\bar{x}=5.57$ . Accordingly, teachers' psychological well-being is above the average level.

The conclusions of the unrelated group "t" test for the self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being scales of the teachers according to the gender variable are given in Table 4.

Table 4. *The Conclusions of the Unrelated Group "t" Test for The Self-Efficacy, Tolerance and Psychological Well-Being Scales of The Teachers According to The Gender Variable*

Scales	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	sd	p
Self-efficacy Total	Female	413	3.12	.43	1.34	676	.178
	Male	265	3.08	.42			
Tolerance Total	Female	413	1.95	.50	-4.83	676	.000***
	Male	265	2.16	.59			
Psychological Well-Being Total	Female	413	5.66	.97	2.87	676	.004**
	Male	265	5.43	1.14			

\*p<.05 \*\*p<.01 p<.001

According to the gender variable of the teachers, the conclusions of the "t" test based on the scales: The "t" test results of the scales other than the Self-Efficacy Scale showed significant differences. The Tolerance Scale gave a significant difference in favor of male teachers at the total level of .001. Accordingly, female teachers' tolerance levels are higher than male teachers. It can be thought that the reason for this is the effect of the social and cultural environment in which female teachers live and their motherhood feelings leading them to more forgiving behaviors. The Psychological Well-Being Scale gave a significant difference in favor of female teachers at the total level of .01. Accordingly, female teachers' psychological well-being levels are higher than male teachers. It can be said that this is since women have a more positive view of events and situations.

The conclusions of the unrelated group "t" test for the self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being scales of the teachers according to the education variable are given in Table 5.

Table 5. *The Conclusions of the Unrelated Group "t" Test for The Self-Efficacy, Tolerance and Psychological Well-Being Scales of The Teachers According To The Education Variable*

N:678 Scales	Educational Background	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	sd	p
Self-efficacy Total	Bachelor's level	508	3.11	.42	.70	667	.480
	Graduate	1 Bl	3.08	.44			
Tolerance Total	Bachelor's level	508	2.03	.56	-.70	667	.482
	Graduate	1 Bl	2.06	.52			
Psychological Well-Being Total	Bachelor's level	508	5.56	1.06	-.50	667	.613

Graduate 1 Bl 5.60 1.02

\*p&lt;.05 \*\*p&lt;.01 p&lt;.001

According to the education variable of the teachers, no significant difference was found according to the unrelated group "t" test conclusions for the Self-Efficacy, Tolerance and Psychological Well-Being Scales.

The conclusions of the ANOVA test for the self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being scales of the teachers according to the professional seniority variable are given in Table 6.

Table 6. *The conclusions of the ANOVA test for the self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being scales of the teachers according to the professional seniority variable*

Scale	Professional seniority	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	sd	F	p
Self-efficacy Total	1-5 years	117	3.16	.40	4-673	2.23	.06
	6-10 years	178	3.10	.41			
	11-15 years	147	3.05	.41			
	16-20 years	109	3.06	.45			
	21 years and above	127	3.17	.44			
	Total	678	3.11	.42			
Tolerance Total	1-5 years	117	1.99	.43	4-673	1.84	.11
	6-10 years	178	2.00	.53			
	11-15 years	147	2.00	.51			
	16-20 years	109	2.05	.61			
	21 years and above	127	2.15	.63			
	Total	678	2.04	.55			
Psychological Well-Being Total	1-5 years	117	5.51	1.11	4-673	.80	.52
	6-10 years	178	5.56	.97			
	11-15 years	147	5.51	1.12			
	16-20 years	109	5.57	1.03			
	21 years and above	127	5.71	.95			
	Total	678	5.57	1.04			

\*p&lt;.05 \*\*p&lt;.01 p&lt;.001

According to the professional seniority of the teachers, no significant difference was found in consequence of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) performed for the mean scores of the Self-Efficacy, Tolerance, and Psychological Well-Being Scales.

The conclusions of the ANOVA test for the self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being scales of the teachers according to the branch variable are given in Table 7.

Table 7. *The conclusions of the ANOVA test for the self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being scales of the teachers according to the Branch variable*

Scale	Branch	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	sd	F	p
Self-efficacy Total	Pre-school	49	3.32	.38	2-675	8.52	.00***
	Classroom teacher	279	3.12	.41			
	Branch teacher	350	3.06	.43			
	Total	678	3.11	.42			
Tolerance Total	Pre-school	49	2.04	.48	2-675	.88	.41
	Classroom teacher	279	2.00	.58			
	Branch teacher	350	2.06	.52			
	Total	678	2.04	.55			
Psychological Well-Being Total	Pre-school	49	5.79	.85	2-675	1.50	.22
	Classroom teacher	279	5.59	.97			
	Branch teacher	350	5.52	1.12			
	Total	678	5.57	1.04			

\*p<.05 \*\*p<.01 p<.001

According to the branch variable of the teachers, in the ANOVA tests for the Self-Efficacy, Tolerance, and Psychological Well-Being Scales mean scores, only a significant difference at the level of .001 was found in the Self-Efficacy Scale total scores. The branch variable met 2.5% of the variance of the Self-Efficacy Scale (Eta: .157). According to the branch variable in the self-efficacy scale, post-hoc techniques were used to understand between which pairs the difference was obtained. For this purpose, the Scheffe test was used.

The conclusions of the Scheffe test for the self-efficacy scale conclusions of the teachers according to the branch variable are given in Table 8.

Table 8. *The Conclusions of the Scheffe Test for The Self-Efficacy Scale Conclusions of the Teachers According To The Branch Variable*

(I) Branch	(J) Branch	Fark Ortalaması (I-J)	SD	p
Preschool	Classroom teacher	.19(*)	.06	.010**
	Branch teacher	.26(*)	.06	.000***
Classroom teacher	Preschool	.19(*)	.06	.010**
	Branch teacher	.06	.03	.199
Branch teacher	Preschool	.26(*)	.06	.000***
	Classroom teacher	-.06	.03	.199

\*p<.05 \*\*p<.01 p<.001

Self-efficacy perception of pre-school teachers is significantly higher than that of the classroom ( $p < .001$ ) and branch ( $p < .01$ ) teachers. It can be said that the reason for this is the simplicity of pre-school education, training activities and practices, and the effect of increasing dominance in the field.

The conclusions of the correlation analysis for the self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being scale conclusions are given in Table 9.

Table 9. *The conclusions of the correlation analysis for the self-efficacy, tolerance, and psychological well-being scale conclusions*

Scales	Self-efficacy Total	Tolerance Total	Psychological Well-Being Total
Self-efficacy Total	1.00		
Tolerance Total	.030	1.00	
Psychological Well-Being Total	.244(***)	.030	1.00

A positive correlation of .244 was found between the total scores of the Self-Efficacy Scale and the total scores of Psychological Well-being. In other words, as teachers' self-efficacy levels increase, their psychological well-being levels also increase. Teachers with sufficient self-efficacy can feel comfortable and peaceful in many ways. Here, no significant correlation was found between the Tolerance Scale total scores and the Psychological Well-Being Scale total scores (.030).

The conclusions of the regression analysis regarding the prediction of tolerance levels of teachers' self-efficacy perceptions are given in Table 10.

Table 10. *The conclusions of the regression analysis regarding the prediction of tolerance levels of teachers' self-efficacy perceptions*

Model		Non-Standard Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	p
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
I	(Constant)	1.92	.15		12.40	.000
	Self-efficacy Total	.038	.049	.030	.78	.435

R: .030 R<sup>2</sup>: .001 F: .610 p: .435

The correlation between total self-efficacy scores and Tolerance Scale total scores was .030, R<sup>2</sup>: .001. No statistically significant results were obtained in the ANOVA performed for the regression analysis. The self-efficacy beta coefficient is .038, and the unrelated group "t" test for this value is also meaningless. In other words, teachers' self-efficacy is not a significant predictor of their tolerance.

The conclusions of the regression analysis regarding the prediction of psychological well-being levels of teachers' self-efficacy perceptions are given in Table 11.

Table 11. *The conclusions of the regression analysis regarding the prediction of psychological well-being levels of teachers' self-efficacy perceptions*

Model		Non-Standard Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	p
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
I	(Constant)	3.71	.28		12.99	.000
	Self-efficacy	.59	.09	.24	6.55	.000***
	Total					

R:.244 R<sup>2</sup>:.060 F:42.896 p:.000

The correlation between teachers' total scores of self-efficacy and total psychological well-being scores is R.244, R<sup>2</sup>:.060. Self-efficacy scores cover 6% of the psychological well-being score variance. A significant result was obtained in the ANOVA performed for the regression analysis. The self-efficacy beta coefficient is .597, and the unrelated group "t" test for this value also gave a significant result at the p<.001 level (t:6.55). In other words, teachers' self-efficacy is a significant predictor of their psychological well-being. In other words, teachers' self-efficacy is a meaningful predictor of their psychological well-being. Therefore, teachers' self-efficacy should be developed.

#### 4. Conclusion, Discussion, and Suggestions

Teachers' self-efficacy perceptions were generally at the level of "mostly suitable for me." Therefore, teachers' self-efficacy has a value above the average. The fact that teachers' self-efficacy is at this level can be seen as a result that should be responded to positively. This result is similar with other research findings (Aslan and Kalkan, 2018; Aytac, 2018; Cansoy, Parlar, Kılınç, 2017; Çakır Kasımoğlu, 2018; Çetinkaya, 2019; Ekici, 2020; Emre, 2017; Receptoğlu, Receptoğlu, 2020). High self-efficacy of teachers means that they spend more time and effort to improve the quality of teaching and student learning (Harrel-Williams, Sorto, Pierce, Lesser and Murphy, 2014; Henson, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy and Hoy, 1998). Positive self-efficacy perceptions of teachers affect students positively in terms of morale and motivation, helping their management to increase their success and create a democratic classroom environment in which effective communication is established.

The tolerance levels of the teachers are generally at the level of "disagree." This value is well below the average. Accordingly, teachers' tolerance levels are low. While this conclusion is similar to the study conclusions of Ersanlı and Dicle (2011) and Çağırğa (2020), it is not similar to the study conclusions of Gündüz (2019), Muhammed (2019), and Gül and Alimbekov (2020). Teachers who have to work together with different individuals or groups due to their profession are expected to have high tolerance levels. Because the teaching profession, by its nature, requires being tolerant and tolerant. It seems difficult for teachers with a low level of tolerance to create and maintain a democratic classroom environment. The environment in such classrooms is generally negative, and this will negatively affect student-teacher relations and negatively affect student success. Therefore, it is considered important to increase the tolerance levels of teachers.

Teachers' psychological well-being is generally at the level of "agree." Accordingly, teachers' psychological well-being is above the average level. This is a positive result for teachers. While this conclusion coincides with the conclusions of many similar studies (Ağaçbacak, 2019; Aydoğan, 2019; Erözyürek, 2019; Genç, Durmuş, 2020; Köylü, 2018; Kurt, 2018; Yakut and Yakut, 2018), it does not coincide with the study conclusion of Yakut and Yakut's (2018). It has been observed that teachers with psychological well-being have

high values such as success, enjoyment, self-direction, benevolence, and harmony (Telef, Uzman, and Ergün, 2013). At the same time, this situation shows that teachers are in a desirable situation in terms of self-esteem and positive communication with people, dominating the environment, and valuing personal development (Ryff, 1995). Teachers with sufficient psychological well-being are expected to have more positive communication and interaction with their students and their environment.

According to the gender variable, there was no significant difference between the scores of the teachers from the self-efficacy scale. While this conclusion coincides with the study conclusions of Aydın, Ömür and Argon (2014), Aytaç (2018), Ekici (2020), Kaçar and Beycioğlu (2017), it does not coincide with the study conclusions of Arış (2019), Koç and Deniz (2020). According to the educational status variable, there was no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of their self-efficacy. While this conclusion coincides with the study conclusions of Benzer (2011) and Ekici (2020), it does not coincide with the study conclusions of Arış (2019) and Çetinkaya (2019). According to their professional seniority, there was no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of their self-efficacy. While this conclusion coincides with the study conclusions of Çakır Kasımoğlu, (2018), Çetinkaya (2019), and Kaçar and Beycioğlu (2017), it does not coincide with the study conclusions of Aytaç (2018), Benzer (2011), Ekici (2020), Koç and Deniz (2020). According to their branch variable, there was a significant difference between teachers' perceptions of their self-efficacy. Accordingly, the self-efficacy perception of pre-school teachers is significantly higher than that of classroom and branch teachers. It can be said that carrying out learner educational activities in pre-school education is effective in this. While this conclusion coincides with the study conclusions of Aytaç (2018) and Benzer (2011), it does not coincide with the study conclusions of Kaçar and Beycioğlu (2017).

Teachers' tolerance levels differed significantly based on their gender, as was found in this study. Tolerance is higher among female instructors in this school district than among male teachers. As a result, while this finding is comparable to the study conclusions of Çağırğa (2020), Gül and Alimbekov (2020), and Muhammed (2019), it differs from the study conclusion of Demir, Eranlı Çağırğa (2020), and Kutlu (2016). There was no significant variation in teachers' perceptions of their tolerance based on the educational status variable. This is also what Çağırğa's research concluded (2020). There was no substantial difference in instructors' perceptions of their tolerances based on their level of professional experience. As far as we know, this result does not match up with the findings of Demir and Eranlı and Kutlu's studies (2020). (2016). According to the branch variable, instructors' opinions of their tolerance were not significantly different. According to a study by Çağırğa, this conclusion is also correct (2020).

According to the gender variable, there was a significant difference between the psychological well-being perceived by the teachers. Here, female teachers' psychological well-being levels are higher than male teachers. While this conclusion is similar to the study conclusions of Ağaçbacak (2019), Çağırğa (2020), Erözyürek (2019) and Sarıtaş (2019), it is not similar to the study conclusion of Aydoğan (2019), Demir (2018), Genç and Durmuş (2020), Köylü (2018), Kurt (2018), Yakut and Yakut (2018). According to the variable of educational status, there was no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of their psychological well-being. While this conclusion is similar to the study conclusions of Aydoğan (2019), Çağırğa (2020), Erözyürek (2019) and Köylü (2018), it is not similar to the study conclusion of Ağaçbacak (2019). According to their professional seniority, there was no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of their psychological well-being.

While this conclusion is similar to the study conclusions of Aaçbacak (2019), ađırğa (2020), Demir (2018) and Erözyürek (2019), it is not similar to the study conclusion of Kurt (2018), Köylü (2018) and Aydođan (2019). According to their branch variable, there was no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of their psychological well-being. While this conclusion is similar to the study conclusions of ađırğa (2020), Kurt (2018), and Yakut and Yakut (2018), it is not similar to the study conclusion of Erözyürek (2019).

A positive and significant correlation was found between teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and their psychological well-being. As a result, as teachers' self-efficacy levels increase, their psychological well-being levels also increase. Since teachers with high self-efficacy feel comfortable in many ways, they also feel comfortable in terms of psychological well-being as a reflection of this. When self-efficacy is considered as the belief (Zimmerman, 1995) that an individual has the capacity required for work, it is considered important for individuals to know their capacities correctly. This will help them relax in business life and stay away from stress. Since self-efficacy is a protective factor against occupational stress, it contributes to teachers' orientation towards their profession and increases their satisfaction (Schmitz, 2000). It is seen that individuals with positive self-efficacy perceptions are more resilient and persistent in the face of difficulties, as well as willingly taking action, and they perceive difficult tasks as tasks that need to be worked on, not as things to be avoided (Pajares and Schunk, 2001). Psychological well-being includes the individual's positive self-perception, self-satisfaction, autonomous and independent behavior, and making life meaningful (Ryff and Keyes, 1995).

No significant correlation was found between teachers' perceptions of their tolerance and their psychological well-being. There is no correlation between teachers' tolerance and their psychological well-being. In the study, while the tolerance level of teachers is low, their psychological well-being is well above the average level. As a natural consequence of this, a correlation did not occur. What needs to be questioned here is the low tolerance of teachers. In fact, teachers should have a high level of tolerance. Because, due to their position, teachers are the owners of a profession that communicates and interacts with individuals with very different characteristics. Managing such differences also requires a high level of tolerance. This conclusion of the study does not coincide with the study conclusion of ađırğa (2020).

Teachers' self-efficacy is not a significant predictor of their tolerance. Although teachers' self-efficacy is high in the study, it is seen that this does not affect their tolerance. In fact, since self-efficacy provides the self-confidence that an individual needs in fulfilling a specific task that requires effort and persistence (Kinzie, Delcourt and Powers, 1994), teachers are expected to be more willing in subjects such as enduring events or situations, condoning them, tolerating events, enduring, understanding and enduring (Aslan, 2001).

Teachers' self-efficacy is a significant predictor of their psychological well-being. Teachers' self-efficacy is 6% of their psychological well-being. Considering that self-efficacy is a psychological mechanism that enables individuals to be motivated (Stajkovic and Luthans, 2002), it can be thought that this situation also affects teachers' psychological well-being. For individuals to use their capacities effectively, they need to have self-confidence regarding the work they do. This is the self-confidence that allows individuals to do their works comfortably. Besides, self-efficacy affects individuals' choices, goals, and efforts in difficult situations (Lunenburg, 2011).

Qualitative studies can be conducted to determine the reasons for the low tolerance levels of teachers. The Ministry of National Education should offer various educational activities to

increase teachers' low tolerance levels. Furthermore, in-service trainings should be organized to improve teachers' self-efficacy.

## References

- Abu-Tineh, A. M., Khasawneh, S. A., & Khalaileh, H. A. (2011). Teacher self-efficacy and classroom management styles in Jordanian schools. *Management in Education*, 25(4), 175-181.
- Ağaçbacak, P. M. (2019). *Examination of the relationships among psychological well-being, self-efficacy beliefs and organizational commitment behaviors of elementary school teachers based on positive psychology*, Master Thesis, Marmara University Institute of Educational Sciences, Istanbul.
- Akbulut, Y. (2010). *Sosyal bilimlerde SPSS uygulamaları*. İstanbul: İdeal Kültür Publishing
- Alkan, C. (2000). Profession and teaching profession. Sönmez, V. (Ed.). *Introduction to the Teaching Profession*. Ankara: Anı publishing.
- Arıç, B. (2019). *Differences in self-efficacy beliefs of foreign language teachers in Turkey*, Master Thesis, İstanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Aslan, Ö. (2001). Hoşgörü ve tolerans kavramlarına etimolojik açıdan analitik bir yaklaşım. *Journal of Cumhuriyet University Faculty of Theology*, 5(2), 357-380.
- Aslan, M. and Kalkan, H. (2018). Analysis of self-efficacy perceptions of teachers. *Bingöl University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 8(16), 477-493.
- Aydın, R., Ömür, Y. E., Argon, T. (2014). Pre-service teachers' perception of self-efficacy and academic delay of gratification, *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 40 (1), 1-12.
- Aydoğan, İ. (2019). *School climate perceptions of teachers as predictors of psychological well-being levels*, Master Thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul Sabahtin Zaim University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Aytaç, A. (2018). Investigating the self-efficacy perceptions of teachers according to several variables *Academy Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2(1), 29-41.
- Ayverdi, İ. (2006) *Misali Türkçe büyük sözlük*, 3, İstanbul, Kubbealtı Lugatı.
- Balcı, A. (2004). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma: yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler*. Ankara: Pegema Publishing
- Balcı Arvas, F. (2016). *Psikoloji din ve mutluluk*. Bursa: Emin Publishing.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy, the exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J: Prentice-Hall.
- Battersby, S. L., & Cave, A. (2014). Preservice classroom teachers' preconceived attitudes confidence, beliefs, and self-efficacy toward integrating music in the elementary curriculum. *National Association for Music Education*, 32(2), 52-59.

- Benzer, F. (2011). *An Analysis on the Sense of Self Efficacy of the Teachers Working in Primary and High Schools*, Master Thesis, Selçuk University, Institute of Education Sciences, Konya.
- Bruce, C. D., Esmonde, I., Ross, J., Dookie, L. ve Beatty, R. (2010). The effects of sustained classroom-embedded teacher professional learning on teacher efficacy and related student achievement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 1598-1608.
- Büyükoztürk, Ş. (2012). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem Academy
- Can, A. (2013). *SPSS ile bilimsel araştırma sürecinde nicel veri analizi*. Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Cansoy, R., Parlar, H., Kılınç, A. Ç. (2017). Teacher Self-Efficacy as a Predictor of Burnout, *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9 (1), 141 – 155.
- Cohen, A. J. (2014). *Toleration*. USA: Polity Press.
- Çağırğa, T. (2020). *The relationship between teachers' tolerance level and their psychological well-being*, Master Thesis, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Graduate School of Education, Samsun.
- Çetinkaya, F. (2019). *Examining the relationship between pre-school teachers' self efficacy beliefs and their teaching attitudes*, Master Thesis, İstanbul Sebahttin Zaim University, Social Sciences University, İstanbul.
- Czerniak, C. M., Lumpe, A. T. (1996). Relationship between teacher beliefs and science education reform. *Journal of Science Teacher Education* 7, 247-266.
- Çakır Kasımoğlu, Ç. (2018). *Determining self-efficacy perceptions related to teaching profession and analyzing associated metaphors of teachers*, Master Thesis, Near East University, Institute of Education Sciences, TRNC.
- Demir, Y., Ersanlı, E., Kutlu, M. (2016). Investigation of Teachers' Tolerance Levels According to Various Variables (Ed. Kurtman Ersanlı), *Hedefe Doğru İnsan* (PDR Symposium), (548-555), Samsun.
- Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist*, 55(2), 34–43.
- Diener, E., King, L. & Lyumbomirsky, S. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to Success?, *American Psychological Association*, 131(6), 803-855.
- Ekici, E. (2020). *Investigation of the relationship between teachers' professionalization levels and self authority perceptions*, Master Thesis, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Institute of Social Sciences, Kahramanmaraş.
- Emre, Ş. C. (2017). *Investigation of relationship between secondary school teachers' self efficacy beliefs and attitude towards teaching*, Unpublished Master Thesis, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Kahramanmaraş.
- Erözyürek, A. (2019). *The relationship between the levels of democracy in the school administration and the psychological well-being of the teachers*, Master Thesis, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Institute of Education Sciences, Samsun.

- Ersanlı, E. (2014). The validity and reliability study of tolerance scale. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 4(1), 85-89.
- Ersanlı, E. & Dicle, A. N. (2011). Üniversite öğretim elemanı yetiştirme programında “Tolerans Eğitiminin” yeri ve önemi. International Higher Education Congress: *Yeni Yönelişler ve Sorunlar*, 2(11), 1531-1535.
- Forst, R. (2004). The limits of toleration. *Constellations*, 11(3), 312-325.
- Genç, H., Durmuş, E. (2020). Forgiveness as a predictor of psychological well-being in candidates teachers, *International Journal of Social Studies*, 13(70), 510-518.
- Gray, C. B. (1999). *The philosophy of law: An encyclopedia*. New York&London: Garland Publishing
- Gül, Y. E. & Alimbekov, A. (2020). Investigation of Teachers Candidates' Tolerance and Life Satisfaction Levels, *Turkish Studies - Education*, 15(2), 831-849.
- Güleç, C. (2016). *Pozitif ruh sağlığı*. Ankara: Arkadaş Publishing.
- Gündüz, M. (2019). Determination of tolerance levels of teacher candidates. *SDU International Journal of Educational Studies*, 6(2), 43-52.
- Hançerlioğlu, O. (2000). *Kavramlar ve akımlar. Felsefe Ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul: Remzi Bookstore.
- Harrel-Williams, L. M., Sorto, M. A., Pierce, R. L., Lesser, L. M., & Murphy T. J. (2014). Validation of scores from a new measure of preservice teachers' self-efficacy to teach statistict in the middle grades. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 32(1), 40-50.
- Henson, R. K. (2001). Teacher self-efficacy: substantive implications and measurement dilemmas. *The Annual Meeting of Educational Research Exchange* (1-13). Texas: A&M University.
- Kaçar, T., Beycioğlu, K. (2017). The Investigation of Elementary School Teachers' Self-efficacy Beliefs in Terms of Various Variables, *İlköğretim Online*, 16(4), 1753-1767.
- Kahyaoğlu, M., Yangın, S. (2007). Views of prospective teachers in elementary school teaching departments about professional self-efficacy, *Kastamonu Journal of Education*, 5(1), 73-74.
- Karabacak, M. (2014). *The opinions of high school teachers in Ankara province in relation to teacher autonomy and teacher self-efficacy*, Unpublished Master Thesis, Ankara University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Karasar, N. (2006). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.
- Keyes, C. L. M., Dhingra, S. S. & Simoes, E. J. (2010). Change in level of positive mental health as a predictor of future risk of mental illness. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100, 2366-2371.
- Kinzie, M. B., Delcourt, M. A. B., & Powers, S. M. (1994). Computer technologies: Attitudes and self-efficacy across undergraduate disciplines. *Research and Higher Education*, 35, 745-768.
- Koç, T., Deniz, L. (2020). An investigation of mathematics teachers' self-efficacy beliefs toward their special field competencies, *International Journal of Social Studies*, 13(72), 669-689.
- Kors, A. C. (2003). *Encyclopedia of the enlightenment*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Köylü, D. (2018). *The relationship between levels of teachers' participation in decision making process and their organisational commitment and psychological well being*, Master Thesis. Ondokuz Mayıs University, Institute of Education Sciences, Samsun.
- Kurt, N. (2018). *The relationship between psychological capital perception, psychological well-being and job satisfaction of teachers*, Doctoral Thesis. Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Self-efficacy in the workplace: Implications for motivation and performance. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, 14(1), 1-6.
- Muhammed, H. İ. (2019). *Development of the tolerance scale: A study of validity and reliability*, Master's Thesis, Yuzuncu Yıl University Institute Of Educational Sciences, Van.
- Nicholson, P. (1985). Toleration as a moral ideal, in: John Horton and Susan Mendus (eds.) *Aspects of Toleration. Philosophical Studies* (158-185), London: Methuen.
- Pajares, F. & Schunk, D. H. (2001). *Self-beliefs and school success: Self-efficacy, self-concept, and school achievement*. In R. Riding and S. Rayner (Eds.), *Selfperception* (239-266). London: Ablex Publishing.
- Pleckaitis, R. (1998). *Tolerancija*. Vilnius: Pradai
- Rawls, J. (2017). *Bir adalet teorisi*. (Translated by V. A. Çoşar). Ankara: Phoenix Publishing
- Ryff, C. D. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4(4), 99-104.
- Ryff, C. D., Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719-727.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is It? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069-1081.
- Ryff, C. D., Singer, B. (1996). Psychological well-being: Meaning, measurement, and implications for psychotherapy research. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 65, 14-23.
- Recepoğlu, S., Recepoğlu, E. (2020). Relationship between Prospective Teachers' Motivation for Teaching Profession and Prospective Teachers' Sense of Efficacy, *Journal of Hacettepe University Faculty of Education*, 35(4), 799-814.
- Ruble, L. A., Usher, E. L., & McGrew, J. H. (2011). Preliminary investigation of the sources of self-efficacy among teachers of students with autism. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 26(2), 67-74.
- Sarıtaş, S. (2019). *Examination of Elementary Teacher Candidates' Psychological Well-Being, Occupational Worry and Self-Efficacy Beliefs*, Master Thesis, Marmara University Institute of Educational Sciences, Istanbul
- Schmitz, G. S.(2000). Zur Struktur und Dynamik der Selbstwirksamkeitserwartung von Lehrern. Ein protektiver Faktor gegen Belastung und Burnout?, Diggitale Dissertation, FU Berlin, [https://refubium.fu-berlin.de/bitstream/handle/fub188/12208/00\\_gs\\_schmitz.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://refubium.fu-berlin.de/bitstream/handle/fub188/12208/00_gs_schmitz.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) Access 20.12.2021.
- Seligman, M. E. (2000). Positive psychology: an introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5–14.

- Sezer, F. (2013). Factors that affect psychological well being. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 8(4),489-504.
- Shoji, K., Cieslak, R., Smoktunowicz, E., Rogala, A., Benight, C. C., & Luszczynska, A. (2015). Associations between job burnout and self-efficacy: A meta-analysis. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, 29(4), 367-386,
- Skaalvik, S. and Skaalvik, E. M. (2017). Motivated for teaching? Associations with school goal structure, teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 152-160.
- Stajkovic, A. D., Luthans, F. (2002). Social cognitive theory and self-efficacy: Implications for motivation theory and practice. In R. M. Steers, L. W. Porter, & G. A. Bigley (Eds.), *Motivation and Work Behavior* (7th ed.), (126-140). NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Telef, B. B. (2013). The Adaptation of Psychological Well-Being into Turkish: A Validity and Reliability Study. *Journal of Hacettepe University Faculty of Education*, 28(3), 374-384.
- Telef, B. B., Uzman, E. and Ergün, E. (2013). Examine the relation between psychological well-being and values in teacher candidates. *Turkish Studies*, 8(12), 1297-1307.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk-Hoy, A. and Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 202–248.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. and Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783-805.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and teacher Education*, 23(6), 944-956.
- UNESCO. (1995). *Declaration of principles on tolerance proclaimed and signed by the member states of UNESCO*. Paris: Cültür Of Pace.
- Ural, A. and Kılıç, İ. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve SPSS ile veri analizi*. Ankara: Detay Publishing.
- Ventura, M., Salanova, M., Llorens, S. (2015). Professional self-efficacy as a predictor of burnout and engagement: The role of challenge and hindrance demands. *The Journal of Psychology* 149 (3), 277-302.
- Waterman, A. S. (1984). *The psychology of individualism*. New York: Praeger.
- Yakut, S., Yakut, İ. (2018). Relationship between psychological well-being in teachers andexclusion fromworkplace, *Turkish Studies Social Sciences*, 13 (18), 357-1376.
- Yapıcı, A. (2007). *Ruh sağlığı ve din, psiko-sosyal uyum ve dindarlık*. Adana: Karahan Bookstore.
- Yılmaz, F. (2017). Paradox of tolerance. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 59, 577-606.
- Yılmaz, M., Köseoğlu, P., Gerçek, C., Soran, H., (2004), *Adaptation of a teacher self-efficacy scale to Turkish*, *Journal of Hacettepe University Faculty of Education* 27, 260-267
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Self-efficacy and educational development. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies* (202-231). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.