

The Examination of the Possible Relationship Between Reality Shock Expectations and Teacher Self-Efficacy Levels of the Prospective Teachers Attending Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program*

Gozde Sezen-Gultekin¹, Senay Sezgin Nartgun²

¹Res. Assist., Sakarya University Faculty of Education Educational Sciences Department, Turkey

²Prof. Dr., Abant Izzet Baysal University Faculty of Education Educational Sciences Department, Turkey

Correspondence: Gozde Sezen-Gultekin, Sakarya University Faculty of Education Educational Sciences Department, Turkey.

Received: December 5, 2017

Accepted: February 1, 2018

Online Published: April 1, 2018

doi:10.11114/jets.v6i3a.3154

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i3a.3154>

Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine the possible relationship between the reality shock expectations and teacher self-efficacy levels of the prospective teachers attending pedagogical formation certificate program. In accordance with this purpose, the study was designed in correlational model among relational survey models, and the study sample was composed of 293 prospective teachers who were attending the Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program in 2016-2017 academic year by selected through convenience sampling. According to the analysis of the obtained data from this sample, it was seen that the prospective teachers' reality shock expectation levels were generally higher in the possible problems with professional differences, while the teacher self-efficacy levels were lower in the situations regarding individual differences. On the other hand, it was observed that the reality shock expectations and teacher self-efficacy levels did not show difference according to gender, education level and graduated field variables, while only the teacher self-efficacy towards teaching strategies sub-dimension had a difference in terms of education level variable. This difference was in favor of teacher candidates receiving postgraduate training. When the main purpose of the study was examined, it was determined that there was no statistically significant relationship between the teacher's self-efficacy and reality shock expectations of the prospective teachers attending to the pedagogical formation certificate program.

Keywords: pedagogical formation certificate program, prospective teacher, reality shock expectations, teacher self-efficacy

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduce the Problem

According to Schlossberg (1989), the professional world is a phase for human development resulting in a trend which involves transitions and crises, and points to a growth-focused milestone (from Bridges, 1980 cited by Caires, Almeida & Martins, 2009). Employees at this phase can experience many positive and negative experiences during their involvement in their professions and organizations. In order to sustain these positive experiences and to overcome negative experiences, professional preparation trainings and the evaluation of the professional qualifications acquired in these trainings are of importance. Considering effective implementation of teaching profession one of the core occupational areas on Earth, this importance becomes even more crucial.

The general purpose of teacher training programs is to provide the prospective teachers with the knowledge and skills required by the profession (Ozdemir & Buyukgoze, 2016a). In these programs, it is expected that the theoretical foundations for the related specialist fields as well as the practical skills will be gained. Because a real preparation for the profession should involve much more than equipping prospective teachers with the technical aspects of teaching (Richards, Templin & Gaudreault, 2013). However this expectation cannot always be met, and sometimes the content presented in the professional training programs and the methods used in the evaluation exams are mostly theory oriented. For example, the exams which are applied with the aim of teacher training and selection are generally conducted as multiple-choice tests due to the reasons such as objective evaluation and standardization concerns in

Turkey. For this reason, it can be said that the majority of these exams are missing in the evaluation of the practical knowledge due to the measurement of only theoretical knowledge of a candidate. Because there are mainly theoretical questions in the Higher Education Institutions Exam (HEIE) applied to study in the faculties of education, in the acquisition into Pedagogical Formation Certificate Programs (PFCP) and Public Personnel Selection Exam (PPSE) applied in teacher selection, the candidates' attitudes towards the teaching profession and the ability to practice the theory are not tested. In addition, although the vocational practical courses offered in the faculties of education vary according to the departments, they are limited to the lessons of "Observation and Teaching Practice" given at certain semesters. This situation may lead prospective teachers to get to work with only theoretical knowledge, to have less experience in putting their information into practice, to be a teacher without being observed of their attitudes towards the profession, and to feel lack of competence. The reason given by the Turkish Republic Ministry of National Education (MoNE) in 2023 vision for teachers also supports this notion.

According to the 2017-2023 Teacher Strategy Document prepared by the MoNE within the scope of the vision of 2023, which is a road map in the process of teacher training and development, the institutions having the teacher training programs will be predominantly restructured with practical actions in an academic and organizational sense (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Education General Directorate of Teacher Training and Development, 2017). In other words, education institutions will be reshaped in a way that will focus on implementation in sense of both educational and organizational functioning for training and development of the teacher candidates constituting one of the basic building blocks of Turkish education system in the light of the target vision. This is because the theoretical knowledge that teacher candidates get in the pre-service training is not sufficient, although it is necessary for carrying out the profession effectively (Ozdemir & Buyukgoze, 2016a). This inadequacy sets the ground for problems to be faced by prospective teachers when they first start to work.

According to Ryan (1979), the main reasons for having problems of novice teachers arise from the reasons such as not being mastered in what to do, having no clear selection criteria for teacher training, not being trained for specific tasks in schools as well as for general education (cited by Veenman, 1984). On the other hand, it is seen that novice teachers have difficulties in some organizational actions such as organizational socialization, cohesion with working group, group attitudes towards organization, dealing with work in the first year, organizational loyalty, commitment and trust norms (Buchanan, 1974), social integration, defense of ethical/moral rights, conflict resolution (from Deppoliti, 2008 cited by Sabanciogullari & Dogan, 2012) as well as in other issues such as how to carry out formal affairs, how to adapt to teaching role, fulfilling teaching duties, classroom management, adaptation to school and its environment, teaching various courses (Korkmaz, Saban & Akbasli, 2004), classroom discipline, motivating students, dealing with individual differences, evaluating students, communicating with parents, organizing classroom work, relations with colleagues, being aware of school policies and rules, guidance and support (Veenman, 1984). One of the main reasons underlying all these problems is reality shock which emerges from the difference between occupational prospective teachers' expectations during pre-service training and the situations encountered during service.

Reality shock is a term used to indicate the shock-like reactions which new employees show when they realize the inconsistency between their ideals and the reality in business life (from Kramer, 1974 and Schein, 1978 cited by Kodama, 2017). In this sense, the term of reality shock is particularly important in revealing expectations about the differences between new employees' thoughts in pre-service training and the situations to be encountered when they start to work.

1.2 Reality Shock and Its Importance in Education Organizations

When considered from the perspective of educational organizations, the first year of transition from prospective teacher to teaching profession can be considered as a critical period. In this transition period, teachers seek to acquire the skills and habits that will shape the basis of their future success; while many teachers either give up on their profession or become discouraged. This situation is called as reality or transitional shock (from Guclu, 2004 cited by Kaya, Balay & Demirci, 2014). Reality shock is related to the acceptance of a complex reality that compels novice teachers constantly inside or outside the school (from Guclu, 1996 cited by Celik, 1998). According to Dracup and Morris (2008), reality shock exists in transition to a business life full of priorities and pressures after a long vocational training, and in the situations in which the organization expects a newly graduate employee to know all the needs and requirements of the system (cited by Koc, Bardak & Yilmaz, 2014). However, the importance considered by the complicated social life to tasks and responsibilities related to teaching profession is increasing every day. In the first years of the profession, these duties and responsibilities can become more influential. Because the perceptions of the profession and the events encountered during practice may not overlap (Kaskaya, Unlu, Akar & Ozturan Sagirli, 2011).

According to Nelson (1987), along with the first business day in the first 6 to 9 months of the compliance phase, the reality shock may occur due to the conflict of personal expectations and organizational demands (cited by Cerik &

Bozkurt, 2010). According to Kramer (1974), the beginners either surrender to the behaviors and values of the working environment or integrate the values and behaviors of the professional and bureaucratic work system into one another. However, reality shock occurs in the first three months of this integration process (from Deppoliti, 2008 cited by Sabanciogullari & Dogan, 2012). According to Taormina (1997), the basis of reality shock is the dimension of understanding the organization defined as the concept through which employees can learn about their organization, colleagues, business and culture (Cited by Cerik & Bozkurt, 2010). Especially the first years when the dimension of understanding the organization is used at a high level is very important in terms of novice teachers. The teachers in their first year are faced with many tasks such as creating a positive reputation in his school, organizing and preparing lessons that he has never taught, trying to adapt to a completely new role as an adult, a professional and a teacher (Gaede, 1978). On the other hand, new teachers have to deal with other issues such as finding places in the organization, interacting with the students in the classroom, coping with the difficulties that the course brings and adapting to the school political system (from Guclu, 2004 cited by Kaya, Balay & Demirci, 2014). Because of these situations reality shock emerges, and for this reason this concept is of great importance in terms of educational organizations in training of prospective teachers.

1.3 Consequences of Reality Shock

Prospective teachers become increasingly idealistic, progressive, or liberal in their attitudes towards education during teacher education while thereafter they move towards opposing and more traditional, conservative or supervised opinions when they first start the profession and in time (Veenman, 1984). One of the reasons for teachers' experiencing reality shock in the first years of the profession is the difficulty of transitioning from 'student' role to 'teacher role'. In this process, prospective teachers have a great expectation regarding the profession in pre-service training but they see that these expectations may not be met in real educational settings (Ozdemir & Buyukgoze, 2016a). In this case, reality shock can be an inevitable condition.

Reality shock is not a clear concept and indicates many heterogeneous forms. Müller-Fohrbrodt, Cloetta and Dann (1978) put forward five indications of the shock of reality - perception of problems, change of behavior, change of attitudes, change of personality and separation from teaching position- in order to resolving this uncertainty (cited by Veenman, 1974). The reality shock carrying these indications can lead to some consequences. Employees may experience a dilemma between organizational values and their own values; in this case they may fall into disappointment, may abandon the personal values that are in conflict with organizational values, and may even leave from the organization (Celik, 1998). According to Kramer (1974), after realizing the discrepancies between the ideals and the real ones, new employees think that they have not been prepared enough for the working environment during their training because they apply what they have learned in vocational training and are unable to meet expectations in the working environment. For this reason, they feel anger to school and this situation causes anger, frustration and severe discomfort (from Deppoliti, 2008 cited by Sabanciogullari & Dogan, 2012).

As a result, it can be said that reality shock is a very common phenomenon among employees although the nature and depth of its results vary (Caires, Almeida & Martins, 2009). It would be useful to address this widespread phenomenon together with the term of self-efficacy, especially in order to prepare and acquire prospective teachers more effectively to the profession.

1.4 Reality Shock and Teacher Self-Efficacy

In the study on reality shock Gaede (1978) found that the novice teachers compare themselves to a norm more different than their pre-service periods, they do not realize the importance of professional qualifications during pre-service training, and they suffer from shortcomings related to these qualifications when they start the profession. In this context, it can be considered that there is a possible relationship between reality shock and teacher self-efficacy since their prior expectations in pre-service years and the occurred situations after starting to work show differences, and they feel inadequacy in the professional sense because of these differences.

Self-efficacy perception concerns personal judgments about how well individuals can perform the actions necessary for coping with possible situations (from Bandura, 1993 cited by Kurt, 2012). Based on social cognitive theory, teacher self-efficacy can be conceptualized as individual teacher beliefs about the ability to plan, organize and carry out the activities required to achieve specific educational goals (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). However, even if the teachers who start to work with some situations such as inexperience and unrealistic expectation think that they are good at some subjects during their class experiences, they do not see themselves adequately in the way of applying teaching methods and materials, discovering the level of the students' ability and problems (from Blase, 1985 cited by Kartal, 2006), and they sometimes query their teachers' qualifications by having an identity concern (from Fuller, 1969 cited by Cooper & He, 2012). It can be claimed that the main reason for this situation is that prospective teachers experience reality shock by falling into dilemmas in their expectations towards the profession, and do not exactly know their professional self-efficacy levels.

The best way to overcome such situations faced by new teachers is to give them a more realistic and integrated education. With the aim of being more flexible in adapting to changes in the teaching field and so not leaving the profession, educators need to reassess their visions for teacher education and contextualize their curricula to include content knowledge, pedagogical experience and knowledge of students for a better professional preparation of prospective teachers (Cooper & He, 2012). In this way, an education system can be established in which prospective teachers are given a combination of theory and practice, and an upskilling of practical knowledge on school functioning rather than only field knowledge and abilities to cope with changes in personal expectations, uncertainty and conflict in the case of duality. This system will be useful on the one hand for increasing the professional qualifications of prospective and novice teachers, on the other hand for identifying their reality shock expectations. For this reason, the possible relationship between two related concepts will be discussed in order to contribute to the literature in this study.

1.5 The Importance and Aim of the Study

According to Wubbells (1992) and Skuja-Steele (1993), although there are attempts to increase their awareness of the importance of professional courses and integrate them into the practical components of teacher education, many prospective teachers generally ignore the theoretical pedagogical information they have gained during the university education when they enter the classroom (cited by Richards & Killen, 1993), and this situation causes duality in theory and practice. This duality situation is quite critical in terms of prospective teachers just because teaching is such a profession that it requires dealing with the other factors (e.g. time management, physical environment, school tasks, etc.) by revealing self-efficacy during the process of putting academic knowledge into practice rather than leaving the class after covering a topic. In this regard, that handling the reality shock emerging in the transition from theory to practice, self-efficacy addressing the professional qualities of teacher candidates at the same time, and examining the possible relationship between these two terms is very important for such a multidimensional profession to be carried out effectively and efficiently.

According to the findings of the study conducted by Sezgin Nartgun (2016), some attendees in the pedagogical formation certificate program continue to this certification program with the thoughts of "appointment as a teacher" or "at least as a teacher" because they cannot get a job in their own fields. However, each profession has certain values and criteria, and the qualifications and training required by a profession are different from those of other professions. The right to be a member of that profession can only be achieved by the successful completion of the nomination process. Nevertheless, those who receive teacher training by coming from different faculties in higher education institutions can experience problems in terms of system integration (Celik, 1998). For this reason, it may be useful to question the reality shock expectancy and teacher self-efficacy in order to present the problems which the candidates who wish to become teachers through the pedagogical formation certification program can experience in a different framework. Because the prospective teachers who go on this certificate program come from a different field and may be stranger teacher training and education system it may be more likely for them to have a dilemma between the real situation and their plan. On the other hand, the prospective teachers in the formation program may feel deficient in developing teaching self-efficacy due to the fact that the pedagogy lessons are squeezed into only few months while the prospective teachers who graduate from education faculties can improve their self-efficacy not only with internship practice courses but also through different courses during the year they are educated. As a matter of fact, it is important to determine the prospective teachers' expectations about the dilemma between what they think and what they will encounter in real life, and their professional self-efficacy. In this context, this study has three distinct importances:

1. As far as known, there is no study focusing directly on the relationship between the reality shock expectancy and teacher self-efficacy concepts on the teacher candidates in the literature. For this reason, this study is important for the examination of the possible relationship between these two concepts.
2. In Turkey, the studies that directly examine reality shock expectation (Ozdemir & Buyukgoze, 2016a; Ozdemir & Buyukgoze, 2016b, Guvendir, 2017; Tekkursun, Cicioglu & Ilhan, 2017) are limited, this concept is generally addressed under the topic of "organizational socialization" (see Celik, 1998; Cerik & Bozkurt, 2010; Demirbilek, 2009; Kartal, 2006). For this reason, this study reveals an effort to develop the concept of reality shock expectancy in Turkish literature.
3. In the studies conducted on reality shock expectancy in Turkey, only prospective teachers or teachers are sampled (e.g. Ozdemir & Buyukgoze, 2016a; Ozdemir & Buyukgoze, 2016b; Guvendir, 2017) while a single study (Tekkursun, Cicioglu & Ilhan, 2017) taking the sample of the prospective teachers who continue the pedagogical formation certificate program is encountered. For this reason, this study is important for the fact that it puts forth the opinions on reality shock of the other prospective teachers who come from outside the field and want to be a teacher by having the formation training.

Based on the importance and rationale presented above, the aim of this study is to examine whether there is a

statistically significant relationship between the reality shock expectancy and teacher self-efficacy levels of the prospective teachers who continue the pedagogical formation certificate program. In this respect, the sub-problems examined within the scope of the research are as follows:

1. How are the reality shock expectancy levels and teacher self-efficacy levels of the prospective teachers who continue the pedagogical formation certificate program?
2. Do the reality shock expectancy levels, the teacher self-efficacy levels and its sub-dimensions' levels of the prospective teachers who continue the pedagogical formation certificate program a significant difference in terms of (a) gender, (b) education level, (c) graduated area?
3. Is there a statistically significant relation between the reality shock expectancy and teacher self-efficacy levels of the prospective teachers who continue the pedagogical formation certificate program?

2. Method

2.1 Research Model

The aim of this study is to determine the possible relationship between the reality shock expectancy and teacher self-efficacy levels of the prospective teachers who continue the pedagogical formation certificate program in Turkey. For this reason, the study was designed in the correlational model among relational survey models. This model aims to determine the coexistence of two or more variables, and the relationships found through screening do not give a real cause-and-effect relationship, but it provides some clues and useful results in estimating the other when a variable is known (Karasar, 2012:81-82). In this regard, the possible relationship between reality shock expectancy and teacher self-efficacy was determined by correlation analysis based on the data gathered from the participants.

2.2 Research Population and Sample

The study population is composed of 1100 prospective teachers who continue to Abant İzzet Baysal University Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program in Turkey in the 2016-2017 academic year. The pedagogical formation training is a certificate program presented in Turkey to the people who are about to finish or have graduated from an undergraduate program except from faculty of education. This program provides the chances to the people who have no chance to attend a faculty of education but the will to become a teacher. For this reason, the pedagogical formation training is very important to support the national educational policy effectively. This study aims to see especially the prospective teachers attending the pedagogical formation training who have different background from the faculty of education graduates. Therefore the study sample is composed of 293 prospective teachers who attend the pedagogical formation certificate program in a state university selected by convenience sampling. The convenience sampling is affordable, easy and the subjects are readily available (Etikan, Musa & Alkassim, 2016).

2.3 Data Collection Tools

Reality Shock Expectations Scale (RSES): Originally developed by Kim and Cho (2014), and adapted to Turkish by Ozdemir and Buyukgoze (2016a), the scale contains a total of 9 items. Designed as a 7-point Likert type with a value between 'not true' and 'very true', the highest score that can be taken from this scale is 63 and the lowest score is 7. The higher score taken from the scale is interpreted as the fact that the reality shock expectancy is higher, while the lower scores are interpreted as the reality shock expectancy is low. Turkish validity and reliability studies of the scale were conducted through the data obtained from 120 prospective teachers. As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), it was seen that the one-dimensional structure of the Turkish version of the RSES, as in the original, was confirmed. Goodness of fit values calculated in the CFA results are as follows; [$\chi^2=48.71$; $Sd=27$; $\chi^2/Sd=1.8$; AGFI = .86; GFI = .92; NFI = .89; CFI = .94; IFI = .84; RMR = .16; RMSEA = .08]. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient of the Turkish version of the scale was found to be .78 while it was found to be .74 in this study. The aim why to use Reality Shock Expectations Scale adapted by Ozdemir and Buyukgoze (2016a) is due to the fact that it was the only Turkish scale assessing the reality shock expectancy of prospective teachers in Turkey.

Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES): Originally developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001), and adapted to Turkish by Capa, Cakiroglu and Sarikaya (2005), the scale contains a total of 24 items. Designed as a 9-point Likert type with a value between 'Not sufficient' and 'Very sufficient', the adaptation of the scale consists of a sample of 628 education faculty students. According to the results, the scale had three sub-dimensions as "self-efficacy towards student participation, self-efficacy towards using instructional strategies, self-efficacy towards classroom management" each of which contains 8 items. As a result of CFA, it was seen that TLI and CFI values of .99 had a good fit with the efficacy data of three factor model, and RMSEA value was .065. In addition, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients of the scale was seen .93 for the overall teacher self-efficacy, .82 for self-efficacy towards student participation sub-dimension, .86 for self-efficacy for using instructional strategies sub-dimension, and .84 for self-efficacy dimension for classroom management sub-dimension. In this study, Cronbach alpha coefficient was found to be .92 for the total of teacher

self-efficacy, .79 for self-efficacy towards student participation sub-dimension, .83 for self-efficacy for using instructional strategies sub-dimension, and .83 for self-efficacy dimension for classroom management sub-dimension. The aim why to use Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale adapted by Capa, Cakiroglu and Sarikaya (2005) is due to the fact that it was found to be more appropriate for the study scope to reflect teacher self-efficacy. The scale gives a chance to see teacher self-efficacy from different perspectives such as participation, instruction and management. This situation provides to evaluate prospective teachers' self-efficacy with a holistic approach.

2.4 Data Analysis and Operations

SPSS 20.0 package program was used for analysis of the data. The distributions of the data were tested and found to be normal distributions except for the self-efficacy for using instructional strategies and classroom management sub-dimensions. For this reason, the parametric tests such as t-test, ANOVA analyzes were performed for reality shock expectancy, overall teacher efficacy, self-efficacy towards student participation sub-dimension while the nonparametric tests Mann Whitney-U, Kruskal Wallis-H for self-efficacy for using instructional strategies and classroom management sub-dimensions in accordance with the aims of the study. For example, t-test and Mann Whitney-U test were used to see whether there was any difference in the data in terms of gender and education level which had only two categories while ANOVA and Kruskal Wallis-H tests were carried out to determine whether the data showed any difference in terms of graduated field which had three categories. Moreover, correlation analysis was applied to see the potential relationship between reality shock expectancy and teacher self-efficacy levels of prospective teachers in the light of the main problem of the study. The normality tests can be seen in the following table.

	Tests of Normality					
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	p	Statistic	df	p
Reality Shock Expectancy	,049	293	,083	,991	293	,086
Teacher Self-Efficacy	,039	293	,200	,993	293	,165
SE towards student participation	,049	293	,086	,993	293	,206
SE towards using instructional strategies	,074	293	,001*	,976	293	,000*
SE towards classroom management	,058	293	,017*	,988	293	,019*

*p<.05

3. Results

The demographic information of 293 prospective teachers participating in the study is 204 female (%70) and 87 male (%30) in terms of gender; 272 undergraduate (%93) and 12 postgraduate (%7) in terms of education level; 101 natural sciences (%34), 84 social sciences (%29) and 108 not graduated yet (37) in terms of graduated field. On the other hand, the analyses of the study sub-problems were presented in the following tables.

Table 1. The levels of reality shock expectancy of the participants

Items	\bar{X}	sd	Total
RS_1	4,46	1,739	293
RS_2	4,89	1,605	293
RS_3	4,24	1,651	293
RS_4	4,39	1,819	293
RS_5	4,68	1,801	293
RS_6	5,11	1,528	293
RS_7	4,72	1,595	293
RS_8	4,77	1,574	293
RS_9	4,79	1,648	293
RStotal	4,67	,951	293

In Table 1, it is seen that the participants' opinions regarding the reality shock expectancy are generally above the "undecided" level. The participants' opinions on the reality shock scale are at the lowest level ($\bar{X}= 4.24$) in the 3rd item "Implementing school policies in the classroom will be very complicated and difficult" while at the highest level ($\bar{X}=5.11$) in the 6th item "In the school environment, there will be professional differences/stratifications which are not taught to me at university and I will have difficulty coping with". In this case, it can be said that the levels of reality shock expectancy of the prospective teachers getting pedagogical formation education are higher than the undecided option. The fact that the reality shock expectancy is in the 3rd item as the lowest level shows that the prospective teachers are already aware of the difficulty that they may experience because of their low reality shock expectations about the implementation of school policies in the classroom environment. On the other hand, the fact that the reality shock expectancy is in the 6th item as the highest level shows that the prospective teachers have high reality shock expectancies for professional stratifications, and so they do not know what to encounter about that.

Table 2. The levels of teacher self-efficacy of the participants

Items	\bar{X}	sd	Total
TSE_1	6,13	1,584	293
TSE_2	6,74	1,529	293
TSE_3	6,71	1,506	293
TSE_4	6,98	1,427	293
TSE_5	6,98	1,573	293
TSE_6	7,30	1,432	293
TSE_7	6,68	1,585	293
TSE_8	6,88	1,521	293
TSE_9	6,98	1,456	293
TSE_10	7,12	1,442	293
TSE_11	7,06	1,469	293
TSE_12	6,77	1,572	293
TSE_13	7,09	1,366	293
TSE_14	6,85	1,460	293
TSE_15	6,87	1,531	293
TSE_16	6,38	1,601	293
TSE_17	6,38	1,747	293
TSE_18	6,74	1,581	293
TSE_19	6,74	1,605	293
TSE_20	7,17	1,411	293
TSE_21	6,80	1,771	293
TSE_22	6,73	1,645	293
TSE_23	6,89	1,442	293
TSE_24	6,96	1,603	293
TSEtotal	6,83	,927	293

In Table 2, it is seen that participants' opinions on teacher self-efficacy are generally close to "very sufficient". The participants' opinions on the teacher self-efficacy scale are at the lowest level ($\bar{X}= 6.13$) in the 1st item "How far can you manage to reach difficult students?" while at the highest level ($\bar{X}= 7.30$) in the 6th item "How much can you ensure that students can succeed at school?". These items are also included in the sub-dimension of self-efficacy towards

student participation. When looking for the sub-dimension self-efficacy towards instructional strategies, the opinions occur at the lowest level ($\bar{X}= 6.38$) in the 17th item “How much can you ensure that the lessons fit the level of each student?” while at the highest level ($\bar{X}= 7.17$) in the 20th item “How much alternative explanation or example can you provide when students are confused?”. When looking for the sub-dimension self-efficacy towards classroom management, the opinions occur at the lowest level ($\bar{X}= 6.38$) in the 16th item “How well can you create an appropriate classroom management system for different groups of students?” while at the highest level ($\bar{X}= 7.09$) in the 13th item “How much can you ensure that the students follow the class rules?”. In this case, it can be said that the teacher self-efficacy levels of the pedagogical formation trainee prospectives are lower in cases of individual differences (e.g. working with difficult students, different student groups and different student levels).

Table 3. t-test and Mann-Whitney U test results regarding the participants' reality shock expectancy, teacher self-efficacy and its sub-dimensions according to gender variable

	Gender	n	\bar{X}	sd	df	t	p*																																																				
Reality Shock Expectancy	Female	204	4,61	,966	289	-1,548	,123																																																				
	Male	87	4,80	,915				Teacher Self-Efficacy (TSE)	Female	204	6,79	,939	289	-1,310	,191	Male	87	6,95	,858	SE towards student participation	Female	204	6,78	,996	187,546	-1,335	,184	Male	87	6,93	,856		Gender	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks		U	p*	SE towards using instructional strategies	Female	204	142,28	29025,50		8115,500	,516	Male	87	154,72	13460,50	SE towards classroom management	Female	204	143,74	29322,50		8412,500	,101
Teacher Self-Efficacy (TSE)	Female	204	6,79	,939	289	-1,310	,191																																																				
	Male	87	6,95	,858				SE towards student participation	Female	204	6,78	,996	187,546	-1,335	,184	Male	87	6,93	,856		Gender	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks		U	p*	SE towards using instructional strategies	Female	204	142,28	29025,50		8115,500	,516	Male	87	154,72	13460,50	SE towards classroom management	Female	204	143,74	29322,50		8412,500	,101	Male	87	151,30	13163,50								
SE towards student participation	Female	204	6,78	,996	187,546	-1,335	,184																																																				
	Male	87	6,93	,856																																																							
	Gender	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks		U	p*																																																				
SE towards using instructional strategies	Female	204	142,28	29025,50		8115,500	,516																																																				
	Male	87	154,72	13460,50				SE towards classroom management	Female	204	143,74	29322,50		8412,500	,101	Male	87	151,30	13163,50																																								
SE towards classroom management	Female	204	143,74	29322,50		8412,500	,101																																																				
	Male	87	151,30	13163,50																																																							

*p<0.05

According to Table 3, there is no significant difference on the participants' opinions about reality shock expectancy [$t(289)= -1,548$; $p>0.05$], the overall teacher self-efficacy [$t(289)= -1,310$; $p>0.05$], self-efficacy towards student participation [$t(187,546)= -1,335$; $p>0.05$], self-efficacy towards instructional strategies [$U= 8115,500$; $p>0.05$] and self-efficacy towards classroom management [$U= 8412,500$; $p>0.05$] according to gender variable. For this reason, it can be said that the fact that the prospective teachers getting pedagogical formation training are male or female does not make a difference in their reality shock expectancy and in the levels of overall teacher self-efficacy and its all sub-dimensions.

Table 4. t-test results and Mann-Whitney U test regarding the participants' reality shock expectancy, teacher self-efficacy and its sub-dimensions according to education level variable

	Education Level	n	\bar{X}	sd	df	t	p*																																																				
Reality Shock Expectancy	Undergraduate	272	4,66	,955	282	-,627	,531																																																				
	Postgraduate	12	4,84	,844				Teacher Self-Efficacy (TSE)	Undergraduate	272	6,81	,914	282	-1,454	,147	Postgraduate	12	7,20	,829	SE towards student participation	Undergraduate	272	6,80	,960	282	-,922	,357	Postgraduate	12	7,06	,886		Gender	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks		U	p	SE towards using instructional strategies	Undergraduate	272	141,62	38520,50		1392,500	,389	Postgraduate	12	162,46	1949,50	SE towards classroom management	Undergraduate	272	140,58	38238,00		1110,000	,061
Teacher Self-Efficacy (TSE)	Undergraduate	272	6,81	,914	282	-1,454	,147																																																				
	Postgraduate	12	7,20	,829				SE towards student participation	Undergraduate	272	6,80	,960	282	-,922	,357	Postgraduate	12	7,06	,886		Gender	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks		U	p	SE towards using instructional strategies	Undergraduate	272	141,62	38520,50		1392,500	,389	Postgraduate	12	162,46	1949,50	SE towards classroom management	Undergraduate	272	140,58	38238,00		1110,000	,061	Postgraduate	12	186,00	2232,00								
SE towards student participation	Undergraduate	272	6,80	,960	282	-,922	,357																																																				
	Postgraduate	12	7,06	,886																																																							
	Gender	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks		U	p																																																				
SE towards using instructional strategies	Undergraduate	272	141,62	38520,50		1392,500	,389																																																				
	Postgraduate	12	162,46	1949,50				SE towards classroom management	Undergraduate	272	140,58	38238,00		1110,000	,061	Postgraduate	12	186,00	2232,00																																								
SE towards classroom management	Undergraduate	272	140,58	38238,00		1110,000	,061																																																				
	Postgraduate	12	186,00	2232,00																																																							

*p<0.05

According to Table 4, there is no significant difference on the participants' opinions about reality shock expectancy [$t(282) = -,627$; $p > 0.05$], the overall teacher self-efficacy [$t(282) = -1,454$; $p > 0.05$], self-efficacy towards student participation [$t(282) = -,922$; $p > 0.05$], self-efficacy towards instructional strategies [$U = 1392,500$; $p > 0.05$] and self-efficacy towards classroom management [$U = 1110,000$; $p > 0.05$] according to education level variable. Therefore, it can be said that the fact that the prospective teachers getting pedagogical formation training are undergraduate or postgraduate does not make a difference in their levels of reality shock expectancy, overall teacher self-efficacy and its all sub-dimensions.

Table 5. ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis H test results regarding the participants' reality shock expectancy, teacher self-efficacy and its sub-dimensions according to graduated field variable

		ANOVA					
		Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p*
Reality Shock Expectancy	Between Groups		5,120	2	2,560	2,867	,059
	Within Groups		259,006	290	,893		
	Total		264,126	292			
Teacher Self-Efficacy (TSE)	Between Groups		4,467	2	2,234	2,626	,074
	Within Groups		246,693	290	,851		
	Total		251,160	292			
SE towards student participation.	Between Groups		4,410	2	2,205	2,353	,097
	Within Groups		271,764	290	,937		
	Total		276,175	292			
			Mean Rank	df	χ^2		p*
SE towards using instructional strategies	Between Groups		140,58	1	3,521		,061
	Within Groups		186,00				
SE towards classroom management	Between Groups		141,46	1	1,035		,309
	Within Groups		166,08				

* $p < 0.05$

In Table 5, the participants' opinions were examined in three categories of field variables as natural sciences, social sciences, and not graduated yet. Based on this examination, there is no significant difference on the participants' opinions about reality shock [$F(2-290) = 2,867$; $p > 0.05$], the overall teacher self-efficacy [$F(2-290) = 2,626$; $p > 0.05$], self-efficacy towards student participation [$F(2-290) = 2,353$; $p > 0.05$], self-efficacy towards instructional strategies [$\chi^2(1) = 3,521$, $p > .05$] and self-efficacy towards classroom management [$\chi^2(1) = 1,035$, $p > .05$] according to graduated field variable. For this reason, it can be said that the fact that the prospective teachers getting pedagogical formation training are still continuing their undergraduate education or have graduated from different science fields does not make a difference in their reality shock expectancy, in the levels of overall teacher self-efficacy and its all sub-dimensions.

Table 6. The relationship between the reality shock expectancy and the teacher self-efficacy levels of the the participants

		Teacher Self-Efficacy (TSE)	SE towards student participation	SE towards using instructional strategies	SE towards classroom management
Reality Shock Expectancy	r	-,046	-,006	-,082	-,035
	p	,429	,912	,164	,551
	n	293	293	293	293

$p^* < 0.05$

According to the results of the correlation test conducted in Table 6 to test the relationship between the participants' level of reality shock expectancy and teacher's self-efficacy, no statistically significant relationship was found ($p > .05$). In this case, it can be said that there is no relation between the reality shock expectancy and teacher self-efficacy levels of the prospective pedagogical formation trainees and that they do not change together.

4. Conclusion and Discussion

When the opinions on the reality shock scale were examined, it was seen that the expectation levels of the prospective teachers getting pedagogical formation education were higher than the "undecided" option. In this case, it can be said that the prospective teachers generally carry an above average reality shock expectancy. The fact that the lowest reality shock expectancy level is in the item addressing the difficulty of implementing school policies in the classroom environment suggests that the prospective teachers are already aware of this possible challenge. On the other hand, the fact that the highest reality shock expectancy level was on the item about professional stratifications indicates that the prospective teachers do not know what they will encounter about these stratifications. When the opinions on the teacher self-efficacy scale are examined, it is obvious that the prospective teachers getting pedagogical formation education believe that their levels of teacher self-efficacy are lower in some situations related to individual differences such as working with difficult students, managing different groups of students and preparing lessons according to different student levels. As a matter of fact, this conclusion is supported by the view of Fuller (1969). In the experimental study conducted by Fuller (1969), it was found that the prospective teachers question their competencies as teachers when it comes to issues such as managing classroom management (cited by Cooper & He, 2012).

When the participants' opinions on the levels of reality shock expectations, the overall teacher self-efficacy and its sub-dimensions were examined according to gender variable, although the female participants' expectancy averages of reality shock were lower than the males in all the dimensions, this did not make a meaningful difference statistically. For this reason, it can be claimed that the gender of prospective teachers getting pedagogical formation training does not make a difference in the levels of reality shock expectancy, overall teacher self-efficacy and its sub-dimensions. The result regarding the reality shock expectancy is consistent with the results of the studies conducted by Ozdemir and Buyukgoze (2016a; 2016b), and by Tekkursun, Cicioglu and Ilhan (2017), while the result about teacher self-efficacy is different from the study done by Kurt (2009). On the other hand, in their study, Kim and Cho (2014) conclude the fact that the male prospective teachers are expected to experience reality shock expectancy in the first year of their teaching profession is more than the female prospective teachers' expectancies (cited by Ozcakmak & Koroglu, 2015).

When the participants' opinions were examined according to the education levels, it was seen that whether the prospective teachers getting pedagogical formation education do an undergraduate or a postgraduate education does not create any difference in their levels of reality shock expectancy, overall teacher self-efficacy and self-efficacy sub-dimensions for student participation, using instructional strategies and classroom management. When the related literature was examined, no similar study or result which supports or denies this result has been encountered. In this context, it can be claimed that the fact that examining the opinions of the prospective teachers getting pedagogical formation education in terms of education level is the first attempt in literature.

When the opinions of the participants were analyzed according to the graduated field variable, it was occurred that whether the prospective teachers getting pedagogical formation training were currently continuing their undergraduate education or had graduated from different fields of science like natural and social sciences did not create any differences in the levels of reality shock expectancy, overall teacher self-efficacy and its sub-dimensions. The similar findings to this result also exist in the studies in conducted by Ozdemir and Buyukgoze (2016a), and Ustuner, Demirtas, Comert and Ozer (2009). In the study done by Ozdemir and Buyukgoze (2016a), it was found that the reality shock expectancy levels did not differ according to the participants' academic department variables, while Ustuner and his colleagues (2009) revealed in their study that the participants' teacher self-efficacy levels did not show a difference according to branch variable.

The main purpose of this study was to determine the possible relationship between participants' expectation of reality and teacher self-efficacy. However, no statistically significant relationship was found when this main problem was tested. In this context, it can be stated that there is no relation between reality shock expectancy and teacher self-efficacy levels of the prospective teachers getting pedagogical formation education, and that they do not change together. When the related literature was examined, as far as is known, there is no study and result directly addressing this result. Therefore, it can be claimed that this situation is the distinctiveness of this study in terms of both national and international literature.

5. Suggestions

- A common tactic used in organization for the socialization of new employees is recruitment training programs. These programs help new employees to define organization and functioning procedures, to feel that his work is

important and he is the part of a new group, and to overcome the fears and worries which prevent success and advancement in his profession (Demirbilek, 2009). For example, within the scope of the study conducted by Kocaman, Intepeler, Sen, Yurumezoglu and Ozbicakci (2012), a training program was designed for counsellor nurses to help them acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to fulfill their role and responsibilities, and the characteristics that are required to be gained regarding the management of the transition period from novice to expertise were gained through sharing the the participants' perceptions on reality shock, feelings and experiences in this program. For this reason, prospective teachers who continue pedagogical formation education should be offered a familiarization job training in order to avoid a possible reality shock both when they first start to work and more importantly during pre-service trainings. If teachers are treated as architects of the future then it will be useful to present this training as a separate course within the pedagogical formation certification program.

- During university education, faculty-school cooperation should be activated to obtain the principles and rules of a profession, and probationary employee must be faced with school environment for practice. This kind of work will reduce a new employee's reality shock regarding the differences between pre-service training and after starting to work process (Kartal, 2006). In this context, considering the fact that prospective teachers who attend pedagogical formation certificate program come from different fields outside education, it can be said that it is crucially important for prospective teachers to include activities that reduce reality shocks and increase teacher self-efficacy into this certificate program with the aim of preventing the possibilities that they have too much dilemma between their anticipations and the facts, and that coming from outside the area becomes a disadvantage for them. In this respect, the duration of the certificate program carried out in Turkey now can be redesigned to be as 2 years in which only theoretical courses will be predominantly given for one year and only teaching practice lessons as well as self-knowledge and self-development lessons for one year will be presented to prospective teachers. Such a design can be effective for testing whether the prospective who come from outside the education field and want to become teachers are indeed suitable for this occupation, and for their discovering professional realities and competencies. This is because, as a result of this research, the reality shock expectancy levels of the prospective teachers are higher about "the professional differences/stratifications not told at university and difficult to cope with", and the teacher self-efficacy levels of the prospective teachers are lower especially in the situations involving individual differences such as "working with difficult students, different student groups and different student levels".
- With the aim of ensuring to train teachers who have higher self-efficacy, the status of having postgraduate education may be considered the accepting the candidates to be admitted to the pedagogical formation certificate program.
- This study was limited only to the items of the Reality Shock Expectation (RSE) and Teacher Self-Efficacy (TSE) scales. RSE is a scale designed in 7-Likert type while TSE RSE 9-Likert type. However, the Likert types more than five are sometimes not seen as suitable for Turkish culture (see Dagli & Baysal, 2016). For this reason, 5-Likert-type scales about these terms can be used for further studies or the scales used in this study can be reduced to a 5-Likert type by ensuring the reliability of the scales. In this way, the relationship between the reality shock expectancy and teacher self-efficacy can be retested.

Acknowledgements

This study was presented as an oral presentation at the 3rd International Conference on Lifelong Learning and Leadership for All - ICLEL17 held at the Politechnica University of Porto-Portugal between the dates of 12-14 September 2017.

References

- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative science quarterly*, 533-546.
- Caires, S., Almeida, L. S., & Martins, C. (2009). The socioemotional experiences of student teachers during practicum: a case of reality shock?. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 103(1), 17-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220670903228611>
- Capa, Y., Cakiroglu, J., & Sarikaya, H. (2005). The development and validation of a Turkish version of teachers' sense of efficacy scale. *Education and Science*, 30(137), 74-81.
- Celik, V. (1998). Alan disindan gelen sinif ogretmenlerinin orgutsel sosyalizasyonu. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Yonetimi*, 14(14), 191-208.
- Cerik, S., & Bozkurt, S. (2010). A research about the bank employees and the relationship between their perception on the organizational socialization and career anchors *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, (35), 77-97.

- Cooper, J. E., & He, Y. (2012). Journey of. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 21(1), 89-108.
- Dagli, A., & Baysal, N. (2016). Adaptation of the satisfaction with life scale into Turkish: the study of validity and reliability. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15(59):1250-1262.
- Demirbilek, T. (2009). Orgutsel sosyallemede ise alistirma egitiminin yeri ve onemi. *Sosyal ve Ekonomik Arařtırmalar Dergisi*, (18), 353-373.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Gaede, O. F. (1978). Reality shock: A problem among first-year teachers. *The Clearing House*, 51(9), 405-409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.1978.9957085>
- Guvendir, E. (2017). Beginning English teachers and their problems (Goreve yeni baslayan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin karsilastiklari sorunlar). *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (51), 74-94.
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel Arastırma Yontemi* (23. Basım). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Kartal, S (2006). The role of preparative and basic education on the organizatonal socializations of candidate civil servants, *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Burdur Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(11), 131-143.
- Kaskaya, A., Unlu, I., Akar, M. S., & Ozturan, S. M. (2011). The effect of school and teacher themed movies on pre-service teachers' professional attitudes and perceived self-efficacy, *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri (Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice)*, 11(4), 1765-1783.
- Kaya, A., Balay, R., & Demirci, Z. (2014). Investigation of secondary school teachers' psychological capital levels (sample of Sanliurfa). *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(48).
- Koc, S., Bardak, A., & Yilmaz, K. (2014). Identifying workplace expectations of final year nursing students, *Hemşirelikte Eğitim ve Araştırma Dergisi 2014*, 11(3), 43-50.
- Kocaman, G., Intepeler, S. S., Sen, H., Yurumezoglu, H. A., & Ozbicakci, S. (2012). An example of a preceptor nursing education program for novice nurses. *Journal of Education and Research in Nursing*, 9(2), 28-35.
- Kodama, M. (2017). Functions of career resilience against reality shock, focusing on full-time employees during their first year of work. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 59(4), 255-265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpr.12161>
- Korkmaz, I., Saban A., & Akbasli, S. (2004). Professional challenges encountered by beginning classroom teachers. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yonetimi*, (38), 266-277.
- Kurt, T. (2012). Öğretmenlerin öz yeterlik ve kolektif yeterlik algilari. *Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, 10(2):195-227.
- Ozcakmak, H., & Koroglu, M. (2015). Expectations of prospective Turkish language teachers from teaching profession, *Ana Dili Egitimi Dergisi*, 3(4), 49-58.
- Ozdemir, M., & Buyukgoze, H. (2016a). The adaptation of reality shock expectation scale and a study on prospective teachers. *Journal of Kirsehir Education Faculty*, 17(2).
- Ozdemir, M., & Buyukgoze, H. (2016b). The role of occupational concerns on the reality shock expectation. *Studies Psychologica*, 58(3), 199-215. <https://doi.org/10.21909/sp.2016.03.717>
- Republic of Turkey Ministry of Education General Directorate of Teacher Training and Development (2017). Öğretmenlere yönelik 2023 vizyonu belirlendi. Retrieved from <http://oygm.meb.gov.tr/www/ogretmenlere-yonelik-2023-vizyonu-belirlendi/icerik/409> on 21.11.2017
- Richards, C., & Killen, R. (1993). Problems of beginning teachers: Perceptions of pre-service music teachers. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 1(1), 40-51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X9300100105>
- Richards, K. A. R., Templin, T J., & Gaudreault, K. L. (2013). Understanding the realities of school life: Recommendations for the preparation of physical education teachers. *Quest*, 65(4), 442-457. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2013.804850>
- Sabancıogullari, S., & Dogan, S. (2012). Professional identity development and nursing (Profesyonel kimlik gelismisi ve hemsirelik). *Journal of Anatolia Nursing and Health Sciences*, 15(4), 275-278.
- Sezgin, N. Ş. (2016). Pedagogical formation students' perceptions about employment and teaching profession. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(12A), 22-30. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.041304>
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 1059-1069. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001>

- Tekkursun, D. G., Cicioglu, H. I., & Ilhan, E. L. (2017). A descriptive study on expectation levels of reality shock of physical education teacher candidates who take pedagogical formation. *Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education & Sport/Science, Movement & Health*, 17(2), 135-140.
- Ustuner, M., Demirtas, H., Comert, M., & Ozer, N. (2009). Secondary School teachers' self-efficacy beliefs (Ortaogretim ogretmenlerinin oz-yeterlik algilari). *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 9(17), 1-16.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2), 143-178. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543054002143>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution license](#) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.