

Investigation of the Relations between Personal Values and Self-Efficacy Perceptions of Adolescents

Figen Akça, Gizem Günçavdı Alabay*

Faculty of Education, Bursa Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey

Corresponding author: Gizem Günçavdı Alabay, E-mail: gizemguncavdi@uludag.edu.tr

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: November 25, 2022

Accepted: January 02, 2023

Published: January 31, 2023

Volume: 11 Issue: 1

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

ABSTRACT

Perception of self-efficacy is the judgment of ability, while self-esteem is judgment about self-worth (Bandura, 1993). Self-efficacy beliefs play a key role in shaping one's life by influencing the environment and activities in which a person wishes to enter. This study tests the relationship between the personal values of adolescents and their self-efficacy levels. In addition, the predictive power of self-efficacy on personal values is also investigated. In the study, the Personal Values Scale and the Self-Efficacy Scale for Children were administered to 390 high school adolescents. Hierarchical regression analysis, t-test, and ANOVA were used in the study. As a result, positive correlations were found between self-efficacy and the sub-dimensions of personal values. It is seen that these relations are between academic and social self-efficacy and discipline-responsibility, honesty-sharing, respect-accuracy, and sharing-respect values. On the other hand, significant relationships were found between personal values and self-efficacy, and it was seen that self-efficacy predicted personal values positively. In addition, it showed that self-efficacy and personal values differed in terms of gender, perception of academic achievement, class, and parental attitudes. These versatile results obtained from the study serve as a guide for psychological counselors to reach more descriptive data for adolescents in cooperation with their colleagues and management.

Key words: Personal Values, Self-Efficacy Perception, Academic Self-Efficacy, Emotional Self-Efficacy

INTRODUCTION

Values are one of our most fundamental characteristics that deeply affect our lives. Values play a key role in decision-making, problem-solving, communication, motivation, and maintaining personal development confronted in one's family, school, friends, and professional life.

Rokeach (1974) discussed the concepts of value and value systems separately. He defined value as a permanent belief in preferring a specific behavior and existence purpose instead of opponents as personal and social and he defined a value system as a permanent organization of beliefs related to the purpose of existence or preferred behavior. According to Rokeach, there are two kinds of values. These are purpose/nominal values (terminal values) and tool values (instrumental values). As examples of Rokeach's instrumental values, we can mention the features such as being responsible and helpful. As an example of terminal values; purposes such as a comfortable life, and self-esteem can be mentioned. According to Aavik and Allik (2002), values are shaped on the following five themes; values (i) are concepts or beliefs, (ii) relate to a desired outcome or behavior (iii) are beyond objective situations, (iv) are determinative in determining

behavior and in evaluating the event, and (v) are ranked according to their relative importance.

Schwartz (1992) determined a scale formed by ten values which were obtained from 20 countries in Value Survey; Power, Success, Hedonism, Excitement, Self-Control, Universality, Helpfulness, Traditionalism, Harmony, and Security. In a similar study, Bilsky and Hermann (2016) studied universality in the content and structure of values, and in particular, they considered drawing attention again to the connection between personal values and guilt as necessary.

Roy (2003) first defined the dimensions for determining core values of interest and then developed a core model of personal value structures by taking the opinions of the experts carrying out studies in this field. As a result of these studies, it has been accepted that seven core values are essential for the development of the personal as a whole and the peace of the personal. These value dimensions are as follows; honesty, trust, discipline, respect, dedication, sharing, and forgiveness. In this study, the scale which Roy tried to explain personal value structures and developed over these values was used because it is assumed that self-efficacy which is another variable of the study, is another variable of this personal structure similarly.

Bandura (1993) mentioned the necessity of bringing up ethical issues in promoting personal and social changes. According to Bandura, ethical considerations depend on factors such as what kind of changes are to be aggrandized the mass which is targeted by the change, the tools used, and the personals to be affected. A wide range of cultural and value analyzes should be done before the development and implementation of change. Efficiency beliefs play a key role in shaping life by influencing activities selected by the people and environmental conditions. Any factor that affects selection behavior will deeply affect the direction of personal development and will undertake a supporting role to regulate some challenges, values, and conflicts. Thus, people will have the power to select and shape their environment (Bandura, 1993). With this statement, we can mention that Bandura emphasizes that by having efficient belief and personal development, values, and relationship difficulties can be overcome. In other words, it is seen that mutual decisiveness comes into play here. Accordingly, there is a complex interaction between the personal, his behavior, and the environmental stimulants and each of these components affects the other. This change is rarely unidirectional. Our behaviors may be affected by our attitudes, beliefs, or past consolidations and current stimulants in the environment. What you did may have an impact on the environment. Significant aspects of your personality can be influenced by feedback from your environment or behaviors.

Self-efficacy perception is the judgment ability; self-respect is a judgment related to self-value. Self-efficacy beliefs play a key role in shaping life by influencing the shape of the environment and activities in which people want to be included (Bandura, 1993). Eccles, (2009), mentions that identity can be conceptualized according to two basic clusters of self-perception in adolescents; (a) perceptions related to abilities, features, and efficiencies; and (b) perceptions related to personal values and objectives. These two self-perceptions determine the personal's success expectations and their value in being included in a wide range of tasks.

Since self-efficacy is estimated to have motivational effects, it particularly appears to be related to children's behaviors. Children who have a strong sense of effectiveness in a specific subject are expected to present strong success efforts (Schunk, 1981). On the contrary, children who perceive themselves as insufficient are in a tendency to reject successful tasks or to participate half-unwillingly and easily give up against obstacles. The higher the perceived competence is, the higher taking responsibility and continuing activities are and then the subsequent success becomes higher (Schunk, 1981). As a matter of fact, in an experimental study by Bandura (1993), he revealed how incompatibility between self-efficacy and performance is positively changed by systematic desensitization. Again, the result of many studies was in the form that there was a relationship between self-efficacy and academic performance and the value given to the task (Wilson & Narayan, 2016; Jiang et al., 2014).

Finn and Frone (2004) assumed that the inverse relationship between academic performance and cheating in exams was managed by school identity and academic self-efficacy. The results show that cheating was higher among

students with low success and low academic self-efficacy when they cannot identify with the school. Studies show that being self-efficient predict in believing multicultural guidance (Sheu, Rigali-Oiler & Lent, 2012), there is a negative relationship between self-efficacy and academic fraud (Ozmercan, 2015) and there is a positive relationship between the self-efficacy belief and personalism-collectivism and power distance perception of class teachers (Yüksel, 2016), are found when the studies between self-efficiency and personal values are analyzed.

In his study, Covington (1984) focused on the strategies of students that they use to maintain their sense of self-esteem against failure and the causes of potential conflicts between teachers and students. It is seen that students perceive success in each education stage as a dominant causal factor for their self-values. And it appears that the choice to use failure avoidance strategies is related to this assessment.

Lee et al. (2014) analyzed the relationship between task values such as academic cheating, defensive pessimism, deferment, self-harm, and self-efficacy. They concluded that the relationships between task value and academic deception and deferment depend on the level of self-efficacy. In their study, Antonucci et al. (2018) concluded that the connection between conflict and forgiveness in social networks was mediated by self-efficacy and trust. In another study, Yun et al. (2009) concluded an experimental study related to the relationship between self-efficacy and personal responsibility. As a result, they determined the positive effect of the intention of mothers to inform their adolescent girls about breast cancer risk reduction precautions with these two variables.

It is seen that personality variables predict course results and being open to sensitivity and experience predicts academic performance. In other words, conscientious personals tend to be reliable, organized, and persistent (Poropat, 2009). Those who are open to experience develop with innovation and avoid routine. Students who are more open to experiences tend to show better graduation grades and more consistency in achieving success than those who score lower according to this personality dimension (Ackerman et al., 2013). Chan (2005) determined that teachers with high self-efficacy in helping students, value interpersonal relationships and cultural diversity. Similarly, Jaeger and Adair (2018), who conducted an experimental study with engineering students, initially found that students with an average level of self-efficacy had lower expectations, interests, gains, and benefits. However, high correlations were found between self-efficacy and expectation after the studies concluded for self-regulation of the students.

The main aim of this study is to explain the relationship between self-efficacy and personal values in adolescents and to analyze how they change according to different variables. Although personal values and self-efficacy variables have been studied separately in different developmental periods, there are very few studies on the direct relationship. For this reason, it is believed that the findings will be instructive in international comparisons and important issues such as social interest. The research questions investigated in this study were as follows:

1. Is there a significant difference between personal values and self-efficacy levels of the participants according to the gender variable?
2. Is there a significant difference between the personal value and self-efficacy levels of the participants according to their GPA?
3. Is there a significant difference between the personal values and self-efficacy levels of the participants according to the family attitudes?
4. Is there a significant difference between the personal value and self-efficacy levels of the participants according to the class level variable?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the personal values and the sub-dimensions of the Self-Efficacy Variables?
6. Do personal values significantly predict self-efficacy?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study has a correlational research design, which is one of the quantitative research models. In this research, the reason for choosing this research is that the aim of this research is to explain the relationship between self-efficacy and personal values in adolescents and to analyze how they change according to different variables.

Participants

The target population of this research consisted of students studying in high schools Turkey-wide. Since it was not possible to reach the target population, high school students ($n=390$) studying in Bursa were selected as a sub-population. The students were selected through the cluster sampling method from the high schools located in three different socio-economic regions of the city. The demographic data of the participants are shown in Table 1.

Data Collection Tools

The data were collected by using two scales. These scales are Self-Efficacy Scale for Children (SESC) and Inventory of Personal Values (IPV). The scales are explained below:

Self-efficacy scale for children (SESC): The scale was developed by Muris (2001) to measure the social, academic, and emotional self-efficacy of adolescents aged 12-19 (cited in Telef & Karaca, 2012). There are seven items in each sub-dimension of the scale consisting of 21 articles. SECS is a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = none and 5 = very good). Total self-efficacy is calculated by adding the points obtained from the relevant article of each sub-factor. The high score obtained from the scale indicates that the adolescents' self-efficacy level is high, and the low score obtained from the scale indicates that the self-efficacy level of the adolescent is low. The scale was adapted to Turkish culture by Telef and Karaca (2012). In the confirmatory factor analysis, the fit index values were found as RMSEA = .04, NFI = .95, CFI = .96, GFI = .94 and SRMR = .06. General Self-Efficacy

Table 1. Participants' demographic characteristics

Variables	n	%
Gender		
Female	160	41
Male	230	59
Grade		
A. 9. grade	103	26
B. 10. grade	138	35
C. 11. grade	70	18
D. 12. grade	79	20
Grade Point Average (GPA)		
50-59,99	35	9
60-69,99	95	24
70-84,99	197	51
85-100	63	16
Family Attitude		
A. Oppressive- Authoritarian	57	15
B. Extremely tolerant	117	30
C. Moody	38	10
D. Over-protective	62	16
E. Apathetic	13	3
F. Democratic	103	26
Perception of Success		
Low	27	7
Medium	330	85
High	33	8
Monthly Income		
Low	34	9
Medium	335	86
High	21	5
Total Sum	390	100

Scale was used to determine the criterion-referenced validity of the scale. Pearson Product Moment Correlation was found to be .57 ($p < .01$) between the points obtained by the implementation of two scales. The internal consistency coefficients of SECS were calculated as .86 for the overall scale, .84 for the sub-dimensions of academic self-efficacy, .64 for social self-efficacy, and .78 for emotional self-efficacy. It was seen that test-retest reliability coefficients of the scale varied between .75 and .89 (Telef & Karaca; 2012). For this study, the reliability coefficient of SECS was calculated as .79 and it was assumed to be sufficiently reliable.

Inventory of Personal Values (IPV): The scale was developed by Roy (2003) and the adaptation to Turkish culture was made by Asan et al. (2008). The original form consists of 55 articles and the Turkish form consists of 47 articles. The scale consists of 5 factors: discipline and responsibility, trust and forgiveness, honesty and sharing, respect and accuracy, and sharing and respect. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient is .63, and the reliability coefficients of the subscales vary between .60 and .71. The scale is a 5-Likert scale. In

this study, the total Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of the scale is .86 and it is assumed to be sufficiently reliable.

Procedure

The research was conducted during 3 weeks of the 2018 fall semester with all participants in a group. The questionnaire forms were distributed to the students who were informed about the aims and measures of the study. Volunteers participated in the study and all students answered the articles in the questionnaire in about 15 minutes.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed by using SPSS 18.0 software. Firstly, the normality test was applied to each variable, no normality was determined in all sub-dimensions of the scales as the result of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and the mean, median, mode, Skewness, Kurtosis values; pp, qq, box and line, frequency distribution and branch-leaf graphs were analyzed and it was seen that data are distributed normally. For the nature of the social sciences, it should be taken into consideration that only the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test is not sufficient to test the hypothesis of the equality of variance and whether distribution graphics are a normal distribution with mean, median, mode, skewness, kurtosis values. In this respect, parametrical t-tests and ANOVA tests were used to compare the groups. To determine the differences between the groups in ANOVA tests, LCD test results among Tukey, Scheffe, and LCD tests were not considered in the analyses of variables with group numbers more than three, and Tukey results were not considered in the analyses with the group size not close to each other, Scheffe test results were reported in all comparisons. The relationship level and relationships in terms of gender were analyzed with hierarchical regression.

RESULTS

The means and the standard deviations of the variables, the differences between variables, and the effect sizes are shown in Table 2.

When Table 2 is analyzed, a significant difference was found in favor of men in honesty-sharing [$t(388) = -2.038$; $p < .05$], respect-accuracy [$t(388) = -2.819$; $p < .05$] sub-dimensions of the scale as the result of t-test in term of gender variable of personal values levels. No significant difference was found in the scale and the sub-dimensions of discipline responsibility, trust-forgiveness, and sharing-respect. It can be said that the effect size of the gender variable for honesty-sharing remains at a small level ($n^2 = .011$, Cohen's $d = .21$). Similarly, the effect size of the gender variable for the respect-accuracy sub-dimension was found to be in small level ($n^2 = .020$, Cohen's $d = .29$). It is noted that the women have higher average when compared to other sub-dimensions and overall of the scale in the sub-dimension of trust-forgiveness.

According to Table 3, a significant difference was found in favor of the women in social self-efficacy [$t(388) = 2.566$; $p < .05$], emotional self-efficacy [$t(388) = 4.091$; $p < .01$] sub-dimensions and in the overall scale [$t(388) = 2.875$; $p < .05$] as the result of t-test in terms of gender variable of self-efficacy level. No significant difference in the academic self-efficacy sub-dimension. It may be said that the effect size of gender variable for SESC-wide ($n^2 = .021$, Cohen's $d = .30$) and social self-efficacy ($n^2 = 0.17$, Cohen's $d = .26$), emotional self-efficacy ($n^2 = .041$, Cohen's $d = .42$) is small.

Table 4 shows the differentiation of the variables according to the average grade point average of the participants. As a result of the Anova test realized for personal values and self-efficacy for the GPA variable, significant difference is found for the students in personal values [$F(3-386) = 12.057$ **, $p < .01$], self-efficacy [$F(3-386) = 9.425$ *, $p < .05$] with GPA between 50-59.99 and 60-89.99 and 70-84.99 and 85-100. In general, it may be said that as the GPA of the students increased, their values and self-efficacy levels increased. It may also be said that the effect size of GPA variable for personal values ($n^2 = .086$, Cohen's $f = .31$) and self-efficacy overall ($n^2 = .068$, Cohen's $f = .27$) is in moderate level.

Table 5 shows the differentiation of the variables according to the family attitudes of the participants. As a result of the ANOVA test [$F(5,384) = 6.662$, $p < .01$], a significant

Table 2. The results of t-test on levels of personal values in terms of gender variables

Scale	Gender	n	M	ss	SD	t	p	η^2	Cohen's d
Discipline accountability	Female	160	3.81	0.52	388	-1.170	0.243	-	-
	Male	230	3.88	0.58					
Reliance forgiveness	Female	160	3.10	0.53	388	1.485	0.138	-	-
	Male	230	3.02	0.60					
Trustworthiness sharing	Female	160	3.98	0.56	388	-2.038	0.042*	0.011	0.21
	Male	230	4.10	0.58					
Respect righteousness	Female	160	4.05	0.65	388	-2.819	0.005*	0.020	0.29
	Male	230	4.23	0.60					
Sharing Respect	Female	160	4.05	0.62	388	-1.456	0.146	-	-
	Male	230	4.15	0.66					
Personal Values General	Female	160	3.80	0.42	388	-1.673	0.095	-	-
	Male	230	3.87	0.45					

$p < .05$ *, $p < .01$ **

Table 3. The Results of t-test on levels of self-efficacy in terms of gender variable

Scales	Gender	n	M	ss	SD	t	p	η^2	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Academic self-efficacy	Female	160	3.24	0.64	388	-0.463	0.644	-	-
	Male	230	3.27	0.73					
Social self-efficacy	Female	160	3.71	0.65	388	2.566	0.011*	0.017	0.26
	Male	230	3.54	0.65					
Emotional self-efficacy	Female	160	3.15	0.69	388	4.091	0.000**	0.041	0.42
	Male	230	2.84	0.76					
Self-efficacy General	Female	160	3.37	0.49	388	2.875	0.004*	0.021	0.30
	Male	230	3.22	0.51					

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

Table 4. ANOVA results for the personal values and self-efficacy level by the GPA

Scales	GPA	n	M	ss	Source of data	Sum of squares	SD	Mean Square	F	p	Difference	η^2	Cohen's <i>f</i>
Personal Values	A.50-59,99	35	3.54	0.45	B.G.	6.414	3	3.256	12.057**	0.000	A-C ^S	0.086	0.31
	B.60-69,99	95	3.74	0.47	W.G.	68.447	386	0.397			A-D ^S		
	C.70-84,99	197	3.90	0.40	T. S.	74.861	389				B-C ^S		
	D.85-100	63	4.00	0.40							B-D ^S		
Self-efficacy	A.50-59,99	35	2.97	0.57	B.G.	6.806	3	2.269	9.425*	0.000	A-C ^S	0.068	0.27
	B.60-69,99	95	3.20	0.47	W.G.	92.917	386	0.241			A-D ^S		
	C.70-84,99	197	3.31	0.51	T. S.	99.724	389				B-D ^S		
	D.85-100	63	3.48	0.41									

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

B.G.: Between-groups W.G: Within-groups T. S.: Total Sum

Table 5. ANOVA results for the personal values and self-efficacy level by family attitudes

Scales	Family attitudes	n	M	ss	Source of data	Sum of squares	SD	Mean Square	F	p	Difference	η^2	Cohen's <i>f</i>
Personal Values	A. Oppressive Authoritarian	57	3.64	0.50	B.G.	5.975	5	1.195	6.662**	0.000	A-B ^S	0.080	0.29
	B. Extremely tolerant	117	3.94	0.37	W.G.	68.886	384	0.179			A-F ^S		
	C. Moody	38	3.71	0.40	T. S.	74.861	389						
	D. Over-protective	62	3.84	0.46									
	E. Apathetic	13	3.57	0.53									
	F. Democratic	103	3.93	0.41									
Self-efficacy	A. Oppressive Authoritarian	57	3.10	0.57	B.G.	5.425	5	1.085	4.419**	0.001	A-F ^S	0.054	0.24
	B. Extremely tolerant	117	3.35	0.47	W.G.	94.298	384	0.246					
	C. Moody	38	3.11	0.56	T. S.	99.724	389						
	D. Over-protective	62	3.28	0.44									
	E. Apathetic	13	3.04	0.47									
	F. Democratic	103	3.39	0.49									

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

B.D.: Between-groups W.G: Within-groups T. S.: Total Sum

difference is found in favor of the children of the families having tolerant and democratic attitudes among their

children and the children of families of families with oppressive and authoritative families. For the self-efficacy level

[F (5,384) = 4.419, p <.01], there is a significant difference in favor of the children of families having democratic attitudes among their children and the children of repressive and authoritative families. It is found that the effect size of the family attitudes variable for the personal values ($n^2 = .080$, Cohen's $f = .29$) is in the middle level and the effect size of the family attitude variable for the self-efficacy scale ($n^2 = .054$, Cohen's $f = .24$) is in a small level.

Table 6 shows the differentiation of variables according to the class level of participants. As the result of the ANOVA test conducted for the personal level and self-efficacy variables related to the class level, a significant difference is found in favor of 9th-grade students between 9th-grade students and 10-12th grade students in the self-efficacy variable [F (3-386) = 2.831, p <.05], no significant difference is found in personal values variable. It may be said that the effect size of the class variable for the self-efficacy variable ($n^2 = .022$, Cohen's $f = .15$) is at a small level.

Table 7 shows the results of the hierarchical regression analysis which is realized to determine how each of the factors forming the self-efficacy of students predicts personal values. In the first step, academic self-efficacy is included inequality, social self-efficacy is included in the second step, and emotional self-efficacy is included in the last step (F_(388,1) = 104.647, p <.01). In the first model, it is determined that academic self-efficacy ($\beta = -.461$) is significantly predictive on personal values. In the second model with

significant relationship (F_(387,2) = 72.5017, p <.01), the order is academic self-efficacy ($\beta = -.374$) and social self-efficacy ($\beta = .260$), which significantly contributed to personal values, self-efficacy ($\beta = -.386$), social self-efficacy ($\beta = .274$) and gender ($\beta = -.064$). While there is a positive relationship between all dependent variables except emotional self-efficacy, there is a negative relationship in the emotional self-efficacy sub-dimension. According to the regression analysis results of personal values, regression equation predicting self-efficacy; $BDE = (.244 \text{ academic self-efficacy scale score}) + (.185 \text{ social self-efficacy scale score}) + (-.038 \text{ emotional self-efficacy scale score}) + (2.492)$. While explaining 21% of the variance of the academic self-efficacy that is taken hierarchically to the regression equation, this ratio increases to 27% by adding social self-efficacy to the equality, and the clarification ratio of variance increases to 28% by adding emotional self-efficacy in the third stage. Therefore, it can be stated that self-efficacy can explain 28% of personal values, and the remaining 72% is explained by other variables. As a result of the analysis, it is determined that 1st model (R = .46, R² = .21) significantly predicts the personal values in medium level, 2nd model (R = .52, R² = .27) and 3rd model (R = .53, R² = .28) significantly predicted personal values in high level.

DISCUSSION

In this study, the differentiations of personal values and self-efficacy perception in terms of some variables and the

Table 6. ANOVA results for the personal values and self-efficacy level by grade variable

Scales	Grade	n	M	ss	Source of data	Sum of squares	SD	Mean Square	f	p	Difference	η^2	Cohen's f
Personal Values	A. 9. Grade	103	3.88	0.47	B.G.	0.284	3	0.095	0.490	0.690	-	-	-
	B. 10. Grade	138	3.80	0.44	W.G.	74.577	386	0.193					
	C. 11. Grade	70	3.86	0.37	T. S.	74.861	389						
	D. 12. Grade	79	3.81	0.46									
Self-efficacy	A. 9. Grade	103	3.34	0.52	B.G.	2.147	3	0.716	2.831*	0.038	A-D ^s C-D ^s	0.022	0.15
	B. 10. Grade	138	3.26	0.52	W.G.	97.576	386	0.253					
	C. 11. Grade	70	3.36	0.41	T. S.	99.724	389						
	D. 12. Grade	79	3.15	0.52									

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

B.D.: Between-groups, W.G.: Within-groups, T.S.: Total Sum

Table 7. Hierarchical regression analysis results for predicting personal values of self-efficacy

Personal Values	B	SHB	β	t	R ²	R ² chance	F	F chance
Model 1	2.893	0.095		30.496**	0.21	0.212	104.647	104.647
Academic self-efficacy	0.291	0.028	0.461	10.230**				
Model 2	2.439	0.122		20.067**	0.27	0.060	72.5017	32.016
Academic self-efficacy	0.236	0.029	0.374	8.127**				
Social self-efficacy	0.175	0.031	0.260	5.658**				
Model 3	2.492	0.127		19.591**	0.28	0.004	49.105	1.936
Academic self-efficacy	0.244	0.030	0.386	8.253**				
Social self-efficacy	0.185	0.032	0.274	5.831**				
Emotional self-efficacy	-0.038	0.027	-0.064	-1.391				

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

relationships between these variables among Turk high school students were analyzed. The results showed that self-efficacy and personal values differ in terms of gender, academic success perception, grade level, and parental attitudes. On the other hand, significant relationships were found between personal values and self-efficacy, and self-efficacy has predictive power on personal values.

One of the findings of the study shows that male students have more honesty-sharing and respect-accuracy values than girls. Unlike male adolescents, girls have a higher average in trust-forgiveness. This finding is significant in terms of representing the expected gender roles in personals who are raised in a traditional society. In the differentiation of self-efficacy levels in terms of gender variable, a significant difference is found in favor of female students in social and emotional self-efficacy levels. These findings are consistent with many studies in the literature (McKay et al., 2014; Chan, 2005; Beyer, 2014). As a result, it is seen that girls have more social and academic self-efficacy, as well as trust-forgiveness values. It is seen that boy students have honesty-sharing and respect-accuracy values. This is very important in terms of representing the characteristics expected from the youth by society.

When the findings of the study are considered, it is determined that the students' personal grade and self-efficacy levels increase as their overall grade point averages increase. These findings are consistent with the findings of Jiang et al. (2014). Eccles and Wigfield (1995) focused on researching the relationship between adolescents' beliefs about success and self-perceptions with a longitudinal study through study lasting two years. As a result, they determined that the tendency to keep high expectations of success against the difficulty of the task together with the values they give to their perception of success and talent have a positive effect on their academic success. When these findings are evaluated together, it is revealed that the linear connection between academic success and personality features must be considered while making educational plans.

Another important finding is the differentiation of different parental attitudes in personal values and self-efficacy levels. Participants, who have the perception that their families had a repressive and authoritative attitude, have lower personal values and self-efficacy perception than the adolescents who have families with tolerant and democratic attitudes. In this context, it is seen that the oppressive and authoritarian parental approaches toward adolescents cause a decrease in their values, emotional harm, and self-efficacy, and this result is consistent with the findings in the literature (Iwaniec et al., 2007; Hussain & Munaf, 2012). In a study concluded by Kim and Cicchetti (2003), it is found that adolescents with abuse and neglect experiences have lower self-efficacy than those without abuse and neglect experiences.

The findings of the study show that 9th-grade students have higher levels of self-efficacy than the students in the upper class. There is no significant difference between the classes in terms of personal values. When the literature is analyzed, it is possible to find some studies that partially comply with these findings. In his study, Schweder (2018)

compared the self-efficacy and detailing dimensions of students at the secondary and high school level and found that the difference was only in control strategies. Self-efficacy showed no differentiation in terms of age. Ozmercan (2015) researched how the academic fraud tendencies and self-efficacy perceptions of candidate teachers were classified according to their points from 1st to 4th grades and just the opposite results of the findings of this study were achieved. Except for the first grade, the average scores of candidate teachers on the academic fraud scale were higher than the scores on the self-efficacy scale. The discrepancy between the findings of our study and the literature can be explained by the different developmental periods. It is expected that self-efficacy perception will be high in a period corresponding to 9th grade and egocentrism (personal legend and imaginary audience) is at its highest level.

One of the most important findings of the study is the positive relationship between self-efficacy and sub-dimensions of personal values. It is seen that these relations are between academic and social self-efficacy and discipline-responsibility, honesty-sharing, respect-truth, and sharing-respect values. Emotional self-efficacy is found to be related only to the level of discipline-responsibility. These findings coincide with the study of Huang and Zhou (2016). In the study, it is concluded that the self-efficacy of Chinese mothers and their commitment to children with autism, and their sense of responsibility are high. In a similar study, significant relationships are found between perceived control and responsibility, self-efficacy, and strong future tendency in adolescents (Permwonguswa et al., 2018). It can be interpreted that it is quite natural that there is a relationship between self-efficacy in a subject with traditional values and having a relationship between protecting the subject, taking responsibility, and keeping the promise. It is also thought that this finding is very important in terms of supporting the hypothesis of the research. It can be said that it will make an important contribution in planning the works both in schools and social dimensioned studies if the identity formation process together with personal values and self-efficacy in adolescents tends to exist together.

The most recent and other important findings of the study is the determination of self-efficacy (especially academic and social self-efficacy) as a predictor of personal values. Based on this finding, it can be stated that self-efficacy explains 28% of personal values, and the remaining 72% is explained by other variables. When the literature is analyzed, some similar findings are found to be similar. For example, Liem et al. (2008) found that self-efficacy, predictive values, deep learning, and peer relationships were predictive. Similarly, Lee et al. (2014) showed that the relationship between task value and academic deception and deferment depends on self-efficacy. Students with low self-efficacy tend to show more academic deferment behavior than students with high self-efficacy. One of the findings obtained in another study is that psychological counselors with high self-efficacy have interpersonal relationships, help, and cultural differences (Chan, 2005). In conclusion, it can be said that self-efficacy is an important factor in the formation of personal values.

Due to being a wider and more abstract subject, giving personal values to adolescents is known as a common problem in all societies. For this reason, it can be said that psycho-education programs, personal psychological counseling formulations, group guidance, or social projects may indirectly contribute to society using self-efficacy with more concrete features.

As a result, we need to accept that we need to focus on personal values (e.g., forgive-based, respect-based), self-efficacy-based interventions, and future-oriented goals (Harris & Thoresen, 2006). In this sense, as academicians, we have a great responsibility through this and similar results and the studies about more variables because I think that we have to be responsible and have high self-efficacy in taking responsibility for planning the future for our young people.

When interpreting these results, some limitations should be considered. First, the participants were Turkish high school students and therefore the results could not be generalized to all adolescents and adults. Secondly, the results obtained are limited to the answers given by the participants. Data can be prejudiced due to being obtained from a single source. Thirdly, self-efficacy and personal values were taken in this study. In the future, studies with new quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods may be planned related to the intermediary role with different variables. Finally, being a cross-sectional study can be considered a limitation. It is considered useful to perform longitudinal research.

REFERENCES

- Aavik, T., & Allik, J. (2002). The structure of Estonian personal values: A lexical approach. *European Journal of Personality, 16*, 221-235. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.439>
- Ackerman, P. L., Kanfer, R., & Beier, M. E. (2013). Trait complex, cognitive ability, and domain knowledge predictors of baccalaureate success, STEM persistence, and gender differences. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 105*, 911-927. doi:10.1037/a0032338.
- Asan, T., Ekşi, F., Doğan, A., & Ekşi, H. (2008). *Bireysel değerler envanteri'nin dilsel eşdeğerlik geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması*. [Valid Equivalent Validity of Personal Values Inventory and Reliability Study] *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 27*, 15-38.
- Antonucci, T. C., Ajrouch, K. J., Webster, N. J., & Birditt, K. S. (2018). Social Networks and Forgiveness: The Role of Trust and Efficacy. *Research in Human Development, 15*(1), 3-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427609.2017.1415093>
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*(2), 117-148. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3
- Beyer, S. (2014). Why are women underrepresented in Computer Science? Gender differences in stereotypes, self-efficacy, values, and interests and predictors of future CS course-taking and grades. *Computer Science Education, 24*(2-3), 153-192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08993408.2014.963363>
- Bilsky, W., & Hermann, D. (2016). Personal values and delinquency: on considering universals in the content and structure of values. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 22*(10), 921-944. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2016.1202250>.
- Chan, D. W. (2005). Counseling values and their relationships with self-efficacy among Chinese secondary school teachers in Hong Kong. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 18*(3), 183-192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070500304474>
- Covington, M. V. (1984). The self-worth theory of achievement motivation: Findings and implications. *The Elementary School Journal, 85*, 5-20. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461388>
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (1995). In the mind of the actor: The structure of adolescents' achievement task values and expectancy-related beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*(3), 215-225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167295213003>.
- Eccles, J. S. (2009). Who am I and what am I going to do with my life? Personal and collective identities as motivators of action. *Educational Psychologist, 44*, 78-89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520902832368>.
- Finn, K. V., & Frone, M. R. (2004). Academic performance and cheating: Moderating role of school identification and self-efficacy. *The Journal of Educational Research, 97*(3), 115-121. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.97.3.115-121>.
- Harris, A. H., & Thoresen, C. E. (2006). Extending the influence of positive psychology interventions into health care settings: Lessons from self-efficacy and forgiveness. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 1*(1), 27-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760500380930>.
- Huang, M., & Zhou, Z. (2016). Perceived self-efficacy, cultural values, and coping styles among Chinese families of children with autism. *International Journal of School & Educational Psychology, 4*(2), 61-70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21683603.2016.1130562>.
- Hussain, S., & Munaf, S. (2012). Perceived Father Acceptance-Rejection in Childhood and Psychological Adjustment in Adulthood. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(1).
- Iwaniec, D., Larkin, E., & McSherry, D. (2007). Emotionally Harmful Parenting. *Child Care in Practice, 13*(3), 203-220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13575270701353531>.
- Jaeger, M., & Adair, D. (2018). Transitioning from diploma to degree—impact on engineering students' self-efficacy, expectancies, values and self-regulation. *European Journal of Engineering Education, 1*-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2017.1421906>.
- Jiang, Y., Song, J., Lee, M., & Bong, M. (2014). Self-efficacy and achievement goals as motivational links between perceived contexts and achievement. *Educational Psychology, 34*(1), 92-117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2013.863831>.
- Kim, J., & Cicchetti, D. (2003). Social Self-Efficacy and Behavior Problems in Maltreated and Nonmaltreated Children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent*

- Psychology*, 32(1), 106-117. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15374424JCCP3201_10.
- Lee, J., Bong, M., & Kim, S. I. (2014). Interaction between task values and self-efficacy on maladaptive achievement strategy use. *Educational Psychology*, 34(5), 538-560. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2014.895296>.
- Liem, A. D., Lau, S., & Nie, Y. (2008). The role of self-efficacy, task value, and achievement goals in predicting learning strategies, task disengagement, peer relationship, and achievement outcome. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33(4), 486-512. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2007.08.001>.
- McKay, M. T., Dempster, M., & Byrne, D. G. (2014). An examination of the relationship between self-efficacy and stress in adolescents: the role of gender and self-esteem. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17(9), 1131-1151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2014.901494>.
- Ozmercan, E. E. (2015). Determining the tendencies of academic dishonesty and senses of self-efficacy with discriminant analysis. *The Anthropologist*, 20(1-2), 353-359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2015.11891739>.
- Permwonguswa, S., Khuntia, J., Yim, D., Gregg, D., & Kathuria, A. (2018). Knowledge sharing in a health intermediary: role of self-concept, emotional empowerment, and self-esteem. *Health Systems*, 7(3), 181-194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20476965.2017.1405875>.
- Poropat, A. E. (2009). A meta-analysis of the five-factor model of personality and academic performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135, 322-338. DOI:10.1037/a0014996.
- Rokeach, M. (1974). Change and stability in American value systems: 1968-1971. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 38, 222-238. <https://doi.org/10.1086/268153>.
- Roy, A. (2003). *Factor analysis and initial validation of the personal values inventory* [Unpublished doctorate dissertation] Tennessee State University, USA.
- Sheu, H. B., Rigali-Oiler, M., & Lent, R. W. (2012). Multicultural counseling self-efficacy scale-racial diversity form: Factor structure and test of a social cognitive model. *Psychotherapy Research*, 22(5), 527-542. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2012.683344>.
- Schunk, D. H. (1981). Modeling and attributional effects on children's achievement: A self-efficacy analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73(1), 93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.73.1.93>.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60281-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6).
- Schweder, S. (2018). The role of control strategies, self-efficacy, and learning behavior in self-directed learning. *International Journal of School & Educational Psychology*, 7(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21683603.2018.1459991>.
- Telef, B. B., & Karaca, R. (2012). Çocuklar için öz-yeterlik ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. [The self-efficacy scale for children; A validity and reliability study] *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32, 169-187.
- Yun, D., Silk, K. J., Bowman, N. D., Neuberger, L., & Atkin, C. K. (2009). Mothers' intentions to teach adolescent daughters about breast cancer risk reduction activities: The influence of self-efficacy, response efficacy, and personal responsibility. *Communication Research Reports*, 26(2), 134-145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824090902861606>.
- Yüksel, S. (2016). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin bireyselci/toplulukçu örgüt yapısı ve güç mesafesine ilişkin algılarının öz yeterlik inançlarına etkisi. [Effects of primary teachers' perceptions associated with personalist/collectivist organisation structure and power distance on self-efficacy beliefs]* [Yayımlanmamış, yüksek lisans tezi]. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bolu.
- Wilson, K., & Narayan, A. (2016). Relationships among personal task self-efficacy, self-regulated learning strategy use and academic performance in a computer-supported collaborative learning environment. *Educational Psychology*, 36(2), 236-253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2014.926312>