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Abstract

This study was conducted to investigate the self-efficiency/efficacy (SEE) levels of camp leaders working in the youth camps under the Ministry of Youth and Sports in consideration of different variables (age, gender, marital status, social security, parental work status of parents, youth camp duties, sporting status, family participation, income level, education level of parents). While the population of this descriptive study is constituted by 1217 active leaders working in the youth camp leader, the sample is constituted by 400 active leaders. The personal information form and the questionnaire form which composed of self-efficiency/efficacy scale adapted into Turkish by Gözüm and Aksayan (1999) are used as data collection tools. The Cronbach’s alfa coefficients of scale questions was found as 0.86 in this study. Pearson’s chi-square, independent samples t-test and one-way variance analyze are used in the analysis of the data. The significance level was considered as p < 0.05. Of the youth camp leaders 57.8% are over the age of 24, 64.0% are male, 47.3% are graduated from regular high school, 85.3% have social security, 68.5% come from core family structure, and the income of 53.8% of this camp leaders equals the expense. The mothers of 52.8% of the camp leaders are graduated from primary school and the fathers of 42.5% of the camp leaders are graduated from primary school. 75.3% of camp leaders have been working in youth camps for 0−4 years. It was determined that the SEE levels of the camp leaders were higher than the average also the age, marital status, education level of the parents, the income level of the family, the duration of duty in the youth camp and the sporting situation are the efficient factor. As a result, it is advisable to organize activities and training programs to improve the SEE levels of camp leaders.
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1. Introduction

Today, countries organize leisure activities for the development of young people. The youth camps which organized by Ministry of Youth and Sports are also among those activities in Turkey. The activities in the youth camps which organized by the leadership of the Ministry of Youth and Sports have aimed to contribute to the overall development of the individuals participating in the camps and have undertaken as a mission to respond to the social, sporting, cultural and personal needs of these young people and to spread these activities throughout the country (Ministry of Youth and Sports, 2016b). Today, these camps stand out as facilities established to enable young people to evaluate their free time with various social, cultural and sportive activities. The purpose of the youth camp organized in Turkey are: To evaluate the time of the youth outside of the study and study areas, to provide relaxation, to contribute to their upbringing as individuals who are creative, productive, responsible, citizenship conscious, adopting and absorbing the principles and reforms of Atatürk (GSGM, 2005). The camp leaders have a critical importance in the preparation and execution of the activities organized in the camps, in controlling the attendance of the participants, in the provision of security and discipline, in the organization and order of the activity. Camp leaders provide guidance and consultancy to campers with their knowledge and experience as well as assisting programmers. In addition, camp leaders both play an important role in educating young people through socio-cultural activities and educating them on moral values and also helping young people
to avoid bad habits by creating role models (Ministry of Youth and Sports, 2016a). SEE is the perception of doing an individual’s action successfully and controlling events or is the jurisdiction of the individual’s capacity to achieve a certain level of performance. Thereby, there is also leadership among important variables in which is interacting of SEE. It is envisaged that the SEE, which is defined as the belief that you will be successful in combating the difficulties encountered in different situations, is one of the most important determinants of leadership (Akin, 2007). At the same time, it is important that camp leaders who act with the aim of providing useful and support to young people participating in youth camps are aware of and able to demonstrate their competences. Therefore, it is important to know and develop the SEE levels of camp leaders who working in youth camps that provide services to ensure the positive development of young people. The aim of this study is to investigate whether the SEE levels of camp leaders who play a role in youth camps and who have a critical importance in terms of the benefits they provide to young people vary according to various variables.

2. Material and Methods

2.1 Population and Sample

The population of investigation which descriptive type consisted of 1217 active leaders who working in the youth camps. The number of samples was calculated as follows: Where, \( d = \pm 0.05 \) is a variation at \( \alpha = 0.01 \) error level. The following power analysis was used to calculate the sample size of the study (Sümbüloğlu & Sümbüloğlu, 2012).

\[
n = \frac{Nt^2pq}{d^2(N-1)+t^2pq}
\]

Based on this formula, the number of samples was determined as 386 people. It has been reached to all the camp leaders who attended the meeting and the investigation was completed with 400 people.

2.2 Data Collection Tools

The data of the research were distributed to youth camp leaders in the in-service training of the Ministry of Youth and Sports in April 2016 and they were provided to respond under supervision. The questionnaire used in the research consists of two parts. In the first chapter, there are 23 questions including their personal information such as the age, gender, education level of camp leaders, how many years they have been the camp leader, their duties in youth camps, mother and father’s profession. In the second part, the SEE scale which was developed by Sherer and friends (1982) and was adapted into Turkish by Gözüm and Aksayan (1999) are used. This scale is consisted of 23 terms and is a Likert type scale ranging from 5 degrees (1-5 point) which defined with “It doesn’t describe me at all” and “It describes me very well”. In calculating the scale score; while the points given for items 1, 3, 8, 9, 13, 15, 19, 21, 23 are taken as basis; points are given in the opposite direction for items 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22. Thus, at least 23, maximum 115 points can be obtained from the scale. The scale has four sub-dimensions; initiating behavior, maintaining behavior, completing behavior and combating obstacles. The total score of SEE is assessed as low for between 23-53 points, as middle for between 54-84 points, and as high for between 85-115 points (Gözüm & Aksayan, 1999). If the total score obtained from the scale is high, this means that the individual’s perception of SEE is at a good level. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient and the test-retest reliability of the Turkish version of the scale are found as 0.81 and 0.92, respectively. In our study, the Cronbach alpha value of the scale questions are determined as 0.86. The data were collected by face to face questionnaire method by the researcher. While collecting the data, the purpose of the research was explained to the camp leaders, the questionnaires were distributed to the leaders who wanted to fill the questionnaire and it is provided that the questionnaires were filled by the leaders under supervision. The data which obtained from research were analyzed by using PASW Statistics 18 (SPSS, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong, version 18.0) statistical package program. Pearson chi-square, t-test in the independent groups and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used in the analysis of the data. \( P < 0.05 \) significance level was taken into consideration in the interpretation of the results.

3. Results

In this section, the data obtained from the research which conducted for the purpose of examining the SEE levels of the camp leaders who working in the youth camps under the Ministry of Youth and Sports in the light of different variables are presented.
Table 1. The distribution of general demographic characteristics of camp leaders

|                          | F  | %   |
|--------------------------|----|-----|
| **Age**                  |    |     |
| 19–23 years old          | 169| 42.2|
| 24–28 years old          | 173| 43.3|
| 29 years and over        | 58 | 14.5|
| **Gender**               |    |     |
| Female                   | 144| 36.0|
| Male                     | 256| 64.0|
| **Marital status**       |    |     |
| Married                  | 49 | 12.2|
| Single                   | 351| 87.8|
| **Graduated high school**|    |     |
| Regular High School      | 189| 47.3|
| Anatolian high school and equivalent school | 99 | 24.8 |
| Vocational high School   | 67 | 16.8|
| Teacher High School      | 13 | 3.3 |
| Sports High School       | 8  | 2.0 |
| Other                    | 24 | 6.0 |

Table 1 presents the age, gender, marital status, graduated high school, graduation department, the place which was lived longest time and social security status of the camp leaders included in the study. It has been seen that 57.8% of the camp leaders were over 24 years old, 64.0% of them were male, 87.8% were single and 47.3% were graduated from normal high school.

Table 2. The distribution of family characteristics of camp leaders

|                               | f  | %   |
|-------------------------------|----|-----|
| **Income status of family**   |    |     |
| If income is more than expenditure | 83 | 20.8|
| If income is equal to expenditure   | 215| 53.8|
| If income is less than expenditure | 102| 25.5|
| **Mother’s education level**  |    |     |
| Illiterate                    | 37 | 9.3 |
| Literate                      | 46 | 11.5|
| Graduated from the elementary education | 211| 52.8 |
| Graduated from the high school| 86 | 21.5|
| Graduated from the university | 20 | 5.0 |
| **Father’s education level**  |    |     |
| Illiterate                    | 10 | 2.5 |
| Literate                      | 30 | 7.5 |
| Graduated from the elementary education | 170| 42.5 |
| Graduated from the high school| 112| 28.0|
| Graduated from the university | 78 | 19.5|
| **Working condition of mother** | | |
| Working                       | 44 | 11.0|
| Not working                   | 356| 89.0|
| **Working condition of father** | | |
| Working                       | 223| 55.8|
| Not working                   | 177| 44.3|

The distribution of family characteristics of the camp leaders included in the study is given in Table 2. It was found that the incomes of 53.8% of the camp leaders is equal to their expenditure. 52.8% of the mothers of the leaders and 42.5% of their fathers are graduated from the elementary education. While 89.0% of mothers do not work, 55.8% of fathers work.
Table 3. The distribution of SEE the total score averages of camp leaders according to gender, marital status and social security status

|                        | n   | SEE the Total Score | p         |
|------------------------|-----|---------------------|-----------|
|                        |     | Avg ± Sd            |           |
| Gender                 |     |                     |           |
| Female                 | 144 | 82.6 ± 13.5         | t = 0.684 |
| Male                   | 256 | 83.5 ± 13.9         | p = 0.494 |
| Marital status         |     |                     |           |
| Single                 | 351 | 83.9 ± 13.6         | t = -2.521|
| Married                | 49  | 78.6 ± 14.7         | p = 0.012 |
| Social security        |     |                     |           |
| Yes                    | 341 | 82.7 ± 14.1         | t = -1.783|
| No                     | 59  | 86.1 ± 11.6         | p = 0.075 |

Table 3 presents the distribution of the scores all from SEE scales which of the camp leaders according to gender, marital status and social security status. It is observed that gender and social security is not an effective factor on SEE (p > 0.05) but that the marital status makes a significant difference statistically. In addition, it was found that the SEE scores of the single camp leaders were higher than the married camp leaders (p < 0.05).

Table 4. The distribution of the SEE total score averages of camp leaders according to the working status of the parents

| Working condition of mother | n  | SEE The Total Score | p         |
|-----------------------------|----|---------------------|-----------|
|                            |    | Avg ± Sd            |           |
| Working                    | 44 | 80.8 ± 13.3         | t = 1.225 |
| Not working                | 356| 83.5 ± 13.9         | p = 0.221 |
| Working condition of father|     |                     |           |
| Working                    | 223| 81.9 ± 13.3         | t = 2.142 |
| Not working                | 177| 84.8 ± 14.3         | p = 0.033 |

Table 4 presents the distribution of the SEE total score averages of the camp leaders according to the working status of the parents. According to this, there is no statistically significant difference between the SEE scores of the camp leaders whose mother working and non-working. However, SEE scores of the camp leaders whose father was not working were higher than the ones whose father was working and the difference between them was statistically significant (p < 0.05).

Table 5. Distribution of the see total score averages of camp leaders according to their duty periods in the youth camp and their sporting situation

| Duty periods in the youth camp | n   | SEE The Total Score | p         |
|-------------------------------|-----|---------------------|-----------|
|                               |     | Avg ± Sd            |           |
| 0−4 yıl                       | 301 | 85.4 ± 13.2         | t = 5.686 |
| 5 yıl ve üzeri                | 99  | 76.6 ± 13.6         | p = 0.000 |
| Yapşiyor                      | 238 | 85.0 ± 13.5         | t = -3.676|
| Yapmuyor                      | 133 | 79.6 ± 13.4         | p = 0.000 |

When distribution of the SEE total score averages of the camp leaders were analyzed according to their duty periods in the youth camp and their sporting situations, it was seen that the difference was statistically significant for both variables (Table 5, p < 0.05). It was found that the SEE score of the camp leaders working in the youth camp for 0 to 4 years was higher than the leaders who had been working for 5 years and longer, and the SEE score of the camp leaders who played sports was higher than those who did not do sports.

Table 6. The distribution of SEE the total score averages of camp leaders by age and family income

| Age                      | n    | SEE The Total Score | p         |
|--------------------------|------|---------------------|-----------|
|                          | Avg ± Sd |           |           |
| 19−23 years old          | 169   | 85.6 ± 13.2         | f = 7.215 |
| 24−28 years old          | 173   | 82.2 ± 13.8         | p = 0.001 |
| 29 years and over        | 58    | 78.5 ± 14.0         |           |
| Income status of family  |      |                     |           |
| If income is more than expenditure | 102  | 84.0 ± 14.1         | f = 6.324 |
| If income is equal to expenditure | 215  | 84.9 ± 13.3         | p = 0.002 |
| If income is less than expenditure | 83   | 79.1 ± 14.0*        |           |

Note. * Group that makes a difference.
Table 6 presents the distribution of the SEE total score averages of the camp leaders according to age and family income. According to this, the SEE scores of the camp leaders between the ages of 19–23 years old were significantly higher than the other age groups (p < 0.05). The SEE scores of the camp leaders whose income of family were less than the expenditure of family were found to be significantly lower than the camp leaders in other income groups (p < 0.05).

Table 7. The distribution of the SEE total score averages of camp leaders according to the education level of parents

|                          | n   | SEE The Total Score Avg ± Sd | p        |
|--------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|----------|
|                          |     |                             |          |
| **Mother’s education level** |     |                             |          |
| Illiterate               | 37  | 83.3 ± 11.3                 | f = 3.078 |
| Literate                 | 46  | 84.5 ± 14.6                 | p = 0.016 |
| Graduated from the elementary education | 211 | 84.8 ± 13.7                 |          |
| Graduated from the high school   | 86  | 78.8 ± 14.2*                |          |
| Graduated from the university       | 20  | 82.5 ± 12.5                 |          |
| **Father’s education level**   |     |                             |          |
| Illiterate               | 10  | 86.6 ± 9.9                  | f = 5.020 |
| Literate                 | 30  | 84.6 ± 13.6                 | p = 0.001 |
| Graduated from the elementary education | 170 | 85.8 ± 13.5                 |          |
| Graduated from the high school   | 112 | 78.6 ± 14.3*                |          |
| Graduated from the university       | 78  | 83.0 ± 12.8                 |          |

* Group that makes a difference.

When the SEE total mean scores of the camp leaders were examined according to the education level of the parents, the difference between the SEE scores of the camp leaders whose parents were high school graduates and the camp leaders whose parents were at other education levels were statistically significant (p < 0.05). SEE scores of the camp leaders whose parents were high school graduates were lower than those of other leaders.

4. Discussion

When the literature is examined, it is obvious that there is no definition of youth and age range accepted by all. While some studies have accepted that the 12–24 age group are young, the other studies have accepted that the 12–26, 15–24, or 15–30 are young. The United Nations (UN), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the World Bank (WB) define people as “young” aged 15–24. In some reports of the European Union, the age range of 15–29 is defined as young (Gür, Dalmuş, Kirmızıdağ, & Boz, 2012). Therefore, since 42.2% of the camp leaders who participated in the research are 19–23 years old, 43.3% of them are 24–28 years old and 14.5% of them are 29 years and over, our sample are considered as young (Table 1). In the study conducted by Coşkuner in youth camps, 36.7% of the leader are 18–24 years old, 34.0% of them are 25–29 years old, 29.3% of them are 30 years and over (Coşkuner, 2009). According to 2013 data of Turkey Demographic and Health Survey (TDHS), Though Turkey has a young population, in parallel with the changes in the population growth rate of our country in recent years, the rate of population growth in young age groups has been decreased. The proportion of young people aged 20–29 years in Turkey was determined as 14.9% (Turkey demographic and health survey, 2020). In our research, 64.0% of the camp leaders are male and 36.0% are female. In a study made by Coşkuner regarding subject, 61.3% of the leaders were male and 38.7% were female and the results of this study are similar to our findings (8). In the study of Kartal, 56.3% of the program managers in the youth camp are male and 43.7% are female (Kartal, 2016). 75.3% of the camp leaders who participated in our research stated that they have worked in youth camps for 0–4 years and 24.8% of them stated that they have worked for 5 years and over. Coşkuner reported that 66.7% of the leaders have worked in youth camps for 1–3 years and 33.3% of them have worked for 4 years and over in his study (Coşkuner, 2009). In our study, the SEE total score average of the camp leaders was determined as 83.2 ± 13.8 (min.53–max.108). The highest score that can be obtained from the whole scale is 115. In the study which conducted by Çetinkaya and colleagues, with young people between aged 17–27, this score is 89.03 ± 1.49 points, in the study which conducted by Gül and Adıgüzel, this score is 85.68 ± 11.21 points, in the study which conducted by Gökdogan et al., this score is 85.04 ± 1.04 points and in the study which conducted by Zengin, this score is 89.29 ± 11.20 points and these points are higher than our results of research. However, a study conducted by Sevindik et al., in the university students, stated that the SEE total score is lower than our findings (Çetinkaya, Özmen, & Fadıloğlu, 2014; Gökdogan, Yönder, & Demir, 2014; Gül & Adıgüzel, 2015; Sevindik, Yeşil, Sevindik, & Açıklı, 2007; Zengin, 2007) The SEE levels of the camp leaders were examined according to age, gender, marital status,
educational level and working status of parents, duty periods in the youth camp, the sporting situation of the youth and income level of the family. Age was found as an effective factor on initiating behavior, maintaining behavior, completing behavior and the SEE total average score. Initiating behavior, maintaining behavior, completing behavior and the SEE total average score of the camp leaders aged 19–23 years old were found higher than the older age group. When the literature is examined, it is seen that there are different findings. Aksayan and Gözüm has stated that a person gained more experience with the progress of the age and this situation constitute an important source of SEE accumulation. Similarly, Unal, Orgun (2006) and Uz (2011) has stated that SEE scores changed positively as the age progressed in their studies. Sari and his friends has stated that the SEE score of youngs aged between 18–20 years is higher than the larger age groups, but the difference between them is not statistically significant in their study which conducted with physical education students. In the study of Yiğitbaş (2003) and Uğur (2010), while the age was not found to be an effective factor on SEE, the study of Koçoğlu (2009) showed that behavior completion dimension scores has decreased significantly as the age progressed (F., 2009; Keskin & Orgun, 2006; Uğur, 2010; Uz, 2011). In our study, gender was not found to be an effective variable on initiating behavior, maintaining behavior, completing the behavior, fighting against obstacles and the total SEE score. This situation can be interpreted as having the equal responsibility beliefs of both genders today. The findings of Yiğitbaş and Yetgin (2003), Unal and Orgun (2006), Özpulat (2016) and Koçoğlu (2009) in their studies support our research results. In the Akgül (2008)’s study, gender was not found to be an effective factor on all dimensions without combating obstacles and total SEE score. Unlike our research findings, the SEE score of female students was found higher than male students in the study conducted by Otacoğlu (2008), Sari et al. (2011) and this difference are statistically significant. In the study of Kızılce et al. (2015), the score of female students was higher than the male students in the starting dimension of behavior, but there were no differences dependent on gender in other dimensions (Akgül, 2008; F., 2009; Karadağ, Aksoy, & Ucuzal, 2011; Keskin & Orgun, 2006; Kızılce, Mert, Küçükgüçlü, & Yardımcı, 2015; Otacoğlu, 2008; Özpulat, 2016; Sari, Yenigün, Altunç, & Öztürk, 2011; Yiğitbaş & Yetkin, 2003). Marital status from demographic variables was determined as an effective factor on initiating behavior, maintaining behavior, completing the behavior and the total SEE score, it was found that the SEE level of single camp leaders are higher than the married camp leaders. The study of Koçoğlu is similar to our research findings. However, in the study of Akgül, although the SEE score of single leader is higher than married, there are no statistically significant difference. As a different finding, in the study of Kulaç et al. (2012) and Çakil (2012), the SEE level of married are higher than singles (Akgül, 2008; Çakil, 2012; F., 2009; Kulaç, Ayyıldız, Emiroğlu, & Köröglu, 2012). Initiating behavior, maintaining behavior, completing the behavior, fighting against obstacles and the total SEE score of the camp leaders who participated in the research were examined according to their social security status and no statistically significant difference was found. In the study of Çakil, the SEE level of those with social security was higher than that of those without social security (Çakil, 2012). When the working status of the parents was examined, there was no statistically significant difference between the SEE scores of the camp leaders whose mother are working and non-working. However, SEE scores of the camp leaders whose father was not working were higher than the ones whose father was working and the difference between them was statistically significant (p < 0.05). In our study, when the SEE level was examined according to the education level of the parents, it was found that initiating behavior, maintaining behavior, completing the behavior and the total SEE score average of the camp leaders whose parents are high school graduates is lower, fighting against obstacles scores of the camp leaders whose mother is literate and her father is illiterate is higher. The increase in the level of education increases the level of knowledge and sensitivity of the individual, the individual can recognize the activating stimuli and the level of SEE is increasing. However, it is thought provoking that our research findings are not supportive of this information. In the study of Koçoğlu, the SEE scores were examined according to the education level of the household head was examined according to the level of education and It was determined that those with a parent university degree had the highest score. In the same study, fighting against obstacles scores of those with a mother university degree were the highest and this situation showed differences with our research findings. In the studies of Gravel and Uğur, it was found that the SEE scores of those with a university degree had significantly higher. As a different finding, in the study of Özkahraman and Yıldırım, no significant difference was found between the education level of the mother and father with the SEE scores (Çakil, 2012; F., 2009; Özkahraman & Yıldırım, 2012; Uğur, 2010). In our study, when the SEE scores of the camp leaders and the family income are compared, it was determined that the group whose income is less than expenditure had statistically significantly lower score in terms of initiating behavior, maintaining behavior, completing behavior, and SEE total scores. Based on these findings, it can be said that the reason of the low SEE total score of the individuals whose income is less than the expenditure is due to lack of self-confidence and abstaining behavior. The study of Koçoğlu also supports our research findings. However, in the studies of Akgül, Büyükyörük and
Özpulat, it was found that the family income level was not an effective factor on the SEE scores (Akgül, 2008; Büyükyörük, 2003; F., 2009; Özpulat, 2016). Youth camp leaders are the person who physical education teachers with training formation, music teachers, teachers and trainers in the field of crafts, experienced in theater, drama, folk dances and performing arts, have the skills, knowledge and skills to run a group in the youth field, successful by attending the courses and seminars opened by the General Directorate of Youth Services and Sports (GSGM, 2005). In our research, it has been determined that Duty periods in the youth camp of camp leaders is an effective factor on initiating behavior, maintaining behavior, completing behavior, combating with obstacles and SEE total score. According to this, the camp leaders who have worked in the youth camp for 0-4 years had a higher SEE score than the camp leaders who have worked for 5 years and over. This result may be due to the fact that being younger, being excited about being new to the task, and being more idealistic. As the duration of the task is longer, the decrease of the SEE scores can be attributed to a low level of motivation caused from the expectations of the leaders are different or that their expectations are not met regarding camp. This may have had a negative impact on the SEE scores of the leaders. In addition to our research, there are also studies indicating that SEE scores increase with the increase in the term of duty (Akgül, 2008; Uz, 2011).

The sporting situation of the camp leaders significantly affected the initiating behavior, maintaining behavior, completing behavior, combating with obstacles and SEE total score and it was found that the SEE scores of the camp leaders who make sport were higher than those who did not. While the sports give feelings to individuals such as mobility through active participation, feeling better and being fit, at the same time individuals with active participation through mobility, feeling better and to feel the fit, at the same time, it is stated that it will help to develop the qualifications that they can use in real life such as the determination to fight against difficulties (Özkahraman & Yıldırım, 2012). Also, in a study which conducted by Ryckman et al., it is stated if the individual is physically fit and healthy, it is affected self-perception. It was stated in the research that the individual’s perception of himself/herself in a field affected the perceptions of SEE positively (Özen, Ölcüçü, Özen, & Demir, 2014). In this sense, it is expected that the SEE points of the camp leaders who make sport were higher than those who did not. Similarly, the SEE level also plays an important role in initiating behavior change and maintaining behavior. It was found that people who had high SEE level attend regular and continuous exercise programs to achieve a certain purpose. And it was found that the people who do not exercise or who do not have the opportunity to exercise had a low SEE levels (Sezer, İşgör, Özpulat, & Sezer, 2006).

5. Conclusions

The concept of self efficacy emerged by Bandura (1986) with “Social Learning Theory”; It is the capacity of the individual to organize the activities necessary to perform a certain performance and also his self-perception, judgment and beliefs to be successful (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). Unless people believe they can produce desired effects by their actions, they have little incentive to undertake activities or to persevere in the face of difficulties. Whatever other factors may serve as guides and motivators, they are rooted in the core belief that one can make a difference by one’s actions (Bandura, 2010). The research findings are consistent with the “Social Learning Theory” of Bandura. As a result, it was determined that the SEE levels of camp leaders were higher than the average and age, marital status, the level of education of the parents, the income level of the family, duty periods in the youth camp and the status of sports making were influential factors on the SEE level of the camp leaders.
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