

## **The Comparison between the Adjustment Levels and the Academic Control Focuses of Teacher Candidates Themselves<sup>1</sup>**

**Assoc. Prof. Figen AKÇA**

Uludağ University  
Department of Educational Sciences  
Bursa – TURKEY

**Asst. Prof. Sezgin DEMİR**

Aksaray University  
Department of Turkish Language Education  
Aksaray-TURKEY

**Gülçilem ŞAHİN ÇELİK**

PhD Candidate  
Aksaray University,  
Department of Educational Sciences  
Aksaray-TURKEY

### **Abstract**

*Focus of control and self monitoring take an important place among many emotional, personal characteristics determining the effectiveness of teachers. The purpose of this research is to compare the adjustment levels of teacher candidates themselves and the academic control focuses between senior class of teacher candidates who are receiving education and the teacher candidates who are receiving pedagogical formation training certificates at Faculties of Education. In this study, 78 teacher candidates who are receiving education in senior classes and 106 teacher candidates who are receiving pedagogical formation training at the same period at Aksaray Faculty of Education constitute the research stuff. For this purpose, Academic Control Focuses Scale and Self Monitoring Scale adapted to Turkish culture have been used. No significant differentiation could be determined in the context of teacher trainee program in terms of academic locus of control.*

**Key words:** adjustment level, self monitoring, academic control focus, teacher, competence.

### **1. Introduction**

Teacher takes an active role in performing the education process effectively in parallel with terminal objectives. Among many affective and personal characteristics that determine the effectiveness of the teacher, locus of control and self-monitoring take an important place. Studies concerning the effectiveness of the teacher started in 1980s and were affected by Rotter's (1966) locus of control model and Bandura's (1994) social learning model. The locus of control structure that Rotter suggests separates into internal and external locus of control in respect of the perception level of personal responsibilities. While internal locus of control is related to the belief that events and outputs result from constant personal characteristics such as own efforts and abilities, external locus of control is related to the belief that events and outputs result from factors beyond control like luck, the difficulty of the task and the behaviors of other people etc. (Dağ, 1992).

Rotter's (1966) view that locus of control variable is not valid in every condition, and this belief of the individual may change in different subjects and fields and also the criticism that Rotter's scale does not measure on dimension caused multi dimensional or domain specific scales to be developed.

---

<sup>1</sup> This study has been presented as an oral presentation at the conference which is "6<sup>th</sup> World Conference on Psychology, Counselling & Guidance" organized in Antalya-Turkey, 14-16<sup>th</sup> of May in 2015.

Locus of control scales have been developed in many fields like health, education, politics, economy and marriage and among these, commonly used one is Academic Locus of Control Scale (cited in Kurbanoglu, 2004; Akın, 2007). Academic locus of control has two dimensions as internal and external locus of control. Individuals that take place in the dimension of external locus of control are in the opinion that academic outputs, success and failures result from a number of factors out of individual's hands.

On the other hand, the individuals who have academic internal locus of control tend to believe that academic success or failures result from their own behaviors and characteristics. There are differences in struggle reactions of opponent individuals in terms of academic locus of control. It is reported that the ones with internal locus of control choose solution oriented methods and techniques however, individuals with external locus of control have appeasingly emotion-focused coping (Akın, 2007; cited in Dağ, 1992). Snyder (1974) developed "self-monitoring theory" for the individuals' control ability and to express themselves. Accordingly, there are two basic information resources that may influence how individuals act while they are getting social. The first of these is the information gained from the environment and other individuals for the appropriate behavior and the other one is the information about the person's intrinsic condition, attitudes and tendencies. According to Snyder and Gangestad (1982), individuals differ from each other according to the information type they use. The individuals affected from the environment while they are forming their social behaviors are responsive to social and interpersonal clues and cannot remain unresponsive. Environment may form social behaviors and accordingly harmony between behaviors and attitudes can be low. On the contrary individuals, whose social behaviors are directed with their characteristics, in other words people who do (can) not have self-monitoring, can be less responsive to environmental and interpersonal clues regarding appropriate behaviors.

People, who could not develop interest in whether the way they present themselves is appropriate for the environment, are not attentive in this level against the experience of social comparison for proper behaviors. Their behaviors may result from rather emotional situations and they tend to behave as how they feel. For instance, when a person who has self-monitoring watches a comedy movie with a friend, she would laugh more than she would when she is alone. On the other hand laughing of the person, who does (can) not have self-monitoring, would show difference in both conditions and it will be more about how much fun she would have (Snyder, 1974; cited in Türegen and Cesur; 2006). Self-monitoring concept trying to be explained above has been one of the most discussed issues in psychology literature (Gangestad and Snyder, 2000). Gangestad and Snyder (1985) have researched what causes personal differences emerge and if the factors in the base of this control behavior emerged as a result of historical, developmental or motivational causes. According to writers the people who do (can) not have self-monitoring could not develop their abilities in arranging expressive behaviors or they do not have enough motivation. Gangestad and Snyder explain this situation as snowball effect carrying a variable that existed in childhood to adulthood. In addition, these differences in childhood not only may originate from a genetic tendency but also may occur as a reaction to child raising attitudes, sibling and peer relationships or combination of all these.

For example, a child who is not taken good care from parents or baby sitters may have chosen the way of meeting his or her own need for care developing his or her own theory regarding other people's behaviors (Gangestad and Snyder, 1985). As it is seen, there is not a conclusive explanation for self-monitoring concept yet. Sunal and Dönmez (2011) studied with 280 university students in a research in which the effects of stress and psychological symptoms on self-monitoring levels in romantic relationships and discovered that the level of relationship distress was an important predictor of self-monitoring scores. In a study, where factors like self-monitoring by changing agents, locus of control, personality taking initiative and personality avoiding risk are researched, a considerable relation was found between being internally controlled and self-monitoring (Allen and et al. 2005). Mahoney and et al. (1973) planned an experiment about the suitability of graduation exams with 27 university students in order to test the relation between self-monitoring and success. According to the results of this experiment, the ones who were allowed to do self-monitoring took review exams more than those who were allowed at intervals. Those who were allowed to do self-monitoring generally answered numerical questions more correctly. In a study in which 4 learning handicapped children that have attention disorder, it is found that academic answer rate is more effective in children who were enabled self-monitoring (Harris, 1986). In a similar study Harris et al. (2005) determined positive effects in writing behaviors of some of hyperactive children those who were enabled to do self-monitoring. Self-monitoring behavior has an important part in academic learning (Zimmerman, 1990).

Hamid, P. N. (1994), found that daily interactions of different student groups from China and Europe were not influenced without internal locus of control or external locus of control. Beginning with the 2010-2011 academic year pedagogical formation programs started to be given to graduated or third and fourth grade students who have 2.5 gpa at least. Researches indicate that formation programs have certain useful points as well as they have many useless parts (Yapıcı and Yapıcı, 2013). Researches that analyses relations between locus of control and variables like burnout on teachers, problem solving, job satisfaction, motivation, professional competence stated considerable relations on behalf of internals (Altunçekiç, Yaman and Koray, 2005; Yeşilyaprak, 2001).

From this point of view it can be said that raising teachers in the direction of being internally controlled is not only crucial for themselves but also for their students. It is found that teachers' level of self-monitoring (Gangestad and Snyder, 1985) and locus of controls (Yeşilyaprak, 2001) are among improvable qualifications. In field scanning, researchers could not find a research which evaluates the relation between level of self-monitoring and academic locus of control directly. Especially considering the issue of raising teachers is delicate; it is obvious that all variables that will influence education environment should be handled carefully. The aim of this study is to analyze the level of self-monitoring and academic locus of control of teacher candidates from Science Teaching and Turkish Language and Literature department (pedagogic formation) according to certain variables (gender and upbringing) and to determine the relation between level of self-monitoring and academic locus of control. In the light of this general aim answers are searched for these sub goals:

1. Do the level of self-monitoring of the teacher candidates from Science Teaching and Turkish Language and Literature pedagogic formation) departments differ from each other in terms of gender and manner of raising teachers?
2. Academic locus of controls of teacher candidates from Science Teaching and Turkish Language and Literature (pedagogic formation) departments differ from each other in terms of gender and manner of raising teachers?
3. What sort of relation is there between the level of self-monitoring and academic locus of controls of teacher candidates from departments of Science Teaching and Turkish Language and Literature (pedagogic formation)?
4. How much does self-monitoring of teacher candidates predict academic focus of controls?

## **2. Method**

### **2.1. Research Model**

This research has descriptive nature and it is done in scanning model. This model aims to confirm the existence of change between two or more variables and the extent of this change (Arlı and Nazik, 2001).

### **2.2. Participants**

The sample of this study consists of 97 final year students from Science Teaching Department in Aksaray University Faculty of Education and 107 teacher candidates, who are taking pedagogical formation certificate, from Turkish Language and Literature Department. Because of the fact that assessment instruments were incomplete 29 data could not be evaluated and analyses were carried out on 165 data (78 final year students from faculty of education, 107 teacher candidates 'who are final year students in pedagogical formation classes). After receiving required permissions teacher candidates were informed and scales were carried out considering voluntary basis. In this research in order to obtain data, Revised Self-Monitoring Scale, Academic Locus of Control Scale and Personal Information Form are used. Scales mentioned have such developmental processes:

**Academic locus of control scale:** Akin (2007), developed it as a result of the study performed with students from Sakarya University Faculty of Education. In the study, in which overall 647 university students were involved as participants, it is determined that the scale, which has 17 items and 2 sub-dimensions developed as internal and external locus of control, has 71.7% overall variance. In the study it is seen that while factor loads between 61 and 95 changed, this scale has a significant relation with Locus of Control Scale developed by Dağ (2002), in terms of adaptation validity study. It is determined that internal locus of control has 94; external locus of control has 95 internal consistency coefficients. The overall point correlations of the sub-scales of the scale mentioned are between 57 and 92. All differences were considered meaningful in 27% part of the averages of upper-lower groups.

**Revised self-monitoring scale** is developed by Lennox and Wolfe in 1984 and adapted into Turkish by Özalp, Turetgen and Cesur in 2004.

This likert scale consists of 13 items. When an item that cannot pass validation analysis is removed from the scale, it is seen that, this scale with 12 items lay on two factors. It is seen that the scale is unrelated in terms of neuroticism; however in terms of self-efficacy it has a significant relation. Also, the fact that Cronbach alpha.80, test-retest reliability is .74 indicates that this scale is reliable and powerful.

### 3. Findings

In this part of the study, findings determined with scales regarding the overall and private self-efficacy perception levels of teacher candidates, gender and mode of teacher training t test for independent groups, Pearson correlation analysis were carried out. When the findings in Table 1 are examined among teacher candidates from Turkish Language and Literature a significant differentiation is not determined in terms of academic external locus of control [ $t(104)=-.758$ ;  $p>0.05$ ], female Turkish Language and Literature teacher candidates by ( $\bar{X}=2.19$ ) and male teacher candidates by ( $\bar{X}=2.28$ ) expressed their opinion at “**low**” level. On the other hand, for science teachers [ $t(76)=-2.143$ ;  $p<.05$ ] a significant differentiation is found. According to this, within the context of gender variable it is found that the views of science teacher candidates differ significantly regarding external locus of control; female science teacher candidates ( $\bar{X}=2.22$ ) and male science teacher candidates ( $\bar{X}=2.49$ ) express their opinion at “**low**” level. The views of teacher candidates within the scope of the research; differ significantly in terms of external locus of control [ $t(182)=-2.242$ ;  $p<.05$ ]. Herein, female teacher candidates ( $\bar{X}=2.20$ ), male teacher candidates ( $\bar{X}=2.39$ ) expressed their opinion at “**low**” level. All in all, it can be stated that academically, males have external locus of control more than females do.

However; there is not a significant differentiation for both branches in terms of internal locus of control. On the contrary, it is determined that among the Turkish Language and Literature teacher candidates [ $t(104)=-.453$ ;  $p>0.05$ ] female ( $\bar{X}=4.28$ ) and male ( $\bar{X}=4.34$ ) participants express their opinion at “**always**” level. Also, among science teacher candidates [ $t(76)=.093$ ;  $p>0.05$ ] female ( $\bar{X}=4.18$ ) and male ( $\bar{X}=4.17$ ) participants express their opinion each other at “**often**” level. Considering all participants [ $t(182)=-.109$ ;  $p>0.05$ ] female ( $\bar{X}=4.24$ ) and male ( $\bar{X}=4.25$ ) express their opinion each other similarly at “**always**” level. At this point it is determined that within the context of internal focus of control according to gender variable the views of females and males are similar to each other. In terms of revised self-monitoring level any differentiation is not determined in context of both branches. Within the context of Turkish Language and Literature [ $t(104)=-.617$ ;  $p>0.05$ ]; female ( $\bar{X}=3.78$ ) and male ( $\bar{X}=3.70$ ) it can be said that they express their thoughts at the level of “**generally true**” and as a result female candidates have higher level of revised self-monitoring. In context of science [ $t(76)=.693$ ;  $p>0.05$ ]; female ( $\bar{X}=3.61$ ) and male ( $\bar{X}=3.50$ ) expressed their thoughts at the level of “**generally true**”. Thus, in terms of this branch it can be said that females have higher level of revised self-monitoring. All in all, in terms of all participants of the research [ $t(182)=1.202$ ;  $p>0.05$ ]; female ( $\bar{X}=3.71$ ) and male ( $\bar{X}=3.59$ ) state their views at the level of “**generally true**” accordingly, it is determined that females have higher level of revised self-monitoring.

When the findings in Table 2 are considered in terms of **academic external locus of control** [ $t(182)=-1.399$ ;  $p>0.05$ ] no differentiation could be detected in the context of teacher trainee program. Conversely, by formation ( $\bar{X}=2.21$ ) and education ( $\bar{X}=2.32$ ) they expressed their thoughts at the level of “**slightly**”. Thus, it can be said that teacher candidates in the formation group have less academic external locus of control compared to the teacher candidates included in faculty of education group. No significant differentiation could be determined in the context of teacher trainee program in terms of **academic locus of control** [ $t(182)=1.367$ ;  $p>0.05$ ]. However, teacher candidates included in the formation group with ( $\bar{X}=4.29$ ) “**always**” teacher candidates included in the faculty of education with ( $\bar{X}=4.18$ ) expressed their thoughts at the “**often**” level. This situation indicates that teacher candidates included in the formation group have higher internal locus of control. Revised self-monitoring level considering [ $t(182)=2.119$ ;  $p<0.05$ ] it is seen that the views of teacher candidates differ significantly in terms of the way of they were raised. In the research, in the formation ( $\bar{X}=3.76$ ) and education ( $\bar{X}=3.57$ ) groups teacher candidates presented their opinions at the level of “**generally true**”. At this point, it is determined that each recanted ates included in the formation group have a higher level of revised self-monitoring.

Analyzing Table 3 it is seen that there are significant relations ( $p<.01$  and  $p<.05$ ) between academic locus of control and revised self-monitoring levels of participants in both groups. The directions and details of the relation are determined as: Within the scope of the research there is negative relation between internal locus of control and academic external locus of control for science group of teacher candidates ( $r=-.25$ ,  $p<.05$ ).

Also, in terms of all teacher candidates ( $r=-.21$ ,  $p<.01$ ) there is negative directed relation. There is negative directed relation between revised self-monitoring level and academic external locus of control in terms of Turkish Language and Literature group ( $r=-.22$ ,  $p<.05$ ) and all teacher candidates ( $r=-.19$ ,  $p<.01$ ) participated in the research. Besides, a positive directed relation is detected between revised self-monitoring level and academic locus of control in terms of Turkish Language and Literature group ( $r=.26$ ,  $p<.01$ ) and all teacher candidates ( $r=.25$ ,  $p<.01$ ) participated in the research.

As a result of the simple linear regression analysis performed in order to determine the level of prediction of revised self-monitoring level on Academic Internal Locus of control, a significant relation is observed between these two variables ( $R=.25$ ,  $R^2=.06$ ) and it is determined that revised self-monitoring level is the predictor of academic internal locus of control ( $F_{(1-182)}=12.066$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Revised self-monitoring level explains 6% of academic internal locus of control. It is determined that 94% of the changes of academic internal locus of control can be explained by other variables. Significance test of predictor variable coefficient ( $B=.23$ ) essential for regression equation indicates that revised self-monitoring level is a significant predictor. As a result of the simple linear regression analysis, the regression equation predicting academic internal locus of control can be visualized as: Academic Internal Locus of Control = (.23 x Revised Self-Monitoring Level) + 3.40.

#### 4. Discussion

The aim of this study is to analyze the level of self-monitoring and academic locus of control of teacher candidates from Science Teaching and Turkish Language and Literature departments according to various variables (gender, upbringing) and to feminize the relation between self-monitoring level and academic locus of control of teacher candidates. Considering the gender variable, it is found that male science teacher candidates are more externally controlled compared to female teacher candidates at a significant level. The individual who has academic external locus of control believe that positive or negative academic outputs, success and failures, result from factors beyond the individuals control (Akin, 2007). In our culture, it can be said that males have more external dependence especially on academic issues and females take more responsibility with anxiety for proving themselves to society. This finding resembles the findings in the study of Sarıcam, Duran and Çardak (2012) performed with preschool teacher candidates. In the study given, it is seen that academic locus of control differs significantly; in terms of gender, internal academic locus of control is for the benefit of female students, while external locus of control is for the benefit of male students. Studies were found in literature regarding academic locus of control differs significantly in terms of gender (Dilmaç, 2008; Gülaçtı, 1999; Yağışan et al., 2007).

In our research it is determined that the ideas of male and female teacher candidates are very close to each other and they do not differ significantly in terms of sub dimensions. Besides, there are studies showing that academic locus of control of the participants do not differentiate significantly in terms of gender (Yalcın et al., 2010; Durna and Şentürk, 2012; Erkmen and Cetin, 2007; Saracaloğlu, Serin and Bozkurt, 2005). In addition, a study indicates that there is a positive significant difference between the level of external and internal locus of control for girls (Gülaçtı, 1999). In the study, although there is no difference, the fact that internal locus of control average points of female teacher candidates are higher than male teacher candidates supports this finding. In the study Dilmaç performed, it is determined that, female teacher candidates have higher internal locus of control compared to males (2008). As a matter of course, it is seen that the data of this research supports itself in all ways. If we look from the viewpoint of upbringing, between the groups, no significant differentiation is encountered in either internal or external dimension of the academic locus of control. When we look at the means of internal locus of control of both groups, it is found that the internal locus of control mean of the teacher candidates in formation group is higher. On the other hand, within the context of self-monitoring, it is seen that groups differ significantly in terms of upbringing. At this very point, it is determined that teacher candidates included in the formation group have a higher level of revised self-monitoring. Also, it is seen that, though it is not significant academically, internal locus of control of the formation group is higher than those students in education faculty.

Considering both findings together, these positive qualities of the candidates being trained with pedagogic formation can be explained with the fact that, they are among the unemployed graduates who had been waiting for a long time to get their economic independence. In the studies of Altinkurt et al. (2014) the motivation of the teacher candidates in the formation groups is quite high regarding their occupation. Also, according to the study of Üstüner et al. (2009), graduates of faculty of science and faculty of letters, have higher averages of self-efficacy perceptions compared to the graduates of education faculty.

It is seen that there are significant relations ( $p < .01$  and  $p < .05$ ) between academic locus of control and level of self-monitoring of teacher candidates in both groups. A positive relationship is found between the level of self-monitoring and academic internal locus of control in terms of Turkish Language and Literature teacher candidates and Science teacher candidates. In addition, as a result of simple linear regression analysis, a significant relationship is observed between these two variables and it is determined that the level of self-monitoring is a significant predictor of academic internal locus of control (6%). Gangestad and Snyder (1985) state that the behavior of self-monitoring needs a kind of control and just as it is in the theory of locus of control, though it is not fully explained they explain childhood events with snowball effect.

On the other hand, it is confirmed that the behavior of self-monitoring helps learning just as it is in the concept of academic control (Lan and Repman, 1998; Allen and et.al 2005; Harris, 1986; Mahoney and et. al, 1973). In a study performed by Sagotsky and et.al (1978) although being exposed to the process of self-monitoring does not have a significant effect on studying behaviors and academic successes, it has provided important increases in appropriate studying behavior and true success in mathematics program. It can be said that, both variables point a dimension of the personality and the increase of the level of self-monitoring has an effect on academic locus of control. From this point of view, giving guidance service in education institutions, studies like developing communication skills will contribute to their educational process. Especially, considering the minority of the studies performed with students graduated from formation programs, studies regarding teacher efficacy can be carried out with these groups. Particularly, in education the aim of changing external locus of control over internal locus of control, should be taken into consideration since besides academic success it will increase quality in a way that provides development of the individual at all points. This study is limited with 185 students from Aksaray University Science Teaching department and students taking Pedagogic Formation Certificate. In the study "Revised Self-Monitoring Scale" and "Academic Control Scale" are used.

## Reference

- Akın,A.(2007).Akademikkontrolodağıölçeği: Geçerlikvegüvenirlikçalışması. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 34(3), 9-17.
- Akın, A. (2010). Achievement goals and academic locus of control: structural equation modeling. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 38, 1-18.Retrieved from <http://www.ejer.com.tr/ODOWNLOAD/pdfiler/eng/31696176.pdf>
- Allen, David G., Weeks, Kelly P., & Moffitt, Karen R. (2005).Turnover intentions and voluntary turnover: The moderating roles of self-monitoring, locus of control, proactive personality, and risk aversion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 980-990.doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.980
- Altınkurt, Y., Yılmaz, K., & Erol, E. (2014). Pedagoji kformasyon programıö ğrencilerininö ğretmenlikmesleğineyönelikmotivasyonları. *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(1), 48-62. Retrieved from: <http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/trkefd/article/view/5000081053>
- Altunçekiç, A., Yaman, S. & Koray, Ö.,(2005). ÖğretmenadaylarınınÖz-yeterlik inançdüzeylerine problem çözümebecerileriüzerinebiraraştırma (Kastamonuiliörneği), *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 3(1), 93-102.
- Arlı, M., & Nazik, M.H. (2001).*Bilimselaraştırmayagiriş*.Ankara: GaziKitapevi
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self efficacy.In V.S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior* (pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press.(Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], *Encyclopedia of mental health*. San Diego: Academic Press, 1998). Retrieved from: <http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/BanduraPubs.html>
- Dağ, İ. (1992).Kontrolodağı, öğrenilmişgüçlülükvepsikopatolojiilişkileri.*Psikoloji Dergisi*, 7(27), 1 -9.Retrieved from: [http://www.ihsandag.gen.tr/index\\_dosyalar/Dag1992tez.pdf](http://www.ihsandag.gen.tr/index_dosyalar/Dag1992tez.pdf)
- Dağ, İ. (2002).KontrolOdağıÖlçeği (KOÖ): Ölçekgeliştirme, güvenilirlik kvegeçerlik çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 17(49), 77-90.
- Dılmaç, O. (2008). An examination of the visual art teacher candidate's focus of control in terms of different variables. *Ataturk Üniversitesi Güzel SanatlarEnstitüsü Dergisi*, 20. Retrieved frome [dergi.atauni.edu.tr/ataunigsed/article/Download/.../1025002257](http://dergi.atauni.edu.tr/ataunigsed/article/Download/.../1025002257)
- Durna, U., & Şentürk, K. F. (2012).Universiteö ğrencilerin indenetimo daklarını çeşitlide ğişkenleryardımyı latespitemeyeyönelikbirçalışma. *ZKU Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(15), 3748.
- Erkmen, N., ve Çetin, M.C. (2007). Bedeneğitimi öğretmenlerininindenetimo dağınınbazıdeğış kenleregöreincelenmesi. *Selcuk Üniversitesi Sosyal BilimlerEnstitüsü Dergisi*, 17, 211-223.

- Gangestad, S., & Snyder, M. (1985). To carve nature at its joints: On the existence of discrete classes in personality. *Psychological Review*, 92(3), 317- 349. Retrieved from [http://psych.colorado.edu/~carey/courses/psyc5112/readings//psnclass\\_gangestad.pdf](http://psych.colorado.edu/~carey/courses/psyc5112/readings//psnclass_gangestad.pdf)
- Gülaçtı, F. (1999). Üniversiteöğrencilerinininsandoğuşınailişintutumları, içtenveyadıştandenetimliolmailebazıdeğişkenlerarasındakiilişkiler. (Unpublished master's thesis). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzurum.
- Hamid, P. N. (1994) Self-monitoring, locus of control, and social encounters of Chinese and New Zealand students, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25(3), 353-368.
- Harris, Karen R. (1986). Self-Monitoring of attention behavior versus self monitoring of productivity: Effects on on-task behavior and academic response rate among learning disabled children, *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 19 (4), 417-423.
- Harris, K.R., Friedlander, B. D., Saddler, B., Frizzelle, R. , Graham S.( 2005). Self- monitoring of attention versus self-monitoring of academic performance effects among students with ad hd in the general education classroom. *Journal of SpecialEducation*,39(3),145-157.Doi: 10.1177/00224669050390030201
- Kurbanoglu, S.S. (2004).Öz-yeterlikinancıvebilgiprofesyonelleri içinönemi.*Bilgi Dünyası*, 5(2),137152.
- Lan, W., Repman, J.& Chyung, S. Y. (1998). Effects of practicing selfmonitoring of mathematical problem solving heuristics on impulsive. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 67(1), 32-53.Doi: 10.1080/00220979809598343
- Lennox, R. D., & Wolfe, R.N. (1984).Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale.*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46 (6), 1349-1364.
- Mahoney, M. J.; Moore, B. S.; Wade, T. C. & Moura, N. G. (1973).Effects of continuous and intermittent self-monitoring on academic behavior. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 41(1), 65-69.
- Sagotsky, G., Patterson, C. J., Lepper, M. R. (1978) Training children's self-control: A field experiment in self-monitoring and goal-setting in the classroom, *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 25(2), 242-253.doi:10.1016/0022-0965(78)90080-2
- Sarıçam, H., Duran, A. & Cardak, M. (2012). The examination of pre-school teacher candidates' academic locus of control levels according to gender and grade. *Mevlana International Journal of Education (MIJE)*, 2(2), 67-74. Retrieved from: [http://mije.mevlana.edu.tr/archieve/issue\\_2\\_2/6\\_mije\\_12\\_14\\_volume\\_2\\_issue\\_2\\_page\\_67\\_74.pdf](http://mije.mevlana.edu.tr/archieve/issue_2_2/6_mije_12_14_volume_2_issue_2_page_67_74.pdf)
- Sunal,A.B. & Dönmez, A. (2011). Romantikilişkilerdeizlenimayarlamacılığı: Stresvepsikolojikbelirtiler. *EğitimveBilim*, 36(162),149-158.Retrieved from: <http://egitimvebilim.ted.org.tr/index.php/EB/article/view/734>
- Snyder, M. (1974).Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30(4), 526-537. Abstract retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org>
- Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1982).Choosing social situations: Two investigations of the self-monitoring processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43 (1), 123-135. Abstract retrieved from PsycINFO Database
- Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S.(1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (1), 125-139.
- Turetgen, Özalpve Cesur, S. (2004). Revize Edilmiş Kendini Ayarlama Ölçeği'ninTürke'ye Uyarlama Çalışması XIII. Ulusal Psikoloji Kongresi'ndesunulmuşposter.İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.
- Turetgen, Özalp & Cesur, S. (2006). Gözden Geçirilmiş Kendini Ayarlama Ölçeği'ningüvenirlikvegeçerlilikçalışması.*Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 9(17), 1- 17.
- Üstüner, M., Demirtaş, H., Cömert, M. &Özer, N. (2009). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerininöz-yeterlikalgıları. *MehmetAkif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(17), 1-16.
- Yağışan, N., Sünbül, A.M. & Yucalan, O. B. (2007). Eğitimfakültesi, güzelsanatlarvedigerbölümöğrencilerininbenlikimgesivedenetimodaklarınıkarşılaştırılması. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(22),243-262. Retrieved from <http://dergisosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr/susbed/article/download/506/488>
- Yalcın, B., Tetik, S. & Açıköz, A. (2010).Yüksekokulöğrencilerinin problem çözümebecerisialgılarıilekontrolodağıdüzeylerininbelirlenmesineyönelikbiraraştırma.*OrganizasyonveYönetimBilimleriDergisi*, 2(2), 19-27. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/oybd/article/viewFile/5000145200/5000132540>
- Yapıcı, M. &Yapıcı, Ş. (2013).Öğretmenadaylarınınpedagojikformasyonailişkin metaforları.*Turkish Studies- International Periodical ForThe Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 8/8, p.1421-1429.
- Yeşilyaprak, B.(2001). Denetim Odağı.InY.Kuzgun & D., Deryakulu (Eds) *Eğitimde Bireysel Farklılıklar* (pp 249). Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

Yıldırım, K. & Bozdoğan, A. E. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının kendilerini ayarlamapsikolojilerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir durum çalışması. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(3), 129-134.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-Regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational Psychologist*, 25(1), 3-17. Retrieved from [http://itari.in/categories/ability\\_to\\_learn/self\\_regulated\\_learning\\_and\\_academic\\_achievement\\_m.pdf](http://itari.in/categories/ability_to_learn/self_regulated_learning_and_academic_achievement_m.pdf)

**Table1. Academic Locus of Control and Revised Self-Monitoring Level t-Test Results of Teacher Candidates In Terms of Gender**

Dimensions	Groups	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
External Locus of Control	Literature	Female	81	2.19	.53	-.758	.45
		Male	25	2.28	.36		
	Science	Female	50	2.22	.43	-2.143	.04
		Male	28	2.49	.68		
	Total	Female	131	2.20	.50	-2.242	.03
		Male	53	2.39	.56		
Internal Locus of Control	Literature	Female	81	4.28	.60	-.453	.65
		Male	25	4.34	.60		
	Science	Female	50	4.18	.50	.093	.93
		Male	28	4.17	.47		
	Total	Female	131	4.24	.56	-1.109	.91
		Male	53	4.25	.54		
Revised Self-Monitoring Scale	Literature	Female	81	3.78	.59	.617	.54
		Male	25	3.70	.51		
	Science	Female	50	3.61	.62	.693	.49
		Male	28	3.50	.66		
	Total	Female	131	3.71	.61	1.202	.23
		Male	53	3.59	.60		

**Table2. Academic Focus of Control and Revised Self-monitoring t Test Results in Terms of Way of Raising Teacher Candidates**

Dimensions	Groups	N	Mean	Sd	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
External Locus of Control	Formation	106	2.21	.50	-1.399	.16
	Education	78	2.32	.54		
Internal Locus of Control	Formation	106	4.29	.60	1.367	.17
	Education	78	4.18	.49		
Revised Self-monitoring Level	Formation	106	3.76	.57	2.119	.04
	Education	78	3.57	.63		

**Table 3: Results of Correlation Analysis between Locus of Control and Revised Self-monitoring Level**

Dimensions	Groups	N	External Locus of Control	Internal Locus of Control	Revised Self-monitoring Level
External Locus of Control	Literature	106	---	---	---
	Science	78	---	---	---
	Total	184	---	---	---
Internal Locus of Control	Literature	106	-.18	---	---
	Science	78	-.25*	---	---
	Total	184	-.21**	---	---
Revised Self-monitoring Level	Literature	106	-.22*	.26**	---
	Science	78	-.13	.21	---
	Total	184	-.19**	.25**	---

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$

**Table 4. The Results of Regression Analysis between Revised Self-Monitoring Level and Academic Internal Locus of Control**

Model		Academic Internal Locus of Control			
		B	$\beta$	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Constant		3.40		13.84	.00
Revised Self-Monitoring Level		.23	.25	3.47	.00
$R^2$		.06			
F		12.066**			

Note: N=184, \*\*  $p < .01$