http://eab.org.tr

Available online at:
http://ijrte.eab.org.tr/1/1/dyavuz_amemis.pdf

http://ijrte.eab.org.tr

Educational Research Association
The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education 2010, 1(1):12-27
ISSN: 1308-951X

Investigation of Self-Efficacy Perception and Metacognitive Awareness of Prospective Teachers

(Öğretmen Adaylarının Öz-Yeterlik Algıları ve Üstbilişsel Farkındalıklarının İncelenmesi)

Dursun YAVUZ* & Aysel MEMİŞ**
Zonguldak Karaelmas University, Turkey

Abstract: This study analyzes self-efficacy perceptions of prospective teachers towards teaching profession and their metacognitive awareness related to selecting teaching as a career. It was conducted with 781 prospective teachers. Self-efficacy perceptions of the participants were detected via the long form of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and their metacognitive awareness was determined by employing the long form of Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI). The motives accounting for their selection of teaching as a career was explored through open-ended questions. It was detected that prospective teachers are at a rather sufficient level with respect to their general self-efficacy perception and its sub-dimensions and their metacognitive awareness is at rather high levels. At the end of the research, in general self-efficacy averages of prospective teachers, amongst all prospective teachers who answered that the profession was selected due to SSE (Student Selection Examination) result and the ones who selected it according to its suitability with his/her personality choice; in general metacognitive awareness averages amongst prospective teachers who answered that the profession was selected due to SSE (Student Selection Examination) result and its conformity with his/her ideal choice, love of children-nation-teaching choice and its suitability with his/her personality choice, a significant difference was detected in comparison with those prospective teachers who selected the profession according to SSE (Student Selection Examination) choice.

Key Words: Self-efficacy, teacher self-efficacy, metacognition, metacognitive awareness

Öz: Bu araştırma öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik öz-yeterlik algıları ve öğretmenliği tercih etmelerine ilişkin üstbilişsel farkındalıklarını incelemektedir. Araştırma 781 öğretmen adayı ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Katılımcıların öz-yeterlik algıları Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale-Öğretmen Öz-yeterlik Ölçeği (TSES)'nin uzun formu, üstbilişsel farkındalıkları Metacognitive Awareness Inventory-Üstbilişsel Farkındalık Envanteri (MAI)'nin uzun formu kullanılarak belirlenmiştir. Katılımcıların öğretmenliği tercih etme sebepleri ise açık uçlu sorularla belirlenmiştir. Öğretmen adaylarının genel öz-yeterlik algıları ve alt boyutlarında oldukça yeterli düzeyde oldukları, üstbilişsel farkındalıklarının ise yüksek düzeyde olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Araştırma sonucunda, öğretmen adaylarının genel öz-yeterlik ortalamalarında, ÖSS (Öğrenci Seçme Sınavı) ile kişiliğime uygun olması cevabı veren, genel üstbilişsel farkındalık ortalamalarında ise ÖSS (Öğrenci Seçme Sınavı) ile idealim, çocuk-ülke-öğretme sevgisi ve kişiliğime uygun olması cevabını veren öğretmen adayları arasında ÖSS (Öğrenci Seçme Sınavı) cevabı veren öğretmen adaylarının aleyhine anlamlı farklılık bulunmuştur.

Anahtar kelimler: Öz-yeterlik, öğretmen öz-yeterliği, üstbiliş, üstbilişsel farkındalık

Introduction:

Self-efficacy concept was originally used by Bandura in an article named Self Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change (1977). Self-efficacy which is termed as "technically perceived self-efficacy" (Senemoğlu, 2005: 230) is according to Bandura "an individual's personal faith in whether or not to take action to form a behavior and how much effort to exert in the face of difficulties" (1977, p. 191). Bandura (1977: 191) notes that self-efficacy is nourished by four main sources which are namely personal experiences, indirect experiences, verbal persuasion and emotional state.

Henson (2001: 3) describes self-efficacy beliefs as the main determiners of our behaviors and behavioral changes in particular. Bandura's research studies have been continuing for the last quarter century and Bandura advocates the idea that faith in our own abilities affects our behaviors, motivation and success. Aydın (2008: 222) puts forward that based on self-efficacy principle, to acquire a consistent personality depends on the harmony between actual efficacy and efficacy perception of the individual; therefore the individual has to obtain a self-oriented, actual and objective perception power. However, at some instances an individual's perception on self-efficacy may not be reflecting his/her actual personality. In that case, some discrepancies may occur between this individual's expectations, needs and his/her behavioral selection. Inner motivation of such individuals is also low. Aktağ (2003: 21) states that efficacy expectations enable the beginning and continuance of behaviors. The power of people's faith in their performance will also affect their ability to deal with certain conditions. Self-efficacy perception affects behavioral choices. Bandura (1977: 193) believes that human behavior is influenced by faiths related to two expectations as result and efficacy. Expectations related to result are estimations indicating that certain behaviors will lead to certain results.

Schunk (2003: 160) asserts that efficacy itself is important but not the only reason behind success. According to him, the other vital factors are skills, knowledge, result (outcome) expectations and significance attributed to results. High efficacy on its own will not be sufficient to bring out the performance that will help attaining desired result when required knowledge and skills are missing. Result (outcome) expectations are significant because people do not take parts in activities which they believe will give way to negative results. It will affect their feelings and thoughts which enable them to ensure control. Pajares and Schunk (2001: 242) emphasize that faiths in personal efficacy also affect a person's expectations on the results of something. Self-confident people hope for brilliant results. If they are convinced not to have successful performances, they will be intimidated and avoid performing this certain action. If they believe to overcome the situation then they can perform this action. Bandura (1993: 144) also notes that a strong faith in efficacy improved the success and health of many people. Self-confident people view challenging tasks not as threats to avoid but as hardships to cope with. They are very much keen on activities, set hard-to-achieve goals, dedicate themselves to these goals and despite obstacles, they never give up.

Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001: 783) define teachers' self-efficacy faith as a teacher's faith in his/her own ability to carry students toward expected results. Similarly, Ashton explains that teachers' faiths as faiths in their capacity to affect learning performance of students (cited in Çapri and Kan, 2006: 49). According to Guskey and Passaro (1994: 628), it is teachers' faith in their self-trust to provide an effective education to students.

Self-efficacy is not a function of personal skills. It is the outcome of a person's judgment on the things s/he can achieve by employing his/her own skills (Kahyaoğlu and Yangın, 2007: 75). It is influential in detecting the amount of effort an individual will exert

in though times (Bandura, 1977). This was the subject of many research studies on education. Pierce (2003) asserts that self-efficacy (motivation), working strategies and self-evaluation (monitoring and reflection) are influenced from each other in a cycle and they in turn affect metacognition.

In education, what matters is teaching students how to attain knowledge and once attained how to use it. In short, the biggest objective of education is to raise students who can control what they learn. Knowing to know describes metacognition in a sense. Metacognition brings with itself an awareness of learning process, planning and strategy selection, monitoring the learning process, correcting the errors, checking the usefulness of applied strategies, owning skills such as changing learning method and strategies when necessary (Özsoy, 2007). According to Hennessey (1999: 1), amongst various objectives of education, the hypothesis stating that high-level cognitive activity is important for learning and mental development is also available. One of the most attractive education practices is the tendency to develop learning on cognitive and metacognitive levels.

Metacognition term is basically associated with Flavell who put forward that metacognition is composed of both metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive experiences and arrangements (Livingston, 2003: 1). Flavell explains metacognition as follows: storing the inputs in memory after consciously structuring them, retrieving needed data after scanning, monitoring the data and awareness state of coded data (Livingston, 2003: 2).

Taylor (1999: 34) describes metacognition as a person's analysis of present knowledge, in a certain condition how to follow strategic knowledge fully and effectively and rightfully perceiving data and skills necessitated by learning mission. One of the main elements of metacognition is to make use of working strategies to reach the objective and on this road, self-evaluation of personal efficacy and in return for this self-evaluation, to make a self-arrangement (Pierce, 2003). According to Winn and Snyder (1996, p. 116) metacognition is although a concept related to perception, it is also tracking a program to actualize the best learning and selecting the best strategies. As stated by Forrest, metacognition is a structure expressing the knowledge of a person on his/her cognitions and his/her ability to control these cognitions (cited in Çakıroğlu, 2007: 10). According to Ertmer and Newby (1996: 1) metacognition is knowing how to make necessary changes when errors need to be checked and developing the applicable strategies for this aim. Brown (1987: 65) puts forward that metacognition is being aware of how to learn, knowing which strategies can facilitate new learning and knowing the learning procedure.

Metacognition, which is analyzed on a three-dimensional level by Brown, is a person's state of awareness of personal thinking processes and ability to control them (1978: 269). According to Brown dimensions of metacognition are awareness, planning, monitoring and thinking. Awareness is knowing what you know, defining your objectives, defining personal sources that will carry you to your goal, knowing how to assess, and being aware of anxiety level and needs. The second dimension, planning, contains elements such as planning the time for mission, forming a work schedule, forming a to-do, done, and must-be-done list, arranging time and materials and forming a strategy to make use of other reminders, diagram and similar main lines. Monitoring and thinking dimension contains thinking to learn and determining the effective and ineffective elements in learning process, learning inspection through self-interrogation, providing feedback, making required verifications and keeping motivation and concentration high (1987: 65-66).

Ertmer and Newby (1996) define metacognitive awareness as; by explaining the objective and personal needs, by being aware of personal knowledge, motivation and anxiety level and needs, determining how to make the assessment. Wilson defines self-awareness of

people in their learning process, their knowledge on the contents, their personal learning strategies and what is done and needs to be done as *metacognitive awareness* (cited in Çakıroğlu, 2007: 12). Andrade (1999: 42) states that self-awareness has a positive effect on the metacognitive awareness level of students.

Purpose of the Study

The aim of this research was to examine the differences between self-efficacy perceptions and metacognitive awareness of prospective teachers in terms of selecting teaching as a profession.

Methodology

Population and Study Group

Population of the research consists of the prospective students from Elementary Teaching, Social Instructions and Turkish Language Teaching departments in Zonguldak, studying in year 2008–2009 fall term. In this research the objective was to reach all of 1048 prospective teachers; however 781 of the population completed the questionnaire.

Data Collection Tools

For the aim of gathering data on teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and metacognitive awareness, two different measurement tools were conducted. The first one is the long form of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) that was developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy to detect self-efficacy perceptions of teachers. The scale is composed of three sub-dimensions: Efficacy in student participation (SP), efficacy in educational strategies (ES) and efficacy in class management (CM).

While evaluating averages of the items on self-efficacy of teachers, point gaps in Table 1 are used:

Table 1: Point gaps of Teachers' Self-efficacy survey

1,00-2,59	2,60-4,19	4,20-5,79	5,80-7,39	7,40-9,00
Insufficient	Slightly sufficient	A little sufficient	Rather sufficient	Quite a lot sufficient

In order to designate metacognitive awareness of teachers, Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI) that was originally developed by Schraw and Dennison and adapted by Akın et al. (2007) was used after testing its validity and reliability. The highest point to receive from this 5-grade Likert type inventory is 260, the lowest point is 52. High points that can be received from this inventory that has no negative items indicate high level of metacognitive awareness. By dividing total point received from inventory into total points of item numbers (52), a result on the metacognitive awareness level of relevant person can be reached. It can be deduced that individuals receiving less than 2.5 points from MAI have

low, and the ones receiving greater points have high levels of metacognitive awareness. The scale is composed of eight sub-dimensions: Explanatory information, procedural information, situational information, planning, monitoring, evaluation, error debugging and information management (Akın et al. 2007).

Data Analysis

Data obtained through the survey was coded via SPSS 13.0 statistical program. While uncovering the differences, parametric (one-way analysis of variance) statistical techniques were employed. To detect the direction of divergence emerging at the end of variance analysis, Bonferroni Multiple Comparison Test was used. In statistical analysis and interpretation of data $p<0.05$ significance level was taken into consideration.

Findings

1. Self-efficacy perceptions of prospective teachers

With respect to the answers given by the prospective teachers to Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale, arithmetical average and standard deviation values of general self-efficacy and efficacy sub-dimensions were illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2: Arithmetical average and standard deviation values of general self-efficacy and sub-dimensions perceptions of prospective teachers

Self-efficacy and sub-dimensions	**Mean**	**SD**
Efficacy in student participation	6.98	1.01
Efficacy in educational strategies	6.98	1.04
Efficacy in class management	7.18	1.08
General self-efficacy	7.05	0.94

As indicated in Table 2, prospective teachers are *rather sufficient* in general self-efficacy (Mean=7.05), efficacy in student participation (Mean=6.98), efficacy in educational strategies (Mean=6.98) and efficacy in class management (Mean=7.18) dimensions. Prospective teachers have the lowest arithmetical average (Mean=6.98) in efficacy in student participation while they have the highest arithmetical average (Mean=7.18) in efficacy in educational strategies.

In several other research studies that employed Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale as well, similar findings were obtained. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) in their study covering 410 teachers indicated that teachers felt *rather sufficient* in general self-efficacy (Mean=7.,1), efficacy in student participation (Mean=7.3), efficacy in educational strategies (Mean=7.3) and efficacy in class management (Mean=6.7) dimensions. In another study conducted by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy in year 2002 amongst 255 prospective teachers, it was revealed that teachers felt *rather sufficient* in general self-efficacy (Mean=7.1), efficacy in educational strategies (Mean=7.3), efficacy in class management (Mean=7.3) and efficacy in student participation (Mean=6.6) dimensions.

2. Metacognitive awareness of prospective teachers

In Table 3 according to the answers of prospective teachers to questions in Metacognitive Awareness Inventory, arithmetical averages and standard deviation of their general metacognitive awareness levels and sub-dimensions were given.

Table 3: Arithmetical average and standard deviation values of prospective teachers on general metacognitive awareness levels and sub-dimensions

Metacognitive awareness and sub-dimensions	**Mean**	**SD**
Explanatory Information	4.02	0.50
Procedural Information	3.68	0.61
Situational Information	3.94	0.55
Planning	3.72	0.61
Monitoring	3.61	0.59
Evaluation	3.76	0.59
Error debugging	3.95	0.63
Information management	3.92	0.54
General metacognitive awareness level	3.83	0.46

As Table 3 indicates, prospective teachers have the lowest arithmetical average (Mean=3.61) in monitoring sub-dimension while they have the highest arithmetical average (Mean=4.02) in explanatory information sub-dimension. General metacognitive awareness level points (Mean=3.83); explanatory information points (Mean=4.02), procedural information points (Mean=3.68), situational information points (Mean=3.94), planning points (Mean=3.72), monitoring points (Mean=3.61), evaluation points (Mean=3.76), error debugging points (Mean=3.95) and information management points (Mean=3.92) of prospective teachers prove that they have high levels of metacognitive awareness.

The result obtained at the end of the research findings is parallel to the research findings detected in a study conducted by Akın et al. (2007) who employed the same survey.

3. Self-efficacy perceptions of prospective teachers in terms of selecting the profession of teaching

In Table 4, the results of one–way analysis of variance which was used to detect if there is any difference in general self-efficacy perception and sub-dimensions of the prospective teachers in terms of selecting the profession of teaching are given.

Table 4: Self-efficacy perceptions of prospective teachers in terms of selecting the profession of teaching

	N	**Mean**	**SD**	**df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Bonferroni**

Efficacy in student participation	1	90	7.09	1.01	5	3.112	.008	3–5
	2	254	7.01	1.03				
	3	163	6.76	1.03				
	4	91	6.84	0.96				
	5	124	7.18	0.89				
	6	59	7.00	1.05				
Efficacy in educational strategies	1	90	7.09	0.98	5	2.298	.033	3–5
	2	254	6.99	1.11				
	3	163	6.79	1.06				
	4	91	6.91	0.95				
	5	124	7.17	1.01				
	6	59	7.04	0.92				
Efficacy in class management	1	90	7.15	1.05	5	.672	.644	-
	2	254	7.21	1.09				
	3	163	7.12	1.08				
	4	91	7.09	1.07				
	5	124	7.32	1.07				
	6	59	7.17	1.11				
General self-efficacy	1	90	7.11	0.93	5	2.104	.048	3–5
	2	254	7.07	0.99				
	3	163	6.89	0.94				
	4	91	6.95	0.89				
	5	124	7.22	0.91				
	6	59	7.07	0.89				

1. It is my ideal, 2. Love of children-nation-teaching, 3.SSE (Student Selection Examination), 4.Influence of family and environment due to the validity of this profession, 5.It suits my personality, 6.Other reasons

According to Table 4;

- The highest average is taken by the prospective teachers who selected the choice "it suits my personality" in general self-efficacy (Mean=7.22) and efficacy in student participation (Mean=7.18), efficacy in educational strategies (Mean=7.17) and efficacy in class management (Mean=7.32) sub-dimensions.
- The lowest average belongs to the prospective teachers who selected the choice "SSE" in general self-efficacy (Mean=6.98) efficacy in student participation (Mean=6.76) efficacy in educational strategies (Mean=6.79) sub-dimensions and the lowest average in efficacy in class management (Mean=7.09) sub-dimension is received by the prospective teachers answering as "influence of family and environment due to the validity of this profession".

According to one-way analysis of variance that was conducted in terms of selecting the teaching of profession on the basis of self-efficacy perceptions of prospective teachers and sub-dimensions, aside from efficacy in class management dimension, in all the other sufficiency fields, a significant difference on $p<.05$ level was obtained. In line with the findings obtained from general self-efficacy perceptions and sub-dimensions in terms of selecting the profession of teaching, below stated results were detected:

- In general self-efficacy points, between the prospective teachers selecting SSE choice and suitability with my personality choice, there is a significant difference ($F(5.\ 775) = 2.104$; $p<0.05$) in favor of the prospective teachers selecting personality choice.
- In efficacy in student participation sub-dimension, between the prospective teachers selecting SSE choice and suitability with my personality choice, there is a significant difference ($F(5.\ 775) = 3.112$; $p<0.05$) in favor of the prospective teachers selecting personality choice.
- In efficacy in educational strategies sub-dimension, between the prospective teachers selecting SSE choice and suitability with my personality choice, there is a significant difference ($F(5.\ 775) = 2.298$; $p<0.05$) in favor of the prospective teachers selecting personality choice.
- In efficacy in class management sub-dimension, there is no significant difference ($F(5.\ 775) = 0.672$; $p>0.05$).

4. Metacognitive awareness of prospective teachers with respect to their motives to select the profession of teaching

Metacognitive awareness of the prospective teachers with respect to their motives to select the profession of teaching is indicated in Table 5.

Table 5: Metacognitive awareness of prospective teachers with respect to their motives to select the profession of teaching

Explanatory Information	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Bonferroni**
1.It is my ideal	90	4.05	0.50	5	3.51	.004	2–3

							3–5
2.Love of children-nation-teaching	254	4.04	0.47				
3.SSE	163	3.89	0.56				
4.Influence of family and environment due to the validity of this profession	91	4.07	0.42				
5.It suits my personality	124	4.11	0.46				
6.Other reasons	59	3.95	0.57				
Procedural Information	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Bonferroni**
1.It is my ideal	90	3.79	0.52				
2.Love of children-nation-teaching	254	3.71	0.62				
3.SSE	163	3.55	0.65				1–3
4.Influence of family and environment due to the validity of this profession	91	3.62	0.53	5	3.15	.008	3–5
5.It suits my personality	124	3.77	0.60				
6.Other reasons	59	3.60	0.62				

Table 5: Metacognitive awareness of prospective teachers with respect to their motives to select the profession of teaching

Situational Information	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Bonferroni**
1.It is my ideal	90	3.99	0.53				
2.Love of children-nation-teaching	254	3.98	0.55				
3.SSE	163	3.77	0.61				1–3
4.Influence of family and environment due to the validity of this profession	91	3.92	0.50	5	4.81	.000	2–3 3–5
5.It suits my personality	124	4.06	0.47				
6.Other reasons	59	3.93	0.62				
Planning	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Bonferroni**
1.It is my ideal	90	3.85	0.54				
2.Love of children-nation-teaching	254	3.77	0.61				
3.SSE	163	3.52	0.65				1–3
4.Influence of family and environment due to the validity of this profession	91	3.65	0.53	5	5.59	.000	2–3 3–5
5.It suits my personality	124	3.81	0.64				
6.Other reasons	59	3.71	0.58				
Monitoring	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Bonferroni**
1.It is my ideal	90	3.72	0.59				
2.Love of children-nation-teaching	254	3.66	0.59				
3.SSE	163	3.44	0.61				1–3
4.Influence of family and environment due to the validity of this profession	91	3.57	0.54	5	4.73	.000	2–3 3–5
5.It suits my personality	124	3.73	0.57				
6.Other reasons	59	3.58	0.58				

Evaluation	N	Mean	SD	df	F	Sig.	Bonferroni
1.It is my ideal	90	3.87	0.57				
2.Love of children-nation-teaching	254	3.79	0.62				
3.SSE	163	3.63	0.62				
4.Influence of family and environment due to the validity of this profession	91	3.72	0.50	5	2.66	.021	1–3
5.It suits my personality	124	3.82	0.57				
6.Other reasons	59	3.70	0.57				

Table 5: Metacognitive awareness of prospective teachers with respect to their motives to select the profession of teaching

Error debugging	N	Mean	SD	df	F	Sig.	Bonferroni
1.It is my ideal	90	4.11	0.58				
2.Love of children-nation-teaching	254	4.04	0.57				1–3
3.SSE	163	3.76	0.69				2–3
4.Influence of family and environment due to the validity of this profession	91	3.81	0.67	5	7.80	.000	3–5 1–4 2–4
5.It suits my personality	124	4.07	0.52				4–5
6.Other reasons	59	3.85	0.75				
Information management	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Bonferroni**
1.It is my ideal	90	4.00	0.44				
2.Love of children-nation-teaching	254	3.96	0.55				1–3
3.SSE	163	3.78	0.57	5	4.08	.001	2–3
4.Influence of family and environment due to the validity of this profession	91	3,88	0,46				3–5

5.It suits my personality	124	4,01	0,52				
6.Other reasons	59	3,82	0,59				
General metacognitive awareness level	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**df**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Bonferroni**
1.It is my ideal	90	3,92	0,43				
2.Love of children-nation-teaching	254	3.87	0.46				
3.SSE	163	3.67	0.50				1–3
4.Influence of family and environment due to the validity of this profession	91	3.79	0.39	5	6.46	.000	2–3 3–5
5.It suits my personality	124	3.93	0.44				
6.Other reasons	59	3.77	0.47				

As seen in Table 5;

- The highest average in general metacognitive awareness (Mean=3.93) explanatory information (Mean=4.11), situational information (Mean=4.06), monitoring (Mean=3.73) and information management (Mean=4.01) sub-dimensions belongs to the prospective teachers selecting the choice "it suits my personality choice".
- The highest average in procedural information (Mean=3.79), planning (Mean=3.85), evaluation (Mean=3.87) and error debugging (Mean=4.11) sub-dimensions belongs to the prospective teachers selecting "it is my ideal choice".
- The lowest average in general metacognitive awareness and all of the sub-dimensions belongs to the prospective teachers selecting "SSE" choice (general metacognitive awareness: Mean=3.67 – explanatory information: Mean=3.89 – procedural information: Mean=3.55 – situational information : Mean=3.77 – planning: Mean=3.52 – monitoring: Mean=3.44 – evaluation: Mean=3.63 – error debugging: Mean=3.76 – information management: Mean=3.78).

As results of one-way variance analysis are examined;

- In general metacognitive awareness averages (F (5. 775)=6.46; p=0.00), amongst the ones selecting SSE choice, my ideal choice, love of children-nation-teaching choice, suitability with personality choice, there is a significant difference against the prospective teachers selecting SSE choice,
- In explanatory information sub-dimension (F (5. 775)=3.51; p=0.00) amongst the ones selecting SSE choice, love of children-nation-teaching choice and suitability with personality choice, there is a significant difference against the prospective teachers selecting SSE choice,

- In procedural information sub-dimension (F (5. 775)=3.15; p=0.01) amongst the ones selecting SSE choice, my ideal choice, and suitability with personality choice there is a significant difference against the prospective teachers selecting SSE choice,
- In situational information sub-dimension (F (5. 775)=4.81; p=0.00) amongst the ones selecting SSE choice, my ideal choice, love of children-nation-teaching choice, suitability with personality choice, there is a significant difference against the prospective teachers selecting SSE choice,
- In planning sub-dimension (F (5. 775)=5.59; p=0.00) amongst the ones selecting SSE choice, my ideal choice, love of children-nation-teaching choice, suitability with personality choice, there is a significant difference against the prospective teachers selecting SSE choice,
- In monitoring sub-dimension (F (5. 775)=4.73; p=0.00) amongst the ones selecting SSE choice, my ideal choice, love of children-nation-teaching choice, suitability with personality choice, there is a significant difference against the prospective teachers selecting SSE choice,
- In evaluation sub-dimension (F (5. 775)=2.66; p=0.02) between the prospective teachers selecting my ideal choice and the ones selecting SSE, there is a significant difference in favor of the prospective teachers selecting my ideal choice,
- In error debugging sub-dimension (F (5. 775)=7.80; p=0.00) amongst the prospective teachers selecting SSE and influence of family and environment due to the validity of this profession choice, and the ones selecting my ideal choice, love of children-nation-teaching choice, suitability with personality choice, there is a significant difference against the prospective teachers selecting SSE and influence of family and environment due to the validity of this profession choices,
- In information management sub-dimension (F (5. 775)=4.08; p=0.00) amongst the ones selecting SSE choice, my ideal choice, love of children-nation-teaching choice, suitability with personality choice, there is a significant difference against the prospective teachers selecting SSE choice.

Discussion and Conclusion

As research findings indicate, self-efficacy perceptions of prospective teachers vary according to the motives urging them to select teaching as a profession. Prospective teachers who selected teaching profession with a conviction that it was their ideal and suited their personality received higher points than the ones selecting this profession due to SSE result or influence of family or environment.

In literature no study was found related to this subject. Thus, it was attempted to reach a conclusion based on earlier definitions and generalizations. The reasons accounting for the differentiation of self-efficacy perceptions of prospective teachers according to the motives in selecting teaching as profession may be the difference between faith in success while performing a mission with or without motivation and non-confidence of prospective teachers who selected this profession against their own will.

In terms of selecting the profession of teaching, in metacognitive awareness level of the prospective teachers, a significant difference was detected. Based on the definition of metacognition given by Flavell, it is possible to assert that prospective teachers who selected

teaching profession against their will cannot structure and control the inputs consciously and for that reason their metacognitive awareness level is lower compared to other prospective teachers. However considering the fact that metacognitive awareness is teachable and improves in advanced years, it is possible that prospective teachers who selected this profession due to several other reasons, but not willfully, can acquire this skill in the future and assist their students to acquire it as well.

Transformations in education give its fruits in the long run. As stated by 1739 no. Basic Law on National Education, individuals should be oriented at early stages according to their interests and skills and young population of our nation should be incorporated into labor force. Teachers who are, in Senemoğlu's words, engineers of person transformation should be assisted to select this profession willfully, not forcefully.

References

Akın, A., Abacı, R., & Çetin, B. (2007). The Validity and Reliability Study of the Turkish version of the Metacognitive Awareness Inventory. *Educational Science: Theory & Practice, 7*(2), 655–680.

Aktağ, I. (2003). Teacher Efficacy of Pre-Service Teachers in Abant İzzet Baysal University in Turkey. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Faculty of The Graduate Collage at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Andrade, H.G. (1999). Student Self-Assessment: at the Intersection of Metacognition and Authentic Assessment, ERIC Doküman no: ED431030. Retrieved November 8, 2008 from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/17/98/28.pdf.

Aydın, A. (ed.) (2008). *Eğitim Psikolojisi Gelişim-Öğrenme-Öğretim*. Pegem Akademi, Ankara.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review,* 84, 191–215.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning. *Educational Pschologist,* 28(2), 117–148.

Brown, A. L. (1978). Knowing when, where and how to remember: a problem of metacognition, In R. Glasser (Ed.). *Advances in İnstructional Psychology*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erbaum.

Brown, A. L. (1987). Metacognition, Executive Control, Self-Regulation, and Other More Mysterious Mechanisms, F. E. Weinert, R. H. Kluwe (Eds.). *Metacognition, Motivation, and Understanding* (65-116). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Çakıroğlu, A. (2007). *Üstbilişsel Strateji Kullanımının Okuduğunu Anlama Düzeyi Düşük Öğrencilerde Erişi Artırımına Etkisi.* Doctoral dissertation, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Çapa, Y., Çakıroğlu, J., & Sarıkaya, H. (2005). Development and Validation of Turkish Version of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale, *Egitim ve Bilim*, 30, 74-81.

Çapri, B., & Kan, A. (2006). Öğretmen Kişilerarası Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeğinin Türkçe Formunun Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(1), 48–61.

Ertmer, P. A., & Newby, T. J. (1996). The expert learner: Strategic, self-regulated and reflective. *Instructional Science, 24*, 1-24.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognitive and cognitive monitoring: a new area of cognitive developmental inquiry, *American Psychologyst, 34*, 906-911.

Guskey, T. G., & Passaro, P. D. (1994). Teacher efficacy: a study of construct dimensions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31, 627–643.

Hennessey, M. G. (1999). *Probing the Dimensions of Metacognition: İmplications for Conceptual Change Teaching-Learning,* ERIC Doküman no: ED446921, Retrieved December 21, 2008 from

http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/16/9d/56.pdf.

Henson, R. K. (2001). Teacher Self-Efficacy: Substantive Implications and Measurement Dilemmas. *Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Educational Research Exchange*, Texas A & M University, College Station, Retrieved December 15, 2008 from http://www.des.emory.edu/mfp/EREkeynote.pdf.

Kahyaoğlu, M., & Yangın, S. (2007). İlköğretim Öğretmen Adaylarının Mesleki Öz-Yeterliklerine İlişkin Görüşleri, *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi,* 15(1), 73–84.

Livingston, J. A. (2003). Metacognition: An Overview. ERIC Doküman No: ED474273, Retrieved December 20, 2008 from

http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/1a/de/02.pdf.

Özsoy, G. (2007). *İlköğretim 5. Sınıfta Üstbiliş Stratejileri Öğretiminin Problem Çözme Başarısına Etkisi*. Doctoral dissertation, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Pajares, F. ve D. H. Schunk (2001). Self-Beliefs and School Success: self-Efficacy, Self Concept and School Achievement. Chapter in R. Riding & S. Royner (Eds.) Perception, 239–266, London: Ablex Publishing.

Pierce, W. (2003). Metacognition: Study Strategies, Monitoring, and Motivation. Retrieved December 14, 2008 from

http://academic.pgcc.edu/~wpeirce/MCCCTR/metacognition.htm.

Schunk, D. H. (2003). Self-Efficacy for Reading and Writing: Influence of Modeling Goal Setting and Self-Evaluation. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 19, 159–172.

Senemoğlu, N. (2005). *Gelişim Öğrenme ve Öğretim Kuramdan Uygulamaya*, Gazi Kitabevi, Ankara.

Taylor, S. (1999). Better Learning Through Better Thinking: Developing Students Metacognitive Abilities. *Journal of Collage Reading and Learning*, 30(1), 34–45

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, w. K. (1998). Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning and Measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 202–248. Retrieved

October 3, 2008 from http:// www.des.emory.edu/mfp/RERTeacherEfficacy1998.pdf.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher Efficacy: Capturing an Elusive Concept. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783–805.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2002). The İnfluence of Resources and Support on Teachers' Efficacy Beliefs. *Paper Presented At The Annual Meeting of The American Educational Research Association*, New Orleans. Retrieved October 5, 2008 from http://www.coe.ohio-state.edu/ahoy/aera%202002%20megan.pdf.

Winn, W. & Snyder, D. (1996). Cognitive Perspectives in Psychology. in: D. H. Jonassen (ed.), *Handbook of Research for Educational Communications and Technology* (New York, Simon and Schuster Macmillan), 115–142.

http://server.karaelmas.edu.tr/2009/guz/ogrsayilari/ogrsay1.asp. (Retrieved October 26, 2008).

About the Author(s):

** Dursun YAVUZ was born in 1981, Zonguldak in Turkey. He graduated from Gazi University, Faculty of Education, Elementary Education in 2005 and the master program of Zonguldak Karaelmas University, Social Sciences Institute, Training Programs and Teaching in 2009. He studied metacognitive awareness and self efficacy. He has also worked at Turkish State Railways (TCDD) since 1999 and he has been teacher in Ankara Central Directorate of Education. e-mail: yavuz.dursun372@gmail.com*

*** Aysel Memiş is assistant professor in the Department of Elementary Education at Zonguldak Karaelmas University. He is also Head of the Primary Teacher Education Branch. He received his PhD in primary education from The Institute of Educational Sciences, Gazi University, Ankara, in 2005. ayselmemis@gmail.com*

