

Araştırma Makalesi

**AKADEMİK KONTROL ODAĞINI YORDANMASINDA DİJİTAL
OKURYAZARLIĞIN BİR ROLÜ VAR MIDIR?**

**DOES DIGITAL LITERACY HAVE A ROLE IN PREDICTION OF
ACADEMIC CONTROL FOCUS?**

Gönderilen Tarih: 11/03/2024
Kabul Edilen Tarih: 11/08/2024

Alptuğ SOYER

Niğde Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi, Niğde, Türkiye

Orcid: 0000-0002-7149-6897

Nuri Berk GÜNGÖR

Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Balıkesir, Türkiye

Orcid: 0000-0002-6579-9146

Fikret SOYER

Kırgızistan-Türkiye Manas Üniversitesi, Bişkek, Kazakistan

Orcid: 0000-0002-8528-3622

* Sorumlu Yazar: Alptuğ SOYER, Niğde Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi, E.mail: alptug.soyer1@gmail.com

** Bu araştırma ERPA 2022 Kongresi'nde sunulan özet bildirden üretilmiştir.

Akademik Kontrol Odağını Yordanmasında Dijital Okuryazarlığın Bir Rolü Var Mıdır?

ÖZ

Araştırmanın amacı, Spor Bilimleri Fakültesinde öğrenim görmekte olan bireylerin dijital okuryazarlık düzeyinin akademik kontrol odağına etkisinin belirlenmesidir. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu; bir kamu üniversitesinin Spor Bilimleri Fakültesinde öğrenim gören 115'i kadın (%40.9), 166'sı (%59.1) erkek katılımcı oluşturmaktadır. Veri toplama aracı olarak; kişisel bilgi formunun yanı sıra Ng'nin (2012) geliştirdiği ve Üstündağ, Güneş ve Bahçivan'ın (2017) Türkçe'ye uyarladığı Dijital Okuryazarlık Ölçeği ile Akın'ın (2007) geliştirdiği Akademik Kontrol Odağı Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizi sürecinde; betimsel istatistikler, T-testi, One Way Anova, Pearson Korelasyon ve Regresyon analizinden faydalanılmıştır. Araştırma bulguları incelendiğinde, katılımcıların dijital okuryazarlık ve akademik kontrol odağı düzeylerinin ortalama seviyede olduğu ifade edilebilir. Katılımcıların dijital okuryazarlık ve akademik kontrol odağının cinsiyet, bölüm ve sınıf düzeyine göre istatistiksel olarak farklılaşmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Buna ek olarak, dijital okuryazarlığın dış kontrol odağını %21.4 oranında yordadığı sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Bu noktadan hareketle, dijital okuryazarlık özelliğinin akademik kontrol odağının gelişimine katkı sağlayabileceği düşünülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dijital okuryazarlık, akademik odaklanma, spor

Does Digital Literacy Have A Role In Prediction Of Academic Control Focus?

ABSTRACT

The aim of the research is to determine the effect of the digital literacy level of the individuals studying at the Faculty of Sport Sciences on the academic locus of control. The study group of the research consisted of 115 (40.9%) female and 166 (59.1%) male participants who are studying at the Faculty of Sports Sciences of a public university. As a data collection tool; In addition to the personal information form, the Digital Literacy Scale developed by Ng (2012) and adapted into Turkish by Üstündağ, Güneş ve Bahçivan (2017) and the Academic Locus of Control Scale developed by Akın (2007) were used. In the process of data analysis; descriptive statistics, T-test, One Way Anova, Pearson Correlation and Regression analysis were used. When the research findings are examined, it can be stated that the digital literacy and academic locus of control levels of the participants are at average level. It was determined that the participants' digital literacy and academic locus of control did not differ statistically according to gender and class level. In addition, it was concluded that digital literacy predicted the external locus of control by 21.4%. From this point of view, it is thought that the digital literacy feature can contribute to the development of academic locus of control.

Keywords: Digital literacy, academic focus, sports

INTRODUCTION

The concept of literacy, which has an important role in the lives of individuals, has been researched by both anthropologists and linguists throughout history. In addition to being defined as the ability to read and write in general, the concept of literacy can be defined as a means of communication through inscriptions decoded with visual meaning, apart from auditory and gestural channels^{1,2}. In other words, literacy can be defined as a process that begins with people's assimilation of written codes. This concept, which has evolved from the past to the present, has evolved from its original focus on individuals' ability to understand information for individual and social benefits³⁻⁵. When some studies in the literature are examined, according to Aşıcı (2009)⁶, although the concept of literacy is tried to be explained with definitions such as the perspective of individuals towards their ongoing lives, adding new meanings to their relationships in life and social life, as well as traditional reading-writing functions, science and scientific research have not yet fully developed this concept. While Kress (2003)⁷ defines the concept of literacy, it is seen that it is the ability of individuals to use communication figures effectively to make their lives more meaningful. According to a definition contributed to the literature by Yıldız (2007)⁸, the concept of literacy is defined as the practice of liberating the individual and becoming more conscious, and also states that academic studies on this concept have increased after 1960. In the 1990s, the concept of literacy became a central focus within the scope of education and training by moving to a functionally versatile dimension as well as just reading and writing, and started to gain new definitions on this subject⁹. The concept of literacy with evolution needed to improve itself as a result of the innovations caused by the technological age¹⁰. Following developments, the concept of digitalization has emerged so that individuals can benefit from elements such as time-saving, efficiency and productivity. With digitalization, people have met their commercial payments, shopping and even their important needs such as education electronically¹¹. It is possible to define the concept of digitalization as the process of transforming the acquired information into a digital platform so that it can be read, prepared and managed in any environment through an electronic tool (computer, tablet, etc.)¹².

With the coronavirus pandemic period that emerged in 2020 worldwide, students could not go to school and distance education took the place of the face-to-face education method. The digitalization process has been accelerated following the needs of students^{13,14}. With the digitalization seen in educational activities, the digital literacy status of the participants is important for the success of individuals¹⁵. When the relevant literature is examined, this concept, which started with visual literacy in the 1960s, left its place for digital literacy in the 1990s. The concept of digital literacy should not be limited to features such as navigating internet networks or using social media. Because this concept can be defined as an important skill that requires the correct analysis and use of digital technologies, the ability to correctly manage any problems that may arise during use, and the ability to find effective solutions to these problems¹⁶. It is known that digital literacy requires the ability to use different technologies correctly, as well as accessing the correct level of information, producing and sharing information, and using technology factors effectively within the scope of learning and teaching processes¹⁷. Considering the information in the literature, in addition to the studies on carrying out reading and writing activities using digital technologies, there are also studies stating that the issue of digital literacy is important in higher education¹⁸⁻²¹.

There are some skills that individuals must have to have for digital literacy²². The concept of digital literacy includes the different skills that individuals need to work in the electronic environment. Reading the texts on the monitor and evaluating the accuracy or inaccuracy of the information in the electronic environment are among the digital literacy activities. Moreover, the ability to search the sources presented in electronic media and to classify the obtained data are indispensable for digital literacy skills^{23,24}. It is thought that digital literacy involves much more than enabling the use of a digital device or software. In addition, it also includes many different skills that will enable users to use it effectively in digital environments. These skills can be specified as sociological, cognitive or emotional skills²⁵. It is known that Buckingham (2015)²⁶ stated that the concept of digital literacy is not a simple concept and that basic computer and digital device usage skills will be insufficient for this concept. Digital literacy is mostly possible to define as the level of ability of individuals to acquire the information they need and the tools they use in this process²⁷. Digital literacy forms a solid foundation for learning throughout life²⁸. Along with the technological developments in the 21st century, the concept of digital literacy has begun to take an important role in educational institutions, with the increase in the access opportunities of the infrastructures and tools that enable the spread of the electronic environment by the users²⁹. Considering the characteristics of the concept of digital literacy and its main skills in a broad context, it is known that individuals benefit from digital tools, platforms and practices to access information. It also requires the ability to have comprehensive technical skills to use, consult, reformat and share the obtained information with other individuals³⁰. The concept of locus of control, which is the other subject of this research, is known as one of the main factors in the formation of the main reasons for the success and failures that individuals can achieve throughout life. Although this factor is not a hereditary feature, it can develop over time, be learned, and show changes in time control³¹. The concept of locus of control, developed by Rotter based on Social Learning Theory³², It can be defined as a personality trait that expresses some situations that individuals encounter in their daily lives. The reason why this concept can be defined as a personality trait is that the responsibility for these situations and events, whether good or bad, is based on luck, fate and similar factors, either within oneself or outside oneself³³. Besides, Rotter (1954)³⁴ explained the term academic locus of control, which is an important part of the research components of the study, in reference to the social-cooperative learning theory as follows: Academic locus of control; In terms of its structure, it explained the students' personal obligations to the current situation, together with their cognitive levels, through their internal-external locus of control qualities. This situation is connected to the ability to perceive and organise the positive or negative gains obtained against the duties, assignments and responsibilities that students encounter in the school environment³⁴. Academic locus of control is known as a concept that focuses on whether student individuals are responsible for their academic results, whether successful or unsuccessful, on their own person or on external factors³⁵. Student individuals with an academic internal locus of control believe that success or failure situations are under their control. According to these students, all their success is due to their own efforts. In contrast, student individuals with an academic external locus of control attribute the reasons for their success or failure to external factors. According to their opinions, their success is due to factors beyond their control, such as luck, fate, examination systems and some attitudes of teachers³⁶. Considering this aspect, when students with academic internal locus of control are compared with students with academic external locus of control; It appears that students with an academic external locus of control make less effort. The

reason for this is known to be that they think that they cannot control the results they have achieved and will achieve. Student individuals with an internal locus of control are proud of their own successes, but also feel ashamed of their own failures. It is observed that student individuals with an external locus of control experience much fewer emotional changes in both situations³⁷⁻³⁹. Locus of control, without a single reinforcer, is a situation that controls the behaviour repetition of the person and defines the beliefs and expectations about what the reinforcers cause⁴⁰. When we look at the sub-dimensions of academic locus of control, it is classified as internal and external⁴¹⁻⁴³. It is very important whether people are internally focused or externally focused. The fact that individuals are internally or externally focused fundamentally affects their mood and thoughts, and this situation is directly reflected in their behaviour towards event patterns. The individual's internal-external locus of control is thought of as their own choice. When the studies on individuals' locus of control orientations are examined, it is seen that the strategies used by individuals with an external locus of control orientation are to sabotage themselves³⁹, their academic performance is at a lower level³⁵, their social support levels and self-efficacy views are lower than their internal self-sabotage. It seems to be at a lower level than control-oriented individuals⁴⁴. At the same time, when this situation is evaluated in the context of gender, it has been observed that the external locus of control orientation is mostly seen in male individuals, while the internal locus of control orientation is dominant in female individuals⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷. The view of Akın (2007)⁴⁰ on this issue is as follows; In cases where people receive positive feedback, they choose to be internal control-focused, while in unsuccessful or negative feedback, they choose to be external control-focused. Locus of control is considered as a continuous structure rather than differing as internal-external control⁴⁸.

Considering the relevant literature; Only Nanda and Suidana's (2022)⁴⁹ research examined the relationship between digital literacy and academic locus of control. However, considering today's relationship with academic success, it is important to consider academic control and the expansion of our digital world together with digital literacy features in the sample of university students. Therefore, it is thought that this research will contribute to the related literature with a different perspective. In this context, this research aimed to determine the effect of the digital literacy of participants on the academic locus of control.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Research Model

Relational scanning model was used in this research, which aims to determine the role of digital literacy in predicting the participants' academic locus of control. This model; "It is used to obtain the relationship between two or more variables in terms of cause and effect"⁵⁰.

Study Group

The study group of the research consisted of 281 participants, 115 (40.9%) female and 166 (59.1%) male, studying at the Faculty of Sport Sciences of a public university. Moreover, 84 (29.9%) of the participants were studying physical education and sports teaching, 56 (19.9%) were in the sports management department, 47 (16.7%) were in the recreation department and 94 were studying coaching education. Besides, 39 (13.9%) of the participants were in the first grade, 56 (19.9%) were in the second grade,

53 (18.9%) were in the third and 133 (47.3%) were in the fourth grade of their education. The mean age of the participants was determined as 22.47 ± 2.52 .

Data Collection Tools

In addition to the personal information form, Digital Literacy and Academic Locus of Control Scales were used as data collection tools in the study.

Digital Literacy Scale

Ng (2012) developed the measurement tool, which Üstündağ et al. (2017)⁵¹ adapted into Turkish. The scale consists of 10 items in total and has a 5-point Likert structure. Increasing the total score average obtained from the measurement tool means that the digital literacy feature also increases. While the internal consistency coefficient of the original form of the scale was .86, the internal consistency coefficient obtained from the data set was found to be .90.

Academic Locus of Control Scale

The measurement tool developed by Akin (2007)⁴⁰ consists of 17 items and 2 sub-dimensions. The names of the sub-dimensions are "internal academic control" and "external academic control". The internal consistency coefficients of the scale are .95 for "academic external control" and .94 for "academic internal control". Considering the values obtained from the data set, the internal consistency coefficients are .90 and .92, respectively.

Analysis of Data

Skewness and Kurtosis values were taken into account by looking at the significance result of the Shapiro-Wilk test regarding the data set. Understanding the compliance of the data with normal distribution parameters is associated with the result that the relevant values are between -1.5 and +1.5⁵². For this reason, analyzes were carried out with parametric tests (Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, Multiple Linear Regression Analysis, T-test, One Way Anova). Excel database and SPSS 22 Package Program were used in the research.

RESULTS

Table 1. Mean Scores of Participants from Digital Literacy and Academic Locus of Control Scales

Scales	N	Min	Max	\bar{x}	Sd
Digital Literacy	281	1.10	5.00	3.50	.77
Internal Locus of Control	281	1.00	5.00	2.46	.86
External Locus of Control	281	1.00	5.00	3.23	.62

The mean score of the participants from the Digital Literacy Scale ($\bar{x}=3.50$) was determined as for internal control ($\bar{x}=2.46$) and for external control ($\bar{x}=3.23$), which was one of the sub-dimensions of the Academic Locus of Control Scale.

Table 2. T-Test Results of the Mean Scores Obtained from the Digital Literacy and Academic Locus of Control Scales by Gender Variable

Scale	Gender	N	\bar{x}	Sd	sd	t	p
Digital Literacy	Female	115	3.47	.65	279	-.43	.66
	Male	166	3.51	.84			
Internal Locus of Control	Female	115	2.38	.90	279	-1.16	.24
	Male	166	2.51	.83			
External Locus of Control	Female	115	3.29	.56	279	1.43	.15
	Male	166	3.19	.65			

It was concluded that the participants' levels of digital literacy, internal locus of control and external locus of control did not differ statistically according to the gender variable, $t_1(279)=-.43$, $p>.05$, $t_2(279)=-1.16$, $p>.05$, $t_3(279)=1.43$, $p>.05$.

Table 3. One-Way Anova Results of the Mean Score from the Digital Literacy and Academic Locus of Control Scales by Grade Variable

Scale	Grade	N	\bar{x}	Sd	F	p
Digital Literacy	1.Grade	39	3.27	.92	1.60	.19
	2.Grade	56	3.47	.72		
	3.Grade	53	3.49	.75		
	4.Grade	133	3.58	.74		
Internal Locus of Control	1.Grade	39	2.32	.98	1.48	.16
	2.Grade	56	2.79	.93		
	3.Grade	53	2.53	.88		
	4.Grade	133	2.33	.75		
External Locus of Control	1.Grade	39	3.21	.86	1.57	.19
	2.Grade	56	3.39	.65		
	3.Grade	53	3.17	.65		
	4.Grade	133	3.19	.49		

When Table 3 was examined, no significant difference was found between digital literacy, internal locus of control and external locus of control and class variable, $F_1(3,277)=$; $p>0.05$; $F_2(3,277)=2.57$; $p>0.05$; $F_3(3,277)=1.79$; $p>0.05$.

Table 4. Examining the Relationship Between Variables Using Pearson Product Moment Correlation

Variables	Digital Literacy	Internal Locus of Control	External Locus of Control
Digital Literacy	1		
Internal Locus of Control	.21**	1	
External Locus of Control	.46**	.32**	1

** $p<.01$

There was a low level of positive correlation between the participants' digital literacy and their internal locus of control ($r_1=.21$, $p<.01$), It was determined that there was a moderate positive relationship with external locus of control ($r_2=.46$, $p<.01$).

Table 5. Regression Analysis Results on Predicting Academic Locus of Control

Variables	Standardize β	Standard Error	Kritik Oran	p	R ²	
Digital Literacy	Internal Locus of Control	.10	.86	1.70	.09	.01
	External Locus of Control	.46	.55	8.71	.00	.21

** $p<.01$

When Table 5 was examined, no statistically significant effect was detected on the relationship between digital literacy and internal locus of control, ($\beta_1=.10$; $p>.05$). However, a significant effect was found in the relationship between digital literacy and external locus of control ($\beta_2=.46$; $p<.05$). Considering the Squared Multiple Correlations (R^2) value in the table, it can be stated that digital literacy explains the external locus of control by 21%.

DISCUSSION

The Covid-19 pandemic, which occurred worldwide, had also affected Turkey. Education-teaching activities were suspended due to the pandemic and a transition was performed to the distance education method to prevent the development of students. It was thought that students and instructors who had no previous experience with distance education experience difficulties in this process, as well as the academic focus of the students, decreased. From this point of view, in the research, the role of digital literacy in predicting the academic locus of control of students receiving sports education at the undergraduate level of a public university was described.

Considering the digital literacy levels of the participants, it can be said that the participants have slightly above mean digital literacy skills. It was seen that there were similar results in the literature⁵³⁻⁵⁷. Considering the mean age of the participants, although it is expected that the level of digital literacy determined will be higher, it can be stated that their current level is an advantage in the usage of digital elements and materials. Moreover, it can be stated that the scores of the participants from the internal locus of control are below the mean, while the scores they get from the external locus of control are slightly above the mean. Therefore, it can be stated that the participants sometimes believe that they will fail, they attribute the reason for failure to external factors, and their subjective success beliefs are low. When the results of the analysis were examined, it was determined that the digital literacy, internal locus of control and external locus of control levels of the participants did not differ statistically according to the gender variable. When the relevant literature was examined, there were studies that showed parallelism with the results of the research^{54,56,58-62}. However, there were studies in the literature that differed from the research results^{63,64}. In this context, it is thought that gender differences did not affect the results of the research, as the access of females and males to technology is getting easier day by day in a constantly developing and changing world. Moreover, it can be said that there was no difference in the academic locus of control of the participants according to the gender variable, due to factors such as the participants had similar cognitive and affective characteristics and they had common courses although they were educated in different departments.

When the results of the analysis were examined, no significant difference was determined between digital literacy, internal locus of control and external locus of control and grade variable. When the relevant literature was examined, there were studies that differed from the results of the research according to the grade variable^{61,65}. Besides, there were studies paralleling this study⁶⁶. Considering the academic locus of control, another variable in the study, there were similar results to the research results^{67,68}. From this point of view, there were no research results in the relevant literature to generalize the grade level variable, digital literacy and academic locus of control characteristics. Therefore, the differences in the sample groups and

the participant characteristics, which are the subject of the research, were thought as the reason for this result.

It was determined that the digital literacy of the participants had a low positive relationship with the internal locus of control, and a moderate positive relationship with the external locus of control. When the analysis results were examined, no statistically significant effect was detected on the relationship between digital literacy and internal locus of control. Moreover, a significant effect was found in the relationship between digital literacy and external locus of control, and its explanatory power was determined as 21%. Therefore, it can be said that the features and awareness of the digital world contribute to the academic control feature. When the relevant literature was examined; Although there were studies to predict academic locus of control with different characteristics⁶⁹⁻⁷¹ only Nanda and Suidana (2022)⁴⁹ research they conducted with economics faculty tests the predictive power of academic locus of control. Considering the results of this research, it was determined that academic locus of control predicted digital literacy. It can be stated that the digital world brings a different perspective to many issues. One of these features is academic control. Therefore, it can be stated that the research results are supported by the relevant literature. However, the minority of research on the two related features is also considered important.

Recommendations

Apart from the development of technology, digital literacy has a very important place for students to continue their academic success against pandemics and similar situations in the world. In this context, it is suggested that these two scales be performed with various demographic variables, as well as applying the universe and sample in different areas and dealing with them more comprehensively.

REFERENCES

1. Besnier N. (1999). Literacy. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. 9(1/2), 141-143.
2. Gee JP. (2006). What is literacy. *Relations, locations, positions: Composition theory for writing teachers*, 29-39.
3. Choi S. (2022). Privacy literacy on social media: its predictors and outcomes. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*. 1-16.
4. Güneş F. (2019). Okuryazarlık yaklaşımları. *The Journal of Limitless Education and Research*. 4(3), 224-246.
5. Gee JP. (2014). *Literacy and education*. Routledge.
6. Aşıcı M. (2009). Kişisel ve sosyal bir değer olarak okuryazarlık. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*. 7(17), 9-26.
7. Kress G. (2003), *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge.
8. Yıldız A. (2007). Geçmişten günümüze okuryazarlık araştırmaları. *Eğitim Bilim Toplum Dergisi*. 5(18), 44-61.
9. Güneş F. (1994). Okur-yazarlık kavramı ve düzeyleri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 27(2), 499-507.
10. Özdemir O. (2021). Dijital okuryazarlık, (Ed.), Kolaç, E. ve Dal, S. *Etkinliklerle Türkçe öğretimi* (s. 694-737), İstanbul: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
11. Taştan HŞ. (2021). Spor yönetiminde dijitalleşme. Tarakçı, İ. & Göktaş, B. (Ed.), *Dijital Gelecek Dijital Dönüşüm* (s. 107-130). İstanbul: Efe Akademi.

12. Üzmez SS., Büyükbeşe T. (2021). Dijitalleşme sürecinde bilgi yönetiminin işletmelerin teknoloji uyumuna etkileri. *Bilgi Ekonomisi ve Yönetimi Dergisi*. 16(2), 117-127.
13. Avcı F., Akdeniz EC. (2021). Koronavirüs (Covid-19) salgını ve uzaktan eğitim sürecinde karşılaşılan sorunlar konusunda öğretmenlerin değerlendirmeleri. *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler ve Eğitim Dergisi*. 3(4), 117-154.
14. Alptekin ZM. (2020). Dijitalleşme ve dijital sosyal sorumluluk iletişimi. *Uluslararası Medya ve İletişim Araştırmaları Hakemli Dergisi*. 3(2), 136-155.
15. Sönmez EE., Gül HÜ. (2014). Dijital okuryazarlık ve okul yöneticileri. *Sözlü Sunum, XIX. Türkiye'de İnternet Konferansı*. 27-29, İzmir.
16. Kozan M. (2018). Bilgisayar ve öğretim teknolojileri eğitimi bölümü öğretmen adaylarının dijital okuryazarlık düzeyleri ve siber zorbalığa ilişkin duyarlılıklarının incelenmesi. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ*.
17. Çubukçu A., Bayzan Ş. (2013). Türkiye'de dijital vatandaşlık algısı ve bu algıyı internetin bilinçli, güvenli ve etkin kullanımı ile artırma yöntemleri. *Middle Eastern & African Journal of Educational Research*. 5, 148-174.
18. Özbay M., Özdemir O. (2014). Türkçe öğretim programı için bir öneri: Dijital okuryazarlığa yönelik amaç ve kazanımlar. *Okuma Yazma Eğitimi Araştırmaları*. 2(2), 31-40.
19. Prior DD., Mazanov J., Meacheam D., Heaslip G., Hanson J. (2016). Attitude, digital literacy and self efficacy: Flow-on effects for online learning behavior. *The Internet and Higher Education*. 29, 91-97.
20. Radovanović D., Hogan B., Lalić D. (2015). Overcoming digital divides in higher education: Digital literacy beyond Facebook. *New media & society*. 17(10), 1733-1749.
21. Tüzel S., Tok M. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının dijital yazma deneyimlerinin incelenmesi. *Tarih Okulu Dergisi (TOD)*. 6(15), 577-596.
22. Belshaw DA. (2012). What is digital literacy?: A pragmatic investigation, Doctoral dissertation, Durham University.
23. Özaydın A., Kumral O. (2021). Dijital yerlilerin gözünden dijital okuryazarlık. *Eğitim ve Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 8(2), 362-377.
24. Karabacak Zİ., & Sezgin, AA. (2019). Türkiye'de dijital dönüşüm ve dijital okuryazarlık. *Türk İdare Dergisi*. 1(488), 319-343.
25. Eshet Y. (2004). Digital literacy: A conceptual framework for survival skills in the digital era. *Journal of educational multimedia and hypermedia*. 13(1), 93-106.
26. Buckingham D. (2015). Defining digital literacy-What do young people need to know about digital media?. *Nordic journal of digital literacy*. 10(1), 21-35.
27. Sezgin AA., Karabacak Zİ. (2020). Yükseköğretimde dijital dönüşüm ve dijital okuryazarlık dersine yönelik betimsel bir analiz. *Kurgu*. 28(1), 17-30.
28. Vega V. (2011). Digital literacy is the bedrock for lifelong learning. *Technology Integration*, <http://www.edutopia.org/blog/digital-divide-technology-internet-access-literacyvanessa-vega> [Erişim Tarihi: 12 Aralık 2023].
29. Martin A. (2005). DigEuLit—a European framework for digital literacy: A progress report. *Journal of eLiteracy*. 2(2), 130-136.
30. Özel N. (2013). Araştırma görevlilerine bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerinin bilgi okuryazarlığı özelliklerinin kazandırılması. *Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara*.
31. Hansemark OC. (2003). Başarı ihtiyacı, kontrol odağı ve yeni kurulan işlerin tahmini: Boylamsal bir çalışma. *Ekonomik Psikoloji Dergisi*. 24(3), 301-319.

32. Yeşilyurt E. (2014). Akademik özyeterliğin yordayıcıları olarak akademik kontrol odağı, akademik sahtekarlık eğilimleri ve sınav kaygısı düzeyleri. *Eğitim Bilimleri: Teori ve Uygulama*. 14(5), 1945-1956.
33. Rotter JB. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal vs. external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs* 80. 1-28.
34. Sarıçam H., Duran A. (2012). The investigation of the education faculty students' academic locus of control levels. 28-30 June 15th Balkan International Conference, Bucurest, Romania.
35. Hasan SS., Khalid R. (2014). Academic locus of control of high and low achieving students. *Journal of Research & Reflections in Education*. 8(1), 22-35.
36. Trice AD. (1985). An academic locus of control scale for college students. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*. 61(3), 1043-1046.
37. Hansemark OC. (2003). Başarı ihtiyacı, kontrol odağı ve yeni kurulan işlerin tahmini: Boylamsal bir çalışma. *Ekonomik Psikoloji Dergisi*. 24(3), 301-319.
38. Mearns J. (2006). The social learning theory of Julian Rotter. In D. P. Crowne (Ed.), *Personality theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
39. Akın A. (2011). Academic locus of control and self-handicapping. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 30, 812-816.
40. Akın A. (2007). Akademik kontrol odağı ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 3(34), 9-17.
41. Battle ES., Rotter JB. (1963). Children's feelings of personal control as related to social class and ethnic group. *Journal of Personality*. 3(1), 482-90.
42. Rotter JB., Mulry RC. (1965). Internal versus external control of reinforcement and decision time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2, 598-604.
43. Stipek DJ. (1993). *Motivation to learn: From theory to practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
44. İskender M., Akın A. (2010). Social self-efficacy, academic locus of control, and internet addiction. *Computers & Education*. 54(4), 1101-1106.
45. Atik G. (2006). The role of locus of control, self-esteem, parenting style, loneliness, and academic achievement in predicting bullying among middle school students. Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
46. Çetinkalp ZK. (2010). Psychometric properties of the Turkish version of the Situational Motivation Scale-SIMS. *Türkiye Klinikleri Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*. 2(2), 86-94.
47. Sarıçam H., Duran A., Çardak M., Halmatov M. (2012). The examination of pre school teacher candidates academic locus of control levels. *Mevlana International Journal of Education*. 2(2), 67-74.
48. Findley MJ., Cooper HM. (1983). Locus of control and academic achievement: a literature review. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 44(2), 419.
49. Nanda AD., Sudiana K. (2022). Pengaruh digital literacy dan locus of control terhadap Minat Berwirausaha pada Mahasiswa Tingkat Akhir Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Telkom. *J-MAS (Jurnal Manajemen dan Sains)*. 7(1), 49-55.
50. Karasar N. (2017). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar ilkeler teknikler*. Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
51. Üstündağ MT., Güneş E., Bahçivan E. (2017). Dijital okuryazarlık ölçeğinin Türkçeye uyarlanması ve fen bilgisi öğretmen adaylarının dijital okuryazarlık durumları. *Journal of Education and Future*. 12, 19-29.
52. Tabachnick BG., Fidell LS. (2007). *Experimental designs using ANOVA*. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Brooks/Cole.

53. Güneş E., Bahçıvan E. (2018). A mixed research-based model for pre-service science teachers' digital literacy: Responses to "which beliefs" and "how and why they interact" questions. *Computers & Education*. 118, 96-106.
54. Güngör NB., Kurtipek S. (2020). Spor bilimleri fakültesi öğrencilerinin bireysel yenilikçilik düzeyinin dijital okuryazarlığa etkisinin yapısal eşitlik modeli ile incelenmesi. *International Journal of Human Sciences*. 17(2), 756-767.
55. Onursoy S. (2018). Üniversite gençliğinin dijital okuryazarlık düzeyleri: Anadolu Üniversitesi öğrencileri üzerine bir araştırma. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi*. 6(2), 989-1013.
56. Özerbaş MA., Kuralbayeva A. (2018). Türkiye ve Kazakistan öğretmen adaylarının dijital okuryazarlık düzeylerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 5(1), 16-25.
57. Uğur OA. (2021). The effect of mindful attention awareness level on digital literacy of sports science faculty students, *International Journal of Education Technology and Scientific Researches*. 6(14), 569-588.
58. Albayrak E., Reisoğlu S. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinde kişilik özellikleri, akademik öz-yeterlik, akademik kontrol odağı ve akademik erteleme. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 1(38), 90-102.
59. Arslan S. (2019). İlkokullarda ve ortaokullarda görev yapan öğretmenlerin dijital okuryazarlık düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi, *Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya*.
60. Bay DN. (2021). Okul öncesi öğretmen adaylarının dijital okuryazarlık düzeyleri. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 5(7), 172-187.
61. Kozan M., Özek MB. (2019). Böte bölümü öğretmen adaylarının dijital okuryazarlık düzeyleri ve siber zorbalığa ilişkin duyarlılıklarının incelenmesi. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 29(1), 107-120.
62. Uyar A. (2021). Meslek yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin dijital okuryazarlık düzeyleri. *Uluslararası Güncel Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 7(1), 198-211.
63. Ocak G., Karakuş G., (2019). Öğretmen adaylarının dijital okuryazarlık öz-yeterlilik becerilerinin farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 21(1), 129-147.
64. Doğan D. (2020). Üniversite öğrencilerinin kendilerine ilişkin dijital okuryazarlık algıları. *Journal of Technology Applications in Education 2020*. Vol. 1(1), 26-35.
65. Yaşar Ç. (2019). BÖTE öğretmen adaylarının kariyer eğilimlerinin, sosyal medyaya ilişkin görüşlerinin ve dijital okuryazarlık beceri düzeylerinin incelenmesi, *Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Balıkesir*.
66. Uyar A. (2021). Meslek yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin dijital okuryazarlık düzeyleri. *Uluslararası Güncel Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 7(1), 198-211.
67. Saracaloğlu AS., Karademir ÇA., Dursun F., Altın M., Üstündağ N. (2017). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının öz-düzenleyici öğrenme becerilerinin, akademik öz-yeterlik, akademik kontrol odağı ve akademik başarıları ile ilişkisi. *Turkish Studies*. 12(33), 379-402.
68. Saracaloğlu AS., Yenice N., Özden B. (2013). Fen bilgisi, sosyal bilgiler ve sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının öğretmen öz-yeterlik algılarının ve akademik kontrol odaklarının incelenmesi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 34(2), 227-250.
69. Churchill SA., Munyanyi ME., Prakash K., Smyth R. (2020). Locus of control and the gender gap in mental health. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. 178, 740-758.

70. Kovach M. (2018). A review of classical motivation theories: A study understanding the value of locus of control in Higher Education. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*. 7(1), 34-53.
71. Kusuma AHP., Rina R., Syam AH. (2018). The main role of locus of control and professional ethics on lecturer's performance (Indonesian Lecturer Empirical Study). *International Review of Management and Marketing*. 8(5), 9.

