




The Use of “Learner Control Strategy” in Courses of Law Faculties in State and Private Universities*

*Devlet ve Özel Üniversite Hukuk Fakültelerindeki Derslerde “Öğrenen Kontrolü Stratejisinin” Kullanımı**

M. Oğuz KUTLU¹, Asım YAPICI², Ceylan YILMAZ³

¹Doç. Dr., Çukurova University, okutlu@cu.edu.tr  0000-0002-6539-2354

²Prof. Dr., Ankara Sosyal Bilimler University, asim.yapici@asbu.edu.tr,  0000-0002-7041-9064

³Inst. Çağ University, ceylanymz88@gmail.com,  0000-0003-1252-7232

Araştırma makalesi/ Research Article

Geliş: 24.10.2019



Kabul: 25.12.2019



Yayın: 31.12.2019

Atıf

Kutlu, O. M., Yapıcı, A. & Ceylan, Y. (2019). The use of “learner control strategy” in courses of law faculties in state and private universities. *Maarif Mektepleri Uluslararası Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(2), 89-102.

Kutlu, O. M., Yapıcı, A. & Ceylan, Y. (2019). *Devlet ve özel üniversite hukuk fakültelerindeki derslerde “öğrenen kontrolü stratejisinin” kullanımı. Maarif Mektepleri International Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(2), 89-102.

Abstract

Learner control, generally, is the strategy of giving the student the opportunity to be effective in the selection and implementation of both content and teaching approaches related to teaching in the teaching process. In other words, it is the situation where the learners are given a certain level of autonomy in order to manage their own learning experiences themselves. Because; learning is not a passive process of taking, but an active meaning-making process, and it is the learner individual who performs the learning. The general purpose of this research is to determine the level of “Learner Control Strategy” used

* This study was presented as an oral paper at the International Eurasian Educational Research Congress (EJER 2019) on June 19-22, 2019.

in the lessons based on the opinions of Law School students studying at Private and State Universities.

Keywords: Learner control, detailed order theory, active learning, teaching theories

Öz

Öğrenen kontrolü; genel olarak; öğrenciye, öğretim sürecinde öğretimle ilgili olarak hem içerik hem de öğretim yaklaşımlarının seçimi ve uygulamasında etkili olma, yetki ve fırsatının verilmesi stratejisidir. Başka bir ifadeyle, öğrenenlerin öğretim sürecinde kendi öğrenme yaşantılarını bizzat kendilerinin yönetmeleri için onlara belirli bir düzeyde de olsa özerklik verilmesi durumudur. Çünkü öğrenme pasif bir alma süreci değil, aktif bir anlam oluşturma sürecidir ve öğrenmeyi gerçekleştiren öğrenen bireyin kendisidir. Bu araştırmanın genel amacı; Özel ve Devlet Üniversitelerinde öğrenim gören Hukuk Fakültesi öğrencilerinin görüşleri temelinde, derslerde "Öğrenen Kontrolü Stratejisinin" hangi düzeyde kullanıldığını belirlemektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğrenen kontrolü, öğretimi ayrıntılı sıralama kuramı, aktif öğrenme, öğretme kuramları

Introduction

The learning process is not a passive taking process, but an interaction process in which the teacher and the student must be active together (Kutlu, 2012, p. 244). Developed countries benefit from the findings of educational sciences in order to identify problems related to education and produce effective solutions. Many students lose their self-confidence and motivation in learning because teachers do not make the teaching process properly during the lessons; as a result, the desired goals in education can not be achieved, superficial / memorized learning is satisfied, and as a result of this, the quality of education decreases. The general purpose of instructional science is to make learning more effective, efficient and interesting; thus, to perform high level learning (Reigeluth, 1983). In this context, the task of the teaching scientists is to determine the teaching methods that can be used by the practitioners to reach the predetermined goals based on the teaching theories. As it is known, the way each teacher organizes the content to be presented in the lessons can be unique. Because a general framework (course definition) is determined in the lessons, detailed decisions are left to the teachers during the teaching. Provided that teachers stay connected to this framework content - with certain flexibility - in what order, how many examples will be sufficient, what kind of exercise is required, how the order of information affects learning, how many questions will be asked, how much and when will summaries be taken; they decide on the basis of their own knowledge and experience, etc. (Karataş Coşkun, 2017). These decisions and the reasons for these decisions may vary greatly from teacher to teacher even if they teach the same subject. The effect of this difference in the regulation of the teaching process is seen directly on the outcomes. There are no doubt that there are teachers who are very successful in arranging the teaching process in a way that enables them to learn, and there are teachers who cannot devote enough time to this subject. What

can my students learn beter? , "What I tell them during the teaching process? ", What do I need to make students do?", "Which elements can I learn to be more productive and interesting? ", "How can students understand what they learn and learn best? ; they are often the questions a teacher should consider (Karataş Coşkun, 2017). In such cases, teachers generally turn to two sources. One of these sources is books or other sources related to the subject (Mathematics, Turkish, Chemistry, English, etc.), and the other is learning theories with a slightly more optimistic prediction. However; although these two ways are the main sources for organizing the content, they do not give the necessary information to the teacher because their aim is not to produce explanations about how the information in question is selected, in which order it will be presented and taught (Karataş Coşkun, 2017). Morrison, Ross, and Kemp (2004, cited in Karataş Coşkun, 2017) describe the ranking as the arrangement of content in order to achieve the objectives in the most efficient manner. In fact, ranking is influenced by other variables related to teaching and influence these variables.

Successful teachers can put themselves in place of their students for a moment and look at the lesson to be explained from the students' window in a systematic structure with the necessary details, and facilitate the learning by establishing connections between the information to be explained and the existing information. This is also necessary for effective and efficient teaching and as a consequence for the increase in motivation. Because one of the most important sources of motivation is learning, in other words, learning is a reward because of the need to be met in fact. According to Köymen (1996), failure in all levels of education, lack of interest in learning, negative attitudes towards schools and education, and the fact that some teaching methods that adversely affect learning in the teaching process are preferred. Since the behaviors that the teacher has to do in traditional teaching processes are not clearly stated, it also leads to different understandings and practices among the teachers. The problem underlying this issue, which has not been clarified for a long time; teaching theories that will form the scientific basis for teaching how to do teaching has not been developed in the last twenty-thirty years (Köymen, 1996). In other words, it is the fact that the theories that form the basis of teaching methods for centuries are learning theories. At the core of this approach; There is the assumption that knowing how learning occurs will show how teaching is done, but this is only an assumption. However, there are important differences between teaching and learning theories. For example; Teaching Theories address effective teaching methods as subjects, while learning theories focus on learning processes. In other words, teaching theories investigate what the instructor should do while gaining behavior at any level, while learning theories investigate what the learner does during learning and how changes in behavior occur and why.

The contemporary understanding teacher has the responsibility of directing students to learning by using their abilities, skills and even their latent powers at the

highest level. On the other hand, the number of teachers using traditional approaches based on passive participation of students within the framework of the textbooks prepared under the influence of the existing curriculum is not less. In the teacher-centered traditional teaching environment activities implemented in our schools, lessons based on teacher presentation are taught (Fer and Cırık, 2007, p.20). The teacher authority in our classrooms drives students into passive listeners and grows as individuals who are passive, unable to question, and cannot produce creative ideas.

According to the Constructivist Learning Theory, in which the learner takes an active role, Constructivist Learning Theory is not just reading and listening; learning is performed through active participation in the process such as discussion, defending ideas, hypothesis building, questioning and sharing ideas. At this point, the interaction of individuals is important. Learners do not accept the information as they are, they form or rediscover the information (Perkins, 1999, p. 370, cited in Montenegro, Deniz, Korkmaz and Deniz, 2008, pp. 383-402). Each acquired knowledge provides the basis for structuring the next information. Thus, constructivist learning is the process of linking existing and new learning and integrating each new knowledge with existing knowledge. However, this process should not be perceived as merely stacking information (Limon, 2001, p.358, cited in Karadağ and et al. 2008, 83-402). If the individual has really structured the information, he / she will make his / her own interpretation and establish the knowledge fundamentally. Constructivist learning is not about accumulating and memorizing knowledge, but about thinking and analyzing. Constructivist learning approach is opposed to calling all students the same and calling them in groups. Instead, it attaches importance to the individual needs, strengths and weaknesses, interests and experiences of the students. Rather than following the program tightly, it chooses to choose topics and adapt them to their own circumstances. Instead of not supporting competition among students; It aims to share knowledge and responsibilities and to create a class atmosphere based on mutual respect. The responsibility of learning is shared by the teacher and the student (Jonassen, 1994, p. 34, cited Karadağ, et al. 2008, pp. 383-402). Consequently, constructivist learning approach is a philosophical approach that explains how an individual understands and learns. Learning in constructivist approach; it is the result of a configuration in the human mind; In other words, learning is an internal process that occurs in the mind of the individual (Yaşar, 1998, p. 699, cited in Karadağ, et al. 2008, pp. 383-402). In this case, the individual; it is not a passive receiver of external stimuli, but an active assimilator and behavior builder. Because the human mind is not an empty warehouse, and the information cannot be stored and transported exactly to the human mind. Therefore, in the constructivist learning approach, each individual should be active in the learning process and be responsible for his / her own learning. For this; the teacher should go to a variety of methods in the classroom and include

more teaching strategies such as problem-based learning, project-based learning, cooperative learning and case study. Thus, the role of the teacher will be a guide, an assistant or a guide that facilitates the learning of the students (Saban, 2004, p. 79, cited in Karadağ et al. 2008, pp.383-402). Reigeluth (1983, p.362), who presented Kontrolü Learner Control as one of the seven macro strategies proposed by Elaboration Theory in his Elaboration Theory of Instruction (ÖAODK), was given the appropriate level of authority and responsibility to ensure that motivated students receive their own learning and emphasizes that the effectiveness, efficiency and attractiveness of teaching may increase. On the other hand, some instructional designers similarly argue that if the student is given the freedom to choose instructional strategies and techniques in teaching, they will increase their motivation and make more efforts to learn (Williams, 1996, cited in Farrell, 2000).

Overview to Elaboration Theory of Instruction and Fundamentals of Theory

The basic principle of cognitive psychology is to ensure the permanent acquisition of knowledge. Ausubel (1963), one of the first proponents of this view, is famous for his theory of hypothesis based on two assumptions about cognitive structure (Merrill, Kelety and Wilson, 1981, cited in Hoffmann, 1997). If learners can incorporate new information into existing knowledge by combining or assimilating the information, the acquisition of new information will be easier and more permanent. According to Ausubel (1963), the hierarchical organization of the cognitive structure places more general information on specific information. In this hierarchical organization, the application of instructional design to present ideas in a general-specific teaching sequence is consistent with the general-specific sequence mentioned in the Elaboration Theory of Instruction (Reigeluth and Darwazeh, 1982). Another descriptive feature of the Elaboration Theory of Instruction is the general context of the subject content with each other and with the subject. This certainly corresponds to Ausubel's secondary assumption about cognitive structure.

Similar to Ausubel's view of the relationship of knowledge, Norman (Merrill, Kelety and Wilson, 1981, p.288) has a concept of "network learning, which advocates that to fully understand a particular concept, it must understand its relationship to all other related concepts. Network learning also requires Bruner to provide general, then more detailed and complex information, such as the "spiral curriculum (Reigeluth and Darwazeh, 1982). In general, the first presentation of information is in a simple form and equals the essence of information. It can handle information in a more detailed and complex way, in accordance with the detailed ranking level of the Elaboration Theory of Instruction.

That certain information needs to be acquired before an information is acquired is related to Gagne, and it is compatible with the Elaboration Theory of Instruction (Reigeluth and Darwazeh, 1982). At the level of Elaboration Theory of Instruction's overview (epitome), there is little likelihood that Bruner's "helical curriculum" will

be implemented if learning is required. According to Reigeluth and Stein (1983), more detailed learning levels are prerequisites. The number of prerequisites for the knowledge learned in previous courses will be relatively small, because students should only learn the prerequisites for the given course.

Although P. Merrill's "pathanalysis" (Reigeluth and Darwazeh, 1982) and Scandura (Reigeluth, 1987) have been used as the source of simplification of the shortest path approach, Ausubel, Bruner, Gagne and Norman's contributions to the Elaboration Theory of Instruction are more visible. Taken together, the contributions of these researchers are closely related to the simple to complex strategy that affects the development of Elaboration Theory of Instruction (Reigeluth, 1987).

According to Elaboration Theory of Instruction; In order of increasing complexity to ensure ideal learning, the necessary guidelines should be prepared before the start of the teaching process. For example, teaching a method in any field presents the simplest version of the work to be done first; subsequent versions are offered in additional versions until all tasks are taught. Each lesson should remind the student of all the examples taught so far (abstract / synthesis). The main idea of the Elaboration Theory of Instruction is that the learner should develop a meaningful context that he or she can absorb later. This theory consists of seven main strategy components:

- (1) A detailed course sequence (conceptual, operational or theoretical)
- (2) An in-class sequence, including the required prerequisite sequences for each course,
- (3) A summary for each course,
- (4) One synthesizer for each course,
- (5) Analogy as required,
- (6) As many cognitive strategy activators as needed
- (7) Appropriate extent of learner control (Reigeluth, 1987, 258).

Basic Strategies of Elaboration Theory of Instruction

Organized structure

Identify a single organizational structure for the course that reflects the primary focus of instruction. This organizational structure can be one of three types: conceptual, operational or theoretical. Reigeluth (1987, p.249) says, in all the studies in the sequence, the details that are based on concepts, principles and operationalism are the three most fundamental things we show. Again, according to Reigeluth (1987, p.248), careful analysis has shown that almost one of these three courses holds more

important than the other two, as a reason for using a single organizational structure. The other two types of content 'only emerge when they are closely related to certain content editing ideas offered at every point of the course' (Reigeluth and Stein, 1983, p.344).

Sequence from simple to complex

Continuing instruction throughout the specified structure is designed from simple to complex with supportive content added into the courses. Concrete begins with a course that includes a few of the most basic and representative ideas (taught) at the application (or skill) level (Reigeluth, 1987, p.248). This first course is called the "epitome". In successive courses, successive layers of complexity are added according to the categories of the organizational structure. For conceptually arranged instruction, "first present the easiest, most known organizational contents" (Reigeluth, 198, p.251). Present the steps for operations based on their performance. For theoretically regulated teaching, it moves from simple to complex. Immediately after editing the relevant content, the supporting content is placed. The prerequisite information is added to the content. Content is delivered simultaneously, not in series. Basic principles are taught before the associated procedure.

Summarizers

Summarizers are content reviews at both the course and unit level (presented in a sample application format).

Synthesizers

Synthesizers are schematic presentation tools designed to help the learner make the content elements a meaningful whole and associate them with previous knowledge. Helps the content structure to be open to the student; exemplify, include a subject hierarchy, a procedure flowchart, and a cause and effect model indicated by arrows.

Analogies

Analogies relate the content to the previous knowledge of the students. Effective analogies will tend to show a strong resemblance to the content; weaker analogies will differ more from the similarities with the target content. (Reigeluth and Stein, 1983).

Activators of Cognitive Strategy

Various tips, schemes, reminders and so on can trigger the necessary cognitive strategies for the proper processing (Reigeluth and Stein, 1983, p.362). The continuous use of these activators can lead students to understand when and where to apply various cognitive strategies to learning materials.

Learner Control

Reigeluth and Stein (1983, p.362) believe that teaching generally increases with effectiveness. Productivity increases with motivated learners, that is, to the extent that conscious learner control is allowed (with a few minor exceptions). Learners are encouraged to be autonomous on both content and teaching strategy. Clearly marking and separation of strategy components ensure effective learning of these components. Regarding content, Reigeluth and Stein (1983, p.363) argue that "only a complex sequence can allow the learner to make an informed decision about the choice of content" because content choices are predicted to be meaningful.

Learner control refers to the degree to which learners can choose methods, timing, implementation and feedback during training (Milheim and Martin, 1991). The greatest advantage of learner control over traditional forms of education is the potential for students to continue education at their own pace, controlled by their own needs and preferences (Eom and Reiser, 2000). The ability to adjust their own order is a learner characteristic that can affect the ability of the student to benefit from controlled learning (Armstrong, 1989; Eom and Reiser, 2000). A student's perception of self-sufficiency can be measured by evaluating his / her abilities and the power of this belief (Bandura, 2003).

The first component is the most important one with respect to Elaboration Theory of Instruction. A detailed series is defined as a series from simple to complex, summarizing the ideas and skills that follow the first lesson. Although two or more types can be developed at the same time in the sample making, they should be based on a single content type (concepts, methods, principles) and should involve learning a few basic or representative ideas or skills at the application level.

Elaboration Theory of Instruction increases student motivation by creating meaningful learning contents in order to create more permanent cognitive structures and thus result in better memorization and transference. Providing information about the content allows learner control. The Elaboration Theory of Instruction is an extension of the work of Ausubel (pre-organizer) and Bruner (spiral curriculum).

With this research, the situation of Student Centered Education in Higher Education has been tried to be examined. The constructivist approach that is being applied in every level of education is accepted in many countries such as USA and Canada and affects the curricula developed (Fer and Cırık, 2007, p.20). The fact that the new primary and secondary education programs, which have started to be implemented in our country, has been prepared by utilizing the constructivist understanding principles, indicates that radical changes have started in the education system of our country. However, the effectiveness of these changes depends on teachers' practices. Because the education programs prepared can find life in the application areas.

Aim

The general purpose of this research is to determine the level of Learner Control Strategy used in the lessons based on the opinions of Law School students studying at Private and State Universities. For this general purpose, the following questions will also be answered:

1. To what extent is the Learner Control Strategy used in the teaching processes of the courses in the Law Faculties of Private and State Universities?
2. Is there a difference between the use of Learner Control Strategy according to the grade levels of the Law Faculties of Private and State Universities?

Significance

It is expected that the research will create awareness about the use of Constructivist Learning Theory in the teaching processes in universities. It is also expected that the research will provide an overview of the learning processes in Private and State Universities. With this research, it will be determined at which levels the Learner Control Strategy, which is one of the seven basic elements of Elaboration Theory of Instruction in general, is used by the lecturers in the teaching process of the courses in the Law Faculties of private and public universities. In addition, the research will determine whether there is a difference in the use of the strategy according to the grade levels of students studying in Law Faculties (State and Private Universities) so that the sectioning approach within the Single Screening Model which is one of the General Screening Models will be used (Karasar, 1995). On the other hand, it is expected that some longitudinal data will be obtained from the General Survey Models. The research is expected to raise awareness on the quality of teaching processes not only in primary and secondary education but also in higher education.

Method

Research Model

This research is a descriptive study in Relational Screening Model. In the research, the levels of using the "Learner Control" strategy of the lecturers during the teaching process in Law Faculties of State and Private Universities will be determined. As it is known, relational surveys are research models aiming to determine the presence and / or degree of change between two or more variables (Karasar, 1995, p.81). In addition, this research will determine whether there is a difference in the use of the strategy stated in the opinions of students studying at

Law Faculties (State and Private Universities) according to their classes so that the sectioning approach within the Single Screening Model which is one of the General Screening Models will be used.

Data Collection Tool

As a Data Collection Tool, "Learner Control Use Strategy Scale consisting of 28 items and 7 dimensions was used. Validity and Reliability Study of this scale was conducted by Kutlu (2012, pp.244-250). Dimensions of the scale are; (1) UASWS: Use of Appropriate Strategy and Working Skills, (2) CAIAS: Control of Appropriate Information at Appropriate Speed, (3) CDMS: Control Decision Making Skills, (4) CC: Content Control, (5) IQC: Information Quantity Control, (6) ILRC: Individual Learning Responsibility Control and (7) DLS: Determination of Learning Strategies.

Population and Sample

The working population of the study is the students studying in the Law Faculties of Private and State Universities in Adana and Mersin. The sample of the research is 335 students studying at the Faculties and identified by means of Simple Random Sampling (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1993, p.86). However, in the determination of these students, due to the fact that the instructors who prepared the paper had lectures in the Law Faculties, the scale was applied to the students in the Law Faculties of Private and State Universities and in this respect, it could be called as the Working Group Purposed Sample (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1993, p.89).

Analysis of Data

In analysis of Data, %, Frequency, Standard Deviation and Independent Groups t-test and one-way analysis of variance techniques will be used. Whether the variance is homogeneous in determining independent groups t test will be determined by Levene's test which is based on F statistic and p value.

Findings and Interpretation

Table 1. According to total and sub-dimensions; opinions of students studying in law faculties of private and state universities regarding the level of use of learner control strategy of instructors in courses

	Groups	n	x	ss	sd	t	p
LCS (Total)	Ç. U. Faculty of Law	153	95,80	15,50	333	4,196	.000*
	Çağ U. Faculty of Law	182	87,80	18,84			
UASWS	Ç. U. Faculty of Law	154	19,62	4,53	334	4,335	.000*
	Çağ U. Faculty of Law	182	17,29	5,19			
CAIAS	Ç. U. Faculty of Law	154	23,02	3,95	334	1,512	.132
	Çağ U. Faculty of Law	182	22,27	4,97			
CDMS	Ç. Ü. Faculty of Law	154	19,41	4,37	334	5,244	.000*

	Çağ U. Faculty of Law si	182	16,57	5,38			
CC	Ç. U. Faculty of Law	153	15,06	2,72	333	4,839	.000*
	Çağ U. Faculty of Law i	182	13,52	3,06			
CAI	Ç. U. Faculty of Law	154	7,34	1,83	334	-6,927	.000*
	Çağ U. Faculty of Law	182	8,75	1,87			
ILRC	Ç. U. Faculty of Law	154	5,06	1,92	334	-6,938	.000*
	Çağ U. Faculty of Law	182	3,63	1,77			
DLS	Ç. U. Faculty of Law	154	6,24	1,91	334	2,135	.034*
	Çağ U. Faculty of Law	182	5,77	2,10			

*p<.05

LCS: Learner Control Scale / UASWS: Use of Appropriate Strategies and Working Skills / CAIAS: Controlling Appropriate Information at an Appropriate Speed / CDMS: Controlling Decision Making Skills / CC: Content Ccontrol / CAI: Controlling the Amount of Information / ILRC: Individual Learning Responsibility Control / DLS: Determining Learning Strategies

According to the values in Table 1, Çukurova University Faculty of Law students received an average score of 95.80 from the Learner Control Scale (LCS); 87.80 students of Çağ University Faculty of Law. According to the results of the t-test, there was a significant difference between the two groups at p <.05 level. This difference was realized in favor of the state university [t (333) = 4,196, p = .000].

Table 2. According to total and sub-dimensions; opinions of 1st and 4th grade students studying in law faculties of private and state universities regarding the level of use of learner control strategy in classes

	Class Level (General)	Çukurova Uni. Faculty of Law Class Level	Çağ Uni. Fac. of Law Class Level
Learner Control Scale Total	,258*	,204*	,249**
Use of Appropriate Strategy and Working Skills	,215**	,138	,218**
Use of Appropriate Information at the Appropriate Speed	,191**	,188*	,182*
Decision Making Skills	,220**	,117	,222**
Content Control	,151**	,095	,111
Checking the Amount of Information	,071	,220**	,129
Individual Learning Responsibilities	,184**	,099	,137
Determination of Learning Strategies	,262**	,185*	,308**

*p<.01 **p<.05

According to the results of Pearson Correlation Coefficient in Table 2, students' scores on Learner Control Use Scale increase as the grade level increases. There is a significant positive relationship [r (336) =, 258, p =, 000]. When the correlation

between subscales and grade level is examined, there was a significant positive relationship between "Use of Appropriate Strategy and Working Skills" [$r(337) = .215, p = .000$], Control the Appropriate Information at the Appropriate Speed "[$r(336) = .191, p = .000$], "Decision Making Skills" [$r(337) = .220, p = .000$], "Content Control" [$r(336) = .151, p = .006$], "Individual Learning Responsibility" [$r(337) = .184, p = .001$], and "Determining Learning Strategies" [$r(337) = .262, p = .000$]. As the grade level increased, there was no increase in Control of the Amount of Information [[$r(337) = .193, p = .071$].

There is a significant positive correlation between the grade level of the students of Çukurova University Faculty of Law and the total score obtained from the Learner Control Scale [$r(153) = .204, p = .011$]. When the correlation between subscales and grade level is examined, it was found to have a significant positive relationship between Control the appropriate information at the appropriate speed "[$r(154) = .188, p = .020$], Determination of Learning Strategies [$r(153) = .185, p = .021$] and the amount of information control [$r(153) = .484, p = .000$]. However, there was no significant relationship between Decision Making Skills with class [$r(154) = .117, p = .150$], Content Control "[$r(153) = .245, p = .095$]," Individual Learning Responsibility [$r(154) = .220, p = .099$] and Use of Appropriate Strategy and Working Skills "[$r(154) = .138, p = .087$].

There is a significant positive correlation between the grade level of the students of Çağ University Law Faculty and the total score obtained from the Learner Control Scale. [$r(182) = .249, p = .001$]. When the correlation between subscales and grade level is examined, a significant relationship was observed between Controlling Appropriate Information at the Appropriate Rate "[$r(182) = .182, p = .014$], Determination of Learning Strategies [$r(182) = .308, p = .000$]," Decision Giving Skills [$r(182) = .222, p = .003$] and "Use of Appropriate Strategy and Working Skills [$r(182) = .218, p = .003$]. However, there was no significant relationship between with the class and "Content Control" [$r(182) = .111, p = .137$], "Individual Learning Responsibility [$r(182) = .137, p = .066$] and the amount of information control [$r(182) = .129, p = .083$].

Conclusion and Discussion

According to the students' opinions about the Levels of Using the Learner Control Strategy öğretim of the lecturers in the courses of Law Faculty of Private and State Universities, it is seen that there is a significant difference between the two groups at the level of $p = .05$ and this difference is realized in favor of the students of the state university. According to this result; The students at private universities adopt the teaching methods applied during their learning process and prefer them more than the students at the state university. The main reason for this situation can be said that the students of private universities find it more appropriate to be passive

during their teaching process in the first years or they try to be more effective in the courses as a result of the working conditions of private universities in general. On the other hand, it was observed that the higher the grade level of students in both universities, the higher the level of use of the learner control strategy in the teaching process. This shows that as the class levels of the students increase, they have entered into a fast orientation from passivity to activity in the lessons and they become more questionable and effective in their learning processes. Because, it can be interpreted that especially senior students who are studying in Law Faculties and chosen as sample in this research are gradually starting to realize the problems that await them when they come into contact with real life and as a result they become active in the courses.

References

- Armstrong, A. M. (1989). Persistence and the causal perception of failure: modifying cognitive attributions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70(2), 154-166.
- Bandura, A., & Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goals effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 87-99.
- Eom, W., & Reiser, R. A. (2000). The effects of self-regulation and instructional control on performance and motivation in computer-based instruction. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 27(3), 247-261.
- Farrell, I. H. (2000). *Navigation tools effect on learners' achievement and attitude* (Dissertation Thesis). Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia.
- Fer S., & Cırık, İ. (2007). *Yapılandırmacı öğrenme, kuramdan uygulamaya*. İstanbul: Morpa Yayıncılık.
- Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (1993). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. NY.: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Hoffman, S. (1997). Elaboration theory and hypermedia: Is there a link? *Educational Technology*, 3 (1).
- Karadağ, E., Deniz, S., Korkmaz, S., & Deniz, G. (2008). Yapılandırmacı öğrenme yaklaşımı: sınıf öğretmenleri görüşleri kapsamında bir araştırma. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21(2), 383-402.
- Karasar, N. (1995). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: 3A Araştırma Eğitim Danışmanlık.
- Karataş Coşkun, M. (2017). İçeriğin öğretim için düzenlenmesi. İçinde *Öğretim ilke ve yöntemleri* (ss. 90-140). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Köymen, Ü. (1996). Öğretim yöntemlerinin kuramsal temelleri ve tarih öğretiminden bir örnek. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 20 (100), 34-43.
- Kutlu, M.O. (2002). Öğretimi ayrıntılaşma kuramına dayalı matematik öğretimi ve bilgisayar destekli sunumun başarı ve kalıcılığa etkisi. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim fakültesi Dergisi*, Özel Sayı, 2. Uluslararası Eğitim Teknolojileri Sempozyum ve Fuarı Bildirileri, 4, 305-322.

- Kutlu, M.O. (2012). Developing a scale on the usage of learner control strategy. *Educational Research and Reviews*,7(10),244-250.
- Merrill, M.D., Kelety, J.C., & Wilson, M. (1981). Elaborative theory and cognitive psychology. *Instructional Science*, 10(3), 217-235.
- Merrill, M. D. (1983). *Instructional design theories and models*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Milheim, W. D., & Martin, B. L. (1991). Theoretical bases for the use of learner control: Three different perspectives. *Journal of ComputerBasedInstruction*, 18(3), 99-105.
- Reigeluth, C.M., & Darwezah, A.N. (1982). *The Elaboration theory's procedure for designing instruction; A conceptualapproach*. *Journal of Instructional Development*, 5, 22-32.
- Reigeluth, C.M.(Ed.). (1983). *Instructional Design Theorie sand Models, An overview of their current status*. Hillsdale, NJ: ErlbaumAssociates.
- Reigeluth, C., & Stein, R. (1983). *The elaboration theory of instruction*. In C. Reigeluth (ed.), *Instructional Design Theories and Models*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Reigeluth, C. M. (1987). Lesson blue prints based on the elaboration theory of Instruction. InC. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional theories in action; Lessons illustrating selected theories and models* (pp.245-288). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.