

*Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article***Teachers' Self-Regulation: An Analysis of Their Levels and Perceptions***Öğretmenlerin Öz-Düzenleme Becerileri: Düzeyleri ve Algılarının İncelenmesi*Solmaz AYDIN BEYTUR<sup>1</sup>DOI : [10.63556/ankad.v10i2.396](https://doi.org/10.63556/ankad.v10i2.396)

Geliş/Received: 10/12/2025

Kabul/Accepted: 01/03/2026

**Abstract**

The self-regulation process, the importance of which is increasingly understood in educational environments, has become an issue that needs to be emphasized for teachers who will teach students about self-regulation and guide them in this regard. Therefore, this study aims to analyze teachers' self-regulation levels and examine their perceptions of self-regulation. General survey model is used in this study. The study group of the study consists of 123 teachers working in Kars. Self-Regulation Scale is used as a data collection tool to determine the self-regulation levels of teachers in the study, moreover, an open-ended question is asked "What is self-regulation? Explain" in order to determine teachers' perceptions on self-regulation. The results from the study show that the self-regulation levels of the teachers participating in the study are at a medium level. Teachers have high levels of self-reinforcement and low levels of self-monitoring and self-evaluation skills. There is no significant difference between male and female teachers in terms of levels of self-regulation. It is also determined that teachers cannot fully define self-regulation, but they have little knowledge about self-regulation processes.

**Keywords:** Perception of self-regulation, self-regulation, teacher

**Öz**

Gün geçtikçe eğitim ortamlarında önemi anlaşılan öz-düzenleme süreci, öz-düzenlemeyi öğrencilere öğretecek olan ve bu konuda onlara rehberlik edecek olan öğretmenler açısından üzerinde durulması gereken bir konu olmuştur. Bu nedenle bu çalışmanın amacı öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme seviyelerinin ve öz-düzenlemeye ilişkin algılarının belirlenmesi şeklindedir. Bu araştırmada genel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu Kars ilinde görev yapmakta olan 123 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme seviyelerini belirlemek amacıyla veri toplama aracı olarak Öz-Düzenleme Ölçeği kullanılmıştır, öğretmenlerin öz-düzenlemeye yönelik algılarını belirlemek amacıyla da "Öz-düzenleme nedir? Açıklayınız" şeklinde açık uçlu bir soru yöneltilmiştir. Çalışmadan elde edilen bulgular göstermektedir ki çalışmaya katılan öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme seviyeleri iyi düzeydedir. Kadın ve erkek öğretmenler arasında öz-düzenleme seviyeleri açısından anlamlı bir fark bulunmamaktadır. Ayrıca öğretmenlerin öz-düzenlemeyi tam olarak tanımlayamadıkları fakat öz-düzenleme süreçleri hakkında az da olsa bilgi sahibi oldukları belirlenmiştir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Öz düzenleme algısı, öz düzenleme, öğretmen

**1. INTRODUCTION**

When the educational environment is considered, researchers are interested in how students are motivated for learning, how they can organize their own learning processes, and whether they use learning strategies. The importance of the self-regulation process, which affects the mechanisms such as motivation, performance skills and strategy selection for students, is becoming more and more important day by day. Zimmerman (2000) views self-regulation as a repeating cycle in which individuals intentionally guide their own thoughts, emotions, and behaviors to reach personal goals. Self-regulated students are motivated to learn, can set their own goals, are aware of their own limitations, take

<sup>1</sup> Sorumlu Yazar/Corresponding Author, Prof. Dr., Kafkas University, Dede Korkut Educational Faculty, Department of Mathematics and Science Education, Kars, Türkiye. E-mail; [solmazaydn@gmail.com](mailto:solmazaydn@gmail.com)

**Önerilen Atf/Suggestion Citation**

Aydın Beytur, S., (2026). Teachers' Self-Regulation: An Analysis of Their Levels and Perceptions, *Anadolu Kültürel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 10(2), 1031-1045.

responsibility for their own learning processes, can create a suitable learning environment, choose learning strategies that are appropriate to their goals, know their strengths and weaknesses, are good at problem solving, and are confident in their own abilities (Aydın & Demir Atalay, 2015; Gaskill & Woolfolk Hoy, 2002; Rott, 2013; Zimmerman 2002).

The teacher, who is the person who carries out the educational process in the school environment, has an important role in helping students gain self-regulation behaviors. Because teachers are models for students. The better teachers understand the nature of self-regulation and how it develops, the better they can be role models and guides for their students (Paris & Winograd, 2003). The fact that self-regulation skill is such an important issue in a student's educational life suggests that students should be taught and developed self-regulation skills. When the development process of self-regulation skills is examined, it is seen that self-regulation, which begins in the 36th month of the child, continues to develop especially in childhood and until the twenties (Kopp, 1982; Raffaelli, Crockett & Shen, 2005). Therefore, students' self-regulation skills develop not only within the family but also, and importantly, through the support and guidance of teachers. In this context, for teachers to act as effective role models and to foster self-regulation in their students, they must themselves possess well-developed self-regulation skills. Accordingly, examining the nature and level of teachers' self-regulation skills is a critical issue. Research conducted in this area is expected to contribute to the relevant literature, enhance the teaching and learning process, and inform teacher education programs.

### 1.1. Self-Regulation

Self-regulated learning (SRL) is a multifaceted construct that includes cognitive, metacognitive, motivational, emotional, and behavioral aspects of learning. It brings together various psychological mechanisms that shape the way individuals approach and engage in learning. Because of this broad scope, SRL has become a central topic of research in educational psychology (Panadero, 2017). Zimmerman (2000) describes self-regulation as a recurring cycle in which learners actively generate and regulate their own thoughts, emotions, and actions to achieve personal objectives. Within educational contexts, SRL refers to students' ability to organize and oversee their own learning activities, particularly in classroom and school environments (Pintrich, 2000).

SRL includes processes such as setting goal-oriented purposes, planning and determining strategies in line with this plan, implementation and self-evaluation. Therefore, students will need a guide when performing these processes (Aydın & Demir Atalay, 2015). Florez (2011) emphasizes that effective teaching of self-regulation to children fundamentally depends on the teacher's own self-regulatory capabilities. Children acquire the skills to manage their thoughts, emotions, and behaviors by observing and internalizing the self-regulatory strategies exhibited by adults. According to Çapa-Aydın, Sungur, and Uzunıryaki (2009), self-regulated teachers evaluate their teaching by taking into account their prior performance, student responses, and the attainment of predetermined lesson goals. In addition, the relevant literature shows that teachers with good self-regulation have a better level of performance and success in their lessons (Gol & Royaei, 2013; Toussi, Boori & Ghanizadeh, 2011).

Ortube et al. (2024) stated in their study that the pedagogical skills of teacher candidates who learn SRL also improve. Arcoverde et al. (2022) stated that teacher candidates should be encouraged to develop their self-regulation skills in teacher education programmes. In this way, teacher candidates can manage their own learning and develop the skills of their future students. Studies emphasise that teachers need to be good SRL professionals in order to support students' self-regulation (Karlen et al., 2020; Ortube et al., 2024).

### 1.2. Kanfer's Self-Regulation Model

The basis of this study is Kanfer's three-stage self-regulation model. Critical variables of self-regulation are proposed in this model. These variables are (a) self-monitoring, (b) self-evaluation, and (c) self-reinforcement (Kanfer, 1970, 1971; Kanfer & Hagerman, 1987; Kanfer & Karoly, 1972). As a result of a series of experiments and laboratory observations on self-reinforcement in Kanfer's self-regulation model, it was determined that self-regulation has a three-component structure (Kanfer & Hagerman, 1981). In this model, the first stage is self-monitoring. It is based on the person's conscious monitoring and observation of himself. The second stage, self-evaluation, is the evaluation of one's own behavior according to internal values or criteria. Self-reinforcement, on the other hand, uses external factors

(verbal expressions, rewards, etc.) to motivate oneself (Brown, 1998). Studies on this subject emphasize that self-monitoring and self-evaluation can be one of the main sources of teacher motivation (Cardelle-Elawar and Lizarraga, 2010; Schunk and Zimmerman, 2003).

In Kanfer's self-regulation model, self-regulation is seen as a goal-oriented process. In addition, in this model, it is stated that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is effective in an individual's learning. In this model, individuals set their learning goals, monitor their own behaviors, cognitions, and motivations, and engage in self-control and self-regulatory processes (Eker, 2014). Therefore, these aspects are also of importance for teachers' self-regulation.

Pintrich (2000) states that all self-regulation models agree that students are in a position to direct their own learning and assume that they use self-regulated activities together to access information in order to be successful. Therefore, in this process, students set goals for their own learning, monitor and regulate their behavior, and take initiative. In this process, teachers will both teach them self-regulation processes through their own self-regulation and plan the teaching process according to self-regulation. Teachers set goals in the teaching process, determine content according to this goal, and choose appropriate teaching methods. In order to achieve their pedagogical goals, teachers must self-regulate the teaching process and have professional motivation (Karlen, Hertel & Hirt, 2020). Effective teachers are teachers who can achieve self-regulation processes in teaching (Ali & Yasmeen, 2019). Therefore, teacher self-regulation is important in the educational process. However, it seems that the studies on this subject in the literature are insufficient (Çapa-Aydın, Sungur & Uzuntiryaki, 2009; Gol & Royaei, 2013; Toussi, Boori & Ghanizadeh, 2011; Sáez-Delgado et al., 2022).

### **1.3. Research problem and research questions**

When the studies on self-regulation are examined, it is seen that the studies generally focus on the self-regulation skills of pre-service teachers (Bembenutty, 2007; Buzza & Allinotte, 2013; Cho, Cheon & Lim, 2021; Jurisevic, Lavrih, Lisic, Podlogar & Zerak, 2021; Sumantri, Prayuningtyas, Rachmadtullah & Magdalena, 2018; Şenler, 2011). Although Kanfer's self-regulation model forms the basis of this study, there appears to be a scarcity of research exploring self-reinforcement, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation processes specifically among teachers (Allinder et al., 2000). Most existing studies have centered on students, and recent research on teachers in this context remains limited (Neilans & Israel, 1981; Spates & Kanfer, 1977; Wall, 1982).

This study is important in that it addresses not only teachers' observable self-regulation behaviors but also their perceptions of their own self-regulation skills. The level of self-regulation refers to the extent to which teachers employ cognitive, behavioral, and motivational regulation strategies in their professional practice. In this sense, self-regulated learning is commonly described as an active and constructive process in which individuals set learning goals and monitor and regulate their cognition, behavior, and motivation in order to achieve these goals (Pintrich, 2000; Panadero, 2017). By contrast, perceived self-regulation reflects individuals' self-reported evaluations of how frequently and effectively they use self-regulation strategies (Vermunt, 1998; Roth et al., 2016). Considering these two dimensions together is crucial, as individuals who perceive themselves as highly self-regulated may not always demonstrate corresponding levels of self-regulatory behavior. Such discrepancies may influence teachers' capacity to serve as effective role models for students and to support the development of students' self-regulation skills. Consistent with this view, previous research has examined the degree of alignment between self-reported self-regulation and behavioral process indicators, suggesting that these measures do not always fully overlap (Siadaty, Gasevic & Hatala, 2016; Han & Ellis, 2023).

Therefore, it is considered essential to investigate teachers' self-regulation levels and their perceptions of self-regulation in order to contribute to the existing body of literature. In line with this aim, the study seeks to answer the following sub-questions.

- (1) What are the self-regulation levels of teachers?
- (2) Do the self-regulation levels of teachers differ by gender?
- (3) How do teachers perceive self-regulation?

## 2. METHOD

### 2.1. Research Design

This study was conducted using the general survey model. Teachers' self-regulation levels were assessed using the Self-Regulation Scale developed by Aydın, Özer Keskin, and Yel (2014).

In this study, teachers' perceived self-regulation was explored through an open-ended question asking participants to describe what self-regulation means to them (What is self-regulation? Explain). This question aimed to reveal how teachers conceptualize and interpret the notion of self-regulation and the meanings they attribute to it. Rather than assessing the extent to which teachers actually employ self-regulatory strategies in practice, the question focuses on their perceptions and conceptual awareness of self-regulation. In this respect, the qualitative data obtained from the open-ended responses were used to represent teachers' perceived self-regulation and were considered complementary to the quantitative findings derived from the self-regulation scale.

### 2.2. Participants

The study group of the research consists of 123 teachers working in the province of Kars in Turkey. All teachers who can be reached in the study and who want to voluntarily fill in the data collection tools are included in the study. The data collection tools were applied to the teachers in their own working environments by the researcher. There are teachers from 22 different branches and 58.5% (72 people) of which are female and 41.5% (51) of which are male teachers. In addition, 81.3% (100 people) of teachers have a professional seniority between 0 and 5 years and 18.7% (23 people) have a professional seniority of more than 5 years. The teachers were informed about the study, and that they could withdraw at any time.

### 2.3. Instruments

Both quantitative and qualitative data are collected from teachers in the study. The Self-Regulation Scale, which is developed to determine the self-regulation levels of teachers, is used as a data collection tool in the study. Quantitative data are collected from teachers with the Self-Regulation Scale.

Also, qualitative data has been achieved with Demographic information form. The demographic information form includes questions about teachers' demographic characteristics and an open-ended question "What is self-regulation? Please explain" to determine teachers' perceptions of self-regulation. These obtained qualitative data are converted into quantitative data by content analysis and expressed and evaluated as frequency (f) and percentage (%).

Self-Regulation Scale: The Self-Regulation Scale developed by Brown, Miller and Lawendowski (1999) and adapted into Turkish by Aydın, Özer Keskin and Yel (2014) is used as a data collection tool to determine the self-regulation levels of teachers in the study. The basic structure of the scale is based on the seven-stage self-regulation model of Miller and Brown (1991). This self-regulation model was developed based on Kanfer's (1970) three-stage self-regulation model. As a result of the factor analysis carried out in the study of adapting the scale to Turkish, it was determined that the scale had three factors and was suitable for Kanfer's self-regulation model. In this way, the Turkish form of the scale is used with three factors.

The scale consists of 51 items and three sub-dimensions as self-reinforcement (29 items), self-monitoring (18 items) and self-evaluation (4 items). In addition, the scale has a 5-point Likert-type rating in the range of "strongly agree" (5), "strongly disagree" (1). The reliability coefficient of the scale is Cronbach Alfa .87.

The adaptation study of the self-regulation scale into Turkish is carried out with pre-service teachers. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is applied to the scale since it will be studied with in-service teachers in this study. As a result of the CFA conducted on the scale with 154 teachers, it is determined that the factor load values and scale procedural values of items 1, 12, 22, 23, 28 and 47 of the self-reinforcement dimension for the self-regulation scale applied to the teachers are very low and these items are removed from the scale. Accordingly, the sub-dimension of self-reinforcement is reduced to 23 items and the self-regulation scale for teachers is analyzed as 45 items. As a result of CFA using Lisrell 8.8 (Jöreskog and Sörbom, 2006) program, it is determined that the model is acceptably compatible with the data

( $\chi^2(933) = 1750.41$ ,  $p < .01$ ;  $\chi^2/df = 1.87$ ,  $RMSEA = 0.076$ ,  $SRMR = 0.09$ ,  $CFI = .90$ ,  $IFI = .90$ ). In addition, the reliability coefficient of the 45-item scale is determined as Cronbach Alfa .75.

The 45-item self-regulation scale obtained by CFA was applied to the in-service teachers, the study group of the research, and the obtained data was evaluated.

## 2.4. Research Ethics

This research was conducted in accordance with ethical principles throughout the conceptual framework, application of data collection tools, data collection, analysis, and interpretation phases. The ANKAD Editorial Board assumes no responsibility for any ethical violations encountered. All responsibility lies with the authors. I hereby declare that this work has not been submitted for evaluation to any academic publication platform other than ANKAD. All rules specified in the "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" were adhered to in this study. None of the actions specified in the second section of the directive, "Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics," were taken. "Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee of Kafkas University" approved the data collection procedures. Ethics Committee's decision date: 20.10.2021. Issue 23, decision 19.

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1. Self-regulation levels of teachers

According to the data obtained from the study, mean and standard deviation values are determined for the whole and sub-dimensions of the self-regulation scale applied to determine the self-regulation levels of the teachers (See Table 1).

**Table 1.** The descriptive statistics on the self-regulation levels of the teachers

	<i>N</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>S</i>
Self-Reinforcement	123	4.07	.41
Self-Monitoring	123	2.14	.60
Self-Evaluation	123	2.36	.69
General Self-Regulation	123	3.17	.23

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that the general self-regulation level of teachers is 3.17. When the score range (highest value – lowest value/5) is calculated for the arithmetic average on the scales with a 5-point Likert structure, its value is 0.80. When Table 1 is examined with this score range, the value of 3.17 corresponds to the range of 2.61-3.4. In other words, it corresponds to the "I am undecided (3)" option of the scale. Therefore, it can be said that the self-regulation levels of teachers are moderate.

When the sub-dimensions of the self-regulation scale are examined, it is seen that the average self-reinforcement dimension of teachers is the highest compared to other sub-dimensions (4.07). When it is evaluated with a five-point Likert scale, this value corresponds to the range of 3.41-4.2, namely "I agree (4)". Teachers therefore have a high level of self-reinforcement. In other words, teachers see extrinsic rewards and verbal expressions as a means to motivate them.

When the dimensions of self-monitoring and self-evaluation are examined, it is understood that teachers have a low average in these dimensions (Self-monitoring: 2.14; Self-evaluation 2.36). This finding shows that teachers cannot observe their own behavior at a good level and cannot evaluate themselves sufficiently.

### 3.2. The self-regulation levels of the teachers according to gender variable

MANOVA test is performed to determine whether the self-regulation levels of teachers differed by gender variable. Self-reinforcement, self-monitoring, self-evaluation and general self-efficacy variables are considered as dependent variables and gender is considered as independent variables in this analysis. The normality, linearity, extreme values, Mahalanobis distance, variance-covariance matrix homogeneity of the data are checked for the MANOVA test. It is seen that the data provide the MANOVA assumptions. The descriptive statistics of self-regulation scores of teachers are given in Table 2 and the results of MANOVA are given in Table 3.

**Table 2.** The descriptive statistical results for the gender variable

		<i>N</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>S</i>
Self-Reinforcement	Female	72	4.08	.45
	Male	51	4.05	.36
Self-Monitoring	Female	72	2.13	.63
	Male	51	2.17	.56
Self-Evaluation	Female	72	2.34	.68
	Male	51	2.38	.71
General Self-Regulation	Female	72	3.16	.25
	Male	51	3.17	.19

**Table 3.** The results of MANOVA Test for the self-regulation levels of teachers according to gender variable

	Wilks' Lambda	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	$\eta^2$
Self-Reinforcement	.99	.072	.72	.001
Self-Monitoring			.68	.001
Self-Evaluation			.76	.001
General Self-Regulation			.87	.000

According to the findings obtained as a result of the MANOVA test in Table 3, the Wilks' Lambda value shows that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers in terms of self-regulation levels ( $F(3.119) = .072, p=.97$ ; Wilks' Lambda=.99; Partial Eta squared=.002). It is seen that there is no significant difference in terms of general self-regulation and sub-dimensions ( $p>.05$ ). In addition, when the average point values of female and male teachers are examined, it is understood that there is no difference in terms of self-reinforcement, self-monitoring, self-evaluation and general self-regulation levels of female and male teachers, in other words, the average values of female and male teachers are very close to each other (See Table 2).

### 3.3. The perceptions of teachers about self-regulation

The responses to the open-ended question "What is self-regulation? Please explain." were subjected to content analysis and quantified. Of the 123 teachers in the study group, 24 left this question unanswered. Thus, similar statements in the data obtained from 99 teachers in total are gathered under a single expression and are expressed as frequency (*f*) and percentage (%) (Table 4).

**Table 4.** The perceptions of teachers about self-regulation

<b>Teachers' statements</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>%</b>
It is the ability to be aware of one's own behavior and to control it.	23	18,6
It is the ability to evaluate oneself	18	14,6
It is the control of one's own behavior, self-knowledge and direction accordingly.	12	9,7
It is the ability to know oneself and act accordingly	7	5,6
It is the person's attempt to achieve the goals by setting goals.	6	4,8
It is the ability to regulate one's own behavior	6	4,8
It is the ability to control one's own learning and organize the learning environment It's the ability to know oneself	5	4,0
It is the control and regulation of the individual's own cognitive processes.	4	3,2
It is the regulation of behavior in accordance with social life	2	1,6
It is the awareness of self-sufficiency	2	1,6
It is the person's own principles and plans	2	1,6
It is to use different methods and techniques in training	2	1,6
It is to plan one's life by learning from mistakes	2	1,6
It is to put one's plans into practice respectively	1	0,8
It is to decide how the person will do the work	1	0,8
It is to maintain self-discipline and self-control	1	0,8
It is the plan, program created for the course and their evaluation	1	0,8
It is to live in a planned way	1	0,8
It is ability to choose the appropriate method and technique to achieve the determined goals	1	0,8
It is the evaluation of the appropriate use of resources	1	0,8
No response	24	19,5
<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>100,0</b>

It is tried to understand how teachers perceive self-regulation with the question "What is self-regulation?" directed to teachers. Accordingly, when the responses of the teacher given in Table 4 are examined, 80.4% of the teachers define self-regulation and 19.5% do not give any response. It is thought that this is due to the fact that teachers do not have any knowledge of the concept of self-regulation or do not want to answer the question. When the responses of teachers who define self-regulation are examined, the highest percentage of teachers (18.6%) define self-regulation as "It is the awareness of one's own behavior and the ability to control it". In addition, 14.6% of the teachers describe it as "It is the ability to evaluate oneself" and 9.7% of the teachers describe it as "It is the ability to control one's own behavior, know oneself and direct oneself accordingly". When these answers are considered, it is seen that teachers have knowledge about self-regulation processes, even if they cannot fully define self-regulation, and they perceive self-regulation correctly, albeit incompletely.

When the other answers given by the teachers are examined, it is seen that the teachers use expressions such as knowing oneself, setting goals, organizing their own learning process, choosing methods appropriate to their goals, and being aware of their own competence. Moreover, it seems that teachers have an idea about self-regulation processes. However, when considered that only one teacher uses each expression, it seems that teachers know self-regulation in a limited way and perceive it as a single process.

In addition, when some statements are examined, it is seen that a small number of teachers do not know or misunderstand self-regulation. The examples of this situation are "It is to use different methods and techniques in education" (1.6%), "The plan, program and their evaluation created for the lesson" (0.8%), "It is to evaluate whether the resources are used appropriately" (0.8%). It is a pleasing result that the number of teachers who do not know fully about self-regulation is low.

#### 4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study examines teachers' levels of self-regulation and their perceptions, emphasizing the pivotal role of self-regulation in effective teaching. The findings indicate that teachers, in general, display a moderate degree of self-regulation. As emphasized by Aydın and Demir Atalay (2015), teachers need to develop self-regulation skills in order to guide their students effectively throughout this

process. In this sense, teachers with higher levels of self-regulation are better equipped to foster similar skills in their students. Consistent with this view, Toussi, Boori, and Ghanizadeh (2011) reported that teachers with strong self-regulation tend to achieve greater success in their instructional practices. Likewise, Gol and Royaei (2013) demonstrated a positive relationship between teachers' self-regulation competencies and their job performance. Although Tillema and Kremer-Hayon (2002) highlight that research on teachers' self-regulation remains limited, the available evidence suggests that teachers who recognize the significance of self-regulation are more inclined to instill this competence in their students.

In addition, it is determined that teachers' self-reinforcement levels, which are among the sub-dimensions of self-regulation, are at a high level in the study. This shows us that teachers often need verbal expressions and extrinsic rewards to motivate themselves. Therefore, we can say that teachers who receive praise from their environment and are rewarded for their achievements are more motivated. Derks, van Laar, and Ellemers (2009) state that people who practice self-reinforcement gain more in the work environment by looking critically at their own performance and realize what appropriate behaviors are required to be successful. Hayes, et al. (1986) states that it is important to receive feedback on the accuracy of one's performance in order for the self-reinforcement process that motivates teachers to be effective. This shows that teachers will be more productive when they receive external reinforcements such as appreciation, reward, and praise in their profession.

Another conclusion from the study is that the self-monitoring and self-evaluation levels of teachers are low. This shows that teachers have deficiencies in observing and evaluating themselves. Sáez-Delgado et al. (2022) determined that male teachers had the lowest averages in the self-regulation process in the self-evaluation dimension. It is thought that teachers need to improve themselves in self-regulation and take their duties more seriously. Allinder, Bolling, Oats, and Gagnon (2000) state in their study with mathematics teachers that the performance of the students of the teachers who do self-monitoring is higher than the students of the teachers who do not do self-monitoring. Oliver, Wehby, and Nelson (2015) state in their studies that teachers' use of self-monitoring checklists helps classroom management practices. People who monitor themselves observe their own behavior and record these observations to decide how to achieve better performance (Bruhn, McDaniel & Kreigh, 2015). Therefore, a teacher who follows him/herself performs better and his/her students are more successful. When self-evaluation is considered, it is the comparison of one's own performance with the performance criteria to be reached (Spates & Kanfer; 1977). Wiyono (2018) determines that self-evaluation increases teachers' motivation, teamwork effectiveness, and teacher's development in school. In addition, the results of the study show that self-evaluation is positively related to job satisfaction (Iqbal, 2012; Zhang, Qing, Miao, & Peng, 2013). As a result, teachers' self-evaluation is an important issue in terms of their motivation, success and job satisfaction as it can be understood from the relevant literature.

The findings of the research further reveal that teachers' self-regulation levels do not significantly differ in relation to gender. When previous studies addressing this issue are examined, their results appear to be consistent with the findings of the present study. For example, Partovi and Tafazoli (2016) reported no significant relationship between teachers' gender and their self-regulation levels. In a similar vein, Ghonsooly and Ghanizadeh (2013) also found that gender does not constitute a distinguishing factor in teachers' self-regulation capacities. Taken together, these findings suggest that teachers' self-regulation may be shaped more by professional experiences, instructional contexts, and individual learning histories than by gender-related differences.

Another result obtained in the study is teachers' perceptions about self-regulation. As a result of the study, it is seen that teachers cannot fully define self-regulation, but they have little knowledge about self-regulation processes. People with self-regulation are successful people who know their own responsibilities and are able to organize their own lives (Zimmerman, 1989). Therefore, the teacher should be a good guide to the student in the learning process. Thus, teachers need to know self-regulation and have self-regulation skills (Aydın & Demir Atalay, 2015). However, the result of this study shows that teachers' knowledge about self-regulation is limited. Indeed, studies show parallelism with this. Dignath-van Ewijk and Van der Werf, (2012) determine that teachers support students' autonomy in their lessons, but do not teach them learning strategies in their study investigating whether teachers make practices that increase self-regulation in their lessons. Perry, Hutchinson, and Thauberger (2008) state in their study that teachers agree to support students to be self-regulated learners, but they do not know

exactly how to do this. Therefore, the studies show that teachers have deficiencies in self-regulation and should be supported in this regard.

## 5. FURTHER DIRECTIONS

Children spend most of their time with the teacher at school from pre-school to higher education. When the educational process is considered, the student both receives the information and learns many behaviors from the teacher. Therefore, a teacher who does not have self-regulation cannot be expected to teach his/her student self-regulation behaviors. For this reason, teachers need to have self-regulation skills and develop themselves in this regard. In addition, both the results of this study and the relevant literature show that teachers with self-regulation are motivated in their work. This situation needs to be taken into account. Teachers should try to overcome their deficiencies in self-regulation and should be supported in this regard.

## REFERENCES

- Ali, S., & Yasmeen, R. (2019). Practice to Preach Self-Regulation: Use of Metacognitive Strategies by Medical Teachers in Their Learning Practices. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 35(6), 1642–1646. <https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.35.6.550>
- Allinder, R. M., Bolling, R. M., Oats, R. G., & Gagnon, W. A. (2000). Effects of teacher self-monitoring on implementation of curriculum-based measurement and mathematics computation achievement of students with disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 21, 219-226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074193250002100403>
- Arcoverde, Â. R. D. R., Boruchovitch, E., Góes, N. M., & Acee, T. W. (2022). Self-regulated learning of Natural Sciences and Mathematics future teachers: Learning strategies, self-efficacy, and socio-demographic factors. *Psicologia: Reflexao e Critica*, 35, 1.
- Cardelle-Elawar, M., & Lizarraga, M. L. S. D. A. (2010). Looking at teacher identity through self-regulation. *Psicothema*, 293-298.
- Aydın, S. & Demir Atalay, T. (2015). *Öz-düzenlemeli Öğrenme [Self-Regulated Learning]*. Pegem Akademi
- Aydın, S., Keskin, M. Ö., & Yel, M. (2013). Öz-düzenleme ölçeğinin Türkçe uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması [Turkish adaptation of the self-regulation questionnaire: A study on validity and reliability]. *Turkish Journal of Education*, 3(1), 24-33.
- Bembenutty, H. (2007). Preservice Teachers' Motivational Beliefs and Self-Regulation of Learning. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Brown, J. M. (1998). Self-Regulation and The Addictive Behaviors. In W. R. Miller & N. Heather (Eds.), *Treating Addictive Behaviors* (pp. 61-74). New York: Plenum Press.
- Brown, J. M., Miller, W. R. & Lawendowski, L. A. (1999). The Self-Regulation Questionnaire. In L. VandeCreek & T. L. Jackson (Eds.), *Innovations in Clinical Practice: A Source Book* (pp. 281-289). Professional Resource Press.
- Bruhn, A., McDaniel, S., & Kreigh, C. (2015). Self-monitoring interventions for students with behavior problems: A systematic review of current research. *Behavioral Disorders*, 40(2), 102-121. <https://doi.org/10.17988/BD-13-45.1>
- Buzza, D., & Allinotte, T. (2013). Pre-service teachers' self-regulated learning and their developing concepts of SRL. *Brock Education Journal*, 23(1), 58-76. <https://doi.org/10.26522/brocked.v23i1.353>
- Cho, M. H., Cheon, J., & Lim, S. (2021). Preservice teachers' motivation profiles, self-regulation, and affective outcomes in online learning. *Distance Education*, 42(1), 37-54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2020.1869528>

- Çapa-Aydın, Y., Sungur, S., & Uzuntiryaki, E. (2009). Teacher self-regulation: examining a multidimensional construct. *Educational Psychology, 29*(3), 345-356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410902927825>
- Sáez-Delgado, F., López-Angulo, Y., Mella-Norambuena, J., Baeza-Sepúlveda, C., Contreras-Saavedra, C., & Lozano-Peña, G. (2022). Teacher self-regulation and its relationship with student self-regulation in secondary education. *Sustainability, 14*(24), 16863.
- Derks, B., van Laar, C., & Ellemers, N. (2009). Working for the Self or Working for the Group: How Self- Versus Group Affirmation Affects Collective Behavior in Low-Status Groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96* (1), 183. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0013068>
- Dignath-van Ewijk, C., & Van Der Werf, G. (2012). What teachers think about self-regulated learning: Investigating teacher beliefs and teacher behavior of enhancing students' self-regulation. *Education Research International, 2012*. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/741713>
- Eker, C. (2014). Öz-Düzenlemeli öğrenme modellerine karşılaştırmalı bir bakış. *Electronic Turkish Studies, 9*(8), 417-433.
- Florez, I. R. (2011). Developing young children's self-regulation through everyday experiences. *Young Children, 66*(4), 46-51
- Gaskill, P. J., & Hoy, A. W. (2002). Self-efficacy and self-regulated learning: The dynamic duo in school performance. In *Improving academic achievement* (pp. 185-208). Academic Press.
- Ghonsooly, B., & Ghanizadeh, A. (2013). Self-efficacy and self-regulation and their relationship: a study of Iranian EFL teachers. *The Language Learning Journal, 41*(1), 68-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2011.625096>
- Gol, A. K., & Royaei, N. (2013). EFL teachers' self-regulation and job performance. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(10), 1855. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.10.1855-1861>
- Han, F., & Ellis, R. A. (2023). Self-reported and digital-trace measures of students' self-regulated learning in blended course designs. *Education and Information Technologies, 28*, 13253–13268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11698-5>
- Hayes, S. C., Munt, E. D., Korn, Z., Wulfert, E., Rosenfarb, I., & Zettle, R. D. (1986). The effect of feedback and self-reinforcement instructions on studying performance. *The Psychological Record, 36*(1), 25.
- Iqbal, Y. (2012). Impact of core self evaluation (cse) on job satisfaction in education sector of Pakistan. *Journal of Global Strategic Management, 6*(2), 132–139.
- Jöreskog, K. G. & Sörbom, D., (2006). LISREL 8.80 for Windows [Computer Software]. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.
- Jurisevic, M., Lavrih, L., Lisic, A., Podlogar, N., & Zerak, U. (2021). Higher education students' experience of emergency remote teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic in relation to self-regulation and positivity. *CEPS Journal, 11*(Special Issue), 241-262.
- Kanfer, F. H. (1970). Self-regulation: Research, issues and speculations. In C. Neuringer & J. L. Michael (Eds.), *Behavior modification in clinical psychology*. Appleton- Century-Crofts.
- Kanfer, F. H. (1971). The maintenance of behavior by self-generated stimuli and reinforcement. In A. Jacobs & L. B. Sachs (Eds.), *The psychology of private events: Perspectives on covert response systems*. Academic Press,
- Kanfer, F. H. and Hagerman, S., (1981). The Role of Self-Regulation. In L. P. Rehm (Ed.), *Behavior Therapy for Depression* (pp. 143–179). Academic Press
- Kanfer, F. H., & Hagerman, S. (1987). A model of self - regulation. In F. Halisch & J. Kuhl (Eds.), *Motivation, intention, and volition* (pp. 293-307) Springer- Verlag.

- Kanfer, F. H., & Karoly, P. (1972). Self-regulation and its clinical application: Some additional conceptualizations. In R. C. Johnson, P. Dokecki, & O. Mowrer (Eds.), *Conscience, contrast and social reality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Karlen, Y., Hertel, S., & Hirt, C.N. (2020). Teachers' Professional Competences in Self-Regulated Learning: An Approach to Integrate Teachers' Competences as Self-Regulated Learners and as Agents of Self-Regulated Learning in a Holistic Manner. *Frontiers in Education*, 5, 159.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.00159>.
- Kopp, C. B. (1982). Antecedents of self-regulation: A developmental perspective. *Developmental Psychology*, 18, 199-214.
- Miller, W. R. & Brown, J. M. (1991). Self-regulation as a Conceptual Basis for the Prevention and Treatment of Addictive Behaviours. In N. Heather, W. R. Miller & J. Greeley (Eds.), *Self-control and The Addictive Behaviours* (pp. 3-79). Maxwell Macmillan Publishing.
- Neilans, T. H., & Israel, A. C. (1981). Towards maintenance and generalization of behavior change: Teaching children self-regulation and self-instructional skills. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 5(2), 189-195.
- Oliver, R. M., Wehby, J. H., & Nelson, J. R. (2015). Helping teachers maintain classroom management practices using a self-monitoring checklist. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 51, 113-120.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.06.007>
- Ortubé, A. F., Panadero, E., & Dignath, C. (2024). Self-Regulated Learning Interventions for Pre-service Teachers: a Systematic Review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 36(4), 113.
- Panadero, E. (2017). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8, 422.
- Paris, S. G., & Winograd, P. (2003). *The Role of Self-Regulated Learning in Contextual Teaching: Principals and Practices for Teacher Preparation*. Washington, D. C., U.S. Department of Education. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED479905>
- Perry, N. E., Hutchinson, L., & Thauberger, C. (2008). Talking about teaching self-regulated learning: scaffolding student teachers' development and use of practices that promote self-regulated learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 47(2), 97-108.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2007.11.010>
- Partovi, N., & Tafazoli, D. (2016). On the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' self-regulation, self-resiliency, gender and teaching experience. *Research in English Language Pedagogy*, 4(1), 7-25.
- Pintrich, P.R. (2000). The roal of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation: Theory, Research and Applications* (pp. 452-502). Academic Press.
- Raffaelli, M., Crockett, L. J., & Shen, Y. (2005). Developmental stability and change in self-regulation from childhood to adolescence. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 166, 54-75.  
<https://doi.org/10.3200/GNTP.166.1.54-76>
- Rott, B. (2013). Process regulation in the problem-solving processes of fifth graders [Usmerjanje procesov reševanja problemov petosolcev]. *CEPS Journal*, 3(4), 25-39.  
<https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.221>
- Roth, A., Ogrin, S., & Schmitz, B. (2016). Assessing self-regulated learning in higher education: A systematic literature review of self-report instruments. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 28(3), 225-250. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-015-9229-2>
- Sáez-Delgado, F., López-Angulo, Y., Mella-Norambuena, J., Baeza-Sepúlveda, C., Contreras-Saavedra, C., & Lozano-Peña, G. (2022). Teacher Self-Regulation and Its Relationship with Student Self-

- Regulation in Secondary Education. *Sustainability*, 14(24), 16863. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142416863>.
- Siadaty, M., Gasevic, D., & Hatala, M. (2016). Trace-based micro-analytic measurement of self-regulated learning processes. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 3(1), 183-214.
- Schunk, D.H., & Zimmerman, B.J. (2003). Self-regulation and learning. In W.M. Reynolds & G.E. Miller (Eds.): *Handbook of psychology*. Vol. 7: Educational psychology (pp. 59-78). New York: Wiley
- Spates, C. R., & Kanfer, F. H. (1977). Self-monitoring, self-evaluation, and self-reinforcement in children's learning: A test of a multistage self-regulation model. *Behavior Therapy*, 8(1), 9-16.
- Sumantri, M. S., Prayuningtyas, A. W., Rachmadtullah, R., & Magdalena, I. (2018). The Roles of Teacher-Training Programs and Student Teachers' Self-Regulation in Developing Competence in Teaching Science. *Advanced Science Letters*, 24(10), 7077-7081. <https://doi.org/10.1166/asl.2018.12412>
- Senler, B. (2011). Pre-service science teachers 'self-efficacy in relation to personality traits and academic self-regulation. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Middle East Technical University.
- Tillema, H.H., & Kremer-Hayon, L. (2002). "Practising what we preach": Teacher educators' dilemmas in promoting self-regulated learning: A cross case comparison. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 593-607. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(02\)00018-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(02)00018-5)
- Toussi, M. T. M., Boori, A. A., & Ghanizadeh, A. (2011). The Role of EFL Teachers' Self-Regulation in Effective Teaching. *World Journal of Education*, 1(2), 39-48.
- Vermunt, J. D. (1998). The regulation of constructive learning processes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68(2), 149-171.
- Wall, S. M. (1982). Effects of systematic self-monitoring and self-reinforcement in children's management of test performances. *The Journal of Psychology*, 111(1), 129-136.
- Wiyono, B. B. (2018). The effect of self-evaluation on the principals' transformational leadership, teachers' work motivation, teamwork effectiveness, and school improvement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 21(6), 705-725. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2017.1318960>
- Zhang, J., Qing, W., Miao, D., & Peng, J. (2014). The impact of core self-evaluation on job satisfaction: The mediator role of career commitment. *Social Indicators Research*, 116, 809-822. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0328-5>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). A social cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. *Journal of educational psychology*, 81(3), 329-339.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self- Regulation: Theory, Research and Applications* (pp.13-39). Academic Press.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into practice*, 41(2), 64-70. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2)

## *Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article*

### **Teachers' Self-Regulation: An Analysis of Their Levels and Perceptions**

#### *Öğretmenlerin Öz-Düzenleme Becerileri: Düzeyleri ve Algılarının İncelenmesi*

Solmaz AYDIN BEYTUR



DOI : [10.63556/ankad.v10i1.396](https://doi.org/10.63556/ankad.v10i1.396)

Geliş/Received: 10/12/2025

Kabul/Accepted: 01/03/2026

#### **GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET**

##### **1. Giriş**

Eğitim ortamı düşünüldüğünde öğrencilerin öğrenme için nasıl motive oldukları, kendi öğrenme süreçlerini nasıl düzenleyebildikleri, öğrenme stratejileri kullanıp kullanmadıkları araştırmacıların ilgisini çekmiştir. Öz-düzenleme üzerine yapılan çalışmaların genellikle öğretmen adaylarının öz-düzenleme becerisi üzerine odaklandığı (Bembenuity, 2007; Buzza ve Allinotte, 2013; Cho, Cheon ve Lim, 2021; Jurisevic, Lavrih, Lisic, Podlogar & Zerak, 2021; Sumantri, Prayuningtyas, Rachmadtullah ve Magdalena, 2018; Şenler, 2011) görülmektedir. Öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme becerileri üzerine de yeteri kadar çalışma olmadığı görülmektedir.

Özellikle bu çalışmanın temelini oluşturan Kanfer'in öz-düzenleme modeli değişkenlerine göre yapılan çalışmalara bakıldığında öğretmenlerin öz-pekiştirme, öz-izleme ve öz-değerlendirme süreçlerinin belirlenmesine yönelik yeterli düzeyde çalışmaya rastlanmamıştır (Allinder, Bolling, Oats ve Gagnon, 2000). Genellikle çalışmaların öğrenci öz-pekiştirme, öz-izleme ve öz-değerlendirme süreçleri üzerine odaklandığı ve güncel çalışmalar olmadığı görülmektedir (Neilans ve Israel, 1981; Spates ve Kanfer, 1977; Wall, 1982).

Bu nedenlerden dolayı öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme seviyelerinin ve öz-düzenlemeye ilişkin algılarının belirlenmesi ve böylece ilgili literatüre katkıda bulunulması gerektiği düşünülmüştür. Bu düşünce doğrultusunda aşağıdaki alt problemlere cevap aranmıştır.

1. Öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme seviyeleri nasıldır?
2. Öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme seviyeleri cinsiyete göre farklılaşmakta mıdır?
3. Öğretmenler öz-düzenlemeyi nasıl algılamaktadır?

##### **2. Yöntem**

###### **2.1. Araştırma Modeli**

Bu çalışmada genel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme seviyelerini belirlemek amacıyla veri toplama aracı olarak Öz-Düzenleme Ölçeği (Aydın, Özer Keskin ve Yel, 2014) kullanılmıştır, öğretmenlerin öz-düzenlemeye yönelik algılarını belirlemek amacıyla da "Öz-düzenleme nedir? Açıklayınız" şeklinde açık uçlu bir soru yöneltilmiştir.

###### **2.2. Çalışma Grubu**

Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu Kars ilinde görev yapmakta olan 123 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır.

###### **2.3. Veri toplama araçları**

Çalışmada öğretmenlerden hem nicel hem de nitel veriler toplanmıştır. Çalışmada veri toplama aracı olarak öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme seviyelerini belirlemek amacıyla geliştirilmiş olan Öz-Düzenleme Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Çalışmada ayrıca demografik bilgiler formu kullanılmıştır. Bu formda öğretmenlerin demografik özelliklerine ilişkin anket soruları ve öğretmenlerin öz-düzenlemeye yönelik algılarını belirlemek amacıyla da "Öz-düzenleme nedir? Açıklayınız" şeklinde yöneltilen açık uçlu bir soru bulunmaktadır

### Öz-Düzenleme Ölçeği

Çalışmada öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme seviyelerini belirlemek için veri toplama aracı olarak Brown, Miller ve Lawendowski (1999) tarafından geliştirilmiş, Aydın, Özer Keskin ve Yel (2014) tarafından Türkçeye uyarlanmış olan Öz-Düzenleme Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Ölçek 51 maddeden, öz-pekiştirme (29 madde), öz-izleme (18 madde) ve öz-değerlendirme (4 madde) şeklinde üç alt boyuttan oluşmaktadır. Öz-düzenleme ölçeğinin Türkçeye uyarlama çalışması öğretmen adayları ile yapılmıştır. Bu çalışmada öğretmenlerle çalışılacağı için ölçeğe doğrulayıcı faktör analizi (DFA) yapılmıştır. 154 öğretmen ile ölçeğe yapılan DFA sonucunda öğretmenler için öz-düzenleme ölçeğinin 45 madde olarak analizleri yapılmıştır. Lisrell 8.8 (Jöreskog ve Sörbom, 2006) programı kullanılarak yapılan DFA sonucu modelin verilere kabul edilebilir düzeyde uyum sağladığı belirlenmiştir ( $\chi^2_{(933)} = 1750.41$ ,  $p < .01$ ;  $\chi^2/df = 1.87$ , RMSEA=0.076, SRMR= 0.09, CFI=.90, IFI= .90). Ayrıca ölçeğin güvenilirlik kat sayısı Cronbach alfa .75 olarak belirlenmiştir.

### 3. Sonuç ve Tartışma

Bu çalışmadan elde edilen bulgular değerlendirildiğinde öğretmenlerin genel öz-düzenleme seviyelerinin orta düzeyde olduğu belirlenmiştir. Öz-düzenleme sürecinde öğretmenin öğrencilerine iyi bir yol gösterici olabilmesi için öz-düzenleme becerisine sahip olması gerekmektedir (Aydın ve Demir Atalay, 2015). Dolayısıyla öğretmenler ne kadar iyi düzeyde öz-düzenlemeye sahip olurlarsa öğrencilerine öz-düzenlemeyi o kadar iyi şekilde öğretebileceklerdir. Toussi, Boori ve Ghanizadeh

(2011) yaptığı çalışmada öz-düzenlemeye sahip öğretmenlerin derslerinde daha başarılı olduklarını belirlemiştir. Ayrıca Gol ve Royaei (2013) de çalışmalarında öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme becerileri ile iş performansları arasında pozitif bir ilişki tespit etmiştir. Tillema ve Kremer-Hayon, (2002), öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme süreçleri hakkında yapılan çalışmaların çok az olduğunu fakat yapılan bu çalışmalarda öz-düzenlemenin önemine inanan öğretmenlerin, bunu öğrencilerine öğreteceklerinin belirtildiğini ifade etmiştir.

Ayrıca çalışmada öğretmenlerin öz-düzenlemenin alt boyutlarından olan öz-pekiştirme düzeylerinin yüksek seviyede olduğu belirlenmiştir. Bu durum bize öğretmenlerin genellikle kendilerini motive etmek için sözlü ifadeler ve dışsal ödüllere ihtiyaç duyduklarını göstermektedir. Dolayısıyla çevresinden övgüler alan, yaptıkları başarıların karşılığını alan öğretmenlerin daha motive olduklarını söyleyebiliriz. Belle, Colletem ve Ellemers, (2009) kendi performansına eleştirel bir gözle bakarak öz-pekiştirme yapan kişilerin iş ortamında daha fazla kazanım elde ettiklerini ve başarılı olmak için gereken uygun davranışların neler olduğunu fark ettiklerini belirtmektedir. Öğretmenleri motive eden öz-pekiştirme sürecinin etkili olabilmesi için Hayes, vd. (1986) kişinin performansının doğruluğuna ilişkin geribildirim almasının önemli olduğunu belirtmektedir. Bu durum öğretmenlerin mesleklerinde taktir, ödül ve övgü gibi dışsal pekiştiriciler aldıklarında daha verimli olacaklarını göstermektedir.

Çalışmadan elde edilen diğer bir sonuç öğretmenlerin öz-izleme ve öz-değerlendirme seviyelerinin düşük olmasıdır. Bu durum öğretmenlerin kendilerini gözlemlene ve değerlendirmede eksikleri olduğunu göstermektedir. Sáez-Delgado at all. (2022) erkek öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme sürecinde en düşük ortalamalarının öz-değerlendirme boyutunda olduğunu belirlemiştir. Öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme konusunda kendilerini geliştirmeleri ve görevlerini daha ciddiye almaları gerektiği düşünülmektedir. Allinder, Bolling, Oats, ve Gagnon (2000) matematik öğretmenleriyle yaptıkları çalışmada öz-izleme yapan öğretmenlerin öğrencilerinin matematik dersindeki performanslarının öz-izleme yapmayan öğretmenin öğrencilerine oranla daha yüksek olduğunu belirtmektedir. Oliver, Wehby ve Nelson (2015) çalışmalarında öğretmenlerin kendini izleme kontrol listesi kullanmalarının sınıf yönetimi uygulamalarına yardımcı olduğunu belirtmiştir. Kendilerini izleyen kişiler, kendi davranışlarını gözlemler ve daha iyi bir performansa nasıl ulaşacağına karar vermek için bu gözlemleri

kaydeder (Bruhn, McDaniel ve Kreigh, 2015). Dolayısıyla kendini izleyen bir öğretmen daha iyi bir performans göstermekte ve öğrencileri daha başarılı olmaktadır. Öz-değerlendirmeye bakıldığında kişinin ulaşılması gereken performans kriterleriyle kendi performansını karşılaştırmasıdır (Spates ve Kanfer; 1977). Wiyono (2018), çalışmasında öz-değerlendirmenin öğretmenlerin motivasyonunu, takım çalışmasının etkililiğini ve öğretmenin okuldaki gelişimini artırdığını belirlemiştir. Ayrıca yapılan çalışma sonuçları öz-değerlendirmenin iş tatmini ile pozitif ilişkili olduğunu göstermektedir (Iqbal, 2012; Zhang, Qing, Miau, ve Peng, 2013). Sonuç olarak ilgili literatürden de anlaşılacağı gibi öğretmenlerin öz-değerlendirme yapımları motivasyonları, başarıları ve iş tatminleri açısından önemli bir husustur.

Çalışmada öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme seviyelerinin cinsiyet değişkenine göre farklılaşmadığı da tespit edilmiştir. Bu konuda yapılan çalışmalara bakıldığında bu çalışmayı destekler niteliktedir. Partovi ve Tafazoli (2016), çalışmalarında öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme seviyeleri ile cinsiyetleri arasında herhangi bir ilişki bulmamıştır. Benzer şekilde Ghonsooly ve Ghanizadeh (2013) de çalışmalarında öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme seviyelerinin cinsiyet değişkenine göre farklılaşmadığını tespit etmişlerdir.

Çalışmada elde edilen diğer bir sonuç öğretmenlerin öz-düzenlemeye yönelik algılarıdır. Çalışma sonucunda öğretmenlerin öz-düzenlemeyi tam olarak tanımlayamadıkları fakat öz-düzenleme süreçleri hakkında az da olsa bilgileri olduğu görülmektedir. Öz-düzenlemeye sahip kişiler kendi sorumluluklarını bilen ve kendi yaşamını düzenleyebilen başarılı insanlardır (Zimmerman, 1989). Dolayısıyla öğrenme sürecinde öğretmenin öğrenciye iyi bir rehber olması gerekmektedir. Bunun için de öğretmenlerin öz-düzenlemeyi bilmesi ve öz-düzenleme becerisine sahip olması gerekmektedir (Aydın ve Demir Atalay, 2015). Fakat bu çalışmanın sonucu da göstermektedir ki öğretmenlerin öz-düzenlemeye yönelik bilgileri sınırlı düzeydedir. Nitekim yapılan çalışmalar da bunu göstermektedir. Dignath-van Ewijk ve van der Werf, (2012), öğretmenlerin derslerinde öz-düzenlemeyi artıran uygulamalar yapıp yapmadıklarını araştırdığı çalışmasında, öğretmenlerin derslerinde öğrencilerin özerkliklerini desteklediklerini fakat onlara öğrenme stratejilerini öğretmediklerini belirlemiştir. Perry, Hutchinson ve Thauberger (2008), çalışmasında öğretmenlerin öğrencilerin öz-düzenlemeli öğrenenler olmalarını destekleme konusunda hemfikir olduklarını fakat bunu nasıl yapacaklarını tam olarak bilmediklerini belirtmiştir. Dolayısıyla yapılan çalışmalar da öğretmenlerin öz-düzenleme konusunda eksiklerinin olduğunu ve bu konuda desteklenmeleri gerektiğini göstermektedir.