

The Relationship between Prospective Teachers' Thinking Styles and Attitudes towards Teaching Profession

Ceyhun Ozan^{1,*}

¹Faculty of Kazım Karabekir Education, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey

*Correspondence: Faculty of Kazım Karabekir Education, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey. E-mail: ozanceyhun@atauni.edu.tr

This article was presented at the 27th International Conference on Educational Sciences held on 18-22 April 2018, in Antalya, Turkey.

Received: June 29, 2019

Accepted: July 26, 2019

Online Published: August 5, 2019

doi:10.5430/jct.v8n3p50

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v8n3p50>

Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine the prospective teachers' thinking styles, attitudes towards teaching profession and the relationship between thinking styles and attitudes towards teaching profession. Relational survey model was used in the study. The universe of the study consists of the prospective teachers studying in the Faculty of Theology, Faculty of Theology and Pedagogical Formation Program of a state university in the fall semester of 2017-2018 academic years. The sample of the study consisted of 1215 prospective teachers who were selected through convenience sampling method. According to the results of the study, prospective teachers preferred the most legislative, monarchic, executive, judicial, liberal thinking styles e.g. the hierarchic, conservative, oligarchic and anarchic thinking styles. Prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession are positive. A significant positive relationship was found between liberal, external, monarchic, executive, hierarchic, legislative, judicial and conservative thinking styles and attitudes towards teaching profession. On the other hand, a significant negative correlation was found between the oligarchic thinking style and the attitude towards teaching profession. The relationship is moderate in liberal and external thinking styles and low in other thinking styles.

Keywords: thinking styles, attitudes towards teaching profession, prospective teachers

1. Introduction

Thinking styles based on Sternberg's Theory of Mental Self-Government are defined as the way that an individual chooses to use his/her skills and it is a connection between intelligence and skill (Sternberg, 1994, s. 169). In his theory of mental self-government, Sternberg identified five basic dimensions for the way people think, by matching the mental functions of the individual with the forms of government. These dimensions are; functions, forms, levels, scope and leanings of mental self-government (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005). Thinking styles used by individuals can change, vary or develop differently throughout life. For example, the style required to describe a study examining the relationships between abstract concepts is not the same as the style required to list prioritized work (Sternberg, 1997).

Thinking styles are important in terms of showing that it is a highly effective variable in daily life and academic life (such as academic performance, learning and creativity) depending on the interpersonal relationship processes. Determining students' thinking styles, creating curriculum and teaching environments appropriate to these styles will contribute to teachers and all parties involved in education (Duru, 2004).

Teaching has always been seen as an important profession. Due to the importance of the profession, teachers are always assigned important duties and responsibilities. Teachers are expected to perform these difficult tasks and responsibilities in the best way. Teaching is a profession with an artistic aspect that requires special expertise. Because of this acceptance, various scientific researchers are carried out on the teaching profession, its problems and their solutions (Aydın, 2009).

Attitude is “a state of continuity that determines whether an individual will react positively or negatively to an object

or situation stamped by any value judgment of a psychological process” (Sherif & Sherif, 1996). The attitude of an individual to a profession affects his / her success and satisfaction in that profession. When this situation is considered in the context of teaching, the importance of the subject increases more. Teachers' attitude towards the profession is one of the most important factors affecting their success and productivity (Erdem, Gezer, & Çokadar, 2005). According to Varış (1988), teaching; it is a profession that requires knowledge, skills and positive attitude and behavior. It is significantly important for the prospective teachers to gain value and attitude about the profession. Because research shows that, a student is affected by the teacher's attitudes and behaviors.

If prospective teachers can be educated with positive attitudes towards their professions, when they become teachers; they fulfill their tasks completely, exhibit more positive behaviors towards students, become researchers, think creatively and easily transfer innovations to the learning environment, reflect positive attitudes on hand-to-face movements and motivate students more easily, behave sincerely to students, do not become strict norms, and influence their time effectively. In short, they enjoy their professions and therefore can better assume the roles, responsibilities and roles of the teacher (Çeliköz & Çetin, 2004).

Teacher training is one of the most important functions of educational science. Teacher training is planned on three bases: field knowledge, general culture and teaching profession knowledge. However, first of all the teacher should love, internalize, respect and have the indispensable skills required by the profession (Durmuşçelebi, Yıldız, & Saygı, 2017). It has to be thought that determining the prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession, which requires great devotion and continuous work, will shed light on the success and satisfaction they will provide in the profession and contribute to the efforts to improve and improve the teaching profession (Çetin, 2006).

In the literature, research has been conducted to examine the relationship between thinking styles and various variables. According to the literature, these studies have been examined that Balamir-Apaydın and Çenberci (2018) teaching styles, Canbolat, Erdoğan and Yazlık (2016) technological pedagogical content knowledge, İnce, Çenberci and Yavuz (2018) scientific research attitudes, Çınar (2016) reflective thinking trends, Dikici (2014) creativity enhancer behaviors, Uyanık (2017) thinking needs, Yaşar and Erol (2015) empathic tendency levels, Yıldırım (2016) mathematics literacy, Zabukovec and Kobal-Grum (2004) social skills, Zhang and Sternberg (1999), between learning approaches and thinking styles examined the relationship.

The aim of this study is to determine the prospective teachers' thinking styles, attitudes towards teaching profession and the relationship between thinking styles and attitudes towards teaching profession. For this purpose, the research aimed to find answers to the following sub-problems:

1. What are the thinking styles of prospective teachers?
2. Thinking styles of prospective teachers,
 - a) faculty
 - b) gender
 - c) grade
 - d) Is there any significant difference according to the weighted grade point average (WGPA) variable?
3. What are the attitudes of prospective teachers towards teaching profession?
4. Prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession,
 - a) faculty
 - b) gender
 - c) grade
 - d) Is there any significant difference according to the weighted grade point average (WGPA) variable?
5. Is there any significant relationship between prospective teachers' thinking styles and their attitudes towards teaching profession?

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

In the research, relational survey model was used. Survey models are approaches that are made on the whole universe or a group to be taken from it in order to make a general judgment about the universe consisting of many elements and aiming to describe a situation that exists in the past or still exists (Karasar, 2009). In this research, the survey model was preferred because the sample was taken from the universe and it was described the prospective

teachers' thinking styles and attitudes towards teaching profession.

2.2 Universe and Sample

The universe of the study consists of the prospective teachers studying in the Faculty of Theology, Faculty of Theology and Pedagogical Formation Program of a state university in the fall semester of 2017-2018 academic years. The sample of the study consisted of 1250 prospective teachers who were selected through convenience sampling method. 35 people who completed the data collection tool incorrectly or incompletely were excluded from the data set and 1215 people were included in the sample.

2.3 Data Collection Instruments

Thinking Styles Inventory, which was developed by Sternberg and Wagner (1992) and adapted to Turkish by Fer (2005b), was used to determine the thinking styles of prospective teachers. The inventory was translated independently by three experts, and then translated into a single translation. The original inventory consists of 13 sub-scales, each containing 8 items, measuring 13 different thinking styles and is a 7-point Likert type. The Turkish version of the inventory consists of 70 items, five of which are Likert type and 13 of which are sub-scales. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients of the subscales ranged from .62 to .90. Cronbach's alpha values obtained in this study ranged from .71 to .92.

In order to measure prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession, Attitude Scale towards Teaching Profession developed by Üstüner (2006) for prospective teachers was used. The 5-point Likert scale has a single-factor structure consisting of 34 items. The reliability coefficient of the scale obtained from the test-retest method was .72, while the Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient was .93. The Cronbach's alpha value obtained in this study was .89.

2.4 Data Analysis

SPSS 23 package program was used for data analysis. Arithmetic mean and standard deviation values were calculated primarily for thinking styles and attitudes towards teaching profession. According to arithmetic mean; the point is: 1. Totally unsuitable (1-1,85), 2. Not very suitable (1,86-2,71), 3. A little suitable (2,72-3,57), 4. Almost suitable (3,58-4,43), 5. Suitable (4,43-5,28), 6. Mostly suitable (5,29-6,14), 7. Totally suitable (6,15-7,00). Independent groups t test was used to determine the differentiation status of teacher candidates' thinking styles and attitudes towards teaching profession according to gender variable in order to determine the differentiation status according to the variables of grade, faculty and WGPA, variance analysis was performed. Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between thinking styles and attitudes towards teaching profession. In case of a significant difference in variance analysis, Scheffe test, which is one of the multiple comparison tests, was applied. The data were tested at .05 significance level.

3. Results

The arithmetic mean, standard deviation values and interpretations related to the thinking styles of the preservice teachers are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values of Thinking Styles

	n= 1215	M	Sd
Functions	Legislative	5,60	.79
	Executive	5.38	1.02
	Judicial	5.36	.93
	Monarchic	5.44	.92
Forms	Hierarchic	3.49	1.29
	Oligarchic	3.61	1.52
	Anarchic	3.63	1.29
Levels	Global	3.84	1.33
	Local	4.31	1.52
Scope	Internal	4.96	1.02
	External	4.79	1.34
Leanings	Liberal	5.29	1.02
	Conservative	3.50	1.13

According to Table 1, the most preferred thinking styles of prospective teachers are listed as legislative, monarchic, executive, judicial, liberal, internal, external, local, global, anarchic, oligarchic, conservative and hierarchic. Table 2 shows the differentiation status of prospective teachers' thinking styles according to faculty variable.

Table 2. Differentiation Status of Thinking Styles According to Faculty Variable

Factors	Sub-Scales		n	M	Sd	F	p	Difference			
Functions	Legislative	Education	508	5.43	.74	23.197	.000	2-1			
		Theology	353	5.75	.72			3-1			
		Formation	354	5.69	.73						
	Executive	Education	508	5.19	.81	19.486	.000	3-1			
		Theology	353	5.51	.89			2-1			
		Formation	354	5.53	1.01						
		Education	508	5.27	.75						
		Judicial	Theology	353	5.42			.81	4.382	.013	2-1
			Formation	354	5.41			.89			
	Forms	Monarchic	Education	508	5.29	.71	17.097	.000	3-1		
			Theology	353	5.55	.80			2-1		
			Formation	354	5.55	.82					
Hierarchic		Education	508	5.39	.80	5.732	.003	2-1			
		Theology	353	5.58	.99			3-1			
		Formation	354	5.56	.98						
Oligarchic		Education	508	3.52	.76	5.015	.007				
		Theology	353	3.72	1.00			2-1			
		Formation	354	3.61	1.00						
Anarchic		Education	508	3.65	1.12	25.967	.000	3-2			
		Theology	353	3.29	1.29			1-2			
		Formation	354	3.95	1.27			3-1			
Levels	Global	Education	508	3.77	1.00	17.114	.000	2-3			
		Theology	353	4.13	1.33			2-1			
		Formation	354	3.63	1.24						
	Local	Education	508	4.18	1.17	37.175	.000	3-2			
		Theology	353	4.02	1.37			3-1			
		Formation	354	4.80	1.37						
Scope	Internal	Education	508	4.77	1.07	17.064	.000	3-1			
		Theology	353	5.04	1.00			2-1			
		Formation	354	5.17	1.03						
	External	Education	508	4.64	1.12	7.252	.001	2-1			
		Theology	353	4.93	1.38			3-1			
		Formation	354	4.86	1.13						
Leanings	Liberal	Education	508	5.21	.90	14.880	.000	3-2			
		Theology	353	5.19	.95			3-1			
		Formation	354	5.51	.80						
	Conservative	Education	508	3.53	.95	10.733	.000	2-3			
		Theology	353	3.65	1.13			1-3			
		Formation	354	3.30	1.02						

Significant differences were found in all thinking styles according to faculty variable. In the anarchic thinking style, the lowest theology faculty students, in the conservative thinking style the lowest pedagogical formation students, in other thinking styles, the students of the faculty of education are low. The differentiation status of teacher candidates' thinking styles according to gender variable is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Differentiation Status of Thinking Styles According to Gender Variable

Factors	Sub-Scales	Group	n	X	Sd	df	t	p
Functions	Legislative	Female	602	5.60	.81	1213	.163	.870
		Male	613	5.59	.77			
	Executive	Female	602	5.59	1.01	1213	8.162	.000
		Male	613	5.18	1.04			
	Judicial	Female	602	5.39	.89	1213	1.603	.109
		Male	613	5.32	.99			
Forms	Monarchic	Female	602	5.55	.88	1213	4.879	.000
		Male	613	5.34	.97			
	Hierarchic	Female	602	5.62	.98	1213	4.742	.000
		Male	613	5.37	1.07			
	Oligarchic	Female	602	3.52	1.04	1213	-3.447	.001
		Male	613	3.70	.91			
	Anarchic	Female	602	3.52	1.26	1213	-3.079	.002
		Male	613	3.74	1.30			
Levels	Global	Female	602	3.65	1.38	1213	-5.351	.000
		Male	613	4.02	1.19			
	Local	Female	602	4.42	1.51	1213	2.761	.006
		Male	613	4.21	1.54			
Scope	Internal	Female	602	4.96	1.02	1213	-.055	.956
		Male	613	4.97	.99			
	External	Female	602	4.84	1.23	1213	1.475	.141
		Male	613	4.74	1.53			
Leanings	Liberal	Female	602	5.33	.97	1213	1.552	.121
		Male	613	5.25	1.04			
	Conservative	Female	602	3.24	1.11	1213	-8.827	.000
		Male	613	3.75	1.11			

According to Table 3, there is a significant difference in terms of gender variable in executive, monarchic, hierarchic, oligarchic, anarchic, global, local and conservative thinking styles. The levels of female prospective teachers were significantly higher in executive, monarchic, hierarchic and local thinking styles, and male prospective teachers in oligarchic, anarchic, global and conservative thinking styles. Table 4 shows the differentiation status of prospective teachers' thinking styles according to the grade variable.

According to Table 4, significant difference was found in terms of grade variable in all thinking styles. In all thinking styles, the levels of 3rd or 4th grade prospective teachers were significantly higher than 1st and 2nd grade prospective teachers. Table 5 shows the differentiation status of prospective teachers' thinking styles according to WGPA variable.

Table 4. Differentiation Status of Thinking Styles According to Grade Variable

Factors	Group		n	M	Sd	F	p
Functions	Legislative	Freshman	204	5.35	,97	19.957	.000
		Sophomore	280	5.45	,84		
		Junior	302	5.77	1,03		
		Senior	429	5.70	,96		
	Executive	Freshman	204	5.12	1,17	15.328	.000
		Sophomore	280	5.21	1,09		
		Junior	302	5.48	1,10		
		Senior	429	5.55	1,24		
	Judicial	Freshman	204	5.42	1,50	9.155	.000
		Sophomore	280	5.13	1,41		
		Junior	302	5.42	1,46		
		Senior	429	5.42	1,41		
Forms	Monarchic	Freshman	204	5.27	1,17	17.756	.000
		Sophomore	280	5.23	1,01		
		Junior	302	5.61	,93		
		Senior	429	5.55	1,09		
	Hierarchic	Freshman	204	5.38	1,25	7.628	.000
		Sophomore	280	5.32	1,26		
		Junior	302	5.57	1,23		
		Senior	429	5.61	1,27		
	Oligarchic	Freshman	204	3.42	1,30	23.725	.000
		Sophomore	280	3.50	1,34		
		Junior	302	3.98	1,31		
		Senior	429	3.51	1,32		
Anarchic	Freshman	204	3.73	,84	5.704	.001	
	Sophomore	280	3.56	,89			
	Junior	302	3.42	,89			
	Senior	429	3.78	,96			
Levels	Global	Freshman	204	3.85	1.24	21.755	.000
		Sophomore	280	3.77	1.27		
		Junior	302	4.27	1.24		
		Senior	429	3.57	1.27		
	Local	Freshman	204	4.30	1.38	7.817	.000
		Sophomore	280	4.10	1.47		
		Junior	302	4.19	1.28		
		Senior	429	4.54	1.51		
Scope	Internal	Freshman	204	4.69	1.17	8.887	.000
		Sophomore	280	4.87	.98		
		Junior	302	5.02	1.01		
		Senior	429	5.12	1.04		
	External	Freshman	204	4.71	1.48	17.566	.000
		Sophomore	280	4.45	1.35		
		Junior	302	5.15	1.30		
		Senior	429	4.80	1.21		
Leanings	Liberal	Freshman	204	5.30	.98	10.169	.000
		Sophomore	280	5.05	1.06		
		Junior	302	5.31	.98		
		Senior	429	5.43	.83		
	Conservative	Freshman	204	3.48	1.08	36.333	.000
		Sophomore	280	3.40	1.10		
		Junior	302	3.99	1.10		
		Senior	429	3.23	1.05		

Table 5. Differentiation Status of Thinking Styles According to WGPA Variable

Factors	Sub-Scales	Group	n	M	Sd	F	p	Difference
Functions	Legislative	Below 2.50	331	5.45	.72	10.523	.000	2-1
		2,50-3,00	379	5.70	.79			3-1
		Above 3,00	452	5.64	.74			
	Executive	Below 2.50	331	5.27	.89	21.035	.000	3-1
		2,50-3,00	379	5.27	.96			3-2
		Above 3,00	452	5.62	.86			
	Judicial	Below 2.50	331	5.40	.63	.576	.562	
		2,50-3,00	379	5.34	.90			
		Above 3,00	452	5.35	.88			
Forms	Monarchic	Below 2.50	331	5.34	.72	7.933	.000	3-1
		2,50-3,00	379	5.42	.82			3-2
		Above 3,00	452	5.56	.81			
	Hierarchic	Below 2.50	331	5.47	1.00	3.340	.036	3-2
		2,50-3,00	379	5.43	.91			
		Above 3,00	452	5.59	.88			
	Oligarchic	Below 2.50	331	3.63	.97	.579	.561	
		2,50-3,00	379	3.57	.97			
		Above 3,00	452	3.61	.85			
	Anarchic	Below 2.50	331	3.34	1.15	10.538	.000	3-1
		2,50-3,00	379	3.67	1.34			2-1
		Above 3,00	452	3.74	1.25			
Levels	Global	Below 2.50	331	3.83	.82	2.461	.086	
		2,50-3,00	379	3.76	1.28			
		Above 3,00	452	3.94	1.37			
	Local	Below 2.50	331	4.25	1.32	2.544	.079	
		2,50-3,00	379	4.24	1.39			
		Above 3,00	452	4.43	1.33			
Scope	Internal	Below 2.50	331	4.66	1.12	19.574	.000	3-1
		2,50-3,00	379	5.08	1.13			2-1
		Above 3,00	452	5.10	.93			
	External	Below 2.50	331	4.65	1.18	8.072	.000	2-1
		2,50-3,00	379	5.00	1.32			2-3
		Above 3,00	452	4.75	1.17			
Leanings	Liberal	Below 2.50	331	5.18	.85	5.852	.003	2-1
		2,50-3,00	379	5.41	.96			
		Above 3,00	452	5.34	.90			
	Conservative	Below 2.50	331	3.54	1.02	.627	.534	
		2,50-3,00	379	3.49	1.19			
		Above 3,00	452	3.45	.94			

According to Table 5, significant differences were found in legislative, executive, monarchic, hierarchic, anarchic, internal, external and liberal thinking style in terms of WGPA variable. In these thinking styles, the scores of students with high WGPA were significantly higher than those with low WGPA. Arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Attitudes Towards Teaching Profession

n= 1215	M	Sd
Attitude	3.44	.23

According to Table 6, prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession were found to be high. Table 7 shows the differentiation status of prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession according to faculty variable.

Table 7. Differentiation of the Attitude Towards Teaching Profession According to the Faculty Variable

		n	M	Sd	F	p
Attitude	Education	508	3.43	.24	2.629	.073
	Theology	353	3.42	.24		
	Formation	354	3.46	.20		

According to the faculty variable, prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession do not differ significantly ($F = 2.629$; $p > .05$). Table 8 shows the differentiation status of prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession according to grade variable.

Table 8. Differentiation of the Attitudes Towards Teaching Profession According to the Grade Variable

	Group	n	M	Sd	F	p	Difference
Attitude	1. Grade	204	3.41	.12	4.258	.005	4-1
	2. Grade	280	3.43	.30			
	3. Grade	302	3.42	.20			
	4. Grade	429	3.47	.23			

Prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession differ significantly according to grade variable ($F = 4.258$; $p < .05$). The attitudes of the 4th grade prospective teachers towards the teaching profession are significantly higher than the 1st grade prospective teachers. Table 9 shows the differentiation status of prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession according to gender.

Table 9. Differentiation of the Attitudes Towards Teaching Profession According to the Gender Variable

	Group	n	M	Sd	df	t	p
Attitude	Female	602	3.47	.26	1067.518	4.643	.000
	Male	613	3.41	.18			

According to gender variable, prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession differ significantly ($F = 4.643$; $p < .05$). The attitudes of female prospective teachers towards teaching profession are significantly higher than male prospective teachers. Table 10 shows the differentiation status of prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession according to WGPA variable.

Table 10. Differentiation of the Attitudes Towards Teaching Profession According to the WGPA Variable

	Group	n	M	Sd	F	p	Difference
Attitude	Below 2.50	331	3.40	.21	8.281	.000	3-1
	2,50-3,00	379	3.41	.24			
	Above 3,00	452	3.46	.21			

According to WGPA variable, prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession differ significantly ($F = 8.281$; $p < .05$). Attitudes of prospective teachers whose WGPA is above 3.00 are significantly higher than prospective

teachers who are between 2.50- 3.00 and below 2.50. The relationship between prospective teachers' thinking styles and their attitudes towards teaching profession is shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Relationship between Thinking Styles and Attitudes Towards Teaching Profession

Thinking Styles	Attitude	p
Legislative	.129	.000**
Executive	.277	.000**
Judicial	.105	.000**
Monarchic	.279	.000**
Hierarchic	.222	.000**
Oligarchic	-.077	.007**
Anarchic	.028	.327
Global	.031	.288
Local	.058	.042*
Internal	.054	.059
External	.366	.000**
Liberal	.383	.000**
Conservative	.081	.005**

*p<0.05; **p<0.01

According to Table 11, significant relationship was found between legislative, conservative, executive, judicial, monarchic, hierarchic, oligarchic, local, external and liberal thinking styles and attitudes towards teaching profession. A negative relationship was found between the oligarchic thinking style and the attitude towards teaching profession. The level of the relationship is moderate in external and liberal learning styles, but low in other thinking styles.

4. Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

According to the results of the study, prospective teachers preferred the most legislative, monarchic, executive, judicial, liberal thinking styles e.g. the hierarchic, conservative, oligarchic and anarchic thinking styles. İnce, Çenberci and Yavuz (2018) also found that prospective mathematics teachers preferred the most legislative, executive, liberal and judicial thinking styles. Pre-service teachers' preference for monarchic thinking shows that they focus their energies on one job at the same time, and their preference for judicial thinking shows that they like to judge and evaluate others' work. The hierarchic thinking style, which performs many tasks at the same time by making good use of time, is preferred at the lowest level. It can be said that this situation does not fully meet with (overlap) the qualifications expected from current prospective teachers. According to Sternberg (1997), although thinking styles are not classified as good or bad, higher preference for creativity-based, legislative hierarchic, judicial and liberal thinking styles have preferred more, and therefore it could be said that creativity-based styles are more favorable for prospective teachers who are expected to acquire 21st century skills. According to the results obtained in this study, especially judicial, legislative and liberal thinking styles are preferred at a high level, while hierarchic style is preferred at the lowest level.

Significant differences were found in all thinking styles according to faculty variable. In the anarchic thinking style, the lowest theology faculty students, in the conservative thinking style the lowest pedagogical formation students, in other thinking styles, the students of the faculty of education are low. When the results were examined in terms of gender variable, it was determined that female prospective teachers in executive, monarchic, hierarchic and local thinking styles and male prospective teachers in oligarchic, anarchic, global and conservative thinking styles were significantly higher. Similar findings were found in the literature. Artut and Bal (2006) anarchic, global and conservative, Buluş (2005) global, internal and conservative, Buluş (2006) judicial, anarchic, global, internal and liberal, Dinçer and Saracaloğlu (2011) global, conservative and external, Esmer (2013) legislative, oligarchic, anarchic, global, conservative, Fer (2005a, 2007) monarchic and conservative, Sternberg and Zhang (2005) judicial, Sünbül (2004) anarchic, internal and conservative, Uygun and Kunt (2014) and Yıldızlar (2010) and internal and conservative, Zhang and Sachs (1997) conservative, Wu and Zhang (1999) determined that males prefer more liberal and monarchic thinking styles than females. Cilliers and Sternberg (2001) concluded that females prefer executive thinking style, Esmer (2013) executive, hierarchic, monarchic; Uygun and Kunt (2014) concluded that they prefer

hierarchical thinking style more than male students. Besides these results, Çubukçu (2004), Saracaloğlu, Yenice and Karasakaloğlu (2008) and Zhang (1999) did not reach a significant difference in any thinking style according to gender variable. Considering that, the thinking styles are influenced by the socio-cultural characteristics of the living environment and society, it may be considered natural to obtain different results in researches. However, if the results obtained are evaluated in general, it can be said that male students prefer global, anarchic and conservative thinking styles more than female students, consistent with the results obtained from these studies. These results in the literature also support the prediction that Sternberg's (1997) thinking style preferences in mental self-government theory differ between females and males.

According to the grade variable, in all thinking styles, the preferences of 3rd or 4th grade prospective teachers were significantly higher than the 1st and 2nd grade prospective teachers. In general, it can be said that the higher academic year is the more prospective teachers' thinking styles preferences increase. The increase in the preferred thinking styles with the increase of university education process can be evaluated as positive. Dinçer and Saracaloğlu (2011) reached a significant difference only in favor of 4th grade in internal thinking style. Buluş (2006) also found that 4th grade students prefer higher internal and lower conservative thinking style than 1st grade students. In contrast, Zhang and Sachs (1997) concluded that lower grade students preferred monarchic and local styles to higher grades. Esmer (2013) also found a significant difference between 1st and 2nd grade students in favor of 1st grade students only in oligarchic thinking style.

According to the WGPA variable, it can be said that as WGPA increases, the levels increase in the legislative, executive, monarchic, hierarchical, anarchic, internal, external and liberal thinking styles. Saracaloğlu, Yenice and Karasakaloğlu (2008) found a significant difference in favor of high average students only among the students with high average in executive thinking style according to the university grade average variable.

Prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession are positive. There are studies in the literature that overlap with this result (Bademcioğlu, Karataş, & Alcı, 2014; Başbay, Ünver, & Nilay, 2009; Bulut, 2009; Camadan & Duysak, 2010; Can, 2010; Demircioğlu & Özdemir, 2014; Engin & Çiçekli-Koç, 2014; Özder, Konedralı, & Perkan-Zeki, 2010; Terzi & Tezci, 2007; Uygun & Kunt, 2014). Durmuşçelebi et al. (2017) concluded that prospective teachers who took pedagogical formation liked and understood the importance of teaching profession.

No significant difference was found according to the faculty variable. The attitudes of the students of Education, Theology and Pedagogical Formation towards teaching profession are positive and very close to each other. Bademcioğlu et al. (2014) concluded that pedagogical formation certificates students' attitudes towards teaching profession were positive. Attitudes of senior prospective teachers were significantly higher than 1st grade prospective teachers. Çapa and Çil (2000) also found that the attitudes of the prospective teachers were significantly higher than those of the prospective teachers.

The attitudes of female prospective teachers were significantly higher than male prospective teachers. Most of the studies' results in the literature are parallel with this result (Akkaya, 2014; Aydın & Sağlam, 2012; Bozdoğan, Aydın, & Yıldırım, 2007; Çapri & Çelikkaleli, 2008; Çetinkaya, 2009; Durmuşçelebi vd., 2017; Gökçe & Sezer, 2012; Güneyle & Aslan, 2009; Özbek, Kahyaoğlu, & Özgen, 2007; Öztürk, Doğan, & Koç, 2005; Saracaloğlu, Serin, Bozkurt, & Serin, 2004; Terzi & Tezci, 2007; Uygun & Kunt, 2014; Yaşar-Ekici, 2014). There are also studies that do not reach significant differences according to gender variable (Bademcioğlu et al., 2014; Bulut, 2009; Çapa & Çil, 2000; Engin & Çiçekli-Koç, 2014; Gürbüz & Kışoğlu, 2007; Özder et al., 2010). However, when the researches are evaluated in general, it can be said that the attitudes of female prospective teachers are higher than male prospective teachers. This result may be because the teaching profession is seen as a more appropriate profession for women because of its working conditions and characteristics. Another result obtained from the study is prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession increase significantly as their WGPAs increase. According to this result, it can be said that prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession increase as academic achievement increases.

A significant positive relationship was found between liberal, external, monarchic, executive, hierarchical, legislative, judicial and conservative thinking styles and attitudes towards teaching profession. On the other hand, a significant negative correlation was found between the oligarchic thinking style and the attitude towards teaching profession. The relationship is moderate in liberal and external thinking styles and low in other thinking styles. In line with this result, Uygun and Kunt (2014) found a significant relationship between executive, monarchic, hierarchical and global thinking styles and attitude towards teaching profession. According to the results of the study, it is suggested that the learning process should be arranged in a way to increase the liberal and external thinking styles in order to increase the preferences of liberal and external thinking styles, which are in the highest relationship with the attitude towards teaching profession.

References

- Akkaya, N. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumlarının bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi [Examination of teacher candidates' attitudes towards teaching profession according to some variables]. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25, 35-42.
- Artut, P., & Bal, A. P. (2006). Comparing the thinking styles and geometry achievement of high school students. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(17), 1-10.
- Aydın, R. (2009). Türkiye’de öğretmen sorunları açısından milli eğitim şuraları’nın değerlendirilmesi (1980–2000). [Evaluation of teachers in terms of national education problems in Turkey (1980-2000)]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42(2), 199-237. https://doi.org/10.1501/Egifak_0000001183
- Aydın, R., & Sağlam, G. (2012). Teacher applicant’s view directed towards to profession of teacher (Example of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University). *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10(2), 257-294.
- Bademcioğlu, M., Karataş, H., & Alıcı, B. (2014). The investigation of teacher candidates’ attitudes towards teaching profession. *The International Journal of Educational Researchers*, 5(2), 16-29.
- Balamir-Apaydın, B., & Çenberci, S. (2018). Correlation between thinking styles and teaching styles of prospective mathematics teachers. *World Journal of Education*, 8(4), 36-46. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v8n4p36>
- Başbay, M., Ünver, G., & Nilay, T. B. (2009). A longitudinal study on secondary education teacher candidates’ attitudes towards teaching profession. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 15(59), 345-366.
- Bozdoğan, A. E., Aydın, D., & Yıldırım, K. (2007). Attitudes of teacher candidates towards teaching profession. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8(2), 83-97.
- Buluş, M. (2005). The investigation of the thinking styles profile of students in the department of elementary education. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 1(6), 1-24.
- Buluş, M. (2006). Assessment of Thinking Styles Inventory, academic achievement and student teacher’s characteristics. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 31(139), 35-48.
- Bulut, İ. (2009). Evaluation of teacher candidates’ attitudes concerning teaching profession (Dicle and Firat University sample). *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14, 13-24.
- Camadan, F., & Duysak, A. (2010). Comparing pre-service teachers’ attitudes in the different programs toward teaching profession in terms of different variables: Example of Rize University. *The Journal of Sakarya University Education Faculty*, 20, 30-42.
- Can, Ş. (2010). Attitudes of the students who attend the non-thesis graduated education program towards the teaching profession. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 24, 13-28.
- Canbolat, N., Erdoğan, A., & Yazlık, D. Ö. (2018). Examining the relationship between thinking styles and technological pedagogical content knowledge of the candidate mathematics teachers. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 4(11), 39-48. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v4i11.1819>
- Cilliers, C. D., & Sternberg, R. J. (2001). Thinking styles: Implications for optimizing learning and teaching in university education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 15(1), 13-24. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v4i11.1819>
- Çapa, Y., & Çil, N. (2000). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumlarının farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Examining the prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession in terms of different variables]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18, 69-73.
- Çapri, B., & Çelikkaleli, Ö. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenliğe ilişkin tutum ve mesleki yeterlik inançlarının cinsiyet, program ve fakültelerine göre incelenmesi [Investigation of preservice teachers’ attitudes towards teaching and professional self-efficacy beliefs according to their gender, programs, and faculties]. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(15), 33-53.
- Çeliköz, N., & Çetin, F. (2004). Anadolu Öğretmen Lisesi öğrencilerinin öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumlarını etkileyen etmenler [Factors affecting the attitudes of the Anatolian Teacher High School students towards the teaching profession]. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 162, 8-9.
- Çetin, Ş. (2006). Establishment of the profession of teaching attitude scale (the study for validity and confidence). *Gazi Üniversitesi Endüstriyel Sanatlar Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18, 28-37.

- Çetinkaya, Z. (2009). Identifying Turkish pre-service teachers' attitudes toward teaching profession. *İlköğretim Online*, 8(2), 298-305.
- Çınar, G. (2016). *The relationship between thinking styles and reflective thinking tendencies of pre-service teachers* (Unpublished master thesis). Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Samsun.
- Çubukçu, Z. (2004). Determine the thinking styles of teacher candidates. *Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(2), 87-106.
- Demircioğlu, E., & Özdemir, M. (2014). Analyzing attitudes of students studying at the faculty of arts and sciences towards teaching profession according to various variables. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(3), 110-122.
- Dikici, A. (2014). Relationships between thinking styles and behaviors fostering creativity: an exploratory study for the mediating role of certain demographic traits. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 14(1), 179-201. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2014.1.1939>
- Diñer, B., & Saracalođlu, A. S. (2011). The investigation of teacher candidates' thinking style profiles in terms of various variables incelenmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(4), 701-744.
- Durmuşçelebi, M., Yıldız, N., & Saygı, E. (2017). Investigation of teacher candidates' attitudes towards teaching profession. *OPUS-Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(12), 8-32. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.256553>
- Duru, E. (2004). Thinking styles: Theoretical and conceptual framework. *Eğitim Araştırmaları*, 14, 171-186.
- Engin, G., & Çiçekli-Koç, G. (2014). The attitudes of prospective teachers towards teaching (The case of Ege University, Faculty of Education). *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 18(2), 153-167.
- Erdem, A. R., Gezer, K., & Çokadar, H. (2005). *Ortaöğretim fen-matematik ve sosyal alanlar öğretmenliği tezsiz yüksek lisans öğrencilerinin öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin tutumları* [Attitudes of secondary school science-mathematics and social sciences teaching non-thesis graduate students towards teaching profession]. 14. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi, Denizli
- Esmer, E. (2013). *Öğretmen adaylarının zihinsel stil tercihlerinin (düşünme stillerinin) incelenmesi* [The examination of teacher candidates intellectual style preferences (Thinking styles)] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Fer, S. (2005a). *Aday öğretmenlerin düşünme stilleri nedir?* [What are the thinking styles of prospective teachers?]. XIV. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri, Denizli.
- Fer, S. (2005b). Validity and reliability study of the thinking styles inventory. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 5(1), 31-67.
- Fer, S. (2007). What are the thinking styles of Turkish student teachers? *Teachers College Record*, 109(6), 1488-1516.
- Gökçe, F., & Sezer, G. O. (2012). The attitudes of student teachers towards teaching profession: Uludağ University sample. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(1), 1-23.
- Güneşli, A., & Aslan, C. (2009). Evaluation of Turkish prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession (Near East University case). *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1, 313-319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.059>
- Gürbüz, H., & Kışođlu, M. (2007). Attitudes of the science and art faculty students and education faculty students attend the non- thesis graduated education program toward teaching profession (Atatürk University sample). *Erzincan Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(2), 71-83.
- İnce, H., Çenberci, S., & Yavuz, A. (2018). The relationship between the attitudes of mathematics teacher candidates towards scientific research and their thinking styles. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(7), 1467-1476. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2018.060707>
- Özbek, R., Kahyaođlu, M., & Özgen, N. (2007). Evaluation of candidate teachers' opinions on teaching profession. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(2), 221-232.
- Özder, H., Konedralı, G., & Perkan-Zeki, C. (2010). Examining the attitudes towards the teaching profession and academic achievements of prospective teachers. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 16(2), 253-275.

- Öztürk B., Doğan, O., & Koç, G. (2005). Comparing the perceptions of the students of faculty of education and arts and sciences concerning the teaching profession. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(1), 1-19.
- Saracaloğlu, A. S., Serin, O., Bozkurt, N., & Serin, U. (2004). The factors that affects the attitudes of the condiate teachers towards teaching profession. *Çağdaş Eğitim*, 29(311), 16-27.
- Saracaloğlu, A. S., Yenice, N., & Karasakaloğlu, N. (2008). The comparison of education faculty student's thinking styles in terms of various varieties. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 1(5), 732-751.
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1996). *Sosyal psikolojiye giriş II* [Introduction to social psychology II] (Trans: M. Atakay v& A. Yılmaz). İstanbul: Sosyal.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1994). Thinking styles: Theory and assessment at the interface between intelligence and personality. In R. J. Sternberg & P. Ruzgis (Eds.), *Personality and intelligence* (pp. 169-187). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, J. R. (1997). *Thinking Style*. New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511584152>
- Sternberg, R. J., & Zhang, L. F. (2005). Styles of thinking as a basis of differentiated instruction. *Theory Into Practice*, 44(3), 245-253. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4403_9
- Sünbül, A. M. (2004). The validity reliability of the Thinking Styles Scale. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 29(132), 25-42.
- Terzi, A. R., & Tezci, E. (2007). The attitudes of the students towards teaching profession at Necatibey Education Faculty. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 52, 593-614.
- Uyanık, N. (2017). *An investigation on the relationship between education faculty students' thinking styles and their need for cognition* (Unpublished master thesis). Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Gaziantep.
- Uygun, M., & Kunt, H. (2014). An analysis of the relationship between prospective teachers' thinking styles and their attitudes to teaching profession according to various variables. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 6(2), 357-370.
- Üstüner, M. (2006). Reliability and validity study of an attitude scale of teaching profession. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 45, 109-127.
- Variş, F. (1988). *Eğitimde program geliştirme, teori ve teknikler* [Curriculum development, theory and techniques in education]. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Wu, X., & Zhang, H. (1999). The preliminary application of the thinking style inventory in college students. *Psychological Science China*, 22, 293-297.
- Yaşar, M., & Erol, A. (2015). Determination of relationship between the empathic tendency levels and thinking styles of preschool teacher candidates. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 2(2), 38-65.
- Yaşar-Ekici, F. (2014). Examining prospective teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession in terms of various variables (İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University sample). *The Journal of International Social Research*, 7(35), 658-665.
- Yıldırım, N. (2016). *Investigating the relationship between math literacy self-efficacy and thinking styles of primary maths and primary teachers* (Unpublished maser thesis). Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.
- Zabukovec, Z., & Kobal-Grum, D. (2004). Relationship between student thinking styles and social skills. *Psychology Science*, 46, 156-166.
- Zhang, L. F. (1999). Further cross-culture validation of the theory of the mental self-government. *Journal of Psychology*, 133(2), 165-181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223989909599731>
- Zhang, L. F., & Sachs, J. (1997). Assessing thinking styles in the theory of mental self-government: A Hong Kong validity study. *Psychological Reports*, 81, 915-928. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1997.81.3.915>
- Zhang, L. F., & Sternberg, R. J. (2000). Are learning approaches and thinking styles related? a study in two Chinese populations. *The Journal of Psychology*, 134(5), 469-489. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980009598230>