



## Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research

Volume 14, Issue 2 June 2019

epasr.penpublishing.net

ISSN: 1949-4270 (Print) 1949-4289 (Online)

### Exploring the relationship between teachers&rsquo; locus of control with different variables

Bilgen Kiral

#### To cite this article

Kiral, B. (2019). Exploring the relationship between teachers&rsquo; locus of control with different variables. Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research, 14(2), 88-104. doi: 10.29329/epasr.2019.201.5

Published Online	June 27, 2019
Article Views	0 single - cumulative
Article Download	1 single - 2 cumulative
DOI	<a href="https://doi.org/10.29329/epasr.2019.201.5">https://doi.org/10.29329/epasr.2019.201.5</a>

Pen Academic is an independent international publisher committed to publishing academic books, journals, encyclopedias, handbooks of research of the highest quality in the fields of Education, Social Sciences, Science and Agriculture. Pen Academic created an open access system to spread the scientific knowledge freely. For more information about PEN, please contact: [info@penpublishing.net](mailto:info@penpublishing.net)

This document downloaded from 96.253.105.162 [2 times] Chesterfield / United States on Thu, 27 Jun 2019 18:16:08 +0300

Pen Academic Publishing, Canakkale/Turkey

Telephone: +90 286 243 06 66 | Fax: +90 286 213 08 00 | [info@penpublishing.net](mailto:info@penpublishing.net) | [www.penpublishing.net](http://www.penpublishing.net)



## Exploring the Relationship Between Teachers' Locus of Control with Different Variables

**Bilgen KIRAL<sup>1</sup>**

Adnan Menderes University, Aydin, Turkey

### Abstract

The research was conducted with 335 Anatolian high school teachers working in Aydın province during 2015-2016 academic year to investigate the relationship between teachers' locus of control and different variables. "*Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale*" was used in the research which is one of the quantitative research methods. The research findings showed that teachers mostly exhibited internal locus of control and this was followed by external and chance locus of control. There was no significant difference in the locus of control according to teachers' gender, marital status, length of service at that school and love the profession. The teachers' locus of control showed significant difference according to age, seniority, teaching specialty and socio-economic status of the school. Based on these findings, the research signified the important of aware raising activities to increase teachers' internal locus of control and delivering practice-based training to teachers through the support of academics working in his field.

**Key words:** Teacher, Anatolian high school, internal, external, chance, locus of control

**DOI:** 10.29329/epasr.2019.201.5

---

<sup>1</sup> Assist. Prof. Dr., Educational Administration Department, Faculty of Education, Adnan Menderes University, Efeler /Aydın, E-Mail: bilgenkiral@gmail.com, bilgen.kiral@adu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-5352-8552

## Introduction

It is important to approve by others for some people; but it doesn't matter to some people. These are indeed related to the concept of locus of control. The concept of locus of control comes from the word control. Control is defined as power to influence or direct human behavior or the course of events (Oxford Dictionary, 2018). Expecting that certain behaviours of individuals will lead to certain consequences; response-result expectation, action-outcome expectation, and the degree of the relationship between the results and responses (Bandura, 1977; Heckhausen, 1977) indicate this concept. Skinner (1996) also pointed out different uses of the word control. There are more than 100 different uses of the concept of control, but partially interrelated and / or overlapping terms. These include concepts such as “*personal control, control sense, locus of control, cognitive control, agenda control, proxy control, misleading control, outcome control, primary control, secondary control, action control, decision control, forecast control, information control and representative control.*” In fact, the use of these concepts is somewhat similar. One of these concepts, the concept of locus of control, was developed by Rotter (1954) and the locus of control scale has been used in social sciences, medicine, psychology etc. The locus of control is expressed as the linking of good or bad events that they have experienced throughout their lives to themselves, others, fate and luck (Rotter, 1966).

The concept of locus of control is categorized as internal and external control. Internal locus of control is defined as self-control (Rotter, 1966), an individual's sense of control and belief that the individual is in charge of the control (Ajzen, 1991; Yesilyaprak, 1988). According to Kiral (2012), individuals believe that good or bad results come up because of their own behaviours although they have feel confident and believe in themselves. Individuals who have internal locus of control have high motivation and success, entrepreneurial, conciliatory and social responsibility; and it also relates with self-esteem, and emotional stability (Judge & Bono, 2001b). Individuals who see events depending on their behavior are the focus of internal control (Loosemore & Lam 2004; Judge & Bono, 2001a; Silvester, Anderson-Gough, Anderson & Mohammed, 2002). According to Jones and George (2003), internal control-oriented individuals have internal characteristics such as diverting situations in a way that they align with their benefits and problem-solving skills and producing coherent work. Norton (2005) states individuals with internal locus of control can better manage their skills, experience less stress, and have more positive attitudes towards situations.

The individuals with external locus of control, contrary to the internal locus of control, do not attribute consequences of events to the individual, but other things (e.g. luck, fate, other people) other than oneself (Rotter, 1966; Yesilyaprak, 1988). According to Kiral (2012), externally controlled individuals believe that they do not have the ability to influence the events in their environment and think that their lives are affected by powerful others. They believe that events can be shaped according

to abstract beliefs such as fate, luck, or by powerful others (such as manager, state, mother, father, state).

Individuals with external locus of control are not open to innovation, do not want to take responsibility, have low motivation and low success. In addition, they lead a stressful life and experience disappointments (Ajzen, 2002; Norton, 2005). Individuals with external locus of control are seen weak in managing themselves and others and they are passive throughout their lives (Edwards, 2005; Vickers, Conway & Haight, 1983). Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979) found a positive relationship between external locus of control and occupational stress. Individuals with external control focus are more passive and more insecure because they think they have no control over the environment (Findley & Cooper, 1983; Loosemore & Lam 2004, Silvester, Anderson-Gough, Anderson & Mohammed, 2002).

Internal and external locus of control seem to be related to positive and negative qualities. Thus, the findings of the research indicate that those who have internal locus of control have intelligent, and successful features, and those with external locus of control show dull, unsuccessful and inadequate features (Lefcourt, 1982; Spector, 1982). Individuals with internal locus of control tend to be more self-directed, while individuals with external control tend to be in a desire and expectation of specific directions and instructions (Lefcourt, Lewis & Silverman, 1968; Lefcourt & Siegel, 1970). Individuals with high internal locus of control have a perception of directing events in their own environment, whereas individuals with external locus of control believe things are beyond their control. They do not have control over what will happen in their lives or what they will do. They believe in fate or chance and think, these play a role in orienting their lives (Friedman, Lehrer & Stevens, 1983; Friedman & Dies, 1974). The awards and penalties sometimes affect the locus of control. People can behave the position or case (Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Hong, Chiu, Dweck, Lin & Wan, 1999; Weiner & Kukla, 1970).

Levenson (1973, 1974, 1975, 1981) argued his researches that the categorisation of internal and external locus of control, which was developed by Rotter (1966), was very simple and added the chance factor as a third categorisation. The reason for adding this factor is the observation that the chance and fate factor affect the decisions of the individuals in addition to the external factors. In short, he proposed belief in fate and destiny as another factor that will affect the events within or beyond the control of the individual. Being control-oriented can affect not only the individual's private life but also the professional life. Among these professions, teaching affects the community and the future of society.

Some researches (Lefcourt, 1982; Spector, 1982 etc.) show that teachers' perceptions of environment and work-related attitudes are related to the locus of control and that they have a relationship with teaching performance. Teachers are affected by environmental factors. For example,

the organizational structure plays a role in the social norms of other teachers, the type of leadership of the school principal, and teachers' locus of control. (1) *Organizational structure* affects the characteristics of work, participation in decision making, and work attitudes and commitment (Cheng, 1994; Oldham & Hackman, 1981), (2) *Social norms of other teachers* play a significant role in teachers' social relations with each other and their behaviors (Cheng, 1994), (3) *The type of leadership of the school principal* shape the school's organizational characteristics, the values and beliefs of the teachers (Cheng, 1994; Sergiovanni, 1984), (4) *Organizational culture*, beliefs and values shared in the school organization are examples of environmental factors that affect teachers' decisions (Cheng, 1994; Shein, 1985). Overall, these affect teachers' motivation and commitment as well as student achievement and performance (Sadowski & Woodward, 1983; Weiner, 2003; Weiner, Nierenberg, & Goldstein, 1976). Parkay, Greenwood, Olejnik & Proller (1988) found that the locus of control had a negative relationship between teacher stress and effectiveness.

The study of Cheng (1994) with 588 secondary school teachers in Hong Kong investigated the relationship between teachers' locus of control and professional attitude along with school organisation and found that the locus of control was a strong indicator of teachers' professional attitudes. The study also found out the teachers who have internal locus of control have job satisfaction, external satisfaction, as well as satisfaction in their social relations, have clear roles in their lives and display an indication that they can do the work. Czubaj's (2000) research also state that the control-oriented feature of the teachers also affects the students. The research of Kiral (2012) found a significant positive correlation between perfectionism of school principals and internal locus of control. Akkaya (2015) has found that single and teachers have higher level of chance locus of control compared to married teachers. Bein, Anderson & Maes' (1990) study indicated that there was a negative correlation between external control focus and job satisfaction of teachers. Sunbul (2003) found that teachers' external locus of control and their age are positively and directly related to emotional burnout.

As seen, researches on the teachers in this field are limited in Aydin. This also raises and reveals the importance of the research. The results of the research will be shared with the Provincial National Education Directorate of Aydin by the researcher and this research will be effective in planning various trainings for teachers. This means that teachers' trainings can be effective in their personal development, professional qualifications, communication with students, colleagues, parents and administrators, and job satisfaction etc. Therefore, this research is important for teachers. In addition, knowing the relationship between the locus of control and the different variables can help the school administrators. For example, if the administrators know what type of locus of control male and female teachers, they can administrate the teachers the best especially in terms of planning, influencing, coordinating and communicating etc. Another example is to be married or single. If the administrators know that the teachers are married and single (including being divorced), they can

behave accordingly. The variables used in the research are important. For these reasons, the aim of this study is to reveal the relationship between high school teachers' locus of control with different variables. Therefore, following research questions are sought:

1. What are the levels of the teachers' locus of control?

2. Does teachers' locus of control show a significant difference according to gender, age, seniority, specialty, marital status, educational status, school type, length of service at that school, love the profession and the socio-economic status of the school?

### **Methodology**

Descriptive survey model (Buyukozturk, Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2008; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006; Karasar, 2012) was used to investigate the relationship between Anatolian High School teachers' locus of control and different variables such as gender, age, seniority, specialty, marital status, educational status, school type, length of service at that school, love the profession and the socio-economic status of the school.

### **Study Group**

The participants of this research are 335 teachers working in public Anatolian High Schools in Aydin during 2015-2016 academic year. The teachers in the research were consist of 68.7 % (n: 230) male and 31.3 % (n: 105) female; 16.1 % (n: 54) 30 ages and less; 20.3 % (n: 68) from 31 to 35 ages; 25.7 % (n: 86) from 36 to 40 ages; 18.2 % (n:61) from 41 and 45 ages; 19.7 % (n: 66) from 46 ages and more; 88.1 % (n:295) of teachers were undergraduate, 11.9 % (n: 40) postgraduate; 20.3% (n: 68) single, 79.7% (n:267) married. The teacher worked in same school 69 % (n: 231) 5 and less years, 17 % (n: 57) from 6 to 10 years, 14 % (n: 47) 11 years and more. The teachers specialties were 61.2 % (n: 205) verbal field, 29.3 % (n: 98) numeric field; 9.6 % (n: 32) skill field. Teachers seniorities were consists of 17.3% (n: 58) 5 years and less; 18.2 % (n: 61) from 6 to10 years; 20.3 % (n: 68) from 11 to 15 years; 21.2 % (n: 71) from 16 to 20 years and 23 % (n: 77) 21 years and more. The teachers who love their professions were 93.1 % (n: 312) and not love their profession 6.9 % (n: 23); the school's socio-economic status were 41.8 % (n: 140) low; 52.2 % (n: 175) medium and 6 % (n: 20) high.

### **Data Collection Tools**

In this study, the locus of control scale and demographic form which included several variables (gender, age, seniority, specialty, marital status, educational status, school type, length of service at that school, love the profession and the socio-economic status of the school) were used. Multi-Dimensional Locus of Control Scale was used in this research. The scale was explained below.

*Multi-Dimensional Locus of Control Scale:* This scale is developed by Levenson (1974, 1981) to measure teachers' locus of control levels and multi-dimensional structure of it. The scale was

adapted to Turkish by Kiral (2012). In the adaptation process, six-scale Likert style was used [Strongly agree (1) – strongly disagree (6)]. Levenson (1974) categorised the items under three factors in the construct validity of research. The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient was .75 for Internal Locus of Control, .76 for External and .61 for Chance. The original scale has 24 items, but five items were removed in the adaptation study. The Turkish adaptation of the scale has 8 items for Internal Locus of Control, 6 items for External others and 5 items for Chance. The scale has no reverse items. The Cronbach alpha co-efficient for the scale are .77 for Internal Locus of Control, .60 for External others and .62 for Chance. Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient for 19 items is .78. The indices calculated for the fit of the scale is three factor structures to the data are as follows:  $X^2(df=149) = 241,04$ ;  $\chi^2/df = 1,62$ ; CFI=.92; SMSR=.078; RMSEA= .057. According to these criteria, the model is good. Construct validity study was not conducted, but for this research, the Cronbach alpha co-efficient are .74 for Internal Locus of Control; .61 for External; and .63 for Chance. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency of the scale is .72. These values are sufficient indicators of validity and reliability. According to Tavşancil (2006), it is sufficient to have a value between .60 and .80 to argue that a scale has valid reliability values.

### **Data Analysis**

Frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, parametric and non-parametric difference tests were used to analyze the data. Frequency and percentage was used for teachers' demographic information; mean and standard deviation was utilized for teachers' locus of control (LOC) level. The parametric difference tests (t-test and ANOVA) were used to find out whether teachers' locus of control levels showed significant difference according to independent variables (gender, age, experience, educational status, etc.) in cases where normality conditions of teachers were ensured (Borg & Gall, 1989; Creswell, 2013; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006; Gravetter & Wallnau, 2004). The Tukey test was used to determine the groups that showed significant difference in ANOVA. Non-parametric difference tests Kruskal Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests were performed in cases where normality conditions were not. The Kruskal Wallis test was conducted using the Mann-Whitney U Test to determine the source of the difference (Cokluk, Sekercioğlu & Buyukozturk, 2012; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006; Gravetter & Wallnau, 2004; Salkind, 2015). Before the normality of the data, extreme values and 12 non-filled data collection tools were excluded from the analysis. The remaining 335 data collection tools were analyzed. The normality conditions of the data were analyzed by measures of central tendency, the skewness and kurtosis coefficient of the data groups and the Kolmogorov-Smirnow test. It was found that the central tendency and skewness and kurtosis coefficients were close to each other between +1,5 and -1,5 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The Kolmogorov-Smirnow test was found to be suitable ( $p > .05$ ). The statistical significance of the data was tested at .05 level.

## Findings

The findings are categorized as findings related to teachers' locus of control level and findings concerning teachers' locus of control with different variables.

### Findings related to teachers' locus of control levels

Findings related to teachers' locus of control (LOC) levels are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** The teachers locus of control levels

Dimensions	n	$\bar{X}$	S
Internal LOC		4.12	.852
External LOC		3.36	.824
Chance LOC	335	3.01	.932
General LOC		3.59	.594

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that Anatolian High School teachers mostly exhibit Internal locus of control and this is followed by external and chance. Teachers' general locus of control is higher than the average.

### Findings related to the relationship of teachers' locus of control with various variables

The statistical data regarding the control locus of Anatolian High School teachers regarding gender, age, seniority, specialty, marital status, educational status, school type, length of service at that school, love the profession and the socio-economic status of the school are given below. The locus of control levels of Anatolian High School teachers change according to gender variable are given in Table 2.

**Table 2.** The results of t-test of teachers' genders

Dimensions	Gender	n	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	t	p
Internal LOC	Male	230	4.11	.843	333	.111	.911
	Female	105	4.12	.876			
External LOC	Male	230	3.35	.803		.409	.683
	Female	105	3.39	.872			
Chance LOC	Male	230	3.01	.918		.037	.970
	Female	105	3.02	.966			
General LOC	Male	230	3.58	.593		.265	.791
	Female	105	3.60	.598			

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference in locus of control according to the gender of teachers. The t-test results to determine whether the locus of control level of Anatolian High School teachers vary according to the educational status variable are given in Table 3.

**Table 3.** The results of t-test of teachers' educational status

Dimensions	Educational status	n	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	t	p
Internal LOC	Undergraduate	295	4.15	.850	333	1.928	.055*
	Postgraduate	40	3.87	.839			
External LOC	Undergraduate	295	3.38	.822		.925	.356
	Postgraduate	40	3.25	.838			
Chance LOC	Undergraduate	295	2.97	.938		2.150	.032*
	Postgraduate	40	3.31	.838			
General LOC	Undergraduate	295	3.60	.586		.681	.496
	Postgraduate	40	3.53	.656			

When Table 3 is examined, it can be seen that the locus of control levels according to the education level of the teachers do not show a significant difference in the subscale of external, but there is a significant difference in the subscale of Internal locus of control and chance. Teachers with undergraduate education have higher levels of Internal control than those with postgraduate education, whereas teachers with postgraduate education have a higher chance of locus of control than those with undergraduate degrees. The results of the t-test of to determine if Anatolian High School teachers' locus of control changed according to the marital status are given in Table 4.

**Table 4.** The results of t-test of teachers' marital status

Dimensions	Marital status	n	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	t	p
Internal LOC	Single	68	3.95	1.037	333	1.747	.081
	Marrried	267	4.16	.796			
External LOC	Single	68	3.45	.952		.956	.340
	Marrried	267	3.34	.789			
Chance LOC	Single	68	3.09	1.107		.703	.483
	Marrried	267	2.99	.883			
General LOC	Single	68	3.57	.771		.353	.724
	Marrried	267	3.59	.541			

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference in locus of control according to the marital status of teachers. The results of ANOVA test to determine if Anatolian High School teachers' locus of control according to age variable are given in Table 5.

**Table 5.** The results of ANOVA (Tukey test) of teachers' ages

Dimensions	Ages	n	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	F	p	Diff.
Internal LOC	30 ages and less	54	4.16	1.104	4.330	1.203	.309	
	31- 35 ages	68	4.03	.757				
	36- 40 ages	86	4.26	.797				
	41 – 45 ages	61	3.98	.660				
	46 ages and more	66	4.11	.928				
External LOC	30 ages and less	54	3.65	1.106	4.330	2.059	.086	
	31- 35 ages	68	3.29	.701				
	36- 40 ages	86	3.30	.669				
	41 – 45 ages	61	3.33	.873				

	46 ages and more	66	3.32	.782			
	30 ages and less	54	2.73	1.128		2.977	.019*
Chance LOC	31- 35 ages	68	3.20	.837			
	36- 40 ages	86	2.91	.869			1/2-4
	41 – 45 ages	61	3.22	.911			
	46 ages and more	66	3.00	.889			
	30 ages and less	54	3.63	.789		.100	.982
General LOC	31- 35 ages	68	3.58	.541			
	36- 40 ages	86	3.60	.520			
	41 – 45 ages	61	3.57	.581			
	46 ages and more	66	3.57	.579			

When Table 5 is examined, the locus of control according to the age of the teachers does not show any significant difference in the other subscales except for the chance locus of control. To find the source of the difference, multiple comparison tests were performed, and it was determined that the level of chance locus of control of the teachers at the age of 30 and below was lower than the teachers between 31 and 35 age group and 41-45 age group. ANOVA test results with regard to teachers specialty is presented Table 6.

**Table 6.** The results of ANOVA (Tukey test) of teachers' specialty

Dimensions	Specialty	n	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	F	P	Diff.
Internal LOC	Verbal field	205	4.09	.884	2:331	1.586	.206	
	Numeric field	98	4.22	.739				
	Skill field	32	3.93	.949				
External LOC	Verbal field	205	3.37	.866		.055	.947	
	Numeric field	98	3.34	.721				
	Skill field	32	3.35	.871				
Chance LOC	Verbal field	205	3.08	.960		6.123	.002*	2/1-3
	Numeric field	98	2.77	.760				
	Skill field	32	3.36	1.073				
General LOC	Verbal field	205	3.60	.647		.132	.877	
	Numeric field	98	3.56	.438				
	Skill field	32	3.60	.665				

As table 6 suggests, teachers' locus of control do not show any significance difference according to the teaching specialty. The only difference can be seen in chance subscale. Numeric field teachers' have lower chance based locus of control compared to verbal field teachers. ANOVA test results regarding Anatolian High School teachers' locus of control according to years of seniority are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7.** The results of ANOVA (Tukey test) of teachers' seniority

Dimensions	Seniority	n	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	F	P	Diff.
Internal LOC	5 years and less	58	4.17	.920	4.289	2.051	.087	
	6-10 years	61	4.00	.878				
	11-15 years	68	4.22	.782				
	16 -20 years	71	3.92	.910				
	21 years and more	77	4.25	.756				
External LOC	5 years and less	58	3.65	1.018	4.289	2.344	.055*	
	6-10 years	61	3.28	.831				
	11-15 years	68	3.33	.653				
	16 -20 years	71	3.36	.833				
	21 years and more	77	3.24	.751				
Chance LOC	5 years and less	58	2.76	1.096	4.289	2.078	.083	
	6-10 years	61	3.09	.812				
	11-15 years	68	3.19	.823				
	16 -20 years	71	3.08	.982				
	21 years and more	77	2.93	.902				
General LOC	5 years and less	58	3.63	.704	4.289	.726	.575	
	6-10 years	61	3.54	.581				
	11-15 years	68	3.67	.527				
	16 -20 years	71	3.52	.650				
	21 years and more	77	3.59	.513				

When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that the locus of control levels according to the experience of teachers do not show any significant difference in other subscales except for external locus of control. When the multiple comparison test was conducted, it was found that the teachers who had experience of 5 years or less had higher levels of external locus of control than the teachers with 21 years of seniority. ANOVA test results with regard to the length of service at that schools are displayed in Table 8.

**Table 8.** The results of ANOVA (Tukey test) of teachers' length of service at that school

Dimensions	Years	n	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	F	p
Internal LOC	5 years and less	231	4.11	.843	2.332	.344	.709
	6-10 years	57	4.07	.898			
	11 years and more	47	4.20	.853			
External LOC	5 years and less	231	3.37	.877	2.332	.158	.854
	6-10 years	57	3.38	.672			
	11 years and more	47	3.30	.729			
Chance LOC	5 years and less	231	3.00	.903	2.332	.125	.883
	6-10 years	57	3.05	.894			
	11 years and more	47	3.06	1.118			
General LOC	5 years and less	231	3.58	.617	2.332	.066	.936
	6-10 years	57	3.58	.553			
	11 years and more	47	3.62	.533			

When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference in locus of control according to the teachers' length of service at that school. The results of the Mann-Whitney U test are shown in Table 9 to determine if the locus of control levels differ according to the love the profession.

**Table 9.** The results of Mann-Whitney U Ttest of teachers' love the profession

Dimensions	Love the profession	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	
					U	p
Internal LOC	Yes	312	168.77	52657	3347	.590
	No	23	157.52	3623		
External LOC	Yes	312	167.17	52158	33300	.564
	No	23	179.22	4122		
Chance LOC	Yes	312	168.70	52633	3371	.628
	No	23	158.57	3647		
General LOC	Yes	312	168.29	52505.5	3498.5	.842
	No	23	164.11	3774.5		

When Table 9 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference in locus of control according to the teachers love the profession. Kruskal Wallis test was conducted to find if teachers' perception with regard to the socio-economic status of the schools they work showed any significant difference. The findings are presented in Table 10.

**Table 10.** The results of Kruskal-Wallis Test of the socio-economic status of the schools

Dimensions	Socio-economic status	n	Mean rank	X <sup>2</sup>	sd	p	Diff.
Internal LOC	Low	140	156.48	3.542	2.332	.170	
	Medium	175	177.12				
	High	20	168.85				
External LOC	Low	140	154.29	14.554	2.332	.001*	3/1-2
	Medium	175	170.55				
	High	20	241.65				
Chance LOC	Low	140	165.97	5.342	2.332	.069	
	Medium	175	164.11				
	High	20	216.30				
General LOC	Low	140	152.95	11.449	2.332	.003*	3/1-2
	Medium	175	173.24				
	High	20	227.48				

As seen table 10, teachers' perceptions showed significance difference only in powerful others subscale and general locus of control. The comparison test (Mann Whitney U test) was conducted to find out the source of the difference, it was seen that the levels of control center and general locus of control of the teachers who perceived the high socio-economic status of the school were higher than the teachers who perceived the socio-economic status of the school as low and medium.

### **Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions**

It is known that Individuals have three different locus of control; internal, external and chance. Those who have internal locus of control believe that they can change the causes and results of incidents, those who believe in external trust in their families, relative, intimate environment or state in changing the course of events. Lastly, those who believe in chance hold superstitious beliefs or think chance, destiny, god or astrology play a significant role in how events evolve.

As the research shows (Kiral, 2012; Rotter, 1954, 1966; Yesilyaprak, 1988 etc.) individuals with high internal locus of control work more enthusiastically and they are more successful. However, some of the individuals in the society prioritize other types of control rather than internal control in their lives. This does not only affect the personal or family life of the individual, but also the professional life. The locus of control is important in the decisions taken by teachers, identifying the causes and results of the events, acting and deciding freely. This research aimed to determine the locus of control levels of high school teachers according to various variables.

According to the results of the study; it is seen that high school teachers' exhibit the internal locus of control at the highest level and then external and chance based locus of control. Akkaya (2015); Bein, Anderson and Maes (1990); Bulus (1996); Cayli (2013); Kiral (2012); Yesilyaprak (1998) found the similar results in their researches. The reason for this similarity is that the teaching profession is based on control. Because the teachers have to keep the events and students under control. Of course, in addition to what they do and their tendency to keep under control, they should decide the course of events themselves.

There is no significant difference between the locus of control according to the gender of the teachers in this research. Akkaya (2015); Bein, Anderson & Maes (1990); Buluş (1996), Çaylı (2013); Kiral (2012); Yeşilyaprak (1998) found similar results, too. On the other hand, Callaghan and Papageorgiou, (2015); Cakır (2017); Fagbohunbe and Jayeoba, (2012); Oguz and Saricam (2016); Sakarya-Kucukkaragoz (1998), Surgen (2014); Stocks, April & Lynton, (2012) found a significant difference. Because of the fact that the sample groups in these studies are different, it can be said that different results can be obtained by the research

In this research and Canbay's (2007) research found that the marital status variable was not effective on teachers' locus of control whereas Jamal, Yaseen, Zahra and Sayyeda (2014) identified significance difference. In addition, other variables that did not differ significantly in this study were the length of service at that school studied, whether or not they would like to do their job. No similar studies could be find that examined these variables.

Teachers with an undergraduate degree have higher internal locus of control than those with a postgraduate degree; and teachers with postgraduate education have higher chance-based locus of

control than those with undergraduate degrees. Akkaya (2015); Canbay (2007); Kiral (2012) and Sakarya-Kucukkaragoz (1998) found that postgraduate education did not make a significant difference on teachers' views.

It was found that the level of chance-based locus of control of teachers at the age of 30 and less was lower than the teachers in the age group 31-35 and 41-45. Young teachers under the age of 30, to be a teacher by taking an exam and they were assigned to the teaching profession according to the result. There is no chance factor for passing this exam. If you study, you pass. Therefore, it can be said that the levels of chance-based locus of control are low. On the other hand, Akkaya (2015); Kiral (2012), Sakarya-Kucukkaragoz (1998) found that the age variable did not make a significant difference in the internal locus of control.

This research shows that the levels of exhibiting the chance-based locus of control of numeric field teachers are lower than the verbal field teachers. Numeric field teachers tend to prove all the thing because of their branches. But Akkaya (2015) and Canbay's (2007) researches' that teachers' locus of control has a significant difference.

The research shows that teachers who have experiences of 5 years or less have higher levels of external locus of control compared to teachers with 21 years of seniority and more. Teachers whose seniority have less, they may be under the influence of others and may tend to do until they learn the profession of teaching, what they say. For this reason, external locus of control levels may be higher than experienced teachers. Ahluwalia and Preet (2017); Akkaya (2015); Kiral (2012); Sakarya-Kucukkaragoz (1998) also revealed similar findings in their research.

It was found that the levels of external and general locus of control of the teachers who perceived the socio-economic status of the school were higher than the teachers who perceived the socio-economic status of the school as low. Teachers think that the socio-economic status of the school based on others to act in accordance with this answer can be interpreted that they have given the answer.

The results of the research underline the importance and necessity of informing teachers on internal locus of control through informative booklets. Teachers can be supported by practical training courses given by the academics who have expertise in this field. There may be efforts to encourage inexperienced teachers to be more independent and they can be encouraged by senior teachers and school leaders so that they can work independently. The same research can be conducted with preschool, primary and secondary school teachers or school principals and the results can be compared. By using qualitative research techniques with teachers and school principals, the effects of locus of control on work, friends and family life can be revealed.

## References

- Ahluwalia, A. K. & Preet, K. (2017). Work motivation, organizational commitment and locus of control work experience amongst university teachers. *SAMVAD: SIBM Pune Research Journal*, XIV, 26-33.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.
- Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived behavioral control, self-efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(4), 665-683.
- Akkaya, R. (2015). *Relationship between locus of control and job satisfaction of teachers*. Master Thesis. Adnan Menderes University, Aydin.
- Balaban-Dagal, A. & Bayindir, D. (2016). The investigation of the level of self-directed learning readiness according to the locus of control and personality traits of preschool teacher candidates. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 8(3), 391-402.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unified theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bein, J., Anderson, D. E. & Maes, W. R. (1990). Teacher locus of control and job satisfaction. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 14(3), 7-10.
- Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational research*. New York: Longman.
- Bulus, M. (1996). *The Relationship between locus of control and loneliness level in adolescents*. Master Thesis. Dokuz Eylul University, İzmir.
- Buyukozturk, S., Cakmak, E. K., Akgun, O. A., Karadeniz, S. & Demirel, F. (2008). *Scientific research methods*. Ankara: PegemAkademi.
- Callaghan, C. & Papageorgiou, E. (2015). Gender differences in locus of control and student performance in the South African context of accounting studies. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 23(3), 348-368.
- Canbay, S. (2007). *The relationship between the locus of control and job satisfaction of the elementary school teachers*. Dokuz Eylul University, İzmir.
- Cheng, Y. C. (1994). Locus of control as an indicator of Hong Kong teachers' job attitudes and perceptions of organizational characteristics. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 87(3), 180-188.
- Cakir, M. (2017). Investigating prospective teachers' perceived problem-solving abilities in relation to gender, major, place lived, and locus of control. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5(6), 1030-1038.
- Cayli, B. (2013). *The relationship between locus of control, job satisfaction and mediating effect of organizational justice*. Master Thesis. Balikesir University, Balikesir.
- Cokluk, O., Sekercioglu, G. & Buyukozturk, S. (2012). *SPSS and LISREL applications of multivariate statistics for social sciences*. Ankara: PegemAkademi.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design*. California: SAGE.
- Czubaj, C. A. (2000). Maintaining teacher motivation. *Education*, 116(3), 372-378.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95, 256-273.
- Edwards, D. J. A. (2005). Personality. Louw, D. A. & Edwards, D. J. A. (eds.). *Psychology: an introduction for students in Southern Africa* (541–604). Sandton: Heinemann.

- Findley, M.J., & Cooper, H.M. (1983). Locus of control and academic achievement: a literature review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(2), 419-27.
- Fagbohunbe, O. B. & Jayeoba, F. I. (2012). Locus of control, gender and entrepreneurial ability. *British Journal of Arts And Social Sciences*, 11(1), 74-85.
- Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Comp.
- Friedman, G. H., Barry E. Lehrer & Stevens, J. P. (1983). The effectiveness of self-directed and lecture/discussion stress management approaches and the locus of control of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 20(4), 563-580.
- Friedman, M. L. W., & Dies, R. R. (1974). Reactions of internal and external test-anxious students to counseling and behavior therapies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 921.
- Gravetter, F. J. & Wallnau, L. B. (2004). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Heckhausen, H. (1977). Achievement motivation and its constructs: A cognitive model. *Motivation and Emotion*, 1, 283-329.
- Hong, Y., Chiu, C., Dweck, C. S., Lin, D. M. S. & Wan, W. (1999). Implicit theories, attributions, and coping: A meaning system approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 588-599.
- Jamal, Y., Yaseen, F., Zahra, F. & Sayyeda, T. (2014). Life satisfaction and locus of control among teachers. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, 5(9), 1115-1118.
- Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (2003). *Contemporary management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Judge, T. A. & Bono, J. E. (2001a). A rose by any other name: Are Self-Esteem, Generalized Self-Efficacy, Neuroticism, and Locus of Control Indicators of a Common Construct? B. W. Roberts and R. Hogan (Edts). *Personality Psychology in the Workplace*. (pp. 93-118). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10434-004>
- Judge, T. A. & Bono, J. E. (2001b). Relationship of Core Self-Evaluations Traits—Self-Esteem, Generalized Self-Efficacy, Locus of Control, and Emotional Stability—With Job Satisfaction and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 80-92.
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Scientific research methods*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Kiral, E. (2012). *The relationship between locus of control and perfectionism perception of the primary school administrators*. Doctoral dissertation. Ankara University, Ankara.
- Kyriacou, C. & Sutcliffe, J. (1979). A note on teacher stress and locus of control. *The British Psychological Society*. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1979.tb00456.x>. Retrived date: 13.04.2019
- Norton, G. (2005). Stress and coping. Louw, D. A. & Edwards, D. J. A., (eds). *Psychology: An introduction for students in Southern Africa*(605–663). Sandton: Heinemann,
- Lefcourt, H. M. (1982). *Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lefcourt, H. M., Lewis, L. & Silverman, I. W. (1968). Internal versus external control of reinforcement attention in decisionmaking tasks. *Journal of Personality*, 36, 668-682.
- Lefcourt, H. M., & Siegel, J. (1970). Reaction time behavior as a function of Internal- external control of reinforcement and control of test administration. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 2, 253-266.

- Levenson, H. (1973). Perceived parental antecedents of internal powerful others and change locus control orientations. *Developmental Psychology*, 9, 260-275.
- Levenson, H. (1974). Activism and powerful others: Distinctions within the concept of Internal-external control. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 38, 377-383.
- Levenson, H. (1975). Additional dimensions at internal -external control. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 97, 303-304.
- Levenson, H. (1981). Differentiating among Internality, powerful others and chance. *Academic Press*, 12, 15-63.
- Loosemore, M. & Lam A.S.Y. (2004). The locus of control: a determinant of opportunistic behaviour in construction health and safety. *Construction Management and Economics*, 22, 385-394.
- Oldham, G. R., & Hackman, J. R. (1981). Relationships between organizational structure and employees reactions: Comparing alternative frameworks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 66-83.
- Oguz, A. & Saricam, H. (2016). The Relationship between critical thinking disposition and locus of control in pre-service teachers. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 4(2), 182- 192.
- Oxford Dictionary. (2018). <https://www.oxforddictionaries.com/> Retrived date: 09.10.2018
- Rotter, J. B. (1954). *Social Learning and Clinical Psychology*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Parkay, F. W., Greenwood, G., Olejnik, S., & Proller, N. (1988). A study of the relationships among teacher efficacy, locus of control, and stress. *Journal of Research & Development in Education*, 21(4), 13-22.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for Internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80(1), 1-28.
- Sakarya-Kuçukkaragoz, H. (1998). *Elementary schools teachers locus of control and theirs locus of controls effects on their students*. Doctoral Dissertation. Dokuz Eylul University, Izmir.
- Salkind, N. (2015). *Statistics for People Who (Think They) Hate Statistics*. (Trans. A. Cuhadaroglu). Ankara: PegemAkademi.
- Sadowski, C. J., & Woodward, H. R. (1983). Teacher locus of control and classroom climate: A crosslagged correlational study. *Psychology in the Schools*, 20, 506-509.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. *Educational Leadership*, 41(5), 4-13.
- Silvester J., Anderson-Gough F. M., Anderson N. R. & Mohammed, A. R. (2002). Locus of control, attributions and impression management in the selection interview. *Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 59-76.
- Skinner, E. A. (1996). A Guide to Constructs of Control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(3), 549-570.
- Spector, P. E. (1982). Behavior in Organizations as a Function of Employees Locus of Control. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91(3), 482- 497.
- Stocks, A., April, K. A. & Lynton, N. (2012). Locus of control and subjective well-being-a crosscultural study. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 10(1), 17-25.
- Surgen, S. (2014), *Correlation between class teacher's focus of control and level of burnout*. Master Thesis. Balıkesir University, Balıkesir.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston: Pearson.
- Tavsancil, E. (2006). *Measurement of attitudes and data analysis with SPSS*. Ankara: Nobel.

- Uslu, M. (1999). *Comparison of job satisfaction of psychological counselors and guidance experts working in official educational institutions according to locus of control and some variables*. Master Thesis. Selcuk University, Konya.
- Vickers, R. R., Conway, T. L., & Haight, M. A. (1983). Association between Levenson's dimensions of locus of control and measures of coping and defense mechanisms. *Psychological Reports, 52*, 323–333.
- Weiner, H. M. (2003). Effective inclusion: Professional development in the context of the classroom. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 35*, 12–18.
- Weiner, B., Nierenberg, R., & Goldstein, M. (1976). Social learning (locus of control) versus attributional (causal stability) interpretations of expectancy of success. *Journal of Personality, 44*, 52–68.
- Weiner, B., & Kukla, A. (1970). An attributional analysis of achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 15*, 1-20.
- Yesilyaprak, B. (1988). *Factors affecting the Internal or external control of high school students*. Doctoral Dissertation. Hacettepe University, Ankara.