Available online at www.jlls.org

JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES

ISSN: 1305-578X

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 14(3), 308-324; 2018

Prospective EFL teachers' locus of control and academic self-efficacy in Turkish context*

Özkan Kırmızı [a]† , Arif Sarıçoban [b]

[a] *Karabük University, Karabük, Turkey*
[b] *Selçuk University, Konya, Turkey*

APA Citation:

Kırmızı, Ö., & Sarıçoban, A (2018). Prospective EFL teachers' locus of control and academic self-efficacy in Turkish context. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 14*(3), 308-324.

Submission Date:25/06/2018

Acceptance Date:16/07/2018

Abstract

This study tries to explore the relationship between prospective EFL teachers' locus of control and academic self-efficacy in Turkey. For the purpose of the study, the quantitative data of the research was collected through Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale developed by Levenson (1974) and adapted to Turkish by Kıral (2012). The scale, consisting of 24 items (6 point Likert type), simply examines the internal and the external locus of control of pre-service EFL teacher candidates. It measures (a) internal locus of control (8 items), (b) locus of control based on others (6 items), and (c) locus of control based on chance (5 items). The Cronbach Alpha coefficient for this scale is .77. As to the Academic Self-efficacy Scale, College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale was adapted from Owen & Froman (1988), consisting of 33 items measuring male and female ELT students' academic self-efficacy beliefs as a whole. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient for this scale is .83. The scale is a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'very little' (1) 'quite a lot' (5). It is assumed that the higher the locus of control of EFL teachers, the higher level of academic self-efficacy is. At the end of the study, considering the results, some recommendations will be made for language instructors at these institutions.

Keywords: locus of control; academic self-efficacy; EFL; state universities

1. Introduction

As a psychological construct, the concept of locus of control was first put forward by Phares (1957) in the form of internal locus of control and external locus of control based on the social-cognitive theory. It was later elaborated on by Rotter (1966) within the scope of his Social Learning Theory. It is defined as "a person's control over life events" (Williams & Burden, 2000, p. 101). Locus of control is an important personality variable based on the assumption that praises or punishments that a person receives lead to generalized expectancies about the consequences of their future behaviors. Rotter (1966) believes that internal locus of control refers to the expectancy that an individual is in control or

* This article is an extended version of the oral presentation presented at GLOBELT 2018 Conference in Belgrad, Serbia, 10-13 May, 2018.

† Corresponding author. Tel.: + 90 370 433 82 94
E-mail address: ozkankirmizi@karabuk.edu.tr

instrumental in obtaining rewards from one's environment. On the other hand, external locus of control implies that rewards are out of one's control and determined by luck.

Locus of control is also closely related to Attribution Theory, developed by Weiner (1979) to explain to what people attribute the causes of their successes or failures. People who have a high level of external locus of control have a tendency to believe that external factors motivate a given event. As opposed to this, an internal attribution views the causal relationship as emerging from factors within a person rather than environmental ones (Vaidyanathan & Aggarwal, 2003). Research in general indicates that those with internal attribution tend to persist and successfully complete tasks. In contrast, externals avoid performing particular learning task and may tend to work on other tasks.

Locus of control is generally defined as the extent to which people or individuals believe that they can control events that affect them. Those who have a high level of locus of control think that events result fundamentally from their own behavior or actions. Individuals with a low level of locus of control believe that powerful others, fate, or chance primarily determine events.

One of the most important components of teacher development is affective factors. Getting an understanding of teachers' affective development, it would be appropriate to investigate teacher effectiveness (Senleri, 2016). Locus of control and self -efficacy beliefs of second language teachers are considered to be effective factors that influence EFL teachers' effectiveness. Therefore, pre-service teachers should be investigated in relation to these variables.

Locus of control is a cognitive-behavioral attribute. It has two dimensions: internal locus of control and external locus of control. Individuals with an internal locus of control believe that the outcomes of events are a result of their own actions. Individuals with an internal locus of control tend to assume responsibility for their own learning or efforts and they believe that they can change the order things. In contrast, those with external locus of control tend to believe that events result from external factors such as chance, fate and powerful others. They have a tendency to put the blame on others or external factors for the outcomes of events.

1.1. Literature review

Locus of control has been studied in relation to a number of variables. Significant correlations have been found, for example, between locus of control, optimism, and academic success of students (e.g. Nilson-Whitten, Morder, and Kapakla, 2007). Nwankwo and colleagues, for example, (2012) found significant relations between high levels of self-esteem and internal locus of control in a sample of well-functioning older adolescents. Moreover, studies conducted by Jansenn and Carton (1999) and Beck et al. (2000) found that students with internal locus of control do not avoid works and tasks as much as those with external locus of control. Besides, studies also came up with results indicating that internality related to achievement for males than females and a better predictor of social adaptation for females than for males. In a study that focused on the relation between locus of control and university students' perceived self-efficacy, Sagone & Caroli (2014) found out that when students viewed themselves as more academically competent, they assumed more control on their everyday life circumstances.

In addition, there are also studies that focus on locus of control and skill learning. Rahimi & Rouhollah (2014), for example, worked on locus of control orientations of students and their vocabulary learning strategies. The results of this study showed that there was a statistically significant correlation between EFL learners' locus of control and their use of vocabulary learning strategies. The study also found that there was no significant difference between male and female participants in terms of their locus of control and their use of vocabulary learning strategies. In another study, Ghonsooly & Mashhad (2011) studies locus of control in terms of L2 reading and writing achievement. Their study found that

learners who believe they can influence their own learning are more likely to succeed in L2 writing and reading.

In Turkish context, locus of control has been studied in relation to different variables. Akkaya and Akyol (2016) conducted a study on the relation between locus of control and job satisfaction of teachers. They found that internal job satisfaction of teachers is high and external job satisfaction is low. In addition, they also found that there is a significant relation between locus of control and job satisfaction and based on this they suggested that teachers must be prompted to take on more responsibility for taking decisions about their profession, especially in their fields. Akça and Yaman (2010) conducted a study investigating the impact of internal locus of control and external locus of control on teacher burnout. They worked with technology, social sciences and classroom teachers. They concluded that teachers tend to have internal locus of control and they suffer from burnout in terms of sensitivity and emotionality.

In another study, Balkır and Yavuz (2017) worked on locus of control orientations of pre-service L2 teachers. Their study found that the participants had greater internal locus of control orientations. In relation to the variables like gender, academic achievement, and grade level, their study did not find any statistically significant differences. In another study, Buluş (2011) worked on the relation between locus of control and pre-service teachers' academic achievement. The results of this study indicate there is a positive relationship between locus of control and academic achievement. Moreover, this study also found that mastery and avoidance goal orientations were predicted by locus of control and academic achievement was predicted by goal orientations and locus of control together.

There is a shortage of studies that focus on pre-service teachers' locus of control in Turkey. In one study, Şenler (2016) focused on pre-service science teachers' locus of control, anxiety, self-efficacy, and attitude. The results indicated that pre-service science teachers' locus of control was found to be related positively to attitude towards science teaching and related negatively to science teaching anxiety. However, this study was conducted with science teachers. although the findings shed light on teacher education in general, it may not be possible to draw conclusions for EFL teachers. Therefore, there is a need to conduct studies that focus on locus of control orientations of EFL teachers.

1.1.1. Self-efficacy beliefs

Having been referred to as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required producing given attainments" by Bandura (1977, p.3), self-efficacy beliefs are a major component for academic achievement. Academic self-efficacy is generally viewed as an individuals' self-concept and self-efficacy beliefs. More specifically, academic self-efficacy consists of the individuals' convictions as to how successfully he or she can perform given academic tasks (Schunk, 1991).

Self-efficacy beliefs influence both how individuals feel, think, motivate themselves, and behave (Pajares, 1997) and how they select their activities, effort and persistence (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Since people's preferences in selecting and taking part in an activity are based on their beliefs that they are able to accomplish the task, self-efficacy is an important mediator of all types of behaviour.

1.2. Research questions

The present study undertook to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the participants' perceptions in terms of their locus of control
2. What are the self-perceptions of the participants in terms of their academic self-efficacy?
3. Which subscales of locus of control and academic self-efficacy correlate?

4. Is there any statistically significant difference between males and females in terms of locus of control and academic self-efficacy subscales?

2. Method

The study is a descriptive and correlational study which is based on the application of locus of control scale and an academic self-efficacy scale.

2.1. Sample / Participants

The participants of the study are 108 English Language and Literature students. The number of male students is 36 (33,6%) and female students is 71 (66,4%). Since the participants are all undergraduate students, their age range is between 19 – 22.

2.2. Instrument(s)

Two data collection tools were used in the study:

2.2.1. Locus of Control Scale:

Locus of Control Scale was developed by Levenson (1974) and adapted to Turkish by Kıral (2012). Locus of Control Scale is formed of three sub-dimensions which are internal locus of control with the items 1, 2, 3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 19; external locus of control with the items 5, 8, 10, 13, 16, 18; and locus of control based on luck/faith with the items 4, 7, 9, 11, 12.

2.2.2. Academic Self-Efficacy Scale:

The second tool used in the present study was Academic Self-Efficacy Scale, developed by Owen & Froman (1988). An adapted version of the scale was used in the present study due to the fact that some items were not applicable for the participants. The scale consists of 33 items measuring academic self-efficacy beliefs as a whole. This scale is a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'very little' (1) to 'quite a lot' (5). The reliability analysis for both tools is given in Table 1 with their subscales.

Table 1. The reliability analysis of the research tools

scale	Cronbach's Alpha	number of items
Locus of control scale (general)	.624	24
Internal locus of control Subscale	.355	8
Chance Subscale	.599	8
Powerful Others Subscale	.514	8
Self-efficacy (overall)	.915	26
cognitive strategies	.868	14
social strategies	.818	9
technical strategies	.516	3
total	.745	50

2.3. Data analysis and findings

The examination of data has been carried out by means of the SPSS 16. The mean scores and standard deviations are obtained on locus of control and academic self-efficacy variables. Additionally, the subscales of both locus of control and academic self-efficacy scales have also been analyzed. As to locus of control, the subscales are internal, external, and chance. For the academic self-efficacy, the subscales

are cognitive, social, and technical. The overall reliability level for both scales and subscales are given in Table 1 (α=.624 for locus of control; α=.915 for academic self-efficacy)

Research question 1: What are the participants' perceptions in terms of their locus of control?

Data analyses have shown that the participants of the study moderately agree about their strengths of locus of control in their language studies (M=3,60).

Table 2. descriptive statistics for locus of control

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
1. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my ability.	107	1.00	5.00	3.9252	.65446
2. To a great extent my life is controlled by accidental happenings.	106	1.00	5.00	3.3113	1.18211
3. I feel like what happens in my life is mostly determined by powerful people.	107	1.00	5.00	3.8411	.88114
4. Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on how good a driver I am.	107	1.00	4.00	3.3364	1.06349
5. When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.	107	1.00	5.00	3.7570	.78717
6. Often there is no chance of protecting my personal interests from bad luck happenings.	106	1.00	5.00	3.5189	1.01635
7. When I get what I want, it's usually because I'm lucky.	107	1.00	4.00	2.8785	1.37848
8. Although I might have a good ability, I will not be given leadership responsibility without appealing to those in positions of power.	107	1.00	5.00	3.8131	.76640
9. How many friends I have depends on how nice a person I am.	107	1.00	5.00	3.1402	1.43703
10. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.	107	1.00	5.00	4.0654	.78031
11. My life is chiefly controlled by powerful others.	107	1.00	5.00	3.6075	.95914
12. Whether or not I get into a car accident is mostly a matter of luck.	107	1.00	5.00	3.4579	1.08402
13. People like myself have very little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of strong pressure groups.	106	1.00	5.00	3.5094	.95862
14. It's not always wise for me to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune.	106	1.00	5.00	3.1226	1.35015
15. Getting what I want requires pleasing those people above me.	108	1.00	5.00	3.3981	1.12690
16. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends on whether I'm lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time.	108	1.00	5.00	3.6019	1.01337
17. If important people were to decide they didn't like me, I probably wouldn't make many friends.	108	1.00	5.00	3.0185	1.40747
18. I can pretty much determine what will happen in my life.	108	1.00	5.00	4.0093	.63386
19. I am usually able to protect my personal interests.	108	3.00	5.00	4.2593	.46101
20. Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on the other driver.	108	1.00	5.00	3.7593	.63937
21. When I get what I want, it's usually because I worked hard for it.	108	1.00	5.00	4.2593	.56981

22. In order to have my plans work, I make sure that they fit in with the desires of people who have power over me.	107	1.00	5.00	3.8972	.56526
23. My life is determined by my own actions.	108	1.00	5.00	4.0741	.54178
24. It's chiefly a matter of fate whether or not I have a few friends or many friends.	107	1.00	5.00	3.0654	1.31946
25. total				3.60	

a. Internal locus of control

The overall mean score for internal locus of control is 3,84, which indicates almost a slightly high level. In that sense, Table 3 simply shows the opinions of the participants on being usually able to protect their personal interests and getting what they want when they work hard (M=4,25). They agree that their lives are determined by their own actions (M=4,07). Additionally, they have feelings of findings what is going to happen will happen (M=4,06). They report that they can pretty much determined what will happen in their life (M=4,00). Lastly, they agree whether or not they get to be a leader depends mostly on their abilities (M=3,92).

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for internal locus of control

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
1. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my ability.	107	1.00	5.00	3.9252	.65446
2. Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on how good a driver I am.	107	1.00	4.00	3.3364	1.06349
3. When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.	107	1.00	5.00	3.7570	.78717
4. How many friends I have depends on how nice a person I am.	107	1.00	5.00	3.1402	1.43703
5. I can pretty much determine what will happen in my life.	108	1.00	5.00	4.0093	.63386
6. I am usually able to protect my personal interests.	108	3.00	5.00	4.2593	.46101
7. When I get what I want, it's usually because I worked hard for it.	108	1.00	5.00	4.2593	.56981
8. My life is determined by my own actions.	108	1.00	5.00	4.0741	.54178
total				3.84	

b. External locus of control

A careful analysis of Table 4 implies that the participants of the study have moderate level of opinions about external locus of control (M=3,60), believing that in order to have their plans work they make sure that they fit in with the desires of people who have power over them (M=3,89). They feel like what happens in their life is mostly determined by powerful people (M=3,84). Another striking finding obtained in the study is that although they might have good abilities, they will not be given leadership responsibilities without appealing to those in positions of power (M=3,84). Lastly, whether or not they commit a mistake they attribute it to others (M=3,75). Last but not least, they think that their life is chiefly controlled by powerful others (M=3,60).

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for external locus of control

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
1. I feel like what happens in my life is mostly determined by powerful people.	107	1.00	5.00	3.8411	.88114
2. Although I might have good ability, I will not be given leadership responsibility without appealing to those in positions of power.	107	1.00	5.00	3.8131	.76640
3. My life is chiefly controlled by powerful others.	107	1.00	5.00	3.6075	.95914
4. People like myself have very little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of strong pressure groups.	106	1.00	5.00	3.5094	.95862
5. Getting what I want requires pleasing those people above me.	108	1.00	5.00	3.3981	1.12690
6. If important people were to decide they didn't like me, I probably wouldn't make many friends.	108	1.00	5.00	3.0185	1.40747
7. Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on the other driver.	108	1.00	5.00	3.7593	.63937
8. In order to have my plans work, I make sure that they fit in with the desires of people who have power over me.	107	1.00	5.00	3.8972	.56526
total				3.60	

c. Chance as locus of control

A very surprising result with regard to chance as locus of control has been obtained in the study (M=3,37). It is a low moderate level. However, in that sense, the participants have a high level of agreement in reporting that they have often found what is going to happen will happen (M=4,06). Second, they think whether or not they get to be a leader depends on whether they are lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time (M=3,60). They often have the feeling that there is no chance of protecting their personal interests from bad luck (M=3,51). At this vein, they feel whether or not they get into a trouble is a matter of luck (M=3,45).

Table 5. Descriptive statistics for chance as locus of control

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. To a great extent my life is controlled by accidental happenings.	106	1.00	5.00	3.3113	1.18211
2. Often there is no chance of protecting my personal interests from bad luck happenings.	106	1.00	5.00	3.5189	1.01635
3. When I get what I want, it's usually because I'm lucky.	107	1.00	4.00	2.8785	1.37848
4. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.	107	1.00	5.00	4.0654	.78031
5. Whether or not I get into a car accident is mostly a matter of luck.	107	1.00	5.00	3.4579	1.08402
6. It's not always wise for me to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune.	106	1.00	5.00	3.1226	1.35015
7. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends on whether I'm lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time.	108	1.00	5.00	3.6019	1.01337
8. It's chiefly a matter of fate whether or not I have a few friends or many friends.	107	1.00	5.00	3.0654	1.31946

total	3.37

Research question 2: What are the self-perceptions of the participants in terms of their academic self-efficacy?

As a result of the analysis of Table 6, the participants of the study reported almost a high level of attitudes towards their self-efficacy (M=3,90). As to the cognitive subscale, the mean score is 3,86. It is 3,91 for social subscale and 3,98 for technical subscale.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics for academic self-efficacy

items	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
Taking well-organized notes during a lecture.	108	1.00	5.00	3.7685	.81581
Participating in a class discussion	108	1.00	5.00	3.6204	.97365
Answering a question in a large class	108	1.00	5.00	3.5463	1.07984
Answering a question in a small class	108	1.00	5.00	4.0833	.64308
Taking “objective” tests (multiple-choice, T-F, matching)	108	1.00	5.00	3.9815	.84258
Taking essay tests	108	1.00	5.00	3.7500	.83302
Writing a high-quality term paper	108	1.00	5.00	3.5926	.94757
Listening carefully during a lecture on a difficult topic	108	1.00	5.00	3.8796	.69333
Tutoring another student	107	1.00	5.00	3.9533	.78167
Explaining a concept to another student.	107	1.00	5.00	3.8879	.79298
Asking a professor in class to review a concept you don’t understand	107	1.00	5.00	3.6916	.99443
Earning good marks in most classes	108	1.00	5.00	4.0000	.76121
Studying enough to understand content thoroughly	108	1.00	5.00	3.7778	.77741
Running for student government office	108	1.00	5.00	4.1574	.79909
Participating in extracurricular events (spots, clubs)	108	1.00	5.00	4.0000	.82030
Making professors respect you	108	1.00	5.00	4.1111	.78934
Understanding most ideas you read in your tests	108	1.00	5.00	3.9815	.69688
Using a computer	108	1.00	5.00	3.9815	.78516
Mastering most content in a language course.	108	1.00	5.00	4.2593	.61705
Talking to a professor privately to get to know him or her	108	1.00	5.00	4.1852	.82199
Relating course content to material in other courses	108	3.00	5.00	3.8796	.69333
Challenging a professor’s opinion in class	108	1.000	5.000	3.59259	.957382
Making good use of the library	108	1.00	5.00	4.1019	.66893
Getting good grades	107	3.00	5.00	3.9533	.71879
Understanding difficult passages in textbooks	108	1.00	5.00	3.9352	.70078
Mastering content in a course you’re not interested in	108	1.00	5.00	3.7037	.70059
total	106			3.90	

a. Cognitive subscale

Data analysis regarding the cognitive subscale simply indicates that the participants believe to have capacity to master most content in language courses (M=4,25). They have self-confidence to earn good marks in most classes (M=4,00). They report that they have confidence to become successful in objective tests (multiple choice, true / false, matching, etc.) and believe that they will be able to understand most ideas in their reading texts (M=3,98) simply because they have a complete self-confidence to get good grades (M=3,95). They report that they have the capacity to comprehend the difficult texts (M=3,93). They trust in themselves to clarify a concept to other students (M=3,88). As a final remark, they feel to understand a lesson the topic of which is complex (M=3,87).

Table 7. Descriptive statistics for cognitive subscale

items	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
1. Taking well-organized notes during a lecture.	108	1.00	5.00	3.7685	.81581
2. Taking "objective" tests (multiple-choice, T-F, matching)	108	1.00	5.00	3.9815	.84258
3. Taking essay tests	108	1.00	5.00	3.7500	.83302
4. Writing a high-quality term paper	108	1.00	5.00	3.5926	.94757
5. Listening carefully during a lecture on a difficult topic	108	1.00	5.00	3.8796	.69333
6. Explaining a concept to another student.	107	1.00	5.00	3.8879	.79298
7. Asking a professor in class to review a concept you don't understand	107	1.00	5.00	3.6916	.99443
8. Earning good marks in most classes	108	1.00	5.00	4.0000	.76121
9. Studying enough to understand content thoroughly	108	1.00	5.00	3.7778	.77741
10. Understanding most ideas you read in your tests	108	1.00	5.00	3.9815	.69688
11. Mastering most content in a language course.	108	1.00	5.00	4.2593	.61705
12. Getting good grades	107	3.00	5.00	3.9533	.71879
13. Understanding difficult passages in textbooks	108	1.00	5.00	3.9352	.70078
14. Mastering content in a course you're not interested in	108	1.00	5.00	3.7037	.70059
total	106			3.90	

b. Social subscale

The mean score for social subscale the participants have reported is 3,91, which indicates that these participants have almost a high level of agreement about the issue. They have the courage to talk to a professor privately (M=4,18). They have self-confidence to run for student government office (M=4,15), to have professors / lecturers to respect themselves (M=4,11), to answer questions in small size classrooms (M=4,08), to attend extra-curricular activities such as sports, clubs, etc (M=4,00), and to tutor other students (M=3,95).

Table 8. Descriptive statistics for social subscale

items	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
1. Participating in a class discussion	108	1.00	5.00	3.6204	.97365
2. Answering a question in a large class	108	1.00	5.00	3.5463	1.07984
3. Answering a question in a small class	108	1.00	5.00	4.0833	.64308
4. Tutoring another student	107	1.00	5.00	3.9533	.78167
5. Running for student government office	108	1.00	5.00	4.1574	.79909
6. Participating in extracurricular events (spots, clubs)	108	1.00	5.00	4.0000	.82030
7. Making professors respect you	108	1.00	5.00	4.1111	.78934
8. Talking to a professor privately to get to know him or her	108	1.00	5.00	4.1852	.82199
9. Challenging a professor's opinion in class	108	1.000	5.000	3.5925	.957382
total	106			3.91	

c. Technical subscale

Data analysis regarding technical subscale has shown an almost high level of agreement among the participants of the study (M=3,98). In this regard, the participants think that they are able to use the library (M=4,10) and the computer actively enough (M=3,98). Lastly, they have a moderate level of belief in their capacity to relating course content to material in other courses (M=3,87).

Table 9. Descriptive statistics for technological subscale

items	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
1. Using a computer	108	1.00	5.00	3.9815	.78516
2. Relating course content to material in other courses	108	3.00	5.00	3.8796	.69333
3. Making good use of the library	108	1.00	5.00	4.1019	.66893
total	106			3.98	

Research question 3: Which subscales of locus of control and academic self-efficacy correlate?

In order to see the correlation among the variables of the study, a correlation analysis has been carried out. The results obtained in the study are presented in Table 10 below. Although there is not an overall correlation between locus of control and self-efficacy (r=–,194; sig.(2 tailed)=,054), there seems to exist some kinds of correlation in between the subscales of locus of control and the subscales of academic self-efficacy as is seen in Table 10.

The results of the analysis obviously indicate that the correlation values range from .195 to .750. a high level of correlation has been observed between

(a) social and cognitive subscales of academic self-efficacy (r=.750 at 0.01 level 2-tailed)

One important interpretation regarding the correlation between social and cognitive sub-scales of locus of control can be made in the sense that socially adjusted learners (with high level of social self-efficacy) participate both in and extra-curricular activities and tend to be more comprehensive in dealing with challening texts (reading passages), mastering content, understanding more ideas given in the text, thus becoming more successful.

(b) technical self-efficacy and cognitive subscale of academic self-efficacy (r=.545 at 0.01 level 2-tailed)

Another striking feature in terms of the correlation between technical self-efficacy and cognitive subscale of academic self-efficacy is of great importance. Those with high level of technical skills display some attractive cognitive behaviors such that they are better understanders of the ideas given in the text and the text content that opens the doors to become successful professionals in the future.

(c) technical self-efficacy and social subscale of academic self-efficacy (r=.519 at 0.01 level 2-tailed), and lastly

Relying on the findings obtained in the study, it can be speculated that those with high level of social adjustment display high level of technical skills, too. Specifically, they participate in extra-curricular events, discuss with others, utilize scaffolding activities by helping other students to understand the most difficult topics (learning from peers), and provide answers to the questions posed to them.

As to the correlation between self-efficacy and locus of control subscales, negative correlations have been observed between;

(a) cognitive subscale of self-efficacy and chance subscale of locus of control (r=-.245 at 0.05 level 2-tailed)

The correlation between cognitive subscale of self-efficacy and chance subscale of locus of control is a negative one. Those who display high level of cognitive behaviors do not believe that it is a chiefly matter of fate whether or not they have friends. They believe that they are self-sufficient in their cognitive characteristics, planning things in advance. On the other hand, those learners with high level of change as locus of control believe that when they get what they want, it is usually because they are lucky. However, cognitive learners never trust in such issues. They carefully plan, design, and implement things.

(b) social subscale of self-efficacy and chance subscale of locus of control (r=-.246 at 0.05 level 2-tailed)

The findings obtained in the study regarding the correlation between social subscale of self-efficacy and chance subscale of locus of control indicates another negative correlation. Those with high level of chance as locus of control believe what is going to happen will happen and they do not need to evaluate, discuss, and negotiate the events or situations with others. However, socially adjusted learners display the opposite behaviors in that sense.

In addition to the above negative correlations, a relatively low level of correlation has been observed between;

(c) social subscale of self-efficacy and internal subscale of locus of control (r=.195 at 0.05 level 2-tailed), and lastly

Although the correlation between social subscale of self-efficacy and internal subscale of locus of control seems to relatively low, it can be speculated that those learners with high level of internal locus of control determine what will happen in their life, able to protect personal interests, and they can get what they want simply because they work hard for it, and their life is determined by their own actions whereas those who have high level of social academic self-efficacy like to work with others, participant in and extra classroom activities, help others, and like to work in cooperation.

(d) external locus of control and internal locus of control (r=.198 at 0.05 level 2-tailed).

In this study, another interesting result indicates that a minute level of correlation has been observed between external locus of control and internal locus of control. Those with external locus of control have

very little chance of protecting their personal interests when they encounter strong pressure groups whereas those with internal locus of control are usually able to protect their personal interests. Therefore, it can be speculated that the life of those with external locus of control is chiefly controlled by powerful others. However, the life of those with internal locus of control is determined by their own actions.

Table 10. Correlation between locus of control and academic self-efficacy subscales

	ILCTOP	CHTOP	EXTOP	COGTOP	SSTOP	TECHTOP
ILCTOP		.072	.198*	.190	.195*	.287**
CHTOP	.072		.375**	-.245*	-.246*	-.185
EXTTOP	.198*	.375**		-.083	-.066	.006
COGTOP	.190	-.245*	-.083		.750**	.545**
SSTOP	.195*	-.246*	-.066	.750**		.519**
TECHTOP	.287**	-.185	.006	.545**	.519**	

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Research question 4: Is there any statistically significant difference between males and females in terms of locus of control and academic self-efficacy subscales?

A careful analysis of Table 11 simply indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between males and females in technical (sig.= ,030) and social (sig.=,003) subscales of academic self-efficacy. Statistically significant differences were also observed in terms of total academic self-efficacy beliefs (sig.= ,032). Male participants seem to have a higher level of total academic self-efficacy levels (M=104,912).

Table 11. t-test results for gender

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	sig. (2 tailed)
internal locus of control	male	36	22.5000	2.39643	.39940	.843
	female	71	22.3944	2.70702	.32126	
chance as locus of control	male	36	26.1944	5.87887	.97981	.169
	female	66	27.5455	3.92304	.48289	
external locus of control	male	36	29.1389	3.78080	.63013	.496
	female	70	28.6286	3.56379	.42595	
cognitive subscale	male	36	55.6944	6.91507	1.15251	.092
	female	69	53.3623	6.53266	.78644	
social subscale	male	36	36.7778	5.49343	.91557	.030
	female	70	34.5857	4.48667	.53626	
technical subscale	male	36	12.5833	1.57435	.26239	.003
	female	71	11.6479	1.43526	.17033	
total self-efficacy	male	35	104.912	12.29627	2.07845	.032
	female	69	99.6087	11.45479	1.37899	
total locus of control	male	36	77.8333	8.61394	1.43566	.593
	female	66	78.6970	7.27688	.89572	

(a) social subscale of self-efficacy

A further analysis has been conducted in order to see in which of the items males and females differ in social academic self-efficacy.

Table 12. t-test results for gender in terms of related items of social academic self-efficacy

social self-efficacy items	gender	N	Mean	SD	sig. (2 tailed)
1. Taking well-organized notes during a lecture.	male	36	3.9722	.69636	,010
	female	71	3.4789	1.01220	
2. Taking "objective" tests (multiple-choice, T-F, matching)	male	36	3.9722	.84468	,005
	female	66	3.3662	1.09856	
3. Taking essay tests	male	36	4.2778	.65949	,027
	female	70	3.9859	.62090	

As we can understand from Table 12, there are statistically significant differences in terms of the three items of social academic self-efficacy (p<.0.5). For all the items, female participants rank higher than male participants. In particular, female participants take well-organized notes during a lecture, feel confident in taking objective and essay type of tests.

(b) technical subscale of self-efficacy

Secondarily, t-test was run again in order to see which items under the technological sub-scale of self-efficacy male and female participants differ. The results are given in Table 13.

Table 13. t-test results for gender in terms of technological academic self-efficacy

technological self-efficacy items	gender	N	Mean	SD	sig. (2 tailed)
1. Using a computer	gender	N	4.3889	.64488	.000
	male	36	3.7746	.77822	
2. Relating course content to material in other courses	female	71	4.1667	.69693	.002
	male	36	3.7324	.65373	

Table 13 makes it clear that male and female students differ in terms of the abilities of using a computer (p<.0.5) and relating course content to material in other courses (p<.0.5). From the mean scores, it can be understood that male students view themselves more successful in using a computer (M=4,3889) than female participants (M=3,7746). In a similar vein, male students believe that they can related the couse content to materials in other courses (M=4,1667, M=3,7324). In terms of technical or technological details, most of the time male students appear to have higher mean scores compared to female participants. It is generally speculated that male students are more engaged in computer games or computer related issues and this contributes to their technical skills.

3. Conclusion and recommendation

The ultimate aim of the current study is to scrutinize the relationship between EFL teacher candidates' locus of control and academic self-efficacy beliefs in Turkey. The results confirmed that the participants of the study moderately agree about their strengths of locus of control in their language studies. The overall mean score for internal locus of control indicates almost a slightly high level of agreement among the participants of the study. In addition, they have moderate level of opinions about external locus of control. A very surprising result is that chance as locus of control is relatively low on the part of the participants.

The second dimension of the study is about the self-efficacy beliefs of the participants. They have reported almost a high level of attitudes towards their self-efficacy. In this vein, data analysis regarding the cognitive subscale simply indicates that the participants believe to have capacity to understand the course content. These participants have almost a high level of agreement about social subscale of self-efficacy. Data analysis regarding technical subscale has shown almost a high level of agreement among the participants of the study, too.

In order to see the correlation among the variables of the study, a correlation analysis has been carried out. The results have shown that although there is not an overall correlation between locus of control and self-efficacy, there seems to exist some kinds of correlation in between the subscales of locus of control and the subscales of academic self-efficacy. These are between:

a. social and cognitive subscales of locus of control,

b. technical self-efficacy and cognitive subscale of locus of control,

c. technical self-efficacy and social subscale of locus of control, and

d. external locus of control and chance.

Another significant correlation is observed between;

a. cognitive subscale of self-efficacy and chance subscale of locus of control

b. social subscale of self-efficacy and chance subscale of locus of control

c. social subscale of self-efficacy and internal subscale of locus of control, and

d. external locus of control and internal locus of control.

As can be drawn from the findings of the correlation between internal and external locus of control, internal locus of control help learners to control their own destiny rather than their fate being largely determiened by extenal forces. They tend to be happier, less depressed, and less depressed. A great amount of stress that we encounter in life is beyond our own control. However, one can still cope with these things by adjusting how we think about them. Therefore, we should focus the things we can control. When we become aware of our strengths about the things we can control, we feel more and more empowered due to having a realistic view of life. As a result, internal locus of control helps us feel less stressed and more empowered in the helpless situations we are in. We quite know that some factors are inborn. However, we can still change our locus of control and empower ourselves. Of course, it is unavoidable for people to have a sense of being controlled by the events and circumstances outside themselves. One should not ignore the fact that he or she is primarily responsible for their own lives. Those who have external locus of control, on the other hand, believe that they are primarily at the mercy of others, fate or chance. They believe themselves as the victims of their situations. No matter how they feel so, they should take the most effective action on their own behalf to become self-fulfilling individuals.

In addition, in literature there is evidence that those who rank high in internal locus of control tend to become more successful. This can be attributed to the fact that those with a high level of internal locus of control tend to have higher higher persistence, assertion, attempt, and exploration compared to those who have a high level of external locus of control. In contrast, externalizers, that is those with a high level of external locus of control attribute their failures to external sources and consequently the desire to learn and improve learning may decrease which in turn might lead to lower achievement.

According to Lorsbach and Jinks (1999) and Schunk (1991), academic self-efficacy means an individual's confidence in conducting academic tasks successfully at selected level by referring to one's abilities, attitudes, and previous experiences. Those who have a high level of academic self-efficacy persevere in difficult tasks whereas those who have a low level of academic self-efficacy give up in the face of difficulties (Pajares, 1996; Schunk,1991). It is known that low academic self-efficacy also leads to lowered participation on instructional activities and thus hinders success.

Therefore, when designing curriculum, practitioners need to tailor the instruction to the development of learner's cognitive and psychological demands. Another point that merits attention, as was pointed out by Sarıçoban and Behjoo (2016), is that academic self-efficacy is linked to motivation. It is stated that high academic self-efficacy correlated with better concentration on tasks.

References

Akçaa, F. & Yaman, B. (2010). The Effects of internal-external locus of control variables on burnout levels of teachers, *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 3976–3980.

Akkaya, R. and Akyol, B. (2016). The Relationship between Teachers' Locus of Control and Job Satisfaction: A Mixed Method Study, *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 8(3), 71-82.

Bayraktar Balkır, N. & Yavuz, A. (2017). Exploring pre-service English language teachers' locus of control orientations, *ELT Research Journal*, 2017, 6(3), 236-249.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Beck, B. L., Koons, S. R., & Milgrim, D. L. (2000). Correlates and consequences of behavioral procrastination: The effects of academic procrastination, self-consciousness, self-esteem and self-handicapping. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality, 15*, 3-13

Buluş, M. (2011). Goal Orientations, Locus of Control and Academic Achievement in Prospective Teachers: An Individual Differences Perspective, *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 11(2), 540-546.

Ghonsooly, B. & Shirvan, M.E. (2011). On the Relation of Locus of Control and L2 Reading and Writing Achievement, *English Language Teaching*, 4(4), 234-244.

Jansenn, T. & Carton, J. S. (1999). The effect of locus of control and task difficulty on procrastination. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 160*, 436-442

Levenson, H. (1981). Differentiating among internality, powerful others, and chance. In H. M. Lefcourt (Ed.), *Research with the locus of control construct* (Vol. 1, pp. 15-63). New York: Academic Press

Lorsbach, A. W. & Jinks, J. L. (1999). Self-Efficacy Theory and Learning Environment Research. *Learning Environments Research*, 2, 157-167.

Nwankwo, B. E., Balogun, S. K., Chukwudi, T. O., & Ibeme, N. C. (2012). Self-esteem and locus of control as correlates of well-functioning adolescents. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences, 9*, 214-228.

Nilson-Whitten, M. K., Morder, B., & Kapakla, G. M. (2007). Relationship between locus of control, optimism and academic performance. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the New Jersey Counseling Association* Eatontown, New Jersey.

Pajares, F. (1997). Current directions in self-efficacy research. In M. L. Maehr, & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (Vol. 10, pp. 1–49). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Phares, E. C. (1976). *Locus of control in personality.* New Jersey: General Learning Pres.

Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (2002). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Rahimi, A. & Bigdeli, R.A. (2014). The Relationship between Locus of Control and Vocabulary Learning Strategies of Iranian EFL Learners, *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*, 2(2), 165-175.

Sagone, E. & Caroli, M. E. (2014). Locus of control and academic self-efficacy in university students: the effects of Self-concepts, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 114 (2014) 222 – 228.

Sarıçoban, A. and Behjoo, B.M. (2016). Academic Self-Efficacy and Prospective ELT Teachers' Achievement, *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12(1), 55-62.
Senleri B. (2016). Pre-service science teachers' self-efficacy: The role of attitude, anxiety and locus of control, *Australian Journal of Education*, 60(1) 26–41.

Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psycholigist*, 26, 207-231.

Şenler, B. (2016). Pre-service science teachers' self-efficacy: The role of attitude, anxiety and locus of control, *Australian Journal of Education*, 60(1) 26–41.

Vaidyanathan, R., &Aggarwal, P. (2003). Who is the fairest of them all? An attributional approach to price fairness perceptions. *Journal of Business Research*, 56(6), 453-463.

Weiner, B. (1979). A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. *Journal of Educational psychology*, 71, 3-25.

Williams, M. & R. L. Burden (2000). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Türkiyedeki İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının kontrol odağı ve akademik öz-yeterlikleri

Öz

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'deki öğretmen adaylarının kontrol odağı ve akademik öz-yeterlik arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmaya çalışmaktadır. Araştırmanın amacı için araştırmanın nicel verileri, Levenson (1974) tarafından geliştirilen ve Kıral (2012) tarafından Türkçe'ye uyarlanan Çok Boyutlu Kontrol Odağı Ölçeği kullanılarak toplanmıştır. 24 maddeden oluşan ölçek (6 puan Likert tipi), hizmet öncesi EFL öğretmen adaylarının iç ve dış kontrol odağını incelemektedir. (a) iç kontrol odağını (8 madde), (b) diğerlerine dayalı kontrol odağını (6 madde) ve (c) şansa dayalı kontrol odağını (5 madde) ölçer. Bu ölçek için Cronbach Alpha katsayısı .77'dir. Akademik Öz-yeterlik Ölçeği'ne göre, Kolej Akademik Özyeterlilik Ölçeği, erkek ve kadın ELT öğrencilerinin akademik öz-yeterlik inançlarını bir bütün olarak ölçen 33 maddeden oluşan Owen & Froman'dan (1988) uyarlanmıştır. Bu ölçek için Cronbach Alpha katsayısı .83'dir. Ölçek 'çok az' (1) 'oldukça fazla' (5) arasında değişen 5 dereceli Likert ölçeğidir. EFL öğretmenlerinin kontrol odağı ne kadar yüksekse, akademik öz-yeterliliğin daha yüksek olduğu varsayılmaktadır. Çalışmanın sonunda, sonuçlara göre, bu kurumlarda dil öğretmenleri için bazı önerilerde bulunulur.

Anahtar sözcükler: denetim odağı; akademik öz-yeterlilik; EFL; devlet üniversiteleri

AUTHOR BIODATA

Dr. Özkan Kırmızı works as an associate professor at English Language and Literature Department at Karabuk University. He completed his Ph.d at Hacettepe University, English Language and Teaching Department. His interest areas are L2 teacher education and pedagogical content knowledge.

Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN has worked as an associate professor of ELT at Hacettepe University for 20 years and currently works at the Department of ELL at Selçuk University as a full professor. Dr. Sarıçoban is the editor-in-chief for an international journal.