

THE IMPACT OF LOCUS OF CONTROL ON MINORITY STUDENTS

by

Jeremy Miller

A Research Paper
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Master of Science Degree
in

Guidance and Counseling

Approved: 2 Semester Credits



Dr. Ed Biggerstaff

The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin-Stout

August, 2005

**The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, WI**

Author: Miller, Jeremy L.

Title: *Impact of Locus of Control on Minority Students*

Graduate Degree/ Major: MS Guidance and Counseling

Research Adviser: Ed Biggerstaff, Ph.D.

Month/Year: August, 2005

Number of Pages: 52

Style Manual Used: American Psychological Association, 5th edition

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine locus of control and its impact on minority students. The objective of this study, through a comprehensive literature review, was to determine if students with internal versus external locus of control achieve more academic success. This study will focused on minority students.

The history and definition of locus of control was reviewed and the differences between internal and external locus of control was discussed. Factors that influence a student's locus of control were examined. The impact of locus of control on minority students was analyzed. Research on how educators and schools facilitate changes in a student's locus of control was reviewed.

Recommendations were made to parents, teachers, and school counselors and for programs that train educators.

The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin Stout

Menomonie, WI

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge Ed Biggerstaff. He has always lent me a helping hand in times of need. I would also like to acknowledge Stori, my wife. Thank you for always standing by me and taking care of me during the process of writing my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
Chapter I: Introduction	1
<i>Purpose of the Study</i>	3
<i>Research questions</i>	4
<i>Definition of Terms</i>	4
<i>Limitations</i>	5
Chapter II: Literature Review	6
<i>Definition and History</i>	6
<i>Differences between Internal and External Locus of Control</i>	15
<i>Factors that Influence a Students' Locus of Control</i>	20
<i>The impact of locus of control on minority students</i>	27
<i>How can educators and schools facilitate changes in a student's locus of control</i>	31
Chapter III Summery & Discussion.....	39
<i>Limitations</i>	42
<i>Conclusions</i>	42
<i>Recommendations</i>	45
References.....	48

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Frank is a seventeen year old, African American, from the low-income area of a large city. Frank dropped out of high school during his tenth grade year. With his class graduating in the spring, Frank signed up for a Graduation Equivalency Degree (GED) class offered by his local community center. As part of the program he must write an essay explaining his educational path to this point and go through an advisement session with a licensed school counselor that the community center has on staff. In his essay he describes instances that he felt pushed him into dropping out. Looking back at his elementary years, Frank felt that it was fate that he did not do well. Growing up without a father and little money is why he often got into trouble and received bad grades. In middle school it was just bad luck that he kept getting into trouble. He explained that most kids were doing the same things as him, but they were lucky because they never got caught. The teachers had it out for him during his high school days. Frank stated in his essay, "The teachers were harder on me than other students; they were always on my back." After reading the essay the school counselor must have a session with Frank and set up a plan with him to graduate. After reading his essay what can the counselor do to help him avoid making the same mistakes and to help him reach his goals?

Frank's situation is not an uncommon problem in the United States' educational system. One factor research has examined, as an explanation to why students struggle, is locus of control. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES, n.d.) over the last decade between 347,000 and

544,000 tenth to twelfth graders dropped out per year (NCES; n.d.). The purpose of this study is to determine what part a student's locus of control plays in academic success, if any.

"Locus of control (LOC) is a psychological construct that identifies an individual's beliefs about the degree of personal control that can be exercised over his/her environment" (Grimes, Millea, & Woodruff, 2004, p.129). The individual can see these causes as internal or external. Students who see that they are able to control and manipulate things that happen in their lives are seen as having an internal locus of control. A student who blames teachers or other students for what is going wrong in their educational experience is seen as having an external locus of control and being at risk.

It is a wide held view that students with an internal locus of control fare better academically and socially within schools versus students with an external locus of control. Lebedina- Manzoni (2004) found in a study of students beliefs about academic success that, unsuccessful students compared to successful ones stated success depended on circumstances which are directed towards outside influences and were beyond their control. Luck, parents, and teachers were among the things unsuccessful students felt influenced their academic success. Externally orientated students were more likely to engage in passive and unsuccessful study strategies, cope poorly with course-induced stress, achieve lower grades, and blame others for poor performance relative to the internally orientated students (Grimes et al., 2004).

The objective of this study, through a comprehensive literature review, is to determine if students with internal versus external locus of control achieve more academic success. This study will focus on minority students. The difference between White student dropout rates and Black student dropout rates has narrowed, with Blacks dropping out at almost twice the percentages (6.9 to 13.1) than Whites (NCES; n.d.). The ethnic group that has the most dropouts is Hispanics (27.8%). This paints a bleak picture for minority groups in the United States, but there are exceptions. Asian/Pacific Islanders have the lowest dropout rates (3.8) of any group looked at by NCES

One study that looked at the effects of locus of control on a minority group indicated that external factors such as luck, task difficulty and ease were the most significant determinates of their failure (Flowers, Milner, & Moore, 2003). Locus of control was also found to impact minorities' educational aspirations. The results of this study indicate that African American high school seniors who reported higher levels of internal locus of control were more likely to have higher educational aspirations than African American seniors who had lower levels of internal locus of control.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to examine locus of control and its impact on minority students. This includes defining locus of control, examining the differences between external and internal locus of control, how locus of control impacts minority populations, what factors contribute to a student's locus of control and how professionals do help students obtain a more personally

beneficial locus of control. This is achieved by conducting a comprehensive literature review, an analysis, and a critique of the findings related to locus of control. Recommendations will be made to parents, teachers, and school counselors and for programs that train educators.

Research Questions

The study addresses the following research questions.

1. What is the definition and historical background of locus of control?
2. What are the differences between external and internal locus of control?
3. What factors influence a student's locus of control?
4. What is the impact of locus of control on minority students?

Definition of Terms

For clarification, the following terms are defined.

1. At-risk – A student who is likely not to graduate (Parsley and Corcoran, 2003)
2. Attribution- refers to how people explain events that happen to themselves and others (*Locus of control*, 2004).
3. Locus of control (LOC) - An individual's perception on the cause of events that they endure in their life (Grimes et al., 2004).
4. External locus of control – Belief that they have little control or power to affect personal outcomes (Wang & Anderson, 1994).

5. Internal locus of control – Understands that they are able to control and manipulate things that happen in their lives (Wang & Anderson, 1994).
6. Minority students – African Americans, Native Americans, Low SES, Hispanic Americans, etc ...
7. Educational aspirations- refer to a student's outlook and perception of his or her intention to chase or acquire further education in the future (Flowers Milner Moore 2003).

Limitations of the Study

A limitation of this study is the minimal research available in regards to locus of control and its relationship to minority students.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews literature related to locus of control (LOC); primarily, how minority are impacted by locus of control. Locus of control will be defined and historical foundations will be discussed. The differences between internal and external locus of control will be examined. Next, factors that influence a student's locus of control will be reviewed. The impact of LOC on minority students is another topic that will be addressed. Finally, the question as to how educators and schools facilitate changes in a student's locus of control will be answered.

Definition and History

When trying to understand the foundational roots of locus of control, the theories from which it was based must be understood. The concept of reinforcement which includes rewards and punishment is essential in understanding locus of control. Locus of control is part of the social learning theory developed by Julian Rotter (1954). Some other concepts that are closely associated with LOC are attribution theory and learned helplessness. All of these concepts and theories are important to understanding LOC but to truly understand what LOC is all about, the concept of reinforcement has to be understood.

Reinforcement

Researchers define reinforcement as an operation or process in which the occurrence of a behavior is followed by a change in the environment (reinforcer) and as a result such behavior subsequently increases in rate, or is otherwise

strengthened (Poling & Normand, 1999). In other words, consequences influence behavior (*Reinforcement theory*, n.d.). In connection with locus of control, Rotter (1966) defined reinforcement as an act to strengthen expectancy that a particular behavior will be followed by a reinforcer.

For example, if a student writes an outstanding paper and the teacher give him/her an "A" that is reinforcement. He/she realizes that if they write good papers he/she will receive "A's" and the behavior of writing good papers is reinforced. Another example of reinforcement is, a student keeps missing handing in assignments and the teacher makes him stay after school and write "I will hand in my work" a hundred times across the white board. In both of these examples the teacher used reinforcement as a consequence for a behavior, but the difference lies in what type of reinforcement the teacher used. In the first example, a reward was used and in the second example a punishment was used.

Both rewards and punishment are types of reinforcement (*Reinforcement theory*, n.d.). Rewards increase a behavior and anything that increases a behavior is a reward. Rewards can include praise, candy, a hug and many other things. If the consequence decreases the behavior you want to decrease, then you have a punishment. The concept is very simple if the consequence increases then you have a reward, if it decreases you have a punishment.

The part of rewards and punishment that is a little trickier is figuring out what an individual considers a reward and what he/she considers a punishment. If Jake and Maria are talking in class and you send them to the principal's office and the principals gives them verbal reprimands, most would consider that a

punishment. Well for Jake it was. He comes back to class and the teacher never has a problem with him speaking to friends during class again. Maria comes back to class and keeps chatting away. So the teacher sends her to the principal's office again, but when she comes back to class the behavior hasn't stopped. Maria doesn't see the principal's office as a punishment; she sees it as a reward. She loves the attention and the fact when she gets in trouble the kids in her class laugh. This is an example of how when reinforcement is used, the function of the consequence must be examined.

In summary, the main concept of reinforcement theory is that consequences impact behavior. Rewarding consequences increase behavior. Punishing consequences decrease behavior. Finally, a consequence (reward/punishment) is known by its function (how it operates).

Julian B. Rotter

The next step in understanding locus of control is to take a look at the person who initially wrote on the subject, Julian B. Rotter. Rotter was born in October 1916 in Brooklyn, NY, into a family of Jewish immigrants (*Social Learning Theory*, n.d.). Rotter grew up during the depression and this influenced him to be aware of social injustice and the effects of the situational environment on people. Rotter's interest in psychology began while he attended high school and Brooklyn College where he read books and attended seminars by some of the greats in the history of psychology. Rotter graduated in 1941 with his Ph.D. from Indiana University, one of the few programs to offer a doctorate in clinical psychology. He wrote his dissertation on "level of aspiration." Rotter became one

of the very first clinical psychologists trained in what is now the traditional mode. After service in the armed services during World War II, Rotter took an academic position at Ohio State University. That is where he embarked on his most famous work, social learning theory, which integrated learning theory with personality theory.

Social Learning Theory

Social learning theory includes many interesting concepts, with one of them being locus of control. When Rotter developed his Social Learning Theory, the dominant theory in clinical psychology was Freud's psychoanalysis (*Social Learning Theory*, n.d.). Individuals were seen as not understanding their unconscious impulses and treatment required long-term analysis of childhood experience. Most learning approaches at the time incorporated drive theory, which stated that people are motivated by physiologically-based impulses that cause an individual to satisfy them.

Rotter's (1954) social learning theory departed from the psychoanalytical and drive-based behaviorism theories that dominated the realm of psychology and education at the time. He felt that a psychological theory should be based upon a psychological motivational principle. Rotter used the "empirical law of effect" as his motivating factor. The law of effect simply states that a person is motivated to seek out positive stimulation, or reinforcement, and to steer clear of unpleasant stimulation. Rotter created his theory by combining behaviorism and the study of personality, but without the use of physiological instincts or drives as a motive force.

The main concept or idea in social learning theory is that personality is highly influenced by the interactions of the person within his or her environment. To understand behavior, one must take both the person (an individual's life history of learning and experiences) and the environment (the situation that the person is aware of and responding to) into account when trying to understand their behavior.

Rotter (1954) saw personality (behavior), as always changing. The way a person thinks and the environment the person is a part of are constantly changing, as is the behavior he/she exhibit. A person uses life experience to build their beliefs and values and this impacts the behaviors he/she exhibit. Rotter felt that people are motivated by their goals (desirable reinforcement), rather than trying to avoid punishment. Rotter's has four key components to his model: behavior potential, expectancy, reinforcement value, and the psychological situation (*Social Learning Theory*, n.d.).

Behavior potential is how likely an individual is to engage in a particular behavior in a given situation (Rotter, 1954). For each possible behavior, there is a behavior potential and whatever behavior has the highest potential is going to be exhibited in that instance. An example would be, if a student was having a bad day and the teacher yelled at him for being late. The student could have an infinite number of behaviors or responses. In this case the student begins to cry because that was the straw that broke the camel's back and that is the typical behavior that the student exhibits when he/she just can't take it anymore. In this

given situation, the student had the highest potential to cry and exhibited that behavior.

Expectancy deals with exhibiting a particular behavior to gain a particular outcome, or reinforcer (Rotter, 1954). Is it likely that the behavior will lead to the desired results? If the individual is confident the exhibited behavior will result in the outcome, he/she would be set to have high or strong expectancies. When a person has low expectancies they feel it is unlikely that his or her behavior will result in reinforcement. A person uses their past experience to dictate their level of expectancy. When a behavior has led to reinforcement in the past, the more certain he/she are that it will happen again and the stronger the person's expectancy will be. Expectancy is a subjective probability, because one cause of problems and pathology are unrealistic expectancies. There may be no relationship between what someone thinks is going to happen and what actually will happen when a certain behavior is exhibited. Individuals can either over- or underestimate this likelihood, and either one could cause some major issues.

Reinforcements are consequences that influence behavior (Rotter, 1954). Reinforcement value refers to how we perceive the outcomes that are in direct response to our behavior. If the individual seeks and desires the reinforcer, it would be said to have a high reinforcement value. If the outcome is something that the person does not desire, it would have low reinforcement value. Reinforcement value is also subjective, meaning that the same event or experience can vastly differ in desirability, depending on the person's life experiences. For most children getting yelled at by their parents is usually

something not to be sought after. In contrast, some children who might seek attention from their parents can seek out punishment because it has a higher reinforcement value than being ignored. Based on behavior potential, expectancy, and reinforcement value, Rotter (1954) developed a predictive formula: $BP = f [E \& RV]$. This formula is saying that behavior potential is a function of expectancy and reinforcement value. The chance of a person exhibiting a certain behavior (behavior potential) is a function of the probability that such behavior will lead to a given outcome (expectancy) and the desirability of that outcome (reinforcement value).

Psychological situation is not part of Rotter's formula for predicting behavior, but Rotter (1954) believed that it is very important to always realize that each individual interprets the same situation differently. It is a person's unique interpretation of the environment, rather than the direct stimuli of the situation, that is meaningful to him/her and that determines how he/she react in a given situation. For instance, a child is having his birthday party and his parents hire a clown to come and entertain the party. Every child at the party is laughing and having fun during the clown's act, except one child who is crying in his mother's arms. That particular child had numerous bad experiences with clowns in the past. That child's psychological situation is different than the other children at the party, thus, the child experiences and reacts to the clown in a different way.

Locus of Control

In his theory of social learning, Rotter introduced the concept of locus of control. The original name was "locus of control of reinforcement", but through

the years it has come to be known simply as “locus of control” (*Locus of Control*, 2004). Rotter (1954) combined behavioral and cognitive psychology concepts because he believed “reinforcements” (rewards and punishments) are the main determinates in our behavior. Through reinforcements people begin to formulate beliefs about what causes their behaviors. These beliefs then establish what kinds of attitudes and behaviors people have. The word “locus” means place. “Locus of control is a psychological construct that identifies an individual’s beliefs about the degree of personal control that can be exercised over his or her environment” (Grimes et al., 2004, p.129).

In other words, locus of control is an individual’s perception on the cause of events that he/she endures in his/her life. An individual can have either an external locus of control or an internal locus of control. When an individual has an external locus of control he/she believes that they have little control or power to affect personal outcomes (Wang & Anderson, 1994). If the person has an internal locus of control they understand that they are able to control and manipulate things that happen in their lives. This will be discussed more in depth in the next section. There are other theories that are closely tied in with locus of control. Two of them are attribution theory and learned helplessness.

Attribution Theory

Attribution theory is concerned with how people interpret situations and how this relates to their thinking and behavior (Corcoran & Ivery, 2004).

Attribution theory assumes that individuals try to determine why other individuals do what they do (what caused the behavior). There are three things that must be

present for attribution: 1) the individual must perceive or observe the behavior; 2) then the individual must believe that the behavior was intentional; and 3) then the individual must make the decision, if he/she believes the other person was pushed into displaying the behavior (attributed to the situation) or if it was their choice (attributed to the individual). In other words, attribution is much like using the word explanation; it is like explaining why it happened. For example, a teacher asks a student why she got an "F" on a test (behavior). The student explains that her dog ate her notes that she was going to use to study for the test. The student is displaying external attribution. An example of internal attribution would be if the student told the teacher that she was lazy and didn't really feel like studying.

Learned Helplessness

Learned helplessness (Firmen, Hwang, Copella, & Clark, 2004) is described as the learned response of being passive in response to adverse or negative situations (conditions), rather than taking action to change, escape, or avoid them. This is learned through repeated exposure to inescapable or unavoidable events. Learned helplessness contains three components: contingency, cognition, and behavior. Contingency addresses how controllable a situation is. Cognition refers to what people attribute as the causes in regards to their situation or surroundings of which they are a part. Behavior in this theory is defined as individuals deciding whether they will give up or proceed with the obstacle set before them. An example of learned helplessness would be if a person is exposed to repeated electric shocks (adverse/negative events) and

they are tied down and have no control over getting shocked (cannot escape or avoid). They will eventually learn it is not under their control; therefore they simply sit by helplessly and suffer the punishment.

Differences between Internal and External Locus of Control

Within Rotter's Social Learning Theory the concept of locus of control (LOC) was introduced. When examining an individual's locus of control and the impact it has on their lives, it must be determined if they have internal or external LOC. Rotter (1966) states, one of the determinates of behavior is how individuals perceive their reinforcement, is it contingent upon an individual's own behavior or is the reinforcement controlled by forces outside of himself independent of his actions. In other words, does the person perceive the reward as dependent on their behavior or independent of it? In this section external and internal locus of control will be defined, research will be reviewed and the difference between internal and external locus of control will be discussed.

External Locus of Control

External locus of control is when reinforcement is perceived by the individual as not to be entirely contingent upon his action (Rotter, 1966). In our culture it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance or fate. It could also be stated as the chance happening of fortunate or adverse events. Rotter (1966) also explains, individuals with an external locus of control could also see reinforcement as being controlled by powerful others or due to the complexities of their particular situation. Individuals use their external locus of control as a defense mechanism (Rotter, 1966). It helps individual's preserve their self

esteem when they fail. An example of this is could be a student who is not doing well in an English class. The student gets a “D” on a paper they felt they worked very hard on. Instead of focusing on the teacher remarks regarding all of their grammatical errors and unclear content in regards to the subject matter, they put blame on the teacher. They imply the teacher didn’t explain the assignment and has always been harder on them compared to the other students in the class. This student’s belief on why they received a “D” doesn’t change their grade but it does perform the service protecting their self esteem. Instead of the student thinking that even though they worked very hard on this paper and still got a “D”. They believe that it’s the teachers fault, and out of their control.

Internal Locus of control

Internal locus of control is defined as an individual’s perception that a particular reinforcement is contingent upon their own behavior or permanent characteristics (Rotter, 1966). In other words, Individual believes that there behavior and reinforcement is guided by there personal decisions and efforts (Locus of Control, 2004). Evidence suggests that a person with internal locus of control is more independent, cognitively able, and mentally aware, predisposed to learning, and motivated (*Locus of control*, nd).

Research suggests that internal locus of control has a connection with the concept of “self as agent”. This means that an individual’s thoughts control their actions. After the individual realizes this executive function of thoughts they will be able to positively influence their beliefs, motivation, and academic performance. The concept of “self as agent” can intentionally or unintentionally

direct, choose, and control the use of all knowledge structures and intellectual processes in support of individual goals and choices. One study established that students with an internal locus of control displayed better adjustment to college in terms of educational accomplishment and societal adjustment (Njus & Brockway, 1999). Another study found that community college students who succeeded at remote instruction had a high internal locus of control (Dille & Mezack, 1991). A third study found that locus of control had a negative correlation with course withdrawal and failure, even though the amount was not significant (Pugliese, 1994). In other words, the more students had an external locus of control, the more prone they were to drop the course.

Research on the Differences between Internal and External Locus of Control

Janssen and Carton (1999) investigated the effects of locus of control on procrastination. Forty-two college students were given an academic locus of control scale and a college homework assignment. Analyses revealed that the individuals with internal locus of control began working on the assignment sooner than students with external locus of control. Also, the students with internal locus of control completed and returned the assignment sooner than students with external locus of control.

Wang and Anderson (1994) performed two studies that examined the differences in excuse-making and blaming by subjects with internal versus external locus of control. In the first study, they took 39 individuals with internal locus of control and 30 individuals with external locus of control and examined various excuses in three situations and also assigned blame for cheating and

lying in other situations. Individuals with external locus of control were more likely to use excuses than individuals with internal locus of control. Also, the individuals with external LOC assigned less blame for cheating and lying. In the second study, 24 internals and 32 externals divided blame among themselves, another person, and 'no one to blame' in ten situations. People with external LOC assigned more blame to the other person compared to themselves, but approximately the same blame to 'no one'. Those with external LOC were more likely to blame others they were also more sensitive to being blamed.

An individual's locus of control is a concept that has a significant effect on their daily lives (Milon, n.d.). Those with an external locus of control believe that their direct actions do not impact outcomes they encounter. Individuals, in turn, are less likely to do what it takes to take advantage of the possibilities that life presents. This is due to the possible motivational, emotional, and cognitive deficits an external locus of control creates. People with an external locus of control are more likely to experience from other both physical and mental ailments because they believe they have no control over their situation. Those with an internal locus of control believe that hard work and personal abilities will lead to positive outcomes. The individuals will be more likely to meet challenges and achieve success in their impending endeavors.

Literature reviews show that individuals with internal locus of control and external locus of control vary in several ways, predominantly in terms of their cognitive activity and environmental mastery (Dollinger, 2000). Since they are more insightful to their situations; individuals with internal locus of control appear

to wield more control over their lives. Individuals with an internal locus of control are more prepared to obtain and make use of information that is significant to their goals. "The superiority of *internals* is particularly relevant to cue explication and incidental learning situations. Externals require more explicit cues to contingencies but when cues are implicit, as with incidental learning, internals out-perform externals"(Dollinger, 2000, p.4).

Connections have been made between locus of control and behavior patterns in a number of different areas (Gale Encyclopedia of Childhood & Adolescence, n.d.). Individuals with an internal locus of control are more likely to take responsibility for their actions, are not usually affected by the opinions of others, and generally do better at activities when they can work at their own speed. By comparison, individuals with an external locus of control are more likely to blame outside influences for their mistakes and credit their successes to luck, chance or fate rather than to their own actions. They are affected by the opinions of others and the status of the opinion-holder is also taken into, while people with an internal locus of control pay closer attention to the content of the opinion regardless of who is saying it. According to the Gale Encyclopedia of Childhood & Adolescence (n.d.) some researchers have claimed that a person with internal locus of control tends to be more intelligent and more success-oriented than those with external locus of control.

If students are flourishing academically, then their locus of control interrelated to educational achievement is likely to be internal as well as controllable (Flowers, Milner, & Moore 2003). If students are ineffective

academically, then their locus of control is likely to be attributed to external factors. Such variables are often looked to be beyond students' power.

Students with an internal locus of control are more likely to earn higher grades (Gale Encyclopedia of Childhood & Adolescence, n.d.). Relationships between a child's locus of control and his or her ability to delay gratification have been found. A child with an internal locus of control would tend to be more successful at forgoing an immediate pleasure or desire in order to be rewarded with a more substantial one later. While a child with an external locus of control would exert less self-control in the present because they believe that they will be able to impact events in the future.

Factors that Influence a Students' Locus of Control

In this section, factors that influence a student's locus of control will be reviewed. The influences of parents, educators, and gender will be discussed.

Parental Factors

There are competing theories on the effects of parental involvement and control on adolescent development (Trusty & Lampe, 1997). McClun and Merrel (1998), investigated relationships linking an adolescents' perceptions of their parents' responsiveness and what they demand, adolescents' locus of control orientation, and adolescents' self-concept ratings. In the study 198 students in eighth and ninth grade participated. "The participants were administered the Nowicki-Strickland Internal-External Locus of Control Scale, the Harter Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents, and the Perceived Parenting Styles Survey" (McClun and Merrel, 1998). Adolescents' who thought of their parents as being

authoritative had a considerable amount more internal locus of control orientation than individuals who interpreted their parents as either permissive or authoritarian. Self-Concept scores were notably elevated for the authoritative group than for the permissive or authoritarian groups in several areas. The conclusion of this study is that an authoritative approach to parenting may contribute to the development of self-adequacy by being connected with an internal locus of control and stronger self-concept. Permissive and authoritarian styles of parenting and external control may be linked with damaging patterns of social-emotional development.

Trusty& Lampe (1997) used a national data set to study parental involvement with students and the power they have over diverse aspects of high-school seniors' lives. Conclusions maintain the argument that parental contribution and parental control are dependent on one another in making predictions in regards to adolescents' locus of control. "From high-school seniors' perspectives, parental control with parental involvement was related to internal locus of control, whereas control without involvement was related to external locus of control. These findings are generally consistent with previous study of adolescents" (Trusty& Lampe, 1997p.377).Adolescents with internal locus of control experienced authoritative parenting (support and high control). Adolescents in democratic families (high involvement and moderate control) were to some degree less internal than those in authoritative families. Adolescents with a high degree external locus of control experienced authoritarian parenting

(low parental involvement and high control). The adolescents in negligent family types (low involvement and low parental control) were faintly less external.

There is also research on parents' locus of control and how/if it influences their child's' locus of control. Numerous studies have investigated the connection involving parental locus of control and children's locus of control (Morton, 1997). The majority of these have established minute or no consistent relationships. Morton (1997) discusses two studies that found a significant relationship. In general, these studies have made reference to a possible modeling or identification progression, in which children assume their parents' views and perceptions to clarify the development of locus of control.

Morton (1997) investigated the connection between parental and child locus of control. He used measures particularly intended to appraise a parent's locus of control in their relationship to their child. "An external parental locus of control was correlated with children's attributing their successes and failures to unknown causes and with children's perceiving that solving their problems is not contingent on their own behavior" (Morton, 1997, p. 222). This suggests that there is need for constant modeling of what a beneficial locus of control looks like. It also makes it difficult for children to establish their own beliefs about the operating in their environment. Morton (1997) states, "this is supported by the discovery that parental contingency and control beliefs were negatively correlated with children's perceptions of unknown causes for success" (p. 223).

The results are consistent with previous findings indicating that some aspects external parental locus of control are correlated with more children

behavioral issues (Morton, 1997). The degree of the correlation between parental locus of control and child behavior toward the parent found in this study is notable but, it is not possible to assess the direction of causation in a correlation study. However, the magnitude of these correlations is much greater than that of correlations that have been reported between parental behavior and children's locus of control. These correlations may tend to predict a direct relationship, such as; children's behavior significantly influences parents' locus of control specific to their relationship with their child.

Educational Factors

Bryant (1974) investigated the experiences of teachers with sixth-grade internal and external locus-of-control males. The study took 40 students and their teachers and had them complete the Interpersonal Perception Method. Children with an external locus of control ascribed notably more negative attribute to their teachers and themselves than did internal locus-of-control children. By probing the interactions of two individuals, who frequently interact and their perspectives some insights can be made. "An individual can determine not only the directly perceived attributes of the two people but also the derivatives that these perceptions have for the state of shared inter-perceptual experiences of the relationship" (Bryant, 1974, pg.163). Based on this statement, individuals want to share and uphold a common sense of interpersonal experience; it can be declared that external children were found to have more excruciating experiences with their teachers than internal children.

Schools are acknowledged as having a major impact, both positive and/or negative, on the psychological well-being of those who attend the schools (Hawkes, 1991). A participant in the American educational structure spends the greater part of twelve years of his/her early life within the classroom walls. Students experience an assortment of influential interactions, which to some extent shape the personality of the individual. Schools are recognized as one of the most dominant influences in the lives of students. It is not a stretch to say that individuals who work inside the schools are also dominant source of influence.

“Educators, by the virtue of their relationship to students in the classroom, become potentially the most influential adults in students’ lives, second only to parents” (Hawkes, 1991, pg 475). They become the role models that students will recognize and pattern for their futures after. One objective of the educational profession, and teacher instruction programs, should be the training of teachers who are internally oriented. In a study by Kremer and Lifmann (1982) note that teachers in extreme age groups (10-30 and over 50 years old) were more externally oriented than the middle (31-49Year) age group (as cited in Hawkes, 1991). An effort to modify the locus of control and behaviors should be directed toward teachers.

Hawkes (1991) states, it is advantageous for students to develop an internal locus of control orientation. Though, this does not come to pass spontaneously as the child develops. These personality attributes are gained mainly through the modeling of important people in the life of the individual. It’s by and large documented that next to parents and home, teachers and schools

are the most prominent forces in the lives of young children. Given that internal locus of control in children is desired, and since educators and schools play important roles models in the personality development of young children, a reasonable statement would be that internal locus of control is desirable in teachers.

Gender Factors

Outcomes on gender differences in locus of control have been wide-ranging (Chubb & Fertman 1997). Several studies have established that females have more external locus of control than males do. Despite the fact that other studies did not find differences in locus of control between genders. One study reviewed 22 studies for gender differences on numerous variables including locus of control (Chubb & Fertman 1997). In 15 of the studies there were no gender differences found. In six studies, the males were more internal and in one study, the females were more internal. The authors concluded that there is not sufficient proof in the research to show that there are gender differences.

Kulas (1996) used a three-year longitudinal study to examine the development of locus of control in adolescence. The adolescent sample consisted of 84 students which included 49 boys and 35 girls. Locus of control was calculated by the use of the Delta questionnaire. Data was analyzed by using locus of control as the dependent variable. The independent variables considered in relation to the locus of control were sex, type of locus of control, and school achievement. Examination of the longitudinal figures exposed irrelevant shifts in the locus of control among both boys and girls when they were

tested and retested one year and two years later. "The male and female cohorts, however, diverged between the first, second, and the third testing" (Kulas, 1996, pg 721).

The females tended to shift toward the external direction whereas males, who were more internal than girls at the commencement of the research, became more internal over a one-year period (Kulas, 1996). After the third testing, the boys had shifted from an internal to more of an external locus of control. The data and analysis demonstrate that adolescence is a stage of relative stability in regards to locus of control. The results indicate that there were no noteworthy changes between boys and girls in regards to locus of control over the three years of the study. Kulas (1996) indicates that adolescence is a phase of relative stability of locus of control, implying that it is created in an earlier phase. Nevertheless, every time the females were tested, they exhibited more (not significant) of an external locus of control than did males. This finding is consistent with that previous research that found females, 14 to 24 years old, became more "external" over a 5-year period (Kulas, 1996).

Kulas (1996) accounts for the change in the perception of personal control of boys between the first and second testing as the results from the amplified sense of competence gained as a product of the physical growth in this period. External control for girls increased as the three years progressed. This may echo the mind-set of society toward the male character.

The impact of locus of control on minority students

This section will investigate research that pertains to the relationship between minority students and locus of control. In examining locus of control (intellectual, social, and physical), Tashakkori & Thompson (1991) reported racial differences with respect to perceived success and failure in an assortment of areas.

Beginning in the middle 1970s and early 1980s, a number of studies were conducted in an attempt to determine the extent of the influence that one's culture has on his or her locus of control (Otterman, n.d). Originally, many researchers came to the conclusion that an individual's culture serves a function in terms of internal and external locus of control that an individual possesses. Nonetheless, it was not long before these findings began being argued. This led to more literature, which disagreed with this exposed connection between culture and locus of control. The cynics instead proposed factors thought to be more relevant. The factors ranged from gender to socialization practices. Previous research was also condemned because the individuals used in the studies did not precisely characterize their culture, hence crushing the entire reason of the study.

Other research has found considerable differences in the internal and external locus of control between Black, White, and Hispanic students (Otterman, n.d). Research has found that locus of control is dependent on culture. It was established that both Blacks and Hispanics were more internal than the whites in regard to accomplishment in intellectual activities. Examples of accomplishment

in intellectual activities might be getting a good score on the ACT or SAT. Blacks were found to be substantially more external than both Whites and Hispanics in response to failure within physical domains. Physical domains can include anything from general health problems to losing in a race. The findings validate the assumption that locus of control directly relates to differences amid culturally diverse populations.

Locus of control was appraised for an adolescent sample for the period of ages 11-17 and again from ages 13-19). It was hypothesized during early and late adolescence that blacks and girls would be more external than whites and boys. Furthermore, it was hypothesized that the effects would be greater during late adolescence. The results acquired to some extent supported these hypotheses. Girls were more external than boys only throughout late adolescence. On the other hand, Blacks scored higher in external locus of control than Whites at both time periods and effect sizes were greater during late adolescence.

Flowers, Milner & Moore (2003) investigated the impact of locus of control on black high school seniors' educational aspirations. Early on studies reported that black students frequently rated external factors such as luck, task difficulty, and ease as the major reasons of their failure. Other studies revealed that black students' and their locus of control in connection to their academic concerns were blamed on external factors (Battle & Rotter, 1963). Other studies stated that black students were described to have a lesser amount of awareness to the

importance of effort as a foundation of achievement (Flowers, Milner& Moore, 2003).

The research centering on locus of control by race has amplified the insight of how performance and achievement are perceived by minority students compared to white students (Flowers, Milner& Moore, 2003). Flowers, Milner& Moore (2003, p. 43) stated, "that comparative studies confound ethnicity and race with social class differences by comparing middle-class White students with lower-class ethnic minority students". In other studies, grades showed that African American students had inferior levels of performance but had elevated perceptions of their skills (Flowers, Milner& Moore, 2003). This led various researchers to the conclusion that motivational factors are dissimilar for African American students and/or African American students do not put as much value on academic accomplishment.

Research also proposes that perceptions of competence are not associated as directly to tangible achievement for African American students as they are for White students (Flowers, Milner& Moore, 2003). Controlling for family, student, and school characteristics, the outcomes of the study imply that African American high school seniors who had more of an internal of locus of control were more apt to have higher educational aspirations than African American high school seniors who reported a more external locus of control.

One accepted view, was that black Americans tend to be more external in their perceived control than white Americans (Otterman, n.d.). One of the studies indicates that young Black workers tend to be more external in terms of locus of

control in contrast to White workers of parallel ages and education. Research suggests that this cultural variation is visible not only in adult workers, but also in children and adolescents.

As mentioned before hand, there is opposition to the relationship connecting culture and locus of control (as cited in Otterman, n.d.). One of the studies disagreed with other studies that found a connection. They established numerous issues that they had including inaccuracies with methodologies utilized. They specified that utilizing college students is not an adequate way to acquire equivalent samples, due to the fact that students who struggled are underrepresented. Other researchers have suggested that different factors have far greater impact on locus of control than does culture (Otterman, n.d.). . The research noted that, information of and optimistic attitude toward surroundings, active participation in recreation, and stress on independence in socialization are advantageous to the increase of an internal locus of control.

Miller, Fitch, & Marshall (2003) compared locus of control between regular education students and at-risk students who attend alternative schools and exhibit chronic behavior problems. The participants included 234 high school and middle school students participated. The students who attend alternative schools scored, on average, as being external in locus of control. School situation accounted for larger mean differences than did both gender and ethnicity. Students in alternative school settings are expected to have a more external locus of control. Most students are placed in alternative schools for persistent behavior problems or attendance problems.

How can educators and schools facilitate changes in a student's locus of control?

As educators we should understand the historical foundations of locus of control, the differences between internal and external, the factors that influence a student's locus of control, and the impact of locus on minority students have been discussed. The focus can shift to research that pertains to what educators can do to influence a student's locus of control.

Hawkes (1991) indicates that locus of control is a feature that can be modified. As a result, it seems advantageous to promote both teachers and students, predominantly individuals who show signs of an external locus of control, to transform their locus of control to a more internal one. Educators and students who are known as having an internal locus of control may benefit by amplifying that orientation. "Research in the area of locus of control does not appear to be popular" (Hawkes, 1991, p. 476). Of the small number of studies that have been in print on the topic, even a smaller number address the concern of the effects of an educator's locus of control on a student's locus of control or the alteration of locus of control in either teachers or students.

In Hawkes (1991) found that locus of control can be tailored through instruction. Individuals exposed to an investigational treatment show signs of a statistically significant ($p \leq 0.05$) shift in the direction of a more internal locus of control. Those with an internal locus of control in this study hold higher mean scores than those with an external locus of control in seven groupings associated to education.

In a study discussed by Hawkes (1991) a change in the direction of internality appeared in students who were educated by teachers who had been recognized as showing signs of internal locus of control. When contrasted with students taught by teachers an external locus of control, students of the "internal" teachers demonstrated considerably larger enduring gains. Students perceived individual control of their own academic success or failure and a favorable attitude toward learning. An earlier study established that fifth graders in courses that were taught by teachers with internal locus of control achieved more on measures than did fifth graders taught by teachers with external locus of control.

"Maples (1984) reviews a number of studies and relates internal locus of control with positive self-concept and high levels of self-discipline in students" (as cited in Hawkes, 1991, p. 477). These are characteristics that education seeks to promote in students. It is logical that the attainment of such attributes can be considerably improved when teachers model such behaviors as a normal ingredient of their personalities. Hawkes (1991) suggests four "links" that can be used by teachers to promote an increased sense of control in students: 1) make sure goals are close at hand rather than long term; 2) educators should use learning strategies that will allow students to achieve their goals; 3) a student must be able to "see" successful experiences as 4) directly attributable to his/her individual effort. At first the teacher possibly will be required to train the students on link four. Hawkes (1991) explains a study in which teachers with an external locus of control partook in an in-service training that focused on effective teaching in terms of locus of control. The study supports the premise that locus of

control orientation can be altered in teachers, and, further, that it should be altered toward an internal orientation.

Flowers Milner & Moore (2003, p. 45) state in regards to school counselors, "they are encouraged to help children learn, help their teachers motivate them, and help parents successfully navigate the school bureaucracy so that they, too, can advocate for their children". To positively impact African American students, school counselors must have a clear understanding of the obstacles that hamper academic accomplishments. To shrink the obstructions that harmfully affect the educational results of African American students, it is imperative that school counselors take suitable actions on behalf of these students. This is in contrast of taking on a stereotypical view of African American students that center on their evident limitations.

School counselors need to be familiar with the domineering external forces that are part of the social, economic, and political framework of the school and community and the effects this has on minority students. (Bailey, Getch, & Chen-Hayes, 2003). School counselors need to center their concentration on recognizing avenues to assist the students in coping and succeeding academically. School counselors must become skilled at how to become leaders within their school building (Flowers Milner & Moore, 2003). They have to be individuals who work to help students attain academic accomplishments, high principles, and high goals for all students.

As leaders, school counselors should link their job duties with being agents for change (Bailey et al., 2003). They must be individuals who eliminate

barriers for all students that hamper academic, social, and career success. A way of training school counselors for the diverse and multifaceted challenges in public schools is to incorporate multiculturalism and social advocacy throughout the curriculum (Bailey et al., 2003). Such infusion is necessary for preparing school counselors for the meticulous demands and requirements in public schools.

Educators who work with students in alternative education programs have to help students develop a more beneficial locus of control (Miller, Fitch, Marshall, 2003). Counselors can assist students by helping them make associations linking their thoughts/actions and academic/social consequences. Furthermore, they can help these students differentiate between elements of their life they do and do not have control over.

Ellis' Rational Emotive Behavior Theory (REBT) can be utilized when working with students that have an external locus of control (as cited in Miller, Fitch, Marshall, 2003). Counselors using REBT dispute the assumptions in regards to locus of control that surround different situations. This can be achieved by investigating the students' analysis of what source of negative event was and examine what the external and internal factors are. Students who encompass an external locus of control will over accentuate external factors. The counselor will have to confront this cognitive miscalculation and present the internal factors that impacted the negative event.

In review, locus of control is a significant aspect when counseling at-risk students (Miller, Fitch, Marshall, 2003). The widespread chaos in their lives can

construct feeling of helplessness and a lack of internal locus of control. It is easy for the student to deem that their actions do not necessarily lead to the observed results. Counselors and teachers who work in alternative education environment can help students by pointing out the specific actions that lead to the consequence

Research studies have established that locus of control in terms of school adjustment can be affected in positive ways (Nunn & Nunn, 1993) In one study; twenty-five classroom teachers were educated on implementing a contingency management educational program to boost responsibility for learning in students. Nunn and Nunn (1993) discussed a study that confirms that task behavior following failure can be altered if a child's locus of control is altered. When teachers were educated to explicitly train the children that failure was a consequence of effort rather than capability, students demonstrated more diligence in the face of failure instead of developing an attitude of helplessness.

Educators aspiring to positively influence Locus of control in their students may desire to reflect on the following (Nunn and Nunn, 1993):

1. Make certain that circumstances for a successful learning experience are in position. Earlier reinforcement experiences of a student influence their cognitive outlook. If a reinforcement history is negative for the task or there are unfavorable consequences associated with the task, the student will likely respond based upon an external locus of control.
2. Stress to students the association between their behavior and their performance. As a child develops, they progressively become more

aware of "causal" relationships between behavior and consequences within their environment. For students with external locus of control, this process doesn't occur, and educators must assist in linking this gap.

3. Educators should have clearly declared expectations for behavior and performance for students with an external locus of control. For the student, this will provide a clear goal for in regards to learning behaviors, as well as knowledge of the connection between behavior and its reinforcements. For the educator it supplies a method for assembling learning expectations, determining at what time they are met, and setting the reinforcement for appropriate learning behaviors.
4. Another way that educators can work with students with external locus of control is to steadily attempt to convey the importance of participatory ownership of their learning experience rather than being an inactive contributor in the process. Students with external locus of control exhibit a larger risk for being passive in classrooms. Efforts to raise participation are advantageous to all students, not just ones with an external locus of control.
5. Recruit the support of parents to endorse the reinforcement of internal locus of control. Parents are influential in reinforcing efforts at self-control and empowerment. Teachers and parents working jointly to establish the link connecting the student's efforts and consequences can have a powerful impact

6. For students with an external locus of control, learning tasks and goals must have plausible value and significance. Teachers should display, model, and offer creative examples of ideas to students, this should be based on the student's frame of reference. If this is accomplished, the student can at least move toward the learning task with more concentration and motivation.
7. Supply students with a genuine choice of how, when, and why they learn within the framework of student-centered teaching. Students with an external locus of control have never learned that they have a real voice in the decision-making process when it comes to their own well-being. Teachers have to be capable focusing on the needs of these students, be able to present them with choices in regards to the system by which they will learn, and be ready to permit the student to experience the consequences of their decisions.
8. The last suggestion deals with the association between external locus of control and other barriers to performance such as depressive warning signs, levels of anxiety, and academic self-concepts. Educators who are conscious of warning signs of anxiety and depression in students should maintain strategies and interventions which improve the well-being of the student. As circumstances which endorse the students' personal well-being are amplified, behaviors which correspond to an internal locus of control tend to increase.

Student's locus of control and empowerment over their learning influences adjustment within the school environment. It can also benefit if the educator believes that every barrier can be overcome, and that every child has the intrinsic ability to mold their educational destiny if only given a chance to do so.

CHAPTER III: SUMMARY & DISCUSSION

Locus of control is concept from Julian Rotter's Social Learning Theory. Social Learning Theory has four key components: behavior potential, expectancy, reinforcement value, and the psychological situation (Social Learning Theory, n.d.). Locus of control is defined as an individual's perception on the cause of events that endure in their life (Grimes et al., 2004). Individuals are said to have an internal or external locus of control. "Students with an internal individual locus of control orientation accept responsibility for control over their environment whereas those with an external orientation believe they have little control of their environment" (Grimes et al., 2004). Locus of control is closely associated with the concepts of learned helplessness and attribution.

Rotter (1966) states, one of the determinates of behavior is how individuals perceive their reinforcement. Is it contingent upon an individual's own behavior (internal) or is the reinforcement controlled by forces outside of himself and independent of his actions (external). External locus of control is when reinforcement is perceived by the individual as not to be entirely contingent upon his action (Rotter, 1966). In our culture it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance or fate. Internal locus of control is defined as an individual's perception that a particular reinforcement is contingent upon their own behavior or permanent characteristics. Janssen and Carton (1999) investigated the effects of locus of control on procrastination. They found that students with internal locus of control completed and returned the assignment sooner than students with

external locus of control. People with an external locus of control are more likely to experience from others both physical and mental ailments because they believe they have no control over their situation (Wang & Anderson, 1994). Those with an internal locus of control believe that hard work and personal abilities will lead to positive outcomes. The individuals will be more likely to meet challenges and achieve success in their impending endeavors.

The factors of parents, school environment, and gender are influential in the development of a student's locus of control. Adolescents who thought of their parents as being authoritative had a considerable amount more internal locus of control orientation than individuals who interpreted their parents as either permissive or authoritarian (McLun and Merrel, 1998). Numerous studies have investigated the connection involving parental locus of control and children's locus of control (Morton, 1997). The majority of these have established minimal or no consistent relationships. Bryant (1974) investigated the experiences of teachers with sixth-grade internal and external locus-of-control males. Children with an external locus of control ascribed notably more negative attribute to their teachers and themselves than did internal locus-of-control children. Schools are acknowledged as having a major impact, both positive and/or negative, on the psychological well-being of those who attend the schools (Hawkes, 1991). "Educators, by the virtue of their relationship to students in the classroom, become potentially the most influential adults in students' lives, second only to parents" (Hawkes, 1991, p. 475). Outcomes on gender differences in locus of control have been wide-ranging (Chubb & Fertman 1997). Several studies have

established that females have more external locus of control than males do, while other studies found no differences in locus of control between genders.

In examining locus of control, Tashakkori & Thompson (1991) reported racial differences with respect to perceived success and failure in an assortment of areas. Research has found considerable differences in the internal and external locus of control between Black, White, and Hispanic students (Otterman; n.d.). Flowers, Milner & Moore (2003) wrote that African American high school seniors who had more of an internal locus of control were more apt to have higher educational aspirations than African American high school seniors who reported a more external locus of control. Some literature has disagreed with this exposed connection between culture and locus of control (Otterman; n.d.). The cynics instead proposed factors thought to be more relevant. The factors ranged from gender to socialization practices. Previous research was also criticized because the individuals used in the studies did not precisely characterize their culture, hence crushing the entire reason of the study.

Research that pertains to what educators can do to influence a student's locus of control is very important in the field of education. Hawkes (1991) indicates that locus of control is a feature that can be modified. In a study discussed by Hawkes (1991) a change in the direction of internality appeared in students who were educated by teachers who had been recognized as showing signs of internal locus of control. To positively impact African American students, school counselors must have a clear understanding of the obstacles that hamper

academic accomplishments. School counselors need to be familiar with the domineering external forces that are part of the social, economic, and political framework of the school and community and the effects this has on minority students (Bailey, Getch, & Chen-Hayes, 2003).

Limitations

Limitations of this study is a, lack of research. There needs to be more research on factors that impact a student's locus of control.

Conclusions

The literature that deals with the definition and historical background of locus of control is comprehensive. The definition of locus of control is clear and easily found, although the words vary the meaning stays the same. Locus of control is an individual's perception on the cause of events that they endure in their life (Grimes et al., 2004). Locus of control is rooted in the more comprehensive theory of social learning. Social learning theory, developed by Julian Rotter, suggests that an individual's personality represents an interaction of the individual with his or her environment. Julian Rotter's work on locus of control and social learning is often cited in more recent research. This is an indication of the importance of his work with personality and learning. Locus of control is influential in other theories such as attribution and learned helplessness.

The differences between external and internal locus of control that were discussed in Chapter II are critical in understanding what the effect of locus of control has on students. Internal and external locus of control are at opposite

ends of the locus of control spectrum. When a student encounters reinforcement (outcomes), such as bad grade or compliment from the teacher, how does he/she perceive their contribution in obtaining it? If the child has an internal locus of control they would determine that they were responsible for the outcome that was encountered. If the student has an external locus of control they would blame the outcome on being lucky or explain that "it was just fate". Through the literature review it is understood that an internal versus external control is more desirable. Evidence suggests that a person with internal locus of control is more independent, cognitively able, and mentally aware, predisposed to learning, and motivated (Howard, 1996). If this is the case it seems that it would be desirable for students to have an internal locus of control.

Chapter II focused on factors that influence a student's locus of control such as, parents, gender and educators. There was detailed literature in regards to parental influences on locus of control. Morton (1997) states, "An external parental locus of control was correlated with children's attributing their successes and failures to unknown causes and with children perceiving that solving their problems is not contingent on their own behavior"(p. 222). Studies have made reference to a possible modeling or identification progression that takes place in the parental relationship. Parenting style was also discussed as a contributor to a student's locus of control (Trusty& Lampe, 1997). Several studies have established that females have more external locus of control than do males (Chubb & Fertman 1997). Despite the fact that other studies did not find differences in locus of control between genders. A study that reviewed 22 studies

for gender differences on numerous variables including locus of control, found in 15 of the studies that there was no difference between genders in locus of control. Educators can be influential in a student's locus of control. "Educators, by the virtue of their relationship to students in the classroom, become potentially the most influential adults in students' lives, second only to parents" (Hawkes, 1991, p.475). This points to the importance of schools in assisting students to acquire a beneficial locus of control.

The impact of locus of control on minority was also discussed in Chapter II. Wade (1996) found, that Blacks scored higher in external locus of control than Whites at different time periods throughout adolescence. Flowers, Milner & Moore (2003) investigated the impact of locus of control on black high school seniors' educational aspirations. The results indicated that black students frequently rated external factors such as luck, task difficulty, and ease as the major reasons for their failure. Black and Hispanic students are dropping out at rates that are at least double the rate of Whites. Does this mean that culture dictates an individual's locus of control? There is evidence signifying that such links do exist, but it should by no means be inferred that one's culture is the sole determinate of the degree of internality or externality an individual has (Otterman n.d.). Research indicates that other factors have a lot more influence than does culture and that the methods used by researchers to link the two are faulty.

The literature indicates that educators and schools can facilitate changes in a student's locus of control. Hawkes (1991) indicates that locus of control is a feature that can be modified. This can be done by promoting both teachers and

students to have an internal locus of control. Flowers Milner & Moore (2003) state that school counselors need to center their concentration on recognizing avenues to assist the students in coping and succeeding academically. School counselors need to be familiar with the domineering external forces that are part of the social, economic, and political framework of the school and community and the effects this has on minority students. (Bailey, Getch, & Chen-Hayes, 2003). Educators can impact a student's locus of control and must be diligent by staying on top of current educational trends in this field.

Recommendations

In this section recommendations will be made to parents, teachers, and school counselors and for programs that train educators. The following recommendations are made as a result of the literature review and conclusions.

Parents

1. It is recommended that parents model an internal locus of control.
2. It is recommended that parents reinforce an internal locus of control in their children.
3. It is recommended that parents do not enable external locus of control in their children.
4. It is recommended that parents address their child's external locus of control and suggest internal alternatives.
5. It is recommended that parents identify things that their child does not have control and refocus them on what they can control.

Teachers

1. It is recommended that teachers stay abreast of current research and trends in the field of locus of control.
2. It is recommended that teachers are able to identify external locus of control in students.
3. It is recommended that teachers incorporate techniques that contribute to an internal locus of control.
4. It is recommended that teachers reinforce internal locus of control in their students.
5. It is recommended that teachers model internal locus of control in the presence of their students.
6. It is recommended that teachers do not enable an external locus of control in their students.

Counselors

1. It is recommended that counselors act as a resource for parents and teachers.
2. It is recommended that counselors facilitate groups that focus on acquiring an internal locus of control.
3. It is recommended that counselors do classroom guidance lessons that focus on the importance of internal locus of control.
4. It is recommended that counselors develop the skills to be able to identify students with an internal locus of control.
5. It is recommended that counselors model an internal locus of control.

6. It is recommended that counselors do not enable an external locus of control in the students they serve.
7. It is recommended that counselors stay abreast of current research and trends in the field of locus of control.

Programs that train educators

1. It is recommended programs train educators to utilize current research and trend in the field of locus of control.
2. It is recommended that programs train educators on the importance of their personal locus of control.
3. It is recommended that programs train educators on how to identify the locus of control in students.
4. It is recommended that programs train educators on how to change the locus of control of their students.
5. It is recommended that programs train educators to be able to reinforce students when they demonstrate an internal locus of control.

References

- Bailey, D. F., Getch, Y. Q., & Chen-Hayes, S. (2003). Multicultural competence. In B. T. Erford (Ed.), *Transforming the school counseling profession* (pp. 411-434). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Battle, E., & Rotter, J. B. (1963). Children's feelings of personal control as related to social class and ethnic group. *Journal of Personality*, 31, 482-490.
- Bryant, B. K. (1974). Locus of control related to teacher-child interperceptual experiences. *Child Development*, 45(1), 157-164.
- Chubb, N. H., & Fertman, C. I. (1997). Adolescent self-esteem and locus of control: A longitudinal study of gender and age differences. *Adolescence*, 32(125), 113
- Corcoran, J., & Ivery, J. (2004). Parent and child attributions for child behavior: Distinguishing factors for engagement and outcome. *Families in Society*, 85(1), 101-106.
- Dille, OB. & Mezack, M. [1991]. Identifying predictors of high risk among community college telecourse students. *American Journal of Distance Education* 5 (1), 24-35.
- Dollinger, S. (2000). Locus of control and incidental learning: an application to college student success, *College Student Journal*, Dec2000, Vol. 34, Issue 4

- Firrin, M., Hwang, C., Copella, M., & Clark, S. (2004). Learned helplessness: The effect of failure on test-taking. *Education, 124*(4), 688-693.
- Flowers, L. A., Milner, H. R., & Moore, J. L. I. (2003). Effects of locus of control on african american high school seniors' educational aspirations: Implications for preservice and inservice high school teachers and counselors. *The High School Journal, 87*(1), 39-50.
- Grimes, P. W., Millea, M. J., & Woodruff, T. W. (2004). Grades-who's to blame? student evaluation of teaching and locus of control. *The Journal of Economic Education, 35*(2), 129-147.
- Gale Encyclopedia of Childhood & Adolescence*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 15,2005, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_g2602/is_0003/ai_2602000356
- Hawkes, B. B. (1991). Teacher locus of control: Who's responsible? *Education, 111*(4), 475-478.
- Janssen, T., & Carton, J. S. (1999). The effects of locus of control and task difficulty on procrastination. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 160*(4), 436.
- Kulas, H. (1996). Locus of control in adolescence: A longitudinal study. *Adolescence, 31*(123), 721.
- Locus of control*. (2004). Retrived May 24, 2005, from <http://www.wilderdom.com/games/descriptions/LocusOfControlExercise.html>

Lebedina-Manzoni, M. (2004). To what students attribute their academic success and unsuccess. *Education (Chula Vista, Calif.)*, 124(4), 699-708.

Miller, C. A., Fitch, T., & Marshall, J. L. (2003). Locus of control and at-risk youth: A comparison of regular education high school students and students in alternative schools. *Education*, 123(3), 548.

Morton, T. L. (1997). The relationship between parental locus of control and.. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 158(2), 216.

Mucclun, L. A., & Merrell, K. W. (1998). Relationship of perceived parenting styles, locus of control orientation, and self-concept among.. *Psychology in the Schools*, 35(4), 381.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (n.d.). Retrived May 22, 2005, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/droppub_2001/

Njus, D.M. & Brockway, J.H. [1999]. Perceptions of competence and locus of control for positive and negative outcomes. *Personality and Individual Differences* 26, 531-548.

Nunn, G. D., & Nunn, S. J. (1993). Locus of control and school performance: Some implications for teachers. *Education*, 113(4), 636.

Otterman. (n.d.) Retrieved June 1,2005,

<http://www.units.muohio.edu/psybersite/control/culture.shtml>

- Parsley, K. & Corcoran, C. (2003). The classroom teacher's role in preventing school failure. *Kappa Delta Phi*, 39(2), 84-87.
- Poling, A., & Normand, M. (1999). Noncontingent reinforcement: An inappropriate description of time-based schedules that reduce behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 32(2), 237-238.
- Pugliese, R.R. [1994]. Telecourse persistence and psychological variables. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 8 [3], 22-39.
- Reinforcement theory*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 23, 2005, from <http://www.as.wvu.edu/%7Esbb/comm221/chapters/rf.htm>
- Rotter, J. B. (1954). *Social learning and clinical psychology*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Rotter, J. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcements, *Psychological Monographs*, 80, Whole No. 609.
- Social Learning Theory*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 23, 2005, from <http://psych.fullerton.edu/jmearns/rotter.htm>
- Tashakkori, A., & Thompson, V. D. (1991). Race differences in self-perception and locus of control during adolescence and early childhood.. *Genetic, Social & General Psychology Monographs*, 117(2), 135.

Trusty, J., & Lampe, R. E. (1997). Relationship of high-school seniors' perceptions of parental involvement and control to seniors' locus of control. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 75*(5), 375-384.

Wang, D., & Anderson, N. H. (1994). Excuse-making and blaming as a function of internal-external locus of control. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 24*(2), 295-302.