- AYRI BASIM (e-baskı) / SPECIAL EDITION -

Gökhan BAŞ

An Analysis of Pupil Control Ideology of Primary Teachers From Different Variables
-
Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Öğrenci Kontrol İdeolojilerinin Farklı Değişkenler Açısından Analizi

YAYIN DANIŞMA KURULU / EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

BU SAYININ HAKEMLERİ / REFEREES OF THIS ISSUE

İÇİNDEKİLER / CONTENTS

İÇİNDEKİLER / CONTENTS

An Analysis of Pupil Control Ideology of Primary Teachers From Different Variables

Gökhan BAŞ

Necmettin Erbakan University

PhD Student, Institute of Education Sciences

gokhanbas51@mail.com

Abstract: The main purpose of this study was to analyse pupil control ideology of primary (classroom) teachers. 176 primary teachers working in elementary schools from Nigde province and its districts constituted the sample of the research. The "survey method" was employed in this research. The data of this research were collected by using the "Pupil Control Ideology Scale". In order to analyse the data obtained, mean, standard deviation, the independent samples t-test, one-way ANOVA analysis were used. Results of this study show that primary teachers had "humanistic pupil control ideology" in general. Also, it was found out that there was not a statistical significant difference between primary school teachers in terms of gender. On the other hand, it was found a statistical significant difference between primary teachers in relation to occupational seniority in favour of younger teachers. It was also found out that there were statistical significant differences between primary teachers in terms of educational level and settlement place of school variables in favour of teachers with postgraduate level of education and working in schools in the city centre.

Keywords: Pupil control ideology, primary education, primary teachers.

Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Öğrenci Kontrol İdeolojilerinin Farklı Değişkenler Açısından Analizi

Özet: Bu çalışmanın amacı, sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğrenci kontrol ideolojileri ile ilgili görüşlerini incelemektir. Araştırmanın örneklemini, Niğde ili merkezi ve bağlı bulunan köy ve kasabalardaki ilköğretim okullarında görev yapmakta olan 176 sınıf öğretmeni oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada "tarama modeli" kullanılmıştır. Çalışmada veri toplamak için "öğrenci kontrol ideolojileri ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın amacına dayalı olarak, yüzde, standart sapma, bağımsız gruplar t-testi, tek-yönlü ANOVA analizi gibi istatistik test teknikleri kullanılmıştır. Çalışmada elde edilen sonuçlara göre, sınıf öğretmenlerinin genel olarak insancıl öğrenci kontrol ideolojisine sahip bulundukları sonucuna varılmıştır. Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğrenci kontrol ideolojilerinin cinsiyete göre farklılaşmadığı, ancak mesleki kıdeme, eğitim durumuna ve görev yapılan okulun yerleşim birimi değişkenlerine göre mesleki kıdemi 1-5 yıl, lisansüstü eğitim yapan ve görev yapılan okulun yerleşim birimi şehir merkezi olan öğretmenler lehine anlamlı şekilde farklılaştığı saptanmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Öğrenci kontrol ideolojisi, ilköğretim, sınıf öğretmeleri.

1. INTRODUCTION

Teachers' ideology, belief or value system exerts great influence on their professional practices (Richardson, 1996). In particular, teachers' pupil control ideology affects on how they think on their students and their classroom practices at school. Pupil control ideology informs and guides teachers' understandings about appropriate and desirable instructional practices, teacher-student interactions and classroom dynamics (Willard, 1972). In general, it can be stated that pupil control ideology is an ideology or belief and value system that directs teachers on how they behave and approach to their instructional and classroom management practices.

Student control has been conceptualised along a continuum ranging from custodialism at one end to humanism at the other (Willower, Eidell & Hoy, 1973). The importance of student control in schools is not surprising since schools are people-developing or people-changing institutions (Street, Vinter & Perrow, 1970 as cited in Lunenburg, 1991). The rigidly traditional school serves as a model for the custodial orientation. This kind of school provides a highly controlled setting concerned primarily with the maintenance of order. Students are stereotyped in terms of their appearance, behaviour, and parents' social status (Hoy, 2001). Schools that adopt custodial control ideology exert high levels of control to maintain their rules. Students are considered as individuals who need to be controlled by sanctions based on restrictions, since they are irresponsible and undisciplined in terms of the way in which they behave, dress, appear, etc. (Willower, Eidell & Hoy, 1973; Hoy, 2001, 2007; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008). Teachers with custodial control ideology stress the maintenance of order, impersonality, one-way downward communication, distrust of students and a punitive, moralistic attitude towards student control (Lunenburg, 1991; Lunenburg & Cadavid, 1992; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008). They tend not to understand their students' behaviours and attitudes. Instead, they maintain a rigid student-teacher status hierarchy. Students must accept the decisions of these teachers without question. Student misbehaviour is viewed as a personal affront and students are perceived as irresponsible and undisciplined persons who must be controlled through punitive sanctions. Impersonality, pessimism and watchful mistrust characteristics characterise the atmosphere of the custodial school (Cadavid & Lunenburg, 1991; Lunenburg & Cadavid, 1992). Traditional classroom teacher control theory implies a kind of domination. Teachers who subscribe to the traditional classroom teacher control theory strive to become the ultimate authority and source of knowledge. They also tend to see students on the receiving end of the instructional process (Honey & Moeller, 1990). On the other hand, the humanistic model conceives of the school as an educational community in which students learn through cooperative interaction and experience (Lunenburg & Cadavid, 1992). According to the humanistic control ideology, students' learning and behaviours are considered psychologically

and sociologically rather than morally (Hoy, 1969; Johns, Karabinus & MacNaughton, 1989; Lunenburg & Cadavid, 1992). Indeed, teachers with humanistic control orientation emphasise the psychological and sociological bases of learning and behaviour, an accepting and trustful view of students and a confidence in students' ability to self-disciplining and responsible (Lunenburg, 1991). In humanistic control orientation, teachers believe that students can learn to be responsible and self-regulating individuals. Moreover, the humanistic teacher is optimistic about students and has open and friendly relations with students. A humanistic orientation leads teachers to desire a democratic classroom climate with its attendant-flexibility in status and rules, open channels of two-way communication, and increased self-determination. Teachers and students are willing to act on their own volition and accept responsibility for their actions (Lunenburg & Schmidt, 1989). The climate of humanistic orientation seeks to meet the needs of every student and student individualism is emphasised (Hoy, 2001). A teacher with humanistic control ideology considers students as an educational group where they participate in their learning process through cooperative interaction and experiences (Lunenburg & Schmidt, 1989). In this regard, it can be stated that constructivist learning theory of classroom control translates effectively the educational and socialisation agendas into their student-centred practice (Keyser, 2000). In a more student-centred classroom control theory (humanistic control orientation), as in constructivist pedagogy, a teacher's authoritarian style of classroom management and instructional practices may yield to less controlling roles such as directing, facilitating, and assisting (Fosnot, 1996). Whereas, some teachers who adopt custodial control ideology resist constructivist pedagogy for some reasons such as commitment to their current instructional approach, concern about student learning, and concern more about classroom control (Brooks & Brooks, 1999).

When the related literature is reviewed, it is seen that there are some studies in regard of pupil control ideology in abroad (Hoy, 1967, 1969, 2001; Helsel, 1971; Jones & Blakenship, 1972; Willower, Eidell & Hoy, 1973; Deibert & Hoy, 1974; Multhauf, Willower & Licata, 1978; Jones & Harty, 1980; Lunenburg, 1984; Lunenburg, 1991; Schmidt, 1992; Okafor, 2006; Rideout & Windle, 2010). However, when the related literature is viewed, it seen that there are studies in relation with pupil control ideology in Turkey (Celep, 1997a, 1997b, 1998; Yılmaz, 2002, 2007, 2009, 2011; Altuğ, 2007; Beycioğlu, Konan & Aslan, 2007; Turan & Can, 2008; Baş, 2011), although the number of the studies is very limited. Hence, more research is needed in order to better understand the general profile of teachers working in schools in Turkey in relation with their pupil control ideology. In this regard, the purpose of this study can be stated to analyse the pupil control ideology of primary teachers with respect to gender, occupational

experience, educational level, and settlement place of school. In order to answer this research question, the following sub-questions will be tried to be answered in the research.

1. What are the views of primary teachers in relation with pupil control ideology?

2. Is there a significant difference between pupil control ideology of primary teachers according to gender, occupational experience seniority, educational level, and settlement place of school variables?

It is hoped that the findings of this study would contribute to an understanding of the role of pupil control ideology and some demographic characteristics. Also, the findings would be helpful for other researchers in policy discussions and efforts to improve classroom management and instructional practices.

2. METHOD

The survey method was employed in this research (Karasar, 2005), because there were some advantages for using the method. This approach is also used to receive a variety of responses from a number of subjects participated in this study (Ekiz, 2003). The survey method is used in order to reach a conclusion about a large number of elements in the universe by taking a group or sample from it (Karasar, 2005).

2.1. Population and Sample

The population of the study consisted of all primary (classroom) teachers working in elementary schools in Nigde province, a province in the centre of Turkey, in 2010-2011 academic year. In order to detect the sampling of the study, elementary schools in population were chosen according to three-layer group sampling method according to socio-economic structure (high-middle-low) of their region, volunteered to participate in the research (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). The sample of the study was consisted of 176 primary teachers working in elementary schools. The subjects were assured for the anonymity and confidentiality for their responses. Of the total 176 subjects, 77 (43.75%) are males while 99 (56.25%) of them are females. 31 (17.61%) of primary teachers have 1-5 years, 27 (15.34%) of them have 6-10 years, 39 (22.16%) of them have 11-15 years, 46 (26.13%) of them have 16-20 years and 33 (18.75%) of them have 21 and above years of occupational experience. 102 (57.95%) of primary teachers work in the country and 74 (42.05%) of them work in the city centre. In terms of education level variable, it can be said that 32 (18.18%) of primary teachers are the graduates of the senior high school, 136 (77.27%) of them are the undergraduates and 8 (4.55%) of them have the postgraduate level of education.

2.2. Data Collection Instrument

In order to answer the problem statement of the research question, the Student Control Ideology Scale (Willower, Eidell & Hoy, 1973) was used in the study. The information in relation with the scale is given below.

2.2.1. Student Control Ideology Scale

The Student Control Ideology Scale was developed by Willower, Eidell and Hoy (1973) and adapted and translated into Turkish by Yılmaz (2002). The scale is one dimensional and consists of 20 items. The higher the total score on the Scale, the higher the level of custodial student control ideology of the teacher. The Cronbach's Alpha level of the scale was calculated as .72 (Yılmaz, 2002).

2.3. Data Analysis

In order to test the normal distribution of the data collected for the study, Kolmogorow Smirnov-Z test was used in the research firstly. According to the result of the test, the data collected in the research were found as showing normal distribution [Z=1.188, p=0.119]. Hence, the data collected for this study were analysed by using parametric tests such as the independent samples t-test and one-way ANOVA (variance) analysis. The independent samples t-test was used to compare between primary teachers' pupil control ideology in terms of gender. The occupational seniority, educational level, and the settlement place of school of primary teachers were compared with the help of one-way ANOVA (variance) analysis. In order to find the variance of the difference, Tukey-HSD test was used in the research.

3. FINDINGS

In order to find out the general pupil control ideology of primary teachers, descriptive statistical analyses are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Pupil Control Ideology of Primary Teachers

η	$\overline{X}$	Sx	Shx
176	2.89	9.69	1.61

As one looks at Table 1 above, it can be clearly seen that primary teachers have humanistic pupil control ideology in general. Hence, it may be stated that an increase on the total score of the pupil control ideology means teachers adopt custodial pupil control ideology. In order to compare primary teachers' pupil control ideology according to gender, the independent samples t-test was carried out and the results of the t-test are given in Table 2.

Table 2: Pupil Control Ideology of Primary Teachers in Relation to Gender

Gender	η	$\overline{X}$	Sx	df	t	p
Male	77	29.44	8.88	34	-.288	.410
Female	99	28.50	10.68			

According to Table 2 given above, primary teachers do not differ statistically in pupil control ideology [t(34)= -2,941, $p>$.05] in terms of gender. Primary teachers' occupational seniority was compared in relation to their pupil control ideology. The results of the one-way ANOVA (variance) analysis in relation to occupational seniority are given in Table 3.

Table 3: Pupil Control Ideology of Primary Teachers in Relation to Occupational Seniority

Occupational Seniority	η	$\overline{X}$	Sx	F	p
1-5 years	31	2.40	10.24		
6-10 years	27	2.84	11.43		
11-15 years	39	2.95	8.45	2.763	.045*
16-20 years	46	3.73	1.49		
21 + years	33	3.35	4.94		

The year of the occupational experience of primary teachers was compared with the help of one-way ANOVA (variance) analysis in Table 3 above. According to the statistical analysis, primary teachers were found out to differ significantly in pupil control ideology [F(4-31)= 2.763, $p<$.05]. In order to find the variance of the statistical significant difference, the Tukey-HSD test was carried out. According to the result of Tukey-HSD test, there is a significant difference between the primary teachers with 1-5 years of occupational experience and 16-20 years of occupational experience [IJ= 13.2143, $p<$.05]. In other words, primary teachers with 1-5 years of occupational experience have more humanistic control ideology [$\overline{X}$ =2.40] than those with more years of occupational experience such as primary teachers with 16-20 years of occupational experience [$\overline{X}$ =3.73]. These results indicate that primary teachers with more occupational experience have more custodial pupil control ideology. In Table 4, primary teachers' education level was compared in relation to their pupil control ideology and the results of the one-way ANOVA (variance) analysis are given.

Table 4: Pupil Control Ideology of Primary Teachers in Relation to Education Level

Education Level	η	$\overline{X}$	Sx	F	p
Senior High School	32	3.68	2.80		
Undergraduate	8	3.07	5.73	58.380	.000*
Postgraduate	136	1.10	0.89		

According to the results of the one-way ANOVA (variance) analysis made in Table 4 above in terms of pupil control ideology of primary teachers in relation to education level, it can

be seen that there is a statistical significant difference amongst teachers [F(2-33)= 58.380, *p*<.05] in the study. In order to find the variance of the statistical significant difference, Tukey-HSD test was carried out. According to the result of Tukey-HSD test, there is a significant difference amongst primary teachers with senior high school, undergraduate and postgraduate level of education. According to the result of Tukey-HSD test, there is a significant difference between primary teachers with senior high school and undergraduate level of education [IJ= 6.1746, *p*<.05]. Similarly, there is a significant difference between primary teachers with undergraduate and postgraduate level of education [IJ= 19.7143, *p*<.05]. Also, it was found out a significant difference between primary teachers with senior high school and postgraduate level of education [IJ= 25.8889, *p*<.05] in the study. In other words, primary teachers with postgraduate level of education have humanistic pupil control ideology [$\overline{X}$ =1.10] than those with senior high school [$\overline{X}$ =3.68] and undergraduate level of education [$\overline{X}$ =3.07] since they are perceived as they have custodial pupil control ideology. The results of the independent samples t test of the pupil control ideology of primary teachers in relation to settlement place of school variance are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Pupil Control Ideology of Primary Teachers in Relation to Settlement Place of School

Settlement Place	η	$\overline{X}$	Sx	df	t	p
Country	102	3.34	7.53	34	-2.335	.082
City Centre	74	2.61	9.99			

According to the results of the independent samples t test made in Table 5 above in terms of the pupil control ideology of primary teachers in relation to settlement place of school variable, it can be seen that there is not a statistical significant difference between teachers [t(34)= -2.335, *p*>.05] in the study.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

According to the results obtained in the study, it was clearly seen that primary teachers had humanistic pupil control ideology in general ($\overline{X}$ =2.89±9.69). Hence, it may be stated that an increase on the total score of the pupil control ideology means teachers adopt custodial pupil control ideology. In many studies carried out in the related literature, it was seen that teachers were found to tend to adopt custodial pupil control ideology in their classroom and instructional practices at school (Altuğ, 2007; Celep, 1997b; Turan & Altuğ, 2008; Yılmaz, 2002, 2011). Also, there are other findings similar to the related finding of this research in the literature (Ekici, 2004, 2006; Yılmaz, 2009). For example, Ekici (2004, 2006) states that primary teachers adopt authoritative classroom management style more compared to other classroom management styles. Also, Yılmaz (2009) found out a moderate, positive and significant

correlation between participants' views about custodial pupil control ideology and authoritative classroom management style. In this regard, it can possibly be stated that the findings obtained from the related literature are paralleled to the finding acquired in this research in relation with teachers' views on pupil control ideology. According to Şişman and Turan (2004), the Turkish Education System seems to be teacher-centred. So, it can be stated that this teacher-centred structure of the Turkish Education System is effective on the result obtained in the study. Custodial teacher control ideology implies a kind of domination in the classroom. On the other hand, Lunenburg and Mankowski (2000) found out a significant correlation between a high degree of school bureaucratisation and custodialism in student control orientation and behaviour, so custodialism in student control orientation was related to a high incidence of rules and regulations, hierarchical authority and centralisation of control. Teachers who subscribe to custodial student control ideology strive to become the ultimate authority and source of knowledge. They also tend to see students on the receiving end of the instructional process (Honey & Moeller, 1990). Custodial teachers were found to apply more traditional classroom management styles and more traditional methods of instruction in the classroom. The custodial teacher sees himself/herself as the only source of knowledge, power and authority so that they tend to apply more teacher-centred instructional methods and classroom applications rather than student-centred activities and methods of instruction as in constructivist learning environment. However, as contemporary classroom practice reveals the teacher is not the only person who is responsible for learning outcomes, power relations and source of knowledge in the classroom. In fact, every student contributes to learning objectives through his/her individual responses to each aspect of classroom activities (Manke, 1997). In a more student-centred classroom control, such as in humanistic student control ideology, a teacher's authoritarian style of classroom management and applications of instructional methods may yield to less controlling roles such as directing, facilitating, and assisting (Fosnot, 1996).

According to the finding in terms of gender variable, it was understood that primary teachers did not differ statistically in pupil control ideology [t(34)= -2.941, $p>.05$] in relation with gender. However, according to the findings obtained in terms of gender variable in the related literature, it was observed that female teachers tend to adopt custodial pupil control ideology in their classroom and instructional practices more than their male colleagues (Altuğ, 2007; Turan & Altuğ, 2008).

According to the finding in relation with occupational experience variable, it was seen that primary teachers were found out to differ significantly in pupil control ideology [F(4-31)= 2.763, $p<.05$]. In some studies carried out in the related literature, it was observed that experienced teachers tend to be more custodial in their pupil control orientations than their

younger or inexperienced colleagues (Altuğ, 2007; Turan & Altuğ, 2008). On the other hand, in a study carried out by Celep (1997b), it was seen that inexperienced teachers tend to adopt custodial pupil control ideology because of the difficulties in classroom management. As the findings in the related literature are evaluated, it is seen that there are different views and findings on pupil control ideology in regard of occupational experience/seniority. However, experienced teachers are believed to adopt custodial pupil control ideology more in their classroom management and instructional practices in the literature. In this sense, experienced teachers believe that they have much more information and experience in relation with classroom discipline and pupil control orientations than their inexperienced colleagues (Altuğ, 2007; Turan & Altuğ, 2008).

On the other hand, in terms of the pupil control ideology of primary teachers in relation to education level, it was seen that there was a statistical significant difference amongst teachers [F(2-33)= 58.380, p<.05] in favour of primary teachers with postgraduate level of education in the study. According to the findings obtained in regard of educational level variable in the related literature, it was seen that teachers' pupil control ideology differed significantly according to educational level in favour of teachers, who were the graduates of senior high schools and other faculties (faculty of science and letters, etc.) out of education faculties since they adopt custodial pupil control orientations in the classroom (Altuğ, 2007; Turan & Altuğ, 2008). The teachers, graduated from senior high schools and other faculties out of education faculties may have pedagogical inability and experience in regard of using different methods of instruction and classroom applications. Hence, in order to control their studies and keep them under discipline, they may tend to adopt more custodial pupil control ideology than their colleagues who have undergraduate and postgraduate level of education from education faculties. In a study carried by Jones and Blankenship (1972), it was found out that there was a significant correlation between teachers' student control ideologies and their innovative classroom practices. In this study made by Jones and Blankenship (1972), it was seen that teachers who adopt humanistic control orientations are more likely to apply alternative and new student-centred instructional methods in their classroom since they take their students interests and needs into consideration and they are in search of new applications of instruction in the classroom.

Lastly, in terms of pupil control ideology of primary teachers in relation to settlement place of school variable, it was understood that there was not a statistical significant difference between teachers [t(34)= -2.335, p>.05] in the study. Although there was no statistical difference between teachers' views on pupil control ideology in terms of settlement place of school variable, it was seen that teachers working in the city centre tend to adopt humanistic

control ideology compared to their colleagues working in the country according to arithmetic means obtained in the research. In other words, it can be clearly stated that teachers working in the country side tend to adopt more custodial pupil control ideology compared to their colleagues working in the city centre. However, on the contrary of the finding obtained in this research, in a study carried out by Lunenburg and Schmidt (1989), urban schools were found as significantly more custodial in pupil control ideology compared to suburban and rural schools in the USA. As the findings in relation with pupil control ideology in terms of settlement place of school variable in the literature and the related finding in the current study are evaluated, it can be stated that there are different results in relation with settlement place of school variable. In order to reach a better conclusion about settlement place of school variable, further studies are needed to be carried out in this very issue.

In light of the data obtained in the study, the following suggestions can be put forward: *i*. In order to raise primary teachers' humanistic control ideology more, in-service and pre-service educational opportunities should be sustained. *ii*. From the beginning of pre-service education at the faculties of education, teacher candidates should be educated to have necessary qualifications of humanistic control ideology. *iii*. Primary teachers should be motivated in order to better apply humanistic control orientation in the classroom. *iv*. Also, classroom atmospheres should be revised and they should be designed to have the qualities of humanistic control ideology. *v*. The physical atmosphere of classrooms may prevent teachers from applying humanistic classroom orientations. Smaller classroom sizes would also be helpful: crowded classrooms make teachers more likely to apply custodial orientations and their management less effective in such classrooms. Hence, school organisation and structure should be developed so as to adopt more humanistic student control orientations *vi*. On the other hand, school principals and educational supervisors should support teachers with their humanistic pupil control orientations and provide guidance in this respect.

References

Altuğ, S. C. (2007). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğrenci kontrol ideolojilerinin bazı demografik değişkenler açısından incelenmesi*. Unpublished master's thesis, Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.

Baş, G. (2011). Teacher student control ideology and burnout: Their correlation. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *36*(4), 84-94.

Beycioğlu, K., Konan, N. & Aslan, M. (2007). Pupil control ideology among high school teachers in Malatya, Turkey. 17-21 September. *Paper presented at the European conference on educational research*, Ghent, Belgium.

Brooks, J. G. & Brooks, M. G. (1999). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. (Revised ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Cadavid, V. & Lunenburg, F. C. (1991). *Locus of control, pupil control ideology, and dimensions of teacher burnout*. 3-7 April. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American educational research association, Chicago, IL, USA.

Celep, C. (1997a). Prospective student teachers' control orientation. *Education and Science*, *21*(106), 12-22.

Celep, C. (1997b). *Classroom teachers' factors affecting the sense of efficacy: In terms of the management, work group, belief about student, and pupil control orientation.* Paper presented at the third national classroom teachers symposium, Çukurova University Education Faculty, Adana, Turkey.

Celep, C. (1998). *Teachers' sense of efficacy, teachers' management work group, belief about student, and pupil control orientation.* Paper presented at the seventh national educational sciences congress, Selçuk University Education Faculty, Konya, Turkey.

Deibert, J. & Hoy, W. K. (1974). Custodial high schools and self-actualization of students. *Educational Research Quarterly*, *2*, 24-31.

Ekiz, D. (2003). *Eğitimde araştırma yöntem ve metodlarına giriş*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Fosnot, C. T. (1996). Constructivism: A psychological theory of learning. In Fosnot, C. T. (Ed.), *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Helsel, A. R. (1971). Value orientation and pupil control ideology of public school educators. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *7*, 24-33.

Honey, M. & Moeller, B. (1990). *Teachers' beliefs and technology integration: Different values, different understandings*. Technical Report No. 143. Center for Technology in Education, New York.

Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice*. (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hoy, W. K. (2007). The pupil control studies: A historical, theoretical, and empirical analysis. In Hoy, W. K. & DiPaola, M. (Eds.), *Essential ideas for the reform of American schools*. USA: Information Age Publishing.

Hoy, W. K. (2001). Pupil control studies: A historical, theoretical, and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *39*(5), 424-441.

Hoy, W. K. (1969). Pupil control ideology and organizational socialization: A further examination. *The School Review Quarterly*, *77*(3-4), 257-265.

Hoy, W. K. (1967). Organizational socialization: The student teacher and pupil control ideology. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *61*(4), 163-155.

Johns, F., Karabinus, N. & MacNaughton, R. (1989). *School discipline guidebook: Theory into practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Jones, D. R. & Harty, H. (1980). Secondary school student teacher classroom control ideologies and amount of engaged instructional activities. *The High School Journal*, *64*, 13-15.

Jones, L. P. & Blankenship, J. W. (1972). The relationship of pupil control ideology and innovative classroom practices. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *9*(3), 281-285.

Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. (15th ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Keyser, M. W. (2000). Active learning and cooperative learning: Understanding the difference and using both styles effectively. *Research Strategies*, *17*, 35-44.

Lunenburg, F. C. & Ornstein, A. C. (2008). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices*. (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Books/Cole.

Lunenburg, F. C. & Mankowski, S. A. (2000). *Bureaucracy and pupil control orientation and behavior in urban secondary schools*. 24-28 April. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American educational research association, New Orleans, LA, USA.

Lunenburg, F. C. & Cadavid, V. (1992). Locus of control, pupil control ideology, and dimensions of teacher burnout. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *19*, 13-22.

Lunenburg, F. C. (1991). Educators' pupil control ideology as a predictor of educators' reactions to student disruptive behavior. *The High School Journal*, *74*, 81-87.

Lunenburg, F. C. & Schmidt, L. J. (1989). Pupil control ideology, pupil control behavior, and the quality of school life. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, *22*, 36-44.

Lunernburg, F. C. (1984). *Pupil control in schools: Individual and organizational correlates*. Lexington, MA: Ginn and Company.

Manke, M. P. (1997). *Classroom power relations: Understanding student-teacher interaction*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

McMillan, J. H. & Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in education: Evidence based inquiry*. Boston: Brown and Company.

Multhauf, A. P., Willower, D. J. & Licata, J. W. (1978). Teacher pupil-control ideology and behaviour and classroom environmental robustness. *The Elementary School Journal*, *79*(1), 40-46.

Okafor, P. C. (2006). *School climate, pupil control ideology, and effectiveness*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. John's University School of Education and Human Services, New York.

Richardson, V. (1966). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In Sikula, J., Bettery, T. J. & Guyton, E. (Eds.), *The handbook of research on teacher education*. New York: Macmillan Company, Inc.

Rideout, G. & Windle, S. (2010). Beginning teachers' pupil control ideologies: An empirical examination of the impact of beliefs about education, mentorship, induction, and principal leadership style. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, *104*(1), 1-30.

Schmidt, L. J. (1992). Relationship between pupil control ideology and the quality of school life. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice*, *45*, 889-896.

Şişman, M. & Turan, S. (2004). Eğitim ve okul yönetimi. In Özden, Y. (Ed.). *Eğitim ve okul yöneticiliği el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Turan, S. & Can, S. (2008). Öğretmenlerin öğrenci kontrol ideolojileri. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *1*(1), 95-113.

Yılmaz, K. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının demokratik değerler ile öğrenci kontrol ideolojilerine ilişkin görüşleri arasındaki ilişki. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 24*(2), 297-315.

Yılmaz, K. (2009). Primary school teachers' views about pupil control ideologies and classroom management styles. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, *4*, 157-167.

Yılmaz, K. (2007). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin okul yöneticilerinin liderlik davranışları ve öğrenci kontrol ideolojilerine ilişkin görüşleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 32*(146), 12-23.

Yılmaz, K. (2002). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin okul yöneticilerinin liderlik davranışları ve öğrenci kontrol ideolojilerine ilişkin görüşleri*. Unpublished master's thesis, Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.

Willard, A. M. (1972). On the concept of ideology in political science. *The American Political Science Review*, *66*, 478-510.

Willower, D. J., Eidel, T. L. & Hoy, W. K. (1973). *The school and pupil control ideology*. (Revised ed.). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.