

*Field : Physical Education*

*Type : Research Article*

*Received:11.01.2016 - Accepted:13.04.2016*

## **The Relationship of Assertiveness and Locus of Control with Learning Styles of the Physical Education and Sports School Students**

**Serdar SUCAN<sup>1</sup>, Mehmet Behzat TURAN<sup>1</sup>, Osman PEPE<sup>1</sup>,  
Barış KARAOĞLU<sup>1</sup>, Doğan DOĞAN<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Erciyes University Physical Education and Sport Department, Kayseri, TURKEY

<sup>2</sup>South Russian University, Institute of Management Business and Law, RUSSIA

**Email: [sesucan@hotmail.com](mailto:sesucan@hotmail.com)**

### **Abstract**

The present study have been conducted to investigate Physical Education and Sports School students' learning style preferences in terms of assertiveness and locus of control to see relationship between and learning style.

For this purpose "Kolb's Learning Style Inventory" translated in Turkish by Askar and Akkoyunlu (1993), "Rathus Assertiveness Scale" which was developed by Rathus A.S. (1973) and "Rotter's Locus of Control Scale" (1966) which was developed into Turkish by Dağ (1990) was administrated to three hundred sixty six Erciyes University School of Physical Education and Sports students. For analysis of the data, Chi-Square test, Spearman correlation analysis and Multiple Linear Regression analysis were used and  $p < 0.05$  level of significance was searched.

According to our findings, assertiveness between learning style were found low levels, negative and significant relationship. Furthermore, the students who have seen their preferred substantially (37.7%) diverge learning style and learning by the feeling and watching.

**Keywords:** learning style, assertiveness, locus of control, undergraduate students

## Introduction

Education is of great importance for the development of individuals and society. Thanks to the Professional education of individuals who learn their life resume path. In this way, communities are progressing faster than in the field of science and technology, increasing the level of prosperity.

Dunn by (1960) discovered the learning style, is in the process of receiving and processing the information of an individual's preferred path is defined as the (Kolb, 1984). Learning styles, in the light of the individual's previous experience in order to well meaning new experiences, thinking to analyze the actions, assessment and reconfiguration based on the "Experiential Learning Theory" (Andresen et al., 2000). Kolp Learning Styles Model; concrete experiences (SY), abstract conceptualization (SK), active experience (AY), reflective observation (YG) there are four key learning format and which of these students classified collection of minds (Felder, 1996). In determining the learning style; in two dimensions, this composition of four learning style. According to this; concrete experience with reflective observation "diverger", abstract conceptualization with reflective observation "assimilator", concrete experience with active experience "accomodator" abstract conceptualization with active experience "converger" creates the style of learning. People who learn the style of learning have, has been said to occur more easily and more quickly (Kaf-Hasırçı, 2006).

People, as long as they communicate with surrounding the new behaviors. Social behavior in the assertive is considered to be a skill, it is known that an important factor for interpersonal communication (Egan, 1976). Assertiveness and locus of control of relationship, such as the locus, there are important roles in the selection of an individual's personality and career. The person, assertive behavior and is the ideal control-oriented, successful and augments the constructive relations (Phares, 1976; Beck et al., 1985; Bulechek et al., 1995).

Assertiveness, the right to property of others without food and little to maintain their own rights of the individual, some kind of interpersonal relationships is developed for the format (Alberti et al., 1998; Phelps et al., 1997). A behavior; an aggressive may be in the form of the assertive or shy. Individuals, in their relations with people who exhibit the expected behavior of the assertive, as it lacks the equality in relations and concerns of their own interests, learning to act in accordance with, you can easily savunabilmeyi yourself, wish and express their feelings honestly and the rights of others without violating our rights has been described as a form of a behavior that allows you to use (Alberti et al., 1998). Students adopt the behavior of the assertive, by affecting friendship relations in a positive, happy, comfortable and capable than themselves will feel.

The locus to the control, individual impacting positive or negative events itself, as a result of their behavior or this event as the effect of the external forces of chance and so detection is the trend (Rotter et al., 1972). As a result of their behavior depending on the individual, is acting "internal audit oriented", is acting for foreign powers or persons "external audit oriented" (Zimbardo, 1985).

The internal audit focused persons, more intimate and sincere relations, aimed at teaching themselves more involved in activities, effective, safe and as independent persons and persons with healthy emotional life. The external audit focused persons, the society's rules, can easily believe everything in the community is to live according to the demands of the majority, except in the case of a failure are individuals who accused their mostly. Research, assertive

and internal audit oriented can be learned and improved behavior of hearty has shown that controlled (Phares, 1976).

Does anyone know of their learning style, being controlled from inside the assertive and internal audit oriented in behavior, the harmony and the profession chosen will contribute to them succeed. But for this purpose, physical education and sports school student has quite a few and for nature study (Guild et al., 1998; Caballero et al., 2008; Weng, 2001; Nilo et al., 2009). Therefore, the theoretical and practical education learning styles of students in schools that have been made, the point of teaching-learning processes of configuration will provide significant contributions.

The aim of this study is, physical education and sports schools-teaching students learning styles, assertiveness and determination of levels the locus of the control, also students learning styles, format of assertiveness and locus of control for gender, schedule, section and class is to determine whether they show the changes according to the level.

## **Materials and Method**

The nature of this research, the seeker cross-sectional relationship 2015-2016 in the academic year of Erciyes University School of Physical Education and Sport was made between three hundred sixty six students studying in. Students will be monitored according to the groups in the study, teaching, coaching, management and recreation. The data, information sheet, “Kolb Learning Style Inventory”, “Rathus Assertiveness Scale” and “Rotter’s Locus of Control Scale”.

### **Kolb’s Learning Style Inventory**

Kolb by (1985) to the Turkish adaptation developed and reliability study (Askar et al., 1993) trying to understand their learning inventory participant made variants of twelve is a test consisting of questions. Participants, ending with the four learning style, four-sentence 4,3,2,1 with rankings in the form of. The ratings action, each line of the parallel process of learning is that participants termed the opposite possibility to choose one of the. Four-stage learning model polar opposites (CE/AC and RO/AE) determines the capabilities that reflect; students must choose from among these learning skills on an ongoing basis. CE/AC and RO/AE scores calculated, which in the quarter circle is determined to be the participant’s learning (learning represents the style of each quarter).

### **Rathus Assertiveness Scale**

Rathus by (1977) to the Turkish adaptation developed and reliability study (Voltan, 1993), six likert type on the thirty item. Inventory items; it doesn’t fit me at all (-3), doesn’t fit me much (-2), not me (-1), fits me a little bit (+1), fits me (+2), fits me very well (+3) is scored. 1,2,4,5,9,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,19,23,24,26,30. if the items in the opposite direction points. Inventory total -90 to +90 and average score in the range +10 and they score above the assertive, +9 and it is considered as the shy down points level.

### **Rotter’s Locus of Control Scale**

Rotter by (1966) developed and to Turkish adaptation and reliability study (Dağ, 1991) dual branch servicing every item on the scale done (a and b) for a total of twenty nine item. These options are more suitable to itself of sentences of persons included in the option you will be prompted to mark. On the scale 1,8,14,19,24,27. substances are not considered in the

calculation. 2,6,7,9,16,17,18,20,21,23,25,29. items (a) options; 3,4,5,10,11,12,13,15,22,26,28. items (b) options (1) points. Scale in the range of 0-23 points in total, 0-11 points internal audit oriented, 12-23 points external audit oriented showed are accepted.

### Analysis of the Data

Demographic characteristics of students in the analysis of the data number (n) and percentage (%) was given in the distribution. According to various characteristics of the students learning style that they show for determining the numeric comparisons to Kay-square test ( $X^2$ ). Learning styles with assertiveness and locus of control to examine the relationship between Spearman Correlation test, Learning styles with assertiveness and locus of control was used Multiple Regression Analysis for the property procedure. For statistical analysis SPSS 22.0 computer package program is used and the level of meaningful  $p < 0.05$  were considered.

### Findings

**Table 1.** Demographic Characteristics of The Students Participating in The Survey

Variables	Students (n = 366)		
	n	%	
<b>Gender</b>	Male	203	55.5
	Famale	163	44.5
<b>Schedule</b>	Day	229	62.6
	Night	137	37.4
<b>Section</b>	Teaching	128	35
	Coaching	104	28.4
	Management	78	21.3
	Recreation	56	15.3
<b>Class</b>	1.	56	15.3
	2.	100	27.3
	3.	157	42.9
	4.	53	14.5
<b>Assertiveness</b>	Shy	278	76.0
	Assertive	88	24.0
<b>Locus of control</b>	Internal Audit Oriented	217	59.3
	External Audit Oriented	149	40.7
<b>Learning Style</b>	Accomodator	73	19.9
	Diverger	118	37.7
	Converger	94	25.4
	Assimilator	81	16.9

Students participating in the study 163 female, 203 of which are male, 15.3% in the first class, 27.3% in the second class, 42.9% in the third class, 14.5% in the fourth class. 35% teaching, 28.4% coaching, 21.3% management and 15.3% recreation department of students. 76% shy behavior and internal audit oriented students rate 59.3%. 37.7% diverger, 25.4% converger, 19.9% accomodator and 16.9% assimilator of students has a learning style (Table1).

**Table 2.** Comparison of Learning with Students' Demographic Characteristics

Variables		Learning style					Total
		Accomodator	Diverger	Converger	Assimilator		
Gender	Male	N	43	75	48	37	203
		%	11.7	20.5	13.1	10.1	55.5
	Famale	N	30	63	45	25	163
		%	8.2	17.2	12.3	6.8	44.5
			X <sup>2</sup> =1.423	P=0.700			
Class level	1.class	N	11	19	16	10	56
		%	3.0	5.2	4.4	2.7	15.3
	2.class	N	17	43	27	13	100
		%	4.6	11.7	7.4	3.6	27.3
	3.class	N	41	44	42	30	157
		%	11.2	12.0	11.5	8.2	42.9
	4.class	N	4	32	8	9	53
		%	1.1	8.7	2.2	2.5	14.5
			X <sup>2</sup> =23.631	P=0.005*			
Section	Teaching	N	33	41	39	15	128
		%	9.0	11.2	10.7	4.1	35.0
	Coaching	N	18	50	25	11	104
		%	4.9	13.7	6.8	3.0	28.4
	Management	N	16	21	18	23	78
		%	4.4	5.7	4.9	6.3	21.3
	Recreation	N	6	26	11	13	56
		%	1.6	7.1	3.0	3.6	15.3
			X <sup>2</sup> =27.911	P=0.001**			
Schedule	Day	N	50	82	60	37	229
		%	13.7	22.4	16.4	10.1	62.6
	Night	N	23	56	33	25	137
		%	6.3	15.3	9.0	6.8	37.4
			X <sup>2</sup> =2.050	P=0.562			

Table 2 demographic characteristics of students learning style with a comparison of findings. Accordingly, a maximum of male students diverger by (20.5%), at least assimilator (10.1%) has a learning style; women students maximum diverger by (17.2%), at least if assimilator (12.3%) is seen with learning style. According to students' learning styles they have observed gender this difference is not significant ( $X^2=1.423$ ,  $p>0.05$ ).

Maximum daytime education schedule students study diverger by (22.4%), at least assimilator (10.1%) has a learning style; night education students maximum diverger by (15.3%), at least accomodator (6.3%) is seen with learning style (Table 2). According to the students' education schedule, learning styles have observed this difference is not significant ( $X^2=2.050$ ,  $p>0.05$ ).

According to Table 2, most of the students in all class level diverger (37.6%) learning style. According to the students' class level learning styles have observed this difference has been found to be significant ( $X^2=23.631$ ,  $p<0.05$ ).

According to Table 2, teaching, coaching and recreation section for students in the has a maximum diverger learning style; management department is up to the students of the who assimilator (6.3%) is seen with learning style. According to students' learning styles section has observed this difference has been found to be significant ( $X^2=27.911, p<0.05$ ).

**Table 3.** Learning Style with Assertiveness and Locus of Control on The Correlation Between

		Assertiveness	Locus of Control
Learning Style	r	-,144 <sup>**</sup>	-,023
	p	,006	,658

$p < 0,01^{**}$

Table 3 students have learning style with assertiveness and the locus of control between correlation findings relating. An examination table, students learning style with the locus of control because it doesn't have a significant relationship between ( $r=-0.023; p>0.05$ ), between assertiveness with the learning style at a low level, it is negative and significant relationship ( $r=-0.144; p<0.05$ ).

**Table 4.** Results of Multiple Regression Analysis for Discussion and Results Learning Style

Variable	B	Standart error	$\beta$	t	p	binary r	partial r
Fixed	2,816	,207	-	13,634	,000	-	-
Assertiveness	-,338	,121	-,146	-2,805	,005	-,146	-,146
Locus of Control	-,002	,105	-,001	-,021	,983	-,015	-,001

$R=0.146, R^2=0.021, F_{(2, 363)}=3.974 p= .020$

According to Table 4; to predict variables dependent variable examined bilateral and partial correlations, calculated between negative learning style with assertiveness and low level correlation ( $r=-0.146$ ), when negative control and low levels of other variables ( $r=-0.146$ ). Assertiveness with students' learning styles variable low level offers negative and significant relationship ( $R=0.146, R^2=0.021; p<.05$ ). Assertiveness and the locus of control variables together, about 2% of the total variance of the learning-style describes how ( $F_{(2, 363)}=3.974; p<.05$ ). Regression analysis results for the prediction of assertiveness and locus of control according to their learning style variant are given in Table 4.

## Discussion and Results

The student's personality and learning style affects the success of school (Monet et al., 2006). Therefore, it is important to realize the students dominant learning style (Hotaman, 2009). Most of those involved in our research and has a learning style that changed, school of physical education and sport students learning format concrete life and reflective observation, feel and much more we can say they prefer to learn by watching. This result is similar to the style of the dominant discourse students learning is often modified and shows parallels with the findings indicating that parses (Yalız et al., 2009; Çelik et al., 2011; Salehi, 2007; Kılıç et al., 2004).

In this study, according to students' learning styles in which they have a gender difference is not meaningful. Supports build upon these discoveries in learning styles according to some studies gender differentiation (Janes et al., 2003; Kayes, 2005; Can, 2010; Cavaş, 2010; Kazu, 2010; Truluck et al., 1999), some studies varied learning styles according to the gender (Çaycı et al., 2007; Çubukçu, 2005). The results, gender may affect students' learning styles have a definite is not decisive.

In a study of learning style is varied according to the class level (Durdukoca et al., 2010), some studies, according to the level of the class differentiation of the learning style (Kaf-Hasırcı, 2006; Tuna, 2008; Arsal et al., 2007). The results, the innate and lifelong learning style easily is thought to be due to a property that does not change. In this study, the students learning style according to the level of the class have varied according to the level of students' learning styles in the class to which they have no significant difference has been found. The mainly theoretical courses in first class, the class level, with the rise with the addition of practical courses, the students learning style preferences of more change, so listening and note-taking, we believe that this constitutes the result of being tended to.

In this study, the students according to parts of a learning style have varied according to students' learning styles in the section to which they have no significant difference has been found. This result has shown consistency with similar study findings (Mutlu, 2008; Clump et al., 2003; Coker, 1996). As the cause of this situation, students teacher, trainer or sport administrator be different expectations be with partitions in prefer and thought about the future of the profession, we believe that the work might be to develop themselves.

In this study, according to students' learning styles in the schedule to which they have no significant difference has been found it is not. Similar and different results in the corresponding field. This is because the quality of the student group as can be caused by mistaken identity.

In this study, the learning style is between assertiveness with low level, the relationship is negative and significant, and founded the General regression model was significant. As a result, the analysis of the learning style of assertiveness feature has been found to be a meaningful predict. According to this conclusion, the students dominant learning forms of Avoidant behavior can be said to be more appropriate to the shape. This is because, to a large extent the students learning style that diverger (37.7%) and people with this learning style, prefer to learn through watching and feeling, and also convert into action the judiciary put forward showing that behavior, the more (76%) believe that they are in Avoidant Personality feature.

Our study results, showed that students have different learning styles. This tutorial is questioning, critical thinking and learning lives application areas, which may reflect the teachers, mostly to the fact that the use of different methods in the process of teaching. Therefore, students with different learning styles, changing environments, decision-making and participating in activities that provide this decision, develop themselves drawn attention to the (Kolb et al., 1985).

As a result, students can build healthy relationships educational environment, will feel more happy and successful. Therefore, students should show the behaviour of the assertive and taking into account the learning styles used by teaching approaches, strategies, methods and techniques to use in a conscious way.

## REFERENCES

- Alberti R, Emmons M (1998). *Atılganlık Hakkınızı Kullanın*. Çeviren: Serap Katlan, 1.Basım, HYB Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Alemdağ C, Öncü E (2015). Kolb Öğrenme Stili Modeline Göre Beden Eğitimi Öğretmeni Adayları, Alan Eğitimi Araştırmaları Dergisi (ALEG), 1(1): 1-12.
- Andresen L, Boud D, Cohen R (2000). Experience-Based Learning. In G. Foley (Ed.) *Understanding Adult Education and Training Second Edition*. (4th Ed.), Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 225-239.
- Arsal Z, Özen R (2007). Sınıf Öğretmeni Adaylarının Öğrenme Stratejileri ve Öğrenme Biçimi Tercihlerinin İncelenmesi. *AİBÜ, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(2): 151-164.
- Askar P, Akkoyunlu B (1993). Kolb Öğrenme Stili Envanteri. *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 17(87): 37-47.
- Beck S, Collins L, Overholser J, Terry K (1985). A Cross-Sectional Assessment of The Relationship of Social Competence Measures to Peer Friendship and Likeability in Elementary-age Children. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs*, 1(111): 43-63.
- Bulechek GM, McCloskey JC (1995). *Nursing Interventions: Treatments for Nursing Diagnosis*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 328-337.
- Can Ş (2010). Determination of The Learning Styles of The Pre-school Teacher Candidates (The case of Muğla University, Turkey). *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2: 4137-4141.
- Cavaş BA (2010). Study on Pre-Service, Class and Mathematics Teachers' Learning Styles in Turkey. *Science Education International*, 21(1): 47-61.
- Clump MA, Skogsbergboise K (2003). Differences in Learning Styles of College Students Attending Similar Universities in Different Geographic Location. *College Student Journal*, 37(4): 501-508.
- Coker CA (1996). Accommodating Students' Learning Styles in Physical Education. *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 67(9): 66-68.

- Çağlayan HS, Taşğın Ö (2008). Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu Sınavına Başvuran Aday Öğrencilerin Öğrenme Biçemlerinin İncelenmesi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 20: 119-212.
- Çaycı B, Ünal E (2007). Sınıf Öğretmeni Adaylarının Sahip Oldukları Öğrenme Stillерinin Çeşitli Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi. Bilim, Eğitim ve Düşünce Dergisi, 7(3): 1-16.
- Çelik F, Şahin H (2011). Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Öğretmen Adaylarının Cinsiyet ve Öğrenim Gördükleri Sınıf Düzeyleri Bakımından Öğrenme Stillерinin İncelenmesi (MAKÜ Örneği). Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 31: 23-38.
- Çubukçu Z (2005). Öğretmen Adaylarının Düşünme Stillерinin Öğrenme Biçimlerini Tercih Etmelerindeki Etkisi, Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi, 30(234): 22-32.
- Dağ İ (1991). Rotter'ın İç-Dış Kontrol Odağı Ölçeğinin Üniversite Öğrencileri İçin Güvenirliği ve Geçerliliği. Psikoloji Dergisi, 7(26): 10-16.
- Durdukoca ŞF, Arıbaş S (2010). İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Sınıf Öğretmenliği Öğretmen Adaylarının Sahip Oldukları Öğrenme Stillерinin Farklı Değişkenlere Göre Değerlendirilmesi. 9.Ulusal Sınıf Öğretmenliği Eğitimi Sempozyumu Bildiriler Kitabı, Elazığ, 517-523.
- Egan G (1976). Interpersonal Living: A Skills/Contract Approach to Human Relations Training in Groups. Brooks/Cole Publishing, Monterey, CA.
- Felder RM (1996). Matters of style. ASEE Prism, 6(4): 18-23.
- Guild PB, Garger S (1998). What Is Differentiated Instruction? Marching to Different Drummers, (2nd Ed.) ASCD, Alexandria, USA, 2
- Hotaman D (2009). Bazı Kişisel Değişkenlerin Öğrencilerin Bağımsız, Bir Partnerle ve Bir Grupla Çalışma Alışkanlıkları Üzerindeki Etkisinin Araştırılması. Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, 6(1): 528-546.
- Janes C, Reichard C (2003). Are Students Learning Styles Discipline Specific. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 27: 363-375.
- Kaf-Hasırcı Ö (2006). Sınıf Öğretmenliği Öğrencilerinin Öğrenme Stilleri: Çukurova Üniversitesi Örneği. Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama, 2(1): 15-25.
- Kayes DC (2005). Internal Validity and Reliability of Kolb's Learning Style Inventory Version 3 (1999). Journal of Business and Psychology, 20(2): 249-257.
- Kazu İY (2010). Learning styles of teacher candidates: A sample of Fırat University. African Journal of Business Management, 4(15): 3265-3276.
- Kolb DA (1984). Experiential Learning: Experience as The Source of Learning and Development. Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 22
- Kolb D, Baker R, Dixon N (1985). Personal Learning Guide. Self-Study Booklet. McBer and Company, Boston.
- Kılıç E, Karadeniz Ş (2004). Cinsiyet ve Öğrenme Stiline Gezinme Stratejisi ve Başarıya Etkisi, Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 24(3): 129-146.

- Moneta GB, Marcantonio MP, Felicitaş MR (2006). Approaches to Studying When Preparing for Final Exams as a Function of Coping Strategies. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(1): 191-202.
- Mutlu M (2008). Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Öğrenme Stilleri. *Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17: 1-21.
- Phares EJ (1976). *Locus of Control in Personality*. General Learning Press, USA: Kansas State University, 23.
- Phelps S, Austin N (1997). *Atılgan Kadın*. Çeviren: Serap Katlan. HYB Yayıncılık, Ankara, 19.
- Rotter JB, Change JE, Phares EJ (1972). *Applications of Social Learning Theory of Personalit*. Rinehard and Winston, New York: Holt, 1-43.
- Salehi S (2007). Nursing Students' Preferred Learning Styles. *Journal of Medical Education Summer and Fall*, 11(3-4): 85-89.
- Truluck JE, Courtenay BC (1999). Learning Style Preferences Among Older Adults. *Educational Gerontology*, 25: 221-236.
- Tuna S (2008). Resim-İş Öğretmenliği Öğrencilerinin Öğrenme Stilleri. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(25): 252-261.
- Voltan N (1980). Rathus Atılganlık Envanterinin Geçerlik-Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Psikoloji Dergisi*, 10: 23-25.
- Yalız D, Erişti B (2009). Anadolu Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Bölümü Öğrencilerinin Öğrenme Stilleri. *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi BESBD*, 4(4):156-163.
- Weng CY (2001). *The Relationship Between Learning Style Preferences and Teaching Style Preferences in College Students*. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi. University of Northern Colorado.
- Zimbardo PG (1985). *Psychology and Life*. Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 275.