

An Analysis of Elementary School Teachers' Causal Attributions
Related to Self-Identified Success and Failure

Thesis submitted to the
Institute of Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Educational Sciences

by
Banu Can

Boğaziçi University
2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Professor Fatma Gök, for her thoughtful guidance and unwavering support during my studies at the department. Her belief in the worth of this study has helped me overcome many moments of indecisiveness, and her positive attitude has eased my anxiety. She even offered to say a Bektaşî prayer when I was anxiously awaiting the results of the retest. We may never know if they were confounded by divine intervention.

I am indebted to Professor Rıfat Okçabol for his helpful comments. Without a word of complaint, he has spent several hot summer afternoons reading and making suggestions on the last few drafts.

I would like to thank Dr. Zeynep Hande Sart for agreeing to be on my committee at a rather advanced stage of the research. She was kind enough to work overtime to be able to make comments on the last drafts.

I am grateful to Dr. Ayşe Caner for her help with the content analysis. She has given generously of her time and effort whenever I consulted her.

Very special thanks are due to Professor Güzver Yıldırım de Weerd for her invaluable support during my graduate studies. She believed in me and my abilities more than I did myself. I wish to gratefully acknowledge her contributions to this thesis and beyond.

I wish to thank Dr. Zeynep Kızıltepe, Dr. Özlem Ünlühisarcıklı, Dr. Ayşe Caner, Filiz Keser, Selin Şen and Salih Cıngıllıoğlu for the translations and the back-translations of the Causal Dimension Scale.

My thanks to Ayşesim Diri for her help with the statistical analyses.

Several people have helped in the collection of data. I wish to thank Güneş Ayyıldız, Şadan Beyen, Neşe Ersöz Taygun, Alev Talebzadeh, Yonca, Selçuk Bay,

Nuray Yel, and all the elementary school teachers who participated in the study, without whose efforts and cooperation it would have been much more difficult to complete this research.

I consider myself fortunate to have had the opportunity to study with many fine individuals. I would like to thank Dilek ankaya, Salih ıngıllıođlu, Filiz Keser, Sevil Taner and Aya Turgut for their enthusiasm to discuss issues related to my thesis and for sharing my concerns.

My friends Meral Eli, Zuhall Yalınay, Georgi Stojanov, NeŖe Ersöz Taygun, Peggy Elliott and Nermin Saatiođlu have provided much appreciated emotional support and some of the most enjoyable digressions during the process of writing my thesis.

Finally, I am grateful to my family for their unconditional support and patience.

ABSTRACT

An Analysis of Elementary School Teachers' Causal Attributions Related to Self-Identified Success and Failure

by

Banu Can

The main purpose of this study was to analyze elementary school teachers' (grades 1-5) causal attributions about their self-identified areas of success and failure in terms of locus of causality, stability, and controllability. The sample consisted of 231 teachers from 21 elementary schools located in 12 sub-provinces of Istanbul. The participants responded to a self-administered questionnaire composed of open-ended questions concerning areas they considered themselves 'most successful' and 'least successful' in their profession, and the perceived primary causes of these outcomes, followed by Russell's Causal Dimension Scale. Content analysis was carried out for the open-ended questions. T-tests and one-way analysis of variance were performed to investigate the effects of teachers' gender, educational background, amount of teaching experience, and perceived outcome (success vs. failure) on the causal attributions made to explain these outcomes. Broad categories of perceived causes of success and failure were compared in terms of locus of causality, stability, and controllability. The results indicated that causal attributions for success were more internal, stable, and controllable than those for failure, a finding supported by literature on attribution theory. Female teachers made more internal attributions for success than male teachers. And, male teachers attributed their failures to causes they perceived as being more controllable, compared to female teachers. Amount of teaching experience and educational

background had no significant effect on the causal attributions made for success and failure. The most frequently reported areas of success and failure were discussed in relation to policy issues and implications, and their perceived causes were discussed in the context of Weiner's attributional model of achievement motivation.

ÖZET

İLKOKUL ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN KENDİ BELİRTTİKLERİ BAŞARI VE BAŞARISIZLIKLARINA İLİŞKİN NEDENSEL YÜKLEMELERİNİN ÇÖZÜMLENMESİ

Banu Can

Bu çalışmada, ilköğretim birinci kademe öğretmenlerinin kendi belirttikleri başarı ve başarısızlıklarıyla ilgili nedensel yüklemelerinin, nedensellik odağı, değişmezlik ve kontrol edilebilirlik bakımından çözümlenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Araştırmanın örneklemini, İstanbul'un 12 ayrı bölgesinde bulunan 21 ilköğretim okulunda çalışmakta olan 231 öğretmen oluşturmuştur. Araştırmaya katılan öğretmenlere, kendilerini mesleklerinde 'en başarılı' ve 'en az başarılı' buldukları alanlar ve bu sonuçların algılanan en önemli nedenleri ile ilgili açık uçlu soruları takiben Russell'ın Nedensel Boyut Ölçeği'ni içeren bir anket uygulanmıştır. Açık uçlu sorular için içerik analizi yapılmıştır. Cinsiyet, mezun olunan yüksek okul türü, kıdem ve algılanan sonucun (başarı veya başarısızlık), öğretmenlerin sonuçla ilgili nedensel yüklemelerine olan etkilerini saptamak için t-testleri ve tek yönlü varyans analizleri yapılmıştır. Genişletilmiş, algılanan başarı ve başarısızlık nedeni kategorileri, nedensellik odağı, değişmezlik ve kontrol edilebilirlik açısından karşılaştırılmıştır. Analizler, başarıyla ilgili nedensel yüklemelerin, başarısızlıkla ilgili nedensel yüklemelere göre daha içsel, değişmez ve kontrol edilebilir olduğunu göstermiştir ki bu bulgular nedensel yükleme kuramı literatüründe de destek bulmaktadır. Ayrıca, kadın öğretmenlerin başarılarını erkek

öğretmenlere göre daha içsel nedenlere bağladıkları; bunun yanında, erkek öğretmenlerin ise başarısızlıklarını kadın öğretmenlere göre daha kontrol edilebilir buldukları nedenlere yükledikleri görülmüştür. Kıdem ve mezun olunan yüksek okul türünün başarı ve başarısızlıkla ilgili nedensel yüklemelere etkisi bulunmamıştır. En fazla sıklıkla belirtilmiş olan mesleki başarı ve başarısızlık alanları, eğitimle ilgili politikalar bağlamında ve bu sonuçların algılanan nedenleri Weiner'in nedensel yüklemeye dayalı başarı güdüsü kuramı bağlamında tartışılmıştır.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	v
ÖZET	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Research Questions	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
A. Attribution Theory	5
B. Hedonic Bias	11
C. Consequences of Attributions and Attributional Change	12
D. Related Literature From Turkey	14
III. METHODOLOGY	17
A. Population and Sample	17
B. Instrument	17
Causal Dimension Scale (CDS)	18
Reliability of the Turkish form of CDS	19
C. Procedure	21
D. Data Analysis	21
IV. RESULTS	23
A. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample	23
B. Findings Related to the Research Questions	24

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	
A. Summary and Discussion	41
B. Limitations of the Study	46
C. Suggestions for Further Research	47
VI. REFERENCES	49
VII. APPENDICES	54
A. Questionnaire Form	55
B. List of Uncategorized Responses – Area of Self-Identified Success	58
C. List of Uncategorized Responses – Perceived Cause of Success	60
D. List of Uncategorized Responses – Area of Self-Identified Failure	62
E. List of Uncategorized Responses – Perceived Cause of Failure	64
F. Scheffé Test- Broad Categories of Perceived Causes of Failure	
Causal Dimension Subscale Mean Differences	66

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>page</u>
Table 3.1 Test- retest correlations for each of the subscales; locus of causality, controllability, and stability, calculated both for perceived causes of success and of failure.	20
Table 4.1 Gender distribution of the sample	23
Table 4.2 Distribution of the sample in terms of educational background	24
Table 4.3 Distribution of the sample in terms of amount of teaching experience	25
Table 4.4 Teachers' self-identified areas of success	26
Table 4.5 Perceived causes of self-identified success	27
Table 4.6 Broad categories of perceived causes of success	28
Table 4.7 Descriptive statistics for broad categories of perceived causes of success	29
Table 4.8 ANOVA for the effect of 'perceived cause of success' category type on causal attribution type	30
Table 4.9 Teachers' self-identified areas of failure	31
Table 4.10 Perceived causes of self-identified failure	33
Table 4.11 Broad Categories of Perceived Causes of Failure	34
Table 4.12 Descriptive statistics for broad categories of perceived causes of failure	35
Table 4.13 ANOVA for the effect of 'perceived cause of failure' category type on causal attribution type	36
Table 4.14 Paired Samples Statistics on Dimensions of Causality	38
Table 4.15 T- test for gender effects on causal attributions	39

	<u>page</u>
Table 4.16 ANOVA for the effect of amount of teaching experience on teachers' causal attributions	40
Table 4.17 ANOVA for the effect of educational background on causal attribution type	40

I. INTRODUCTION

In most of the public schools in Turkey, the majority of the subjects are taught by a single classroom teacher during the first five years of elementary education. Hence, the importance of the role of elementary school teachers in setting a firm educational foundation the students can later build on, cannot be overemphasized. Despite their major consequences, issues related to teachers' perceptions and attributions about their successes and failures have been addressed to a limited degree in Turkish education literature.

The main purpose of this study is to provide an analysis of causal attributions made by Turkish elementary school (grades 1-5) teachers about their self-identified areas of success and failure in their profession, within the framework of attribution theory developed by B. Weiner (1974&1985), H. H. Kelley (1967&1980), E. E. Jones and K. E. Davis (1965), and F. Heider (1958).

Attribution theories and attributional models are cognitive approaches to behavior; they assume that people's responses to stimuli are mediated by their interpretations of the stimuli. One of the basic philosophical assumptions behind the version of attribution theory that constitutes the background for this research can be found in G. Kelly's "constructive alternativism", or "epistemological responsibility" (1966/1970, p.31). According to this view, meaning is not inherent in an event, but depends on the way the event is construed by the person. "All our present perceptions are open to question and reconsideration.... The most obvious occurrences of everyday life might appear utterly transformed if we were inventive enough to construe them differently" (p.28). Therefore, Kelly argues that individuals are able to produce alternate constructs, and they are responsible for their own well-being.

It is another basic contention of most attribution theorists that the process of attribution serves a function. Causal explanations of outcomes help people to survive and to attain personal goals (Weiner, 1985, 1992). Attributions help the individual to attain a cognitive mastery of the world and to control events (Forsyth, 1980).

A number of studies have linked types of causal attributions regarding previous performances to future motivation and action in that domain (Weiner & Kukla, 1970; Weiner, 1972, 1985; Kukla, 1972; Abramson, Seligman and Teasdale, 1978). There is further evidence from clinical psychology suggesting that through awareness and training, the types of attributions made can be altered, leading people to take positive action to improve their performances and feel more confident and self-efficacious (Försterling, 1985, 1988; Seligman, 1992). Therefore, it is important to seek not just the naming of the perceived causes/reasons for teachers' successes and failures, but to have a detailed analysis of the causal structure of their attributions.

The first systematic analysis of the causal structure of attributions was proposed by Heider (1958) who distinguished between internal (dispositional) and external (situational) attributions (p.82). An internal attribution means that a person is thought to behave in a certain way because of something about him or her, such as the person's attitudes, character or personality. An external attribution explains a behavior through reference to the situation the person is in.

In 1971, Weiner et al. argued that a second dimension of causality was required (Weiner, 1985), the reason being that, among the internal causes, some fluctuate, whereas others remain constant. For example, ability or aptitude is perceived as a constant capacity. Mood, on the other hand, is internal like ability,

but not constant. The same distinction applies also to external causes; task difficulty is external and constant while effort is external and variable. This led Weiner (1985) to a 2*2 categorization scheme with locus (external vs. internal) and stability (stable vs. unstable) as the two dimensions. A third dimension of causality was introduced by Rosenbaum in 1972, who noticed that a distinction could be made between attributed causes depending on the volitional control that can be exerted over them. Weiner (1979) later termed this property 'controllability' which led to a the final 2*2*2 categorization scheme.

The logical -deductive- analysis of causal structure was checked against the conceptions of laypeople through various empirical studies (Stern, 1983; Meyer, 1980; Passer,1977- cited in Weiner 1985) which arrived at the same three dimensions; locus, stability and controllability.

The present study differs from previous studies carried out in Turkey concerning teachers' causal attributions in three respects: (1) It focuses on elementary school teachers. (2) It does not rest on the premise of an 'attributional style' that is generalizable across contexts. (3) Instead of hypothetical cases, it requires the teachers to reason about their own experiences.

An in depth understanding of teachers' attributions about their success and failures can aid decisions concerning necessary provisions or interventions.

A. Research Questions

In this research, the answers to the following questions have been sought:

- 1) What are the most frequently reported areas of professional success according to self-reports by elementary school teachers (grades 1-5)?
- 2) What are the perceived causes of self-identified professional success according to elementary school teachers?

- 3) Are there significant differences between (broad) categories of perceived causes of success in terms of locus of causality, stability and controllability?
- 4) What are the most frequently reported areas of professional failure according to self-reports by elementary school teachers (grades 1-5)?
- 5) What are the perceived causes of self-identified professional failure according to elementary school teachers?
- 6) Are there significant differences between (broad) categories of perceived causes of failure in terms of locus of causality, stability and controllability?
- 7) Do the types of causal attributions change in terms of locus of causality, stability and controllability in case of success and failure?
- 8) Do the types of attributions, in terms of locus of causality, stability and controllability, change according to teachers' gender, educational background and amount of teaching experience?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter contains information about the development of attribution theories, the hedonic bias, consequences of attributions and attributional change, concluding with related literature from Turkey.

A. Attribution Theory

Attribution theory is concerned with the causal explanations given for events by ordinary people. It is a shared conviction of attribution theorists that causal attributions play a central role in human behavior. People's causal attributions reveal their understanding of the causal structure of the world, and therefore, it is suggested that they should be important determinants of people's interaction with that world (Kelly & Michela, 1980)

In *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*, Heider (1958) observes that people have the desire to predict and control what goes on around them. He argues that in order to do so, they impose structure to social stimuli and to the environment, make inferences from those structures and behave in accordance with them. He concludes that an awareness of the causal structure of human behavior is necessary for prediction and control of outcomes. Heider's core ideas in his 1958 book will be given some further attention here as they lay the groundwork for all theories of attribution in psychology. In his book, Heider makes an analogy between person perception and object perception to illustrate his point that behavior is a "medium for the transmission of psychological characteristics" (p.35). He calls those characteristics "dispositions". To briefly summarize the analogy: although an egg has one shape and one color, it appears to us in different shapes and colors depending on our perspective and the conditions of light. Nevertheless, we are able

to extract certain invariances from these appearances and say that the egg looks round. Similarly, we observe many behaviors of a person and extract certain invariances to conclude that the person has a certain disposition. Heider writes, “dispositional properties are the invariances that make possible a more or less stable, predictable, controllable world. They refer to the relatively unchanging structures and processes that characterize or underlie phenomena.” (p. 80). It is the attributional system that enables people to arrive at these ‘dispositions’, and as such it is vital. If we didn’t perceive things and people with their invariant properties, Heider writes the world would be a very disturbing place (p.53). At a later point, he states that whatever rules the attributional and perceptual systems use, they tend to use unconsciously (p.82). If observers of variable behaviors perform an unconscious attributional analysis that reaches conclusions about actors’ invariant dispositions, the question arises as to what kinds of principles are used in this analysis. Heider suggests that behaviors are the products of two general classes of variables; the dispositions of persons and the dispositions of environments. Just as the visual system factors out environmental contributions to the appearance of an object, the attributional system can factor out situational causes of behavior. Gilbert et al. (1998, p.96) write that, “ Heider’s most enduring theoretical contribution lies in his description of the causal model that the attributional system uses to extract dispositional invariances”. Heider reasons that behavior requires that an actor both *can* and *try* to do it. So, a performance would imply that the actor has both the *capacity* and the *motivation* to perform. The actor’s capacity is a function of both the actor’s abilities and the environment’s facilitating or inhibiting influences. And, the actor’s motivation is a function of the actor’s *intentions* and *exertion*. The attributional system is supposed to know the equation

that describes how these factors combine to create behavior, so that it can use the equation to solve for unknowns. Heider (1958, p.123) writes that this general scheme makes it possible for the person to do a “naïve factor analysis of action”. Even if Heider’s theory has not contributed anything specific enough to test the workings of this attributional mechanism, it has inspired views about the structure of people’s causal attributions by stating, “ In common-sense psychology (as in scientific psychology) the result of an action is felt to depend on two sets of conditions, namely, factors within the person and factors within the environment” (p. 82). Although this distinction has formed the basis for the locus dimension of causal attributions, Weiner points out that, Heider “did not propose a dimensional analysis of causes, with polar opposites placed at the ends of a single dimension” (Weiner, 1974, p.5). It was Rotter et al. who proposed, in 1966, a one-dimensional classification scheme of perceptions of control. Rotter called this dimension “locus of control” as he classified controls as within (internal) or outside (external) to the person (Weiner, 1974, pp.4-5).

In 1971, Weiner et al. argued that a second dimension of causality was required (Weiner, 1974, p.5). Their reasoning was based on the observation that some of the internal causes change over time, whereas others remain relatively constant. For example, aptitude is perceived as a constant capacity, unlike mood or effort which are perceived to be changing from period to period. The same reasoning can be applied the external causes. Considering the example of ‘success in rowing across a lake’, it may be perceived as being due to the unchanging narrowness of the lake or to the variable presence of the wind (Weiner, 1985, p.551). Therefore, Weiner et al. proposed a 2 * 2 categorization scheme in 1971, where ‘stability’ became the second dimension. The same year, Weiner et al.

classified the most commonly cited causes in attribution research as ability (internal & stable), effort (internal & unstable), task difficulty (external & stable) and luck (external & unstable)(Weiner, 1985).

It should be noted that the shortcomings of this classification became obvious to Weiner and his colleagues in 1983 who realized that ability may be perceived as unstable if it can be improved by learning; effort was often perceived as a stable trait (i.e. lazy/hardworking/industrious); and luck, too, can be thought of as a property of a person (lucky or unlucky) (Weiner, 1983 & Weiner, 1985). This led them to seek less ambiguous terms such as aptitude, temporary exertion and chance (Weiner, 1985).

The logical analysis of causal structure continued with the identification of a third dimension by Rosenbaum in 1972 who recognized conceptual difficulties such as the following: “mood, fatigue and temporary effort, for example, all are internal and unstable causes. Yet they are distinguishable in that effort is subject to volitional control -an individual can increase or decrease effort expenditure” (Weiner, 1985). Rosenbaum had suggested ‘intentionality’ as a third dimension, to be included with the ‘locus’ and the ‘stability’ of the cause (Weiner, 1974, p.6). Weiner, in 1979, has termed this property ‘controllability’ and also argued that the first identified dimension would be more appropriately labeled ‘locus of causality’ instead of ‘locus of control’ to avoid confusion (Weiner, 1985). This resulted in the final 2*2*2 categorization scheme with *locus of causality* (internal versus external), *stability* (stable versus unstable) and *controllability* (controllable vs. uncontrollable) as the three dimensions.

The logical analysis of causal structure has the limitation that it is only based on attribution theorists’ reasoning. Empirical evidence is needed to demonstrate that the same rational scheme of causal organization is employed by

the layperson. A number of studies have used factor analysis and multidimensional scaling to analyze the responses of research participants for underlying causal structure (Wimer & Kelly, 1982; Meyer, 1980; Kelly & Michela, 1980).

Weiner's 1985 article summarizes these empirical studies most of which found results that conformed with attribution theorists' intuitions and derivations about the perceived structure of causal dimensions. Weiner (1983) carefully notes that the "dimensions are conceived as invariant, whereas the location of any specific cause on a dimension is variable".

While these endeavors to uncover the structure of causal attributions were going on, E. Jones & K. Davis (1965) developed 'correspondence inference theory' which attempts to describe how people arrive at an internal attribution from 'corresponding behavior'. According to this theory, people make internal attributions when there are few noncommon effects of the person's behavior and the behavior is unexpected. Jones & Davis (1965, pp.230-232) reason that only the unique attributes of the chosen and unchosen alternatives can provide an adequate explanation for a person's choice, and to the extent that there are few non-common effects (effects produced by a particular action that cannot be produced by an alternative action), an internal attribution is easier to make. According to Jones, the other type of information that people use when making attributions is information about two different types of expectations. Category-based expectancies refer to expectations about people based on groups to which they belong, and target-based expectancies refer to how one expects a particular person to behave based on their past actions. Unexpected actions are much more diagnostic of what someone is really like (dispositional-internal attribution) than expected actions (Aronson et al. 1997).

Jones & Davies (1965) focused on information people use to make dispositional (internal) attributions, Kelley (1967, 1980) on the other hand, focused on how people decide whether to make an internal or an external attribution. Unlike Jones and Davis' model, Kelley's 'covariation model' applies to multiple instances of behavior, and not only to a single observation of a behavior. According to Kelley, we collect data about how a person's behavior covaries across time, place, different targets of behavior. He talks about three important types of information. Consensus information refers to how different people behave towards the same stimulus. Distinctiveness information refers to how the actor responds to other stimuli. And, consistency information refers to the frequency with which the observed behavior between the same actor and the same stimulus occurs across time and circumstances. According to the theory, when these sources of information combine into one of two distinct patterns, a clear attribution can be made. The theory predicts that people will make internal attributions when the consensus and distinctiveness of the act are low while the consistency is high. On the other hand, people will likely make external attributions if consensus, distinctiveness and consistency are all high (Aronson et al., 1997).

Kelley & Michela (1980, p.468) report in their review that attributions for success are usually relatively internal and attributions for failure are usually relatively external. More information about these findings will be given in the section about the hedonic bias.

Weiner (1974, pp.17-18) reports that "both correlational and experimental studies have firmly established that high and low need for achievement have disparate attribution biases. Individuals high in need for achievement perceive themselves as more able than persons low in this motivational tendency." which

results in persons in the high motive group making more frequent attributions to high ability in case of success, and the persons in the low motive group more frequently attributing failure to low ability. On the other hand, given a failure, individuals high in achievement needs compared to subjects in the low motive group attribute the outcome to a lack of effort, while persons in low achievement needs attribute the outcome to a lack of ability (Weiner, 1974, p.18).

Deaux and Emsweller (1974) and Etaugh and Brown (1975) report that causal attributions for achievement differ according to the gender of the individual (actor). Male success is generally attributed to skill, whereas female success is attributed to luck or effort. Along the same lines, male failure is attributed to bad luck, whereas female behavior is attributed to low ability.

Hedonic Bias

The hedonic bias is also known as the self-serving attribution bias, ego enhancement and ego-defensiveness. It refers to people's tendency to take more credit for success than they are willing to take responsibility for failure. Success is often explained by internal causes (such as ability and effort), whereas failure is related more strongly to external causes (such as luck and task difficulty). It is thought that this pattern of attributions maximizes the pleasure linked with success and minimizes the pain generated by failure. (Weiner, 1992, p. 244).

Several comprehensive reviews have concluded that the self-serving attributional bias is a robust phenomenon in human cognition (Bradley, 1978; Miller & Ross, 1975). It has been associated with greater self-reported trait happiness (Kuiper, 1978), while an attenuated or absent self-serving bias has been associated with depression (Sweeney, Anderson & Bailey, 1986).

Several empirical studies and literature reviews have compared the self-

serving attributional bias in Western cultures with that observed in Eastern cultures (Heine et al. 1999, Mezulis et al., 2004) and concluded that the self-serving bias is a uniquely Western phenomenon that is either absent or is much weaker in non-Western cultures. Fletcher & Ward (1988) note that caution should be exercised before labeling attribution tendencies as self-serving or otherwise, because whether an attributional bias is self-serving or not depends on the structure of the self being served, and given that the concepts of self vary between individualistic and collective cultures, universality cannot be assumed in this context. An important question to investigate is whether the self-serving attributional bias is present and common across populations that differ in age, gender, education, and other factors.

B. Consequences of Attributions and Attributional Change

Försterling (1985) states, “theoretical and empirical advancements in the area of attribution theories have been followed by attempts to use attributional principles to initiate behavioral change”. Behavioral change applications of attributional research can be categorized under two headings: ‘misattribution training’ and ‘retribution programs’. Misattribution studies, Försterling (1985) points out, were stimulated by Schachter and Singer’s two-factor theory of emotion, according to which, affects result from an interaction of physiological arousal and cognitive processes. The arousal is thought to be responsible for the intensity, and the cognition, for the quality of the affect. The same arousal can give rise to feelings of happiness, when the situation is positive, and anger when the situation is negative (Försterling, 1985).

Therefore, negative emotional states are thought to be alterable by giving

people appropriate cognitive explanations for their arousal. Storms & Nisbett (1970) gave insomniacs a placebo while telling them its ingestion produced the arousal they often experienced when they try to go to sleep. This explanation was supposed to change the insomniacs' explanation of their arousal from an emotional internal, stable and uncontrollable one (e.g. I sweat because I am an insomniac) to an unemotional external, unstable and controllable one. Storms and Nisbett(1970) found that people who thought they had taken an arousing pill went to sleep earlier than the control group. Försterling (1985) reports that misattribution studies have addressed a wide variety of issues such as depression, sleeplessness, increasing pain tolerance, speech irregularities, etc.

There is a second set of attribution change programs called attributional retraining. This research was guided by Bandura (1977)'s 'self-efficacy theory, Seligman's (1975) 'learned helplessness', and Weiner's (1979,1985) attributional model of achievement motivation. These models do not make use of the concept of arousal. Their common assumption is that many behaviors are consequences of causal attributions one makes about behavioral outcomes such as successes or failures.

In attributional retraining studies, behaviors /reactions that are considered undesirable and are thought to be caused by specific attributional tendencies are identified (such as giving up trying after a failure as a result of attribution of failure to low ability, and in a training period, subjects are taught to make more 'favorable' causal attributions (i.e. external, controllable ones) (Försterling, 1985).

The crucial question in the area of attributional change is "What are the desirable/ favorable attributions and what are the unfavorable ones?" Försterling (1985) states that "most of the attributional change studies have focused on teaching subjects to attribute outcomes in achievement situations to effort." One of the

theoretical models that have guided these causal reattribution studies is Weiner's (1985) model of achievement motivation and emotion. Weiner's model does not postulate a direct link between causal attributions and behavioral consequences (persistence, performance), but has affects and expectancies as mediating variables. In this case, one may reason that attribution of failure to lack of ability, for example, may decrease expectancy of success while causing low self-esteem. Thus, Weiner's model would predict a second failure; this time perhaps due to lack of effort. Weiner's model guides us to train individuals to make 'lack of effort' or 'bad luck' attributions following the first failure so that high expectancies of achievement for the next trial can be maintained (Försterling, 1985).

Both misattribution training and reattribution programs can help provide guidelines for improving teacher performance based on the information on their present causal attributions.

Related Literature From Turkey

Teachers' causal attributions in achievement contexts have been the subject of at least two studies carried out Turkey. Both of these studies involve an assumption about an attributional style which is thought to generalize across situations, and responses in hypothetical cases are used in its measurement.

Oktan (1999) investigated the relationship between self-actualization, as measured by the adapted Turkish form of E. Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory (1964), and attributional style, as measured by the adapted Turkish form of Peterson et al.'s Attributional Style Questionnaire (1982), in secondary school and high school teachers and teacher candidates. This study found a negative correlation between teacher candidates' self-actualization levels and the stability of their causal attributions, but found no significant relationships between locus of

causality and globality scores, and self-actualization levels, neither in the teachers nor the teacher candidates. The same study revealed that male teachers with six or more years of teaching experience had more external attributional styles compared to male teachers with two to five years of experience.

Dursun (2000) looked at the relationships between teacher burn-out, as measured by the adapted form of Seidman and Zager's Teacher Burn-out Scale (1987), attributional style as measured by Peterson et al.'s Attributional Style Questionnaire (1982), and gender, level of education and years of service in high school teachers. This study found a significant positive correlation between burn-out and years of teaching experience. Also, the generality of causal attributions, across situations, was positively correlated with burn-out.

Cutrona et al. (1985) have questioned cross-situational consistency in causal attributions, and the existence of an 'attributional style'. Also, Gürel (1994) has compared people's causal attributions concerning their real life experiences, as measured by Russell's Causal Dimension Scale (1982), with their attribution styles, as measured by the Attributional Style Questionnaire, and found that on the dimension of stability, people's real life event attributions are not congruent with their attributions concerning hypothetical cases. The study also found significant differences between types of attributions made concerning academic and social situations which raises doubts about the existence of an attributional style for individuals, that is generalizable across different contexts.

The Turkish Ministry of National Education (MONE) (2002) has recently issued a report specifying teacher competencies. The fourteen competencies listed in this report are as follows: getting to know the students, planning of instruction, developing instructional materials, teaching, classroom management, measurement

and evaluation, guidance, helping the students develop basic skills (i.e. computer literacy, artistic appreciation), assisting students with special needs, adult education, organization of extra-curricular activities, professional development, participation in school activities, and development of the school-community relationship. (MONE, 2002).

Seferoğlu (2004) has investigated teacher candidates' evaluations of their teaching competencies. The study, which uses an instrument developed by Mahiroğlu (2004) based on the recent report issued by MONE (2002) concerning teacher competencies, was conducted with senior year students at the Computer Education and Instructional Technology Department at Hacettepe University. Therefore, the generalizability of its findings are limited. The study revealed that in half of the fourteen competency areas listed above, non of the teachers perceived themselves as being low in competence. Highest levels of perceived competence, based on mean scores, were reported for the following areas: planning of instruction, development of instructional materials and teaching. Lowest levels of perceived competence were reported for instruction of students with special needs and adult education.

Deniz (1998) carried out a study to find out about teacher candidates' conceptions of a "contemporary teacher", "successful teacher", and "good teacher". Most of the respondents (70%) defined a "contemporary teacher" as one who keeps oneself current by following and employing new teaching methods and materials. Nearly half of the teacher candidates defined a "successful teacher" as one who ensures that the students meet the learning objectives set for them. As for the question of what constitutes a "good teacher", half of the teacher candidates stated that a good teacher is one who communicates well with his/her students, and 20 percent defined a good teacher as one who is "generous" in terms of grading policy.

III. METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains information about the population and the sample, the instrument that was used in the study, the procedure and the analyses that were carried out on the data.

A. Population and Sample

The population of the study is elementary school teachers currently teaching grades 1 to 5 in public elementary schools in Istanbul. Convenience-cluster sampling method has been used to choose 21 schools from neighborhoods representing a range of economic backgrounds. The sample consisted of 231 teachers teaching in 21 public schools located in the following 12 sub-provinces of Istanbul: Bakırköy, Beşiktaş, Dudullu, Etiler, İstinye, Kağıthane, Kartal, Küçükyalı, Levent, Şişli, Ümraniye and Üsküdar.

B. Instrument

The instrument of the study is a questionnaire developed by the researcher, based on Russell's (1982) Causal Dimension Scale. The first part of the instrument contains information about the subjects' gender, educational background and amount of teaching experience. The second part contains four open-ended questions about areas the participants consider themselves most successful and least successful in their profession, and the perceived causes of their success and lack of success. The third part consists of Russell's (1982) Causal Dimension Scale (CDS) which is composed of nine items, and used to assess the types of causal attributions made about success and failure (Appendix A).

Causal Dimension Scale (CDS)

The CDS was developed by Russell (1982) to assess how the attributor perceives the causal attributions he or she has stated. It consists of nine items designed to measure the three causal dimensions described by Weiner (1979). Of the nine items; three relate to locus of causality, three to stability, and three to controllability. The conceptual definitions provided by Weiner of the locus of causality and stability dimensions were used for writing the items. Locus of causality refers to whether the cause is something about the attributor (internal) or outside the attributor (external). Stability is defined as referring to whether the cause is constant over time (stable) or variable over time (unstable). Russell has slightly modified the definition of controllability to allow for both external and internal causal factors to be considered controllable. A cause is considered controllable if it can be changed or affected by either the actor or other people.

Based on the above definitions, a set of semantic differential scales was developed by Russell (1982) to measure perceptions of causes along each dimension, and each item was subjected to separate analyses of variance to test the validity of the individual semantic differential scales. The main effects for the three causal dimensions, and the variance accounted for by each main effect was calculated. The results of these validity tests indicated that all three causal dimensions were adequately assessed by their respective three-item subscales. For each item, the largest main effect was found for the dimension the item was designed to assess. The factor structure for the scale has been shown to correspond to the three causal dimension subscales. As for internal reliability, coefficient alpha values of .87, .84, and .73 were found for locus of causality, stability and

reported, and the decision was made to administer the questionnaire to the sample without any changes.

Internal validity has been checked by calculating item-total correlations for each subscale. Alpha coefficients of .58, .55 and .73 were found for locus of causality, stability and controllability subscales, respectively.

In order to check the test retest reliability of the Turkish form, the same questionnaire (with the instrument) was administered a second time to 66 of the teachers ten days after the first administration. Each of the subscale scores in the two administrations were found to be correlated at a significant level (Table 3.01).

Table 3.1

Test- retest correlations for each of the subscales; locus of causality, controllability, and stability, calculated both for perceived causes of success and of failure.

Dimensions of Causality		Test- Retest					
		Success			Failure		
		Locus of Causality	Contr.	Stability	Locus of Causality	Contr.	Stability
Locus of Causality success	r	.51(**)	-.04	.30(*)	-.01	.12	.06
	p	.000	.773	.014	.964	.331	.617
	N	66	66	66	64	64	64
Controllability success	r	.09	.63(**)	.17	.07	-.10	.01
	p	.466	.000	.184	.587	.418	.915
	N	66	66	66	64	64	64
Stability success	r	.37(**)	.00	.63(**)	.04	.17	.06
	p	.002	.981	.000	.728	.181	.638
	N	66	66	66	64	64	64
Locus of Causality failure	r	-.09	-.09	.03	.76(**)	-.02	.41(**)
	p	.491	.467	.824	.000	.874	.001
	N	65	65	65	64	64	64
Controllability failure	r	.07	.21	.12	.22	.43(**)	.28(*)
	p	.568	.093	.333	.082	.000	.023
	N	65	65	65	64	64	64
Stability failure	r	-.19	.18	.01	.23	.18	.68(**)
	p	.133	.157	.954	.068	.164	.000
	N	65	65	65	64	64	64

Note: ** significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

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

C. Procedure

The questionnaire was administered in elementary schools by the researcher and by a few trained colleagues during the last couple of weeks of June 2005. It took about 10 minutes for the subjects to answer the questions on the questionnaire. Before returning the questionnaire form, the teachers were asked to put down a nickname they would remember ten days later, and ten days after the first administration, a retest was carried out with sixty-six of the teachers.

D. Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS- version 13.0) was used to carry out the statistical analyses on the data. The significance level was set at .05, unless otherwise indicated.

The internal consistency of the Turkish form of the CDS was calculated by the use of Cronbach's alpha coefficients. The stability of the scores was found by the computation of test-retest Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients.

For the demographic characteristics of the sample, frequencies and percentages were calculated. T-tests and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were carried out to investigate the relationships between demographic variables and CDS scores.

For the four open-ended questions, content analysis was carried out by the researcher and two faculty members at the Department of Educational Sciences at Boğaziçi University. The results were discussed, and an agreement has been reached on the final categories. Their frequencies and percentages were tabulated. As a second step, the categories were combined into more general ones, and the relationships between these categories and CDS subscale mean scores were

investigated via one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). When a statistically significant difference was indicated, post hoc tests (i.e. Scheffé) were performed to find the groups which are significantly different.

T-tests were done to check for statistically significant differences between mean causal attribution scores for success and mean causal attribution scores for failure for each subscale.

IV. RESULTS

In this chapter, first the demographic characteristics of the sample will be presented, followed by the findings concerning each research question.

A. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

The questionnaire contained questions about the teacher's gender, educational background and amount of teaching experience. The data was gathered from 231 elementary school teachers (grades 1-5), of which three did not answer the question about their educational background, and five teachers did not answer the question about their teaching experience.

Of the 231 teachers who participated in the study, 152 (65.8 %) were females and 79 (34.2 %) were males (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1
Gender distribution of the sample

Gender	f	%
Female	152	65.8
Male	79	34.2
Total	231	100

The question concerning the educational background of the teachers asked them to indicate whether they graduated from a department of primary education; another department of a faculty of education; or a department of a faculty other than education (in which case they would have obtained teaching certificates upon taking courses for several months). Of the 228 teachers who answered this question, 150 (64.9 %) had graduated from a department of primary education, 38 (16.5 %) had

graduated from a faculty of education, but studied at a department other than primary education, and 40 (17.3 %) were graduates of faculties other than education and had teaching certificates (Table 4.2). A survey study by Okçabol et al. (2003, p.40), with a sample size of 2088 teachers (drawn from 15 cities in Turkey at 5 different levels of development), of which 44 % were elementary school teachers, has found that 37% of the teachers in the sample were graduates of higher institutions not related to teacher education. This figure is very close to the 33.8 % found in this study.

Table 4.2
Distribution of the sample in terms of educational background

Educational Background	f	%
Faculty of Education- Primary Education	150	64.9
Faculty of Education- graduates of other programs	38	16.5
Teaching certificate holders	40	17.5
Missing	3	1.3
Total	231	100.0

Information about the teachers' amount of teaching experience has been collected. Of the 223 elementary school teachers who provided this information, 195 (84.4 %) had over 5 years teaching experience, 25 (10.8 %) had 3 to 5 years teaching experience, and 3 (1.3 %) had 1 or 2 years teaching experience (Table 4.3 below).

Table 4.3
*Distribution of the sample in terms of
 amount of teaching experience.*

Years of teaching experience	f	%
1-2 years	3	1.3
3-5 years	25	10.8
6 years or more	195	84.4
Missing	8	3.5
Total	231	100.0

B. Findings Related to the Research Questions

In this section, the research questions will be taken up one by one, and the related results will be presented.

The first research question concerned the most frequently reported areas of perceived professional success according to self reports by elementary school teachers (grades 1-5). The teachers were asked to identify the area they considered themselves most successful in their profession in the first open-ended question. Two hundred twenty-nine teachers have responded, and their answers were grouped in 18 categories (Table 4.4), however 17 of the responses appeared only once and were either too specific or too general to be grouped under a category heading. They are given in Appendix B.

The most commonly reported area of success was having a good rapport and communication with the students (37.7 %), 5.7 % of these teachers also mentioned communicating well with parents. This was followed by classroom management (7.8 %), general competence in teaching (7.4 %) and adoption of an age and level appropriate approach when working with the students (5.2 %), and

warm reception of students (4.8 %). Seven teachers (3 %) considered themselves to have attained complete professional success and refused to identify an area they were most successful.

Table 4.4
Teachers' self-identified areas of success

Categories	f	%
Good rapport and communication with the students and/or parents	87	37.7
Adoption of developmentally appropriate practices	12	5.2
Motivating the students	3	1.3
Classroom management	18	7.8
Empathy with the students	4	1.7
Keeping oneself current, constantly improving ones skills	9	3.9
Maintaining one's patience	6	2.6
Competence in teaching Turkish	6	2.6
Competence in teaching mathematics	9	3.9
General competence in teaching	17	7.4
Organization of extra-curricular activities	5	2.2
Warm reception of students	11	4.8
Guidance	3	1.3
High motivation in ones job	8	3.4
Planning and organization skills	3	1.3
Encouraging creativity	2	.9
Successful in every way	7	3.0
Helping the students acquire skills to express themselves	2	.9
Other	17	7.4
Missing	2	.9
Total	231	100.0

The second research question is about the perceived causes of professional success according to self-reports by elementary school teachers. The second open-ended question on the form, followed by the one which asked the teachers to identify the area they considered themselves most successful, asked them to identify the major cause behind this success. Two hundred twenty-nine teachers have responded to this question, and 218 of these responses were grouped under 16 categories (Table 4.5). The 11 responses which appeared singular and were not

under any category heading are given in Appendix C. The most commonly reported cause of success was love of children/students (24.7 %), which was followed by positive attitude towards the teaching profession (15.2 %), personal characteristics and interests (12.6 %), good communication skills (7.4 %), and having a strong (formal) educational background (6.9 %).

Table 4.5
Perceived causes of self-identified success

Categories	f	%
A - Love of children/ students	57	24.7
B - Positive attitude towards the teaching profession	35	15.2
C - Having a strong (formal) educational background	16	6.9
D - Knowing one's subject well	2	.9
E – Keeping oneself current, following the advancements in one's area of teaching	14	6.1
F - Effort, hard-work	9	3.9
G - Ability to empathize with the students	5	2.2
H - Good communication skills (general)	17	7.4
I - Transforming negative childhood experiences into practical lessons	9	3.9
J - God given, genetic endowment	2	.9
K -Treating and respecting the students as individuals	4	1.7
L - Personal characteristics and interests	29	12.6
M- Listening to the students	4	1.7
N- Ability to motivate the students	4	1.7
O- Developmentally appropriate practices	2	.9
P- Belief in the importance and value of the teaching profession	9	3.9
Z - Other reasons	11	4.8
Missing	2	.9
Total	231	100.0

Perceived causes of success listed in Table 4.5 were combined into broader categories and one-way analysis of variance was carried out to check for significant differences between groups (broad categories) in terms of perceived locus of causality, stability and controllability of attributions (Research question three).

The broad categories were formed as follows: Category (1), 'Love and respect for children' is a combination of subcategories A (Love of

children/students) and K (Treating and respecting the students as individuals). Category (2), ‘Strong educational background and knowledge base’ is a combination of subcategories C (Having a strong formal educational background) and D (Knowing one’s subject well). Category (3), ‘Effort to improve in one’s profession’ is a combination of subcategories E (Keeping oneself current in one’s area of teaching) and F (Hard-work, effort). Category (4), ‘Communication skills and ability to motivate the students’ is a combination of subcategories G (Ability to empathize with the students), H (Good communication skills in general), I (Transforming negative childhood experiences into practical lessons), M (Listening to the students), N (Ability to motivate the students), and O (Developmentally appropriate practices in teaching). Category (5), ‘Innate or acquired personal characteristics and preferences’ is a combination of subcategories J (God given, genetic endowment) and L (Personal characteristics and preferences). Finally, Category (6), ‘Belief in the importance of the teaching profession and enjoyment of teaching’ is a combination of subcategories B ‘Positive attitude towards the teaching profession’ and P ‘Belief in the importance and value of the teaching profession’. (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6
Broad Categories of Perceived Causes of Success

Categories	Frequencies
C 1 (A, K) Love and respect for children	61
C 2 (C, D) Strong educational background and knowledge base	18
C 3 (E, F) Effort to improve in one’s profession	23
C 4 (G, H, I, M, N, O) Communication skills and ability to motivate the students	41
C 5 (J, L) Innate or acquired personal characteristics and preferences	31
C 6 (B, P) Belief in the importance of the teaching profession and enjoyment of teaching	44

Table 4.7 shows the means and standard deviations of scores on dimensions of causality for each broad success category. It can be seen that mean scores on the locus of causality subscale are rather high, the lowest mean being 22 out of 27 for category C3 (Effort to improve in ones profession). On the controllability dimension, innate or acquired personal characteristics and preferences (C 5), and belief in the importance of the teaching profession and enjoyment of teaching (C6) have means (16.37 and 16.84, respectively), which may be interpreted as being in the ambivalence range.

Table 4.7
Descriptive statistics for broad categories of perceived causes of success

Dimensions of Causality	Categories (reasons for success)	\bar{x}	s
Locus of Causality	C 1	24.84	3.90
	C 2	22.39	5.26
	C 3	22	5.21
	C 4	22.92	4.92
	C 5	23.47	3.85
	C 6	24.07	4.19
Controllability	C 1	18.84	6.89
	C 2	19.78	5.58
	C 3	19.39	4.16
	C 4	20.05	5.17
	C 5	16.37	6.94
	C 6	16.84	7.44
Stability	C 1	23.82	4.72
	C 2	19.33	5.87
	C 3	19.83	5.90
	C 4	21.68	5.40
	C 5	20.90	5.53
	C 6	21.26	6.32

To check whether there is a significant relationship between ‘perceived cause of success’ category type and causal attributions in terms of locus of causality, controllability, and stability, an ANOVA was carried out. A significant

difference ($p=.009$) in terms of stability has been found between broad categories of perceived causes of success.

Table 4.8
ANOVA for the effect of 'perceived cause of success' category type on causal attribution type

Dimensions	Between Groups			Within Groups			F	p
	SS	df	MS	SS	df	MS		
Locus of Causality	206.56	5	41.31	4093.67	209	19.59	2.11	ns
Controllability	405.63	5	81.13	8531.68	209	40.82	1.99	ns
Stability	483.37	5	96.67	6391.68	209	30.84	3.16	.009

The fourth research question was about the most frequently reported areas of perceived professional 'failure' according to self-reports by elementary school teachers (grades 1-5). The third open-ended question asked the teachers to identify an area they considered themselves least successful in their profession. Of the 231 elementary school teachers in the sample, 217 responded to this question, while 14 teachers (6.1 %) declined to identify an area they were least successful. One hundred ninety-nine of the responses (86.1%) were grouped under 20 categories (Table 4.9). There remained 18 responses (7.8 %) which did not come under any category heading. They are listed in Appendix D.

The most commonly reported areas the teachers considered themselves least successful were as follows: lack of competence in teaching music and/or art and/or physical education (25.5 %); poor planning, organization and time management skills (8.6 %); lack of patience, losing one's temper easily (5.6 %); poor communication with students (5.6 %), and classroom management 4.7 %).

It is evident that quite a large proportion (1/4) of elementary school teachers in the sample have problems teaching music, art or physical education. These are subject areas they are not equipped to teach, and they require specific skills. Nevertheless, at grades 1-5, most schools do not have teachers specialized in those subjects and one classroom teacher is expected to teach all the subjects.

Table 4.9
Teachers' self-identified areas of failure

Categories	f	%
Lack of competence in teaching music and/or art and/or P.E.	59	25.5
Lack of competence in teaching math	7	3.0
Lack of competence in teaching science	3	1.3
Organization of extra-curricular activities	6	2.6
Lack of competence in teaching English	2	.9
Poor planning, organization and time management skills	20	8.6
Not being able to keep up with innovations in ones field	8	3.5
Not being able to keep up with paper work	7	3.0
Discord with administrators	2	.9
Poor communication with students	13	5.6
Not knowing what to do with students with behavior problems or special needs	10	4.3
Not being able to motivate some of the students	5	2.2
Being unable to spare time to read educational materials to improve oneself	5	2.2
Classroom management	11	4.7
Lack of patience, losing one's temper easily	13	5.6
Lack of communication and cooperation with parents	3	1.3
Lack of competence in using educational methods, materials and equipment	9	3.9
Successful in everyway	7	3.0
Being over-tolerant and emotional	5	2.2
Lack of motivation, despair	4	1.7
Other	18	7.8
Missing	14	6.1
Total	231	100.0

The fifth research question was about the perceived causes of professional failure according to self-reports by elementary school teachers. This was addressed by the fourth open-ended question on the form, followed by the one which asked

teachers to identify the area they considered themselves least successful, and asked them to identify the major cause of this situation.

Seventeen teachers (7.4 %) did not answer this question, 14 of those had not identified an area they were least successful, either. One hundred sixty-eight of the 214 responses were grouped under 22 category headings (Table 4.10). The remaining 46 responses were considered singular, and are given in Appendix E. The most commonly reported cause of 'failure' is personality characteristics (13.9 %), followed by insufficient education/training (11.7 %), poor school infrastructure, lack of teaching materials and equipments (9.1 %), lack of time (4.3 %), and lack of ability (3.9 %).

In order not to lose the nuances, the categories of 'insufficient education/training', 'having graduated from a program other than primary education', and 'unsatisfactory level of knowledge' were kept separate.

Table 4.10
Perceived causes of self-identified failure

Categories	f	%
A Insufficient education /training	27	11.7
B Poor school infrastructure, lack of teaching aids and equipment	21	9.1
C Lack of experience	4	1.7
D Unsatisfactory level of knowledge	7	3.0
E Having graduated from a program other than primary education	3	1.3
F Believing in the non-importance of the issue at hand	6	2.6
G Lack of interest	4	1.7
H Lack of time	10	4.3
I Lack of ability	9	3.9
J Overcrowded classrooms	5	2.2
K Personality characteristics	32	13.9
L Students' lack of motivation	3	1.3
M Dislike (of the taught subject)	5	2.2
N Overloaded curriculum	6	2.6
O Parents' lack of cooperation with the teacher and/or lack of communication with parents	8	3.5
R Economic reasons	2	.9
S Lack of self-discipline	2	.9
T Health problems (mental or physical)	3	1.3
U Not being able to keep up with the technological innovations and new knowledge in one's field	3	1.3
V Burn-out, despair	2	.9
W Negative past experiences	4	1.7
Y Being over-tolerant with the students	2	.9
Z Other reasons	46	19.9
Missing	17	7.4
Total	231	100.0

Perceived causes of failure listed in Table 4.10 were combined into broader categories (Table 4.11), and one-way analysis of variance (4.13) was performed to check for differences between groups (broad categories) in terms of perceived locus of causality, stability and controllability of attributions.

Broad categories of self-identified reasons for failure were formed as follows: CF1 'Insufficient education/training/knowledge' is a combination of subcategories A (Insufficient education/training), D (Unsatisfactory level of knowledge) and E (Having graduated from a program other than primary

education). CF 2 ‘Lack of interest and motivation -in a specific area‘ is a combination of subcategories F (Believing in the non-importance of the issue at hand), G (Lack of interest) and M (Dislike of the taught subject). CF 3 ‘Poor infrastructure and educational facilities, crowded classrooms and overloaded curriculum’ is a combination of subcategories B (Poor school infrastructure, lack of teaching aids and equipment), J (overcrowded classrooms), N (Overloaded curriculum) and R (Economic reasons). CF 4 ‘Personal characteristics’ is a combination of subcategories I (Lack of ability), K (Personality characteristics) and Y (Being over-tolerant with the students). CF 5 ‘Not putting in sufficient effort and time to improve’ is a combination of subcategories H (Lack of time), S (Lack of self-discipline), U (Not being able to keep up with the technological innovations and current knowledge in one’s field) and V (burnout, despair). The frequencies of responses in the broad categories of perceived reasons for failure can be seen in Table 4. 11. Some of the categories in Table 4. 10 could not be included under any broad category. These are C ‘Lack of experience’ (f = 4), L ‘Students’ lack of motivation’ (f = 3), O ‘Parents’ lack of communication/cooperation with the teacher’ (f = 8), and T ‘Health problems’ (f = 3).

Table 4.11
Broad Categories of Perceived Causes of Failure

Categories	Frequencies
CF 1 (A, D, E) Insufficient education/ training/ knowledge	37
CF 2 (F, G, M) Lack of interest and motivation (in a specific area)	15
CF 3 (B, J, N, R) Poor infrastructure and educational facilities, crowded classrooms and overloaded curriculum	34
CF 4 (I, K, Y) Personal characteristics	43
CF 5 (H, S, U, V) Not putting in sufficient effort and time to improve	16

Table 4.12 shows the means and standard deviations of scores on dimensions of causality for each broad failure category. Explanations about each significantly different pair are given below. It is seen that the most internal attributions are made for CF 4 (personal characteristics) which were also rated as being more stable than the other categories of causes, but still not very stable ($\bar{x} = 15.60$). CF 3 (Poor infrastructure, educational facilities, crowded classrooms and overloaded curriculum) was the broad perceived cause category that was rated as being the most external ($\bar{x} = 9.44$), and the least stable ($\bar{x} = 9.88$) one among the five categories.

Table 4.12
Descriptive statistics for broad categories of perceived causes of failure

Dimension of Causality	Categories (reasons for failure)	\bar{x}	s
Locus of Causality	CF 1	13.14	6.68
	CF 2	18.67	8.46
	CF 3	9.44	6.68
	CF 4	21.09	5.24
	CF 5	14.19	7.15
Controllability	CF 1	14.68	4.60
	CF 2	16.60	4.88
	CF 3	15.26	4.96
	CF 4	15.26	5.11
	CF 5	16.12	3.07
Stability	CF 1	13	6.14
	CF 2	12.60	8.10
	CF 3	9.88	6.48
	CF 4	15.60	7.29
	CF 5	12.06	5.34

To identify the categories which are significantly different in terms of causal dimensions, a Scheffé test (Appendix F) has been performed, and it has revealed significant differences between CF 1 and CF 4, CF 2 and CF 3, CF 3 and CF 4 & CF 4 and CF 5 in terms of perceived locus of causality; CF3 and CF4 in terms of perceived stability.

Table 4.13
ANOVA for the effect of 'perceived cause of failure' category type on causal attribution type

Dimensions	Between Groups			Within Groups			F	p
	SS	df	MS	SS	df	MS		
Locus of Causality	2973.30	4	743.32	6004.10	140	42.89	17.33	.001
Controllability	50.50	4	12.62	3146.26	140	22.47	.562	ns
Stability	637.10	4	159.28	6322.35	140	45.16	3.53	.009

'Insufficient education/ training/ knowledge' (CF 1) is perceived as being a more external cause of self-identified failure than 'Personal characteristics, such as lack of ability and personality traits '(CF 4) at a significant level (mean difference= - 7.96, $p = .000$).

'Lack of interest and motivation -in a specific area' (CF 2) is perceived as being a more internal cause of failure than 'poor school infrastructure, educational facilities, crowded classrooms and overloaded curriculum' (CF 3) at a significant level (mean difference = 9.22, $p = .000$).

'Personal characteristics' (CF 4) are perceived as being a more internal causes of failure than 'poor school infrastructure, crowded classrooms and overloaded curriculum' (CF 3) at a significant level (mean difference = 11.65, $p = 000$).

'Personal characteristics' (CF 4) are perceived as being more internal causes of failure than 'Not putting in sufficient effort and time to improve' (CF 5) at a significant level (mean difference = 6.9, $p = .014$).

In terms of the perceived stability of the cause, 'Personal characteristics' (CF 4) were perceived as being significantly more stable causes of failure than 'Poor school infrastructure, crowded classrooms and overloaded curriculum'(CF 3)

(mean difference = 5.7, $p = .010$).

No significant differences were found between self-identified causes of failure in terms of perceived controllability. Mean scores between 14.68 and 16.60 on this subscale indicate that perceived causes of failure are neither perceived as being highly controllable nor uncontrollable.

The seventh research question was concerned with how the types of causal attributions change in case of success and failure. The teachers have answered the nine questions on the Causal Dimension Scale both for their perceived cause of success and for failure. The three subscales measure the perceived locus of causality, stability and controllability of the reported cause. The mean scores, standard deviations, and the results of the t- test are shown in Table 4.14. All the differences between pairs were found to be significant.

The higher the score on the locus of causality subscale, the more internal the cause is perceived to be. Conversely, the lower the score, the more external the cause is perceived to be. Mean scores on locus of causality for success were found to be significantly higher than mean scores for failure ($\bar{x} = 23.50 > \bar{x} = 15.62$, $p = .000$). Therefore, success can be said to be attributed to more internal causes than failure which suggests the existence of a self-serving attribution bias.

Higher scores on the controllability subscale indicate higher perceived controllability of the cause, and lower scores indicate lower perceived controllability. Mean scores on the controllability dimension were significantly higher for causes of success than for failure ($\bar{x} = 18.29 > \bar{x} = 15.58$, $p = .000$). Therefore, success can be said to be attributed to more controllable causes, and failure to less controllable ones.

Higher scores on the stability subscale indicate higher perceived stability of the cause. Mean scores on the stability subscale were significantly higher for causes of success than that of failure ($\bar{x} = 21.54 > \bar{x} = 13.34$, $p = .000$). That means success is attributed to causes that are perceived as being more stable than causes for failure.

Table 4.14
Paired Samples Statistics on Dimensions of Causality

Dimensions of Causality	\bar{x}	n	s	df	t	p
Locus of causality Success (LCA)	23.50	221	4.50	220	12.49	.000
Locus of causality Failure (LCB)	15.62	221	8.02			
Controllability Success (CA)	18.29	221	6.51	220	5.33	.000
Controllability Failure (CB)	15.58	221	4.90			
Stability Success (SA)	21.54	221	5.80	220	13.27	.000
Stability Failure (SB)	13.34	221	7.21			

The eighth research question was about the effect of teachers' gender, educational background and amount of teaching experience on their causal attributions.

The results of the t-test (Table 4.15) has shown that female teachers have a more internal locus of causality in case of success compared to male teachers. The other significant difference is found in the controllability subscale scores. Male teachers attribute failure to more controllable causes compared to female teachers.

Table 4.15
T- test for gender effects on causal attributions

Dimension	Female			Male			df	t	p
	\bar{x}	n	s	\bar{x}	n	s			
LCA	24.26	148	4.13	22.32	79	4.8	225	3.05	.003
CA	18.48	148	6.72	18.20	79	6.01	225	.31	ns
SA	22.16	148	5.67	20.70	79	5.84	225	1.83	ns
LCB	15.38	143	8.52	16.05	78	7.03	219	-.63	ns
CB	15.02	143	4.50	16.62	78	5.44	219	-2.33	.020
SB	13.10	143	7.25	13.79	78	7.16	219	-.69	ns

Analysis of variance results indicated no significant relationships between the amount of teaching experience and locus of causality, stability and controllability of the causal attributions the teachers made for their success and failures (Table 4.16). There were only three teachers who had one to two years of experience. This number was not sufficient to check for differences between this group and the others. No significant differences were found between the locus of causality, stability and controllability of the causal attributions of teachers with three to five years of teaching experience and six or more years of teaching experience.

Table 4.16
ANOVA for the effect of amount of teaching experience on teachers' causal attributions

Dimensions	Between Groups			Within Groups			F	p
	SS	df	MS	SS	df	MS		
LCA	25.12	2	12.56	4399.22	216	20.37	.62	ns
CA	28.73	2	14.37	8853.93	216	40.99	.35	ns
SA	21.96	2	10.98	7266.05	216	33.64	.33	ns
LCB	229.17	2	114.58	13271.12	210	63.20	1.81	ns
CB	45.90	2	22.95	5051.08	210	24.05	.95	ns
SB	55.58	2	27.79	10719.73	210	51.05	.54	ns

As a result of ANOVA, no significant relationships were found between teachers' educational backgrounds and locus of causality, stability and controllability of the causal attributions they made for their success and failures (Table 4.17).

Table 4.17
ANOVA for the effect of educational background on causal attribution type.

Dimensions	Between Groups			Within Groups			F	p
	SS	df	MS	SS	df	MS		
LCA	85.16	2	42.58	4272.26	221	19.33	2.20	ns
CA	131.71	2	65.86	9026.28	221	40.84	1.61	ns
SA	141.24	2	70.62	7245.25	221	32.78	2.15	ns
LCB	92.51	2	46.26	13891.5	215	64.61	.72	ns
CB	75.85	2	37.92	5064.28	215	23.56	1.61	ns
SB	60.78	2	23.56	11158.3	215	51.90	.58	ns

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, a summary of the study is given together with a discussion of the findings, and followed by the limitations of the study. The chapter ends with suggestions for further research.

A. Summary and Discussion

The aim of the present study was to find out about elementary school teachers' self-identified areas of success and failure, and to analyze their causal attributions related to successes and failures, in terms of perceived locus of causality, stability and controllability. The effects of teachers' gender, educational background, amount of teaching experience and perceived outcome (success vs. failure) on the causal attributions made to explain these outcomes were investigated.

The sample consisted of 231 elementary school teachers from 21 public schools located in 12 sub-provinces of Istanbul. The instrument used in the study consisted of three parts. The first part contained demographic information about the teachers' gender, educational background and amount of teaching experience. The second part contained four open-ended questions concerning areas the teachers considered themselves most and least successful, and their perceived causes for these outcomes. The third part consisted of Turkish form of Russell's Causal Attribution Scale which is used to identify the types of causal attributions for success and failure. The internal reliability and test- retest reliability of the Turkish form of the CDS have been established.

The frequencies and percentages of the demographic data were tabulated. Content analysis was carried out to categorize the responses to the four open-ended questions concerning areas of self-identified success and failure, and the perceived

major cause for each outcome. Broader categories of perceived causes of success and failure were formed and they were compared in terms of locus of causality, stability and controllability via oneway ANOVA and post hoc Scheffé tests. T-tests and one-way ANOVA were performed to investigate the effects of the demographic variables and perceived achievement outcomes (success vs. failure) on the types of causal attributions in terms of locus of causality, stability and controllability measured by the CDS.

The results revealed that the five areas elementary school teachers currently teaching grades one to five consider themselves most successful were: communication with students, classroom management, general competence in teaching, developmentally appropriate practices, and warm reception of children. The categories are as specific as the teachers' responses. One of the difficulties in content analysing the responses stemmed from the fact that teachers' replies came in varying levels of specificity. Some teachers identified very general areas of success (i.e. communication, general teaching competence) whereas others were more specific (i.e. empathy with the students, teaching mathematics). Thus, some of the more specific responses could be subsumed under relatively general ones (i.e. empathy under good communication skills), nevertheless, this was not the method pursued in the first round of categorization in order not to lose the nuances between replies.

The teachers' satisfaction with their communication with students complements the findings of the study by Okçabol and Gök (1998) where 70% of high school teachers stated they were satisfied with their communication with students. Communication skills is not included among the teacher competency areas in the report issued by MONE (2002). Perhaps, because it is a very general and

basic skill which is a prerequisite for all other teacher competencies. However, on the basis of short responses given by the teachers in this study, not much can be said about what the participants understand from 'good communication'.

The five most frequently mentioned areas of failure were the following: lack of competence in teaching music and/or art and/or physical education, poor organizational and time management skills, lack of patience and poor communication with students, and classroom management.

It is evident that quite a large proportion (1/4) of elementary school teachers in the sample have problems teaching music, art or physical education. These are subject areas they are not equipped to teach and they require specific skills. Nevertheless, at grades 1-5, most schools do not have teachers specialized in those subjects and one classroom teacher is expected to teach all the subjects. This is a problem that merits the attention of the Ministry of National Education. The fact that music, art and physical education are taught by classroom teachers in most public schools is the result of a policy and not a lack of resources.

Communication appears under frequently mentioned areas of failure as well as success, although it is mentioned by a much smaller percentage of teachers as an area of failure.

Sixty-one of the teachers reported their caring (love, value) for the students to be the major cause behind their major success in the profession, while 44 teachers identified their belief in the importance of the teaching profession and their enjoyment of teaching as the leading causes behind their major success. Together these two constitute almost 50% of the perceived reasons behind teachers self-identified areas of success in their profession.

As much as 34 % of the teachers have identified poor school infrastructure, educational facilities, overcrowded classrooms and overloaded curriculum as the major cause of their major failures as teachers. These are clearly beyond the control of individual teachers, but if they are perceived as being unstable and controllable, common effort, such as putting pressure on the government and drawing more attention to the needs of schools and students may be more likely.

The fact that teachers mention personality characteristics, which are considered relatively stable, as the major cause behind a failure is noteworthy. The student selection procedure for faculties of education, which takes no account of personality characteristics, may need to be reconsidered. Alternatively, by way of 'retribution training' people can be trained to attribute unsuccessful outcomes to unstable and controllable causes which could prevent learned helplessness and depression. (Försterling, 1985, 1988).

Internal causal attributions are made for success ($\bar{x} = 23.5$) while relatively external causal attributions are made for failure ($\bar{x} = 15.6$). The difference between the means is statistically significant ($p = .001$). This finding suggests the existence of a self-serving attribution bias in our sample, and supports the findings of a number of studies carried out in Western cultures (Mezulis et.al., 2004).

Success is attributed to more controllable causes, and failure to less controllable ones. One might reason that if the cause for a failure were controllable, then something would have been done about it. Therefore, it may be expected for causes of failure to be perceived as being not highly controllable.

Reasons for success are perceived as being more stable than reasons for failure. The latter may be considered a positive finding, because if the reasons for failure were perceived as being stable, there could be a tendency for helplessness

and despair (Abramson, et al., 1978). People may not have made the effort to turn things around. However, the perceived instability of the causes for failure, together with relatively low perceived control ($\bar{x} = 15.58$) may be expected to lead to passivity while hoping that things would improve themselves or someone else does something to improve them. These are some of the hypotheses that could be checked by future research.

Significant differences in terms of locus of causality (internal vs. external) were found between broad categories of causes of failure. Personal characteristics, such as personality traits and lack of ability are perceived as being more internal than insufficient education, training and knowledge. They were also rated as being more internal than not putting in sufficient effort and time to improve, as well as poor school infrastructure, crowded classrooms and overloaded curriculum. Lack of interest and motivation are perceived as being more internal reasons than poor infrastructure, educational facilities, crowded classrooms and overloaded curriculum.

In terms of perceived stability of the causes of failure, personal characteristics were rated as being significantly more stable than poor school infrastructure, educational facilities, crowded classrooms and overloaded curriculum.

No significant differences were found between broad categories of causes of failure in terms of controllability. All the category means were below 16.61 on the controllability subscale, indicating that no category of self-identified cause of failure were perceived as being highly controllable. This is a finding which requires further investigation.

Weiner (1979) contends that each of the three dimensions of causality has a psychological function, and several secondary effects. According to his theory of achievement motivation, locus of causality has implications for self esteem, an

emotional consequence of achievement performance; perceived stability of the cause is posited to be related to the magnitude of expectancy change following success or failure; and perceived control is related to helping, evaluation and liking (Weiner, 1979). Whether these predictions hold for our sample can be checked by another study. It needs to be noted here that the controllability construct, and consequently the related measure used in this study are different from Weiner's. Russell (1982) has modified the definition of controllability so as to allow for both external and internal factors to be considered controllable.

It is hoped that this study may be a contribution towards facilitating critical awareness about the structure of people's causal attributions, and the formulation of new hypotheses.

B. Limitations of the Study

It has to be noted that self-identified areas of success and failure are responses to questions asking teachers to report only areas they consider themselves most and least successful. If each teacher had reported a few areas of success and failure the results might have looked different. The same caution goes for reasons for success and failure. The results reflect the self-identified primary cause in case of success and failure. It is known, however, that reasons behind outcomes are more complex and a different response format would have revealed more about how elementary school teachers reason about their successes and failures.

Another limitation is due to the sample size and the number of categories that emerged during content analysis. We did not want to limit the number of categories in order for results to reveal some of the subtle differences between responses which may have a bearing on the type of causal attributions in terms of loci of causality, stability and controllability. However, since the frequencies of

some of these responses were very small, in a second round of categorization, some had to be combined to form broader categories to perform oneway analysis of variance. The significant differences in the mean scores on locus of causality, stability and controllability subscales were checked for these broad categories. The effect (or the failure to find any effect) may partly be an effect of categorization. Because of the relatively small sample size for the number of categories that emerged and some of the analyses being carried out on combined broad categories, it cannot be said with confidence that failure to find significant differences between broad categories was not a result of bringing together categories with opposite properties which cancelled out eachother's effects. A larger sample size is necessary to find out if this had been the case.

C. Suggestions for Further Research

One suggestion would be to increase the sample size so that sufficiently large categories are formed under rather specific/highly differentiated reasons and analysis of variance to be performed on them.

Another suggestion would be to check the validity of the scale for various groups in the Turkish population. Some of the participants in the study commented that controllability of a cause did not imply someone's (anyone's) responsibility for them. More evidence is needed to uncover whether and how the underlying dimensions of perceived causality differ between cultures.

The stability subscale of the Causal Dimension Scale does not seem to differentiate between changes that are considered possible and changes considered probable. If the items related to perceived stability of causes are interpreted to be about the mere possibility of a change in a given situation by some of the subjects

this may confound the results. Therefore, the researcher suggests the construction of a new stability subscale.

Weiner's attributional theory about achievement motivation and emotion (1979, 1985) has certain predictions mentioned in the previous sections related to the locus of causality, stability and controllability of attributions. Further research, perhaps a longitudinal study with elementary school teachers, may reveal if these predictions hold.

VI. REFERENCES

- Abramson, L.Y., Seligman, M. E. P., & Teasdale, J. D. (1978). Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 87*, 49-74.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T.D., & Akert, R.M. (1997). *Social Psychology*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Bradley, G. W. (1978). Self-serving biases in the attribution process: A reexamination of the fact or fiction question. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 15*, 281-297.
- Cutrona, C. E. , Russell, D., & Jones, R. D. (1985). Cross-situational consistency in causal attributions: Does attributional style exist? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*, 1043- 1058.
- Deaux, K., & Emsweller, T. (1974). Explanations of successful performance on sex-linked tasks: what is skill for the male is luck for the female. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 29*, 80-85.
- Deniz, L. (1998). Çağdaş öğretmen, başarılı öğretmen, iyi öğretmen. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 10*, 83-95.
- Dursun, S. (2000). *Öğretmenlerde tükenmişlik ile yükleme biçimi, cinsiyet, eğitim düzeyi ve hizmet süresi değişkenleri arasındaki yordayıcı ilişkilerin incelenmesi*. Master's Thesis, Institute of Social Sciences, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Trabzon.

Etaugh, C., & Brown, B. (1975) Perceiving the causes of success and failures of male and female performers. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 11.

Fletcher, G. J.O., & Ward, C. (1988). Attribution theory and processes: A cross-cultural perspective. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The cross cultural challenge to psychology* (pp.230-244) California: Sage Publications.

Forsyth, D. R. (1980). The function of causal attributions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 43, 184- 189.

Försterling, F. (1985). Attributional retraining: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol.98, 3, 495-512.

Försterling, F. (1988). *Attribution theory in clinical psychology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Gürel, A. (1994). *Durum tipine bağlı olarak negatif ve pozitif olaylar ile hipotetik ve gerçek olaylarda görülen yükleme farklılıkları ve yükleme stili*. Master's Thesis, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara University.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. NewYork: Wiley.

Heine, S. J., Lehman, D. R., Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1999). Is there a universal need for positive regard? *Psychological Review*, Vol. 106, 766-794.

Jones, E.E.,& Davis, K.E. (1965). From acts to dispositions: The attributional process in social psychology. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 219-266). New York: Academic Press.

- Kelley, H. H. (1967). Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Levine (Ed.) *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Kelley H.H., & Michela, J.L. (1980). Attribution theory and research. In M.R. Rosenzweig & L.W. Porter (Eds.), *Annual review of psychology* (Vol.31, pp.457-501). Palo Alto, California: Annual Reviews.
- Kelly, G. A. (1970). A summary statement of a cognitive-oriented comprehensive theory of behavior. In J. C. Mancuso (ed.), *Readings for a cognitive theory of personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. (Original work published in 1966).
- Kuiper, N. A. (1978). Depression and causal attributions for success and failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 36, 236-246.
- Kukla, A. (1972). Attributional determinants of achievement related behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 21, 166-174.
- Meyer, J. P. (1980). Causal attributions for success and failure: A multivariate investigation of dimensionality, formation, and consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol.38, 704-715.
- Mezulis, A. M., Abramson, L. Y., Hyde, J. S., & Hankin, B. L. (2004). Is there a universal positivity bias in attributions? A meta analytic review of individual, developmental, and cultural differences in the self-serving attributional bias. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 130, 5, 711-747.

- Miller, D. T., & Ross, M. (1975). Self-serving biases in the attribution of causality: Fact or Fiction? *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 82, 213-225.
- Ministry of National Education (2002). *Öğretmen Yeterlilikleri*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Okçabol, R., Akpınar, Y., Caner, A., Erkin, E., Gök, F., & Ünlühisarcıklı, Ö. (2003) *Öğretmen Yetiştirme Araştırması*. Ankara: Eğitim-Sen Yayınları.
- Okçabol, R. & Gök, F. (1998). *Öğretmen profili araştırma raporu*. Ankara: Eğitim-Sen Yayınları.
- Oktan, V. (1999). *Öğretmen adaylarında ve öğretmenlerde kendini gerçekleştirme düzeyleri ile yükleme biçimlerinin incelenmesi*. Master's Thesis, Institute of Social Sciences, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Trabzon.
- Peterson, C., Semmel, A., von Baeyer, C., Abramson, L. Y., Metalski, G. I., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1982). The attributional style questionnaire. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, Vol. 6, 287-299.
- Russell, D. (1982). The Causal Dimension Scale: A Measure of how individuals perceive causes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 42, 1137-1145.
- Seferoğlu, S. S. (2004). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen yeterlilikleri açısından kendilerini değerlendirmeleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol. 26, 131-140.

- Seligman, M. E. P., Abramson, L. Y., & Semmel, A., Baeyer, C. (1979). Depressive attributional style. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. Vol. 88 No.3, 242- 247.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1992). *Learned optimism*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Sweeney, P. D., Anderson, K., & Bailey, S. (1986). Attributional style in depression: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 974-991.
- Weiner, B., & Kukla, A. (1970). An attributional analysis of achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol.15, 1-20.
- Weiner, B. (1972). *Theories of motivation: From mechanism to cognition*. Chicago: Markham.
- Weiner, B. (Ed.). (1974). *Achievement motivation and attribution theory*. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press.
- Weiner, B. (1979). A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 71, 3-25.
- Weiner, B. (1983). Some methodological pitfalls in attribution research. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 75, 530-543.
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, Vol. 92, 548-573.
- Weiner, B. (1992). *Human motivation: Metaphors, theories and research*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

VII. APPENDICES

Appendix A-
Questionnaire Form

RUMUZ:

Sayın Öğretmen,

Aşağıdaki sorular öğretmenlerin kendilerini mesleklerinde başarılı ve az başarılı buldukları yönler ve bununla bağlantılı olarak kurdukları neden-sonuç ilişkileri hakkında bilgi edinmek amacıyla, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı Yetişkin Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Programı'nda yüksek lisans tez çalışması kapsamında hazırlanmıştır. Araştırmanın konusu, hangi öğretmenin hangi soruya nasıl yanıt verdiği değil, genel olarak öğretmenlerin algıları ve yargılarıdır. Ankette isim belirtilmeyecektir. Soruları dikkatlice yanıtlamanız bu araştırmanın güvenilir olması için önemlidir. Katılımınız için teşekkür ederiz.

Demografik Bilgiler

Cinsiyetiniz: () K () E

Öğretmenlik formasyonunuz:

() Eğitim fakültesi veya enstitüsü, sınıf öğretmenliği alanı mezunu

() Sınıf öğretmenliği dışında bir öğretmenlik alanı mezunu.

() Öğretmenlik sertifikası sahibi

Kıdeminiz: () 1-2 yıl () 3-5 yıl () 6 yıl ve daha fazla

A - Mesleğinizde kendinizi en başarılı bulduğunuz yönünüzü yazınız.

.....

Sizce bu başarının en önemli nedeni nedir?

Neden (A) :

B - Mesleğinizde kendinizi en az başarılı bulduğunuz yönünüzü yazınız.

.....

Sizce bu durumun en önemli nedeni nedir?

Neden (B):

Aşağıdaki soruları Neden (A)'yı düşünerek yanıtlayınız.

- (a) Bu neden; sizin bir özelliğinizi yansıtıyor. 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 sizin dışınızdaki koşulların bir özelliğini yansıtıyor.
- (b) Bu durum, siz veya diğer insanlar tarafından kontrol edilebilir. 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Bu durum, siz veya diğer insanlar tarafından kontrol edilemez.
- (c) Bu neden, kalıcıdır. 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Bu neden geçicidir.
- (d) Bu durum/neden, siz veya başkaları tarafından amaçlanmış bir şeydir. 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Bu neden/durum, kimse tarafından amaçlanmamış bir şeydir.
- (e) Bu neden, sizin dışınızdadır. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Bu içsel bir nedendir.
- (f) Nedeni oluşturan durum, zaman içinde değişen bir durumdur. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Nedeni oluşturan durum, zaman içinde değişmeyen bir durumdur.
- (g) Bu neden, sizinle ilgilidir. 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Bu neden, başkalarıyla ilgilidir.
- (h) Bu değişebilir bir durumdur. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Bu değişmez bir durumdur.
- (i) Bu durumdan kimse sorumlu değildir. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Bu durumdan siz veya başkaları sorumludur.

Aşağıdaki soruları Neden (B)'yi düşünerek yanıtlayınız.

- (a) Bu neden; sizin bir özelliğinizi yansıtıyor. 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 sizin dışınızdaki koşulların bir özelliğini yansıtıyor.
- (b) Bu durum, siz veya diğer insanlar tarafından kontrol edilebilir. 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Bu durum, siz veya diğer insanlar tarafından kontrol edilemez.
- (c) Bu neden, kalıcıdır. 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Bu neden geçicidir.
- (d) Bu durum/neden, siz veya başkaları tarafından amaçlanmış bir şeydir. 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Bu neden/durum, kimse tarafından amaçlanmamış bir şeydir.
- (e) Bu neden, sizin dışınızdadır. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Bu içsel bir nedendir.
- (f) Nedeni oluşturan durum, zaman içinde değişen bir durumdur. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Nedeni oluşturan durum, zaman içinde değişmeyen bir durumdur.
- (g) Bu neden, sizinle ilgilidir. 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Bu neden, başkalarıyla ilgilidir.
- (h) Bu değişebilir bir durumdur. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Bu değişmez bir durumdur.
- (i) Bu durumdan kimse sorumlu değildir. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Bu durumdan siz veya başkaları sorumludur.

APPENDIX B –

List of Uncategorized Responses – Area of Self-Identified Success

- Eğitime önem vermek.
- Öğretmen olarak yetiştirilmek.
- Kolay para kazanma yollarını bilmem.
- Başarının elde edilmesi.
- Öğrencilerimden olumlu geribildirimler alabilmem.
- Çok yönlü alanda çalışma.
- Açık sözlü olmam.
- Öğretmede, öğrencinin başarısını arttırmaya dönük çalışmam.
- Lisan dersi.
- Sosyal bilgiler.
- Fen ve teknoloji eğitimi, öğretimi.
- Yapararak, yaşayarak öğretim.
- Mesleğimde başarılı olduğumu düşünmüyorum.
- Araştırma ve çözümlenmeye önem verme.
- Eşitlik ve güven duygusunu azami düzeyde aşılabilir.
- Çocuklar beni severler.
- Sınıf öğretmenliği.

APPENDIX C –

List of Uncategorized Responses – Perceived Cause of Success

- İimden geliyor.
- Kalıcı ğrenimi saėlaması.
- Otorite.
- Őartlar.
- “Ya grndğn gibi ol, ya da olduėun gibi grn.” hayat felsefesine sahip olmam.
- Kendi branŐıma yakın.
- Okul motivasyonu.
- Huzurlu bir ortam ve ekonomik.
- Eėitim ve ğretim alanında pekiŐtirme.
- BranŐım o olduėu iin. (Matematik, fen).
- Edebiyat fakltesinde okumam.

APPENDIX D -

List of Uncategorized Responses – Area of Self-Identified Failure

- Kendi öğretmenlik anlayışım ile Türk Milli Eğitim sistemindeki öğretmenlik anlayışı arasında paralellik kurmakta zorlanıyorum.
- Haklarımı savunmada yetersiz buluyorum.
- Eğitememe.
- Zaman zaman öğrencileri rahat bırakmak.
- Çocuklar üzerindeki ilgimin tempolu gitmemesi.
- Tecrübelerimi gerektiği şekilde kullanma.
- Mutlakiyetçilik.
- Çocuğun evden aldığı davranış bozukluğu etkiliyor.
- Mevzuat.
- Davranışların hedefe ulaşmasında.
- Çok fazla yazı yazmak.
- Emeğimi göstermemem (çok hırslı olmama rağmen).
- Zaman zaman hızlı konuşuyor olmak, ellerimi fazla kullanmam, dikkat dağıtabilmem.
- Kontrol.
- Soru sormak, mantıki açıklamaya yönlendirme.
- Politikayı anlamamam. Öğretmenler arası çekişmeyi çözememem.
- Kompozisyon yazma.

APPENDIX E –

List of Uncategorized Responses – Perceived Cause of Failure

- Planlı çalışmak isteyişim.
- Olayları, durumları çok geniş açıdan görmeye çalışıyorum. Bu nedenle ben de bir sınır oluşturamıyorum.
- Okuldaki düzensizlik ve herkesi aynı görmekten.
- Çok değişkenlik, engeli kuramama, imkansızlık.
- Yaşamımda çatışmaya girmekten veya tanık olmaktan hoşlanmıyor olmam.
- Bakış açılarımızın aynı olmaması.
- Alışkanlık.
- Okumayı sevdirmemiş olmaları.
- Müzik aleti çalamamam.
- Zor geliyor.
- Enstrüman çalmayı bilmemek.
- Kendimi bu konuda yeterli görmüyorum. (Beden eğitimi).
- Öğrenciyi özgür bırakma isteği.
- Öğrencilerin özellikleri ve yöntem çeşitlerinin araştırılmaması.
- Öğretmenlere yüklenen yasal zorunluluklar.
- Severek işimi yapmam.
- Öğrenciye yeterinden fazla not verme.
- Sınıf içi kuralcılık anlayışımın olmaması.
- Konunun işlenişine odaklanmış olmam.
- Öğrencilerle ilgili olmak.
- Benden kaynaklanıyor.
- Öğretmenliğe ait olan ruh halim.
- Öğrencide psikolojik etki yaratması.
- Çocukları sevmem.
- Daha detaylı ders anlatmam.
- Farklı olup başarıyı süreklileştirmek.
- Öğrencilerimin yaptıkları işi her zaman ciddiye almalarını istiyorum. Çünkü ben böyle yapıyorum.
- Hayatın şartları akla vurgu yapıyor.
- Çok para harcamak.
- Başarısız öğrencilerde başarı sağlayamama.
- Model olmada eksiklik.
- Çok hassasiyet göstermem.
- Toplumun gelişimi için iyi yetişmiş, kişilikli insanlara gereksinim olduğunu düşündüğümünden.
- Görsel yayın araçları ve kaynak kitaplar kullanmak.
- Bir anda çok şey vermek istemem.
- Yaptığım işi öncelikle kendim ve işim için yapmam.
- Çalışmak.
- Takip edememek.
- Ülkenin geleceği ve durumu.
- Sık sık kanun ve yönetmeliklerin değişimi.
- Çalışmak.
- Yöneticilerin donanımlı olmamaları. İdarecilik eğitimi almamış olmaları.
- Mesleğime duyduğum saygı.
- Eğitimin toplumsal görevini yerine getirememesi. Bireycilik.
- Çalışmayı sevmem.

APPENDIX F –

Scheffé Test- Broad Categories of Perceived Causes of Failure

Causal Dimension Subscale Mean Differences

Results of the Scheffé Test performed to identify (broad) reason categories for failure whose subscale means are significantly different

Dependent Variable	(I) Reason for failure	(J) Reason for failure	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Locus of Causality	CF 1	2.00	-5.5315	2.00454	.113	-11.7892	.7261
		3.00	3.6940	1.55578	.234	-1.1628	8.5507
		4.00	-7.9579(*)	1.46849	.000	-12.5421	-3.3737
		5.00	-1.0524	1.95946	.990	-7.1693	5.0646
	CF 2	1.00	5.5315	2.00454	.113	-.7261	11.7892
		3.00	9.2255(*)	2.02989	.001	2.8887	15.5623
		4.00	-2.4264	1.96379	.821	-8.5568	3.7041
		5.00	4.4792	2.35361	.463	-2.8682	11.8265
	CF 3	1.00	-3.6940	1.55578	.234	-8.5507	1.1628
		2.00	-9.2255(*)	2.02989	.001	-15.5623	-2.8887
		4.00	-11.6518(*)	1.50291	.000	-16.3435	-6.9602
		5.00	-4.7463	1.98539	.228	-10.9442	1.4515
	CF 4	1.00	7.9579(*)	1.46849	.000	3.3737	12.5421
		2.00	2.4264	1.96379	.821	-3.7041	8.5568
		3.00	11.6518(*)	1.50291	.000	6.9602	16.3435
		5.00	6.9055(*)	1.91775	.014	.9188	12.8922
	CF 5	1.00	1.0524	1.95946	.990	-5.0646	7.1693
		2.00	-4.4792	2.35361	.463	-11.8265	2.8682
		3.00	4.7463	1.98539	.228	-1.4515	10.9442
		4.00	-6.9055(*)	1.91775	.014	-12.8922	-.9188
Controll-ability	CF 1	2.00	-1.9243	1.45107	.780	-6.4542	2.6055
		3.00	-.5890	1.12622	.991	-4.1048	2.9267
		4.00	-.5801	1.06302	.990	-3.8986	2.7383
		5.00	-1.4493	1.41844	.903	-5.8773	2.9787
	CF 2	1.00	1.9243	1.45107	.780	-2.6055	6.4542
		3.00	1.3353	1.46942	.934	-3.2519	5.9224
		4.00	1.3442	1.42157	.925	-3.0936	5.7820
		5.00	.4750	1.70376	.999	-4.8437	5.7937
	CF 3	1.00	.5890	1.12622	.991	-2.9267	4.1048
		2.00	-1.3353	1.46942	.934	-5.9224	3.2519
		4.00	.0089	1.08794	1.000	-3.3874	3.4052
		5.00	-.8603	1.43721	.986	-5.3469	3.6263
	CF 4	1.00	.5801	1.06302	.990	-2.7383	3.8986
		2.00	-1.3442	1.42157	.925	-5.7820	3.0936
		3.00	-.0089	1.08794	1.000	-3.4052	3.3874
		5.00	-.8692	1.38824	.983	-5.2029	3.4645
	CF 5	1.00	1.4493	1.41844	.903	-2.9787	5.8773
		2.00	-.4750	1.70376	.999	-5.7937	4.8437
		3.00	.8603	1.43721	.986	-3.6263	5.3469
		4.00	.8692	1.38824	.983	-3.4645	5.2029
Stability	CF 1	2.00	.4000	2.05698	1.000	-6.0214	6.8214
		3.00	3.1176	1.59648	.435	-1.8662	8.1015
		4.00	-2.6047	1.50690	.562	-7.3088	2.0995
		5.00	.9375	2.01072	.994	-5.3395	7.2145
	CF 2	1.00	-.4000	2.05698	1.000	-6.8214	6.0214

		3.00	2.7176	2.08299	.790	-3.7849	9.2202
		4.00	-3.0047	2.01516	.695	-9.2955	3.2862
		5.00	.5375	2.41518	1.000	-7.0021	8.0771
	CF 3	1.00	-3.1176	1.59648	.435	-8.1015	1.8662
		2.00	-2.7176	2.08299	.790	-9.2202	3.7849
		4.00	-5.7223(*)	1.54222	.010	-10.5367	-.9079
		5.00	-2.1801	2.03733	.886	-8.5402	4.1799
Stability	CF 4	1.00	2.6047	1.50690	.562	-2.0995	7.3088
		2.00	3.0047	2.01516	.695	-3.2862	9.2955
		3.00	5.7223(*)	1.54222	.010	.9079	10.5367
		5.00	3.5422	1.96792	.521	-2.6012	9.6855
	CF 5	1.00	-.9375	2.01072	.994	-7.2145	5.3395
		2.00	-.5375	2.41518	1.000	-8.0771	7.0021
		3.00	2.1801	2.03733	.886	-4.1799	8.5402
		4.00	-3.5422	1.96792	.521	-9.6855	2.6012

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.