Influence of Gender, Types of School and Occupational Stress on Pupil Control Ideology of Secondary School Teachers in India

Mariya Aftab[1*] Tahira Khatoon[2]

1. Senior Research Fellow, Department of Education, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh(U.P.)– India
2. Associate Professor, Department of Education, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh(U.P.)– India
* E-mail of the corresponding author: maria.aftabaug12@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examined the effects of gender, types of school and occupational stress on pupil control ideology of teachers. The population for this study comprises of 281 males and 327 females from 41 schools of Uttar Pradesh (India). The Pupil Control Ideology Scale and Teachers Occupational Stress Scale were used for data collection, while stepwise multiple regression, t-test and Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique were used for statistical analysis. The results of the analysis showed that among the three independent variables, occupational stress had the greatest influence on PCI (51%). Further, it is revealed that male and female teachers' do not differ in their PCI. The study also finds that teachers in Government schools are more custodial than teachers in Government-aided, Muslim, Hindu, A.M.U. and Christian/ Missionary managed schools; while A.M.U and Christian/ Missionary managed school teachers' appear to be the most humanistic of all the schools. Findings also reveal a significant positive correlation (r= 0.48) between occupational stress and PCI of secondary school teachers'. Most interestingly, females in the sub groups of types of schools (except females of Muslim and Christian/ Missionary schools) and occupational stress (except female teachers' of More stress group) show more PCI and indicate a custodial approach than their counterparts.

Keywords: Pupil Control Ideology, Occupational Stress, Indian Secondary Schools, Humanistic and custodial Teachers.

1. Introduction

Schools as social institutions are assigned the task of preparing the young ones for the roles they will be called upon in future to play in the society. In order to discharge this onerous responsibility the teacher focus not merely on cognitive growth of children but also attempt to bring about their emotional, social and physical development. Since all pupils are not motivated by a desire to learn, it becomes incumbent on the part of the teacher to control their behavior. Again, pupils coming from different socio-economic and cultural backgrounds, as they do, often come into conflict with one another, resulting into intervention by the teacher and use of some control device by him. As a consequence of the mandatory nature of the interaction between teachers' and students', control becomes essential ingredient of the classroom situation.

Control is a salient aspect of school life. A teacher can influence the climate within the class to stimulate the students' learning by exercising varying levels of control (Oppenlander, 1970). The form and nature of control exercised by the teacher is determined, by and large, by his own ideological orientations and positional and personality factors. The earliest work on PCI began with a case study of a junior high school in central Pennsylvania by Donald J. Willower (Willower, Eidel & Hoy, 1973; Hoy, 2001, 2007). Willower, Eidel & Hoy (1973) sought to define teachers' perceptions about student control (discipline) in the classroom and they and other, later researchers conceptualized pupil control as a point on a continuum ranging from custodial to humanistic (Lunenburg, 1990a; Hoy, 2001; Lunenburg & Cadavid, 1992; Rideout & Morton, 2010).

A custodial pupil control ideology (Willower, et al., 1967; Lunenburg, 1990a; Cadavid & Lunenburg, 1991; Lunenburg & Cadavid, 1992; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008) refers to external controls imposed on the student. Humanistic ideology on the other hand, stresses self-discipline rather than imposed discipline. In that ideology sanctions are more personal and are based more on an individual's understanding of right and wrong.

The custodial and humanistic orientations on pupil control are only the ideological extremes. They are analytic abstractions, that is, pure types that may or may not be found in such form in experience. Outcomes, (grades, office referrals, and accountability scores) are more positive in humanistic classrooms than in custodial classrooms (Brame, 2007). The perspectives, however, are useful to compare, contrast, and analyze patterns of controlling students in school. Therefore, a secondary school teacher's pupil control ideology may fall anywhere between these two major extremes.

It is evidenced that pupil control ideology of the teachers are associated with the variables such as school class size (Cicmanec, 2001), school culture (Kottkamp & Mulhern, 1987), behaviors of school administrators (Appleberry & Hoy, 1970), whether the teacher is a candidate teacher (Griepenstrop & Miskel, 1976) or student-teacher, teacher-administrator relationships (Deibert & Hoy, 1977), school atmosphere (Hoy & Henderson, 1983), personal characteristics (Hoy, 2001), job satisfaction (Uskiewicz & Willower, 1973), professional

satisfaction (Willower, Heckert & Hoy, 1977), bureaucracy (Lunnenberg, 2000) and low self-perception (Lunenberg, 1983). The limited number of studies done on pupil control ideology showed that there is a great dearth of educational research on teachers' pupil control ideology and effects of gender and school types, or that of pupil control ideology and occupational stress.

In India the problem of pupil control has not received as much attention of the researchers as it deserves, despite its great significance for pupil growth and school climate. Hence, teacher being a key factor in pupil control becomes a variable of priority for studies in this area.

2. Theoretical Framework

Very few studies relating to pupil control ideology and their relationship with gender have been observed, that fail to yield clear cut results. For instance, Harris (1984) reveals that male teachers tended to have a more authoritarian approach than female teachers. Researchers (Munir & Khatoon, 2008; Khatoon & Munir, 2011) also found male teachers to be more custodial than their female counterparts. On the converse, in a study by Harris, Halpin, and Halpin (1985) female teachers tended to have a more humanistic orientation. In the same vein, gender roles of women teachers were found to have important effects on their educational practices (Sari, 2011). Stress, close relationships with students and parents, and lack of authority and issues of confidence came out to be the few main points in teachers' explanations that how their gender roles affected their profession mostly.

This study also investigates the difference in teachers' pupil control ideology on the basis of different types of school. Schools differ in terms of the nature of their educational viewpoints and policies concerning control of students. Indeed, there is no lack of opinion or prescription on pupil control in public schools, but unfortunately there is little systematic study on the subject, much less, study which begins from the perspective of the school as a social system. Lunenburg (1990) examined differences between public and Catholic schools concerning teachers' pupil control ideology and found teachers in the Catholic schools to be more humanistic in PCI than teachers in public school. After an extensive study of public schools, Silberman (1970) concluded that the most important general characteristic of schools was a pre-occupation with order and control. However, the teachers of Private and Government schools do not differ in relation to their control ideology, but males in Private as well as Government schools were more custodial than their counterparts (Khatoon & Munir, 2011).

Significant direct relationships between pupil control ideology and occupational stress are also reported (Agoglia, 1998). Alternative path models suggested that teachers' control beliefs (i.e., locus of control and pupil control ideology), independent of occupational stress, significantly affected attitude formation. In the same vein, Khatoon and Munir (2011) observed that pupil control ideology is highly related to teacher stress, and teachers experiencing high levels of stress either in family or in work places tended to report more custodial orientation.

Harris, Halpin, and Halpin (1985) support the bivariate and multivariate relationships between the dependent variable of pupil control orientation, and the independent variables of the dimensions of teacher stress. They found all of the correlations between the PCI and the stress factors were negative. Results obtained on the bivariate analyses indicated that an authoritarian orientation was significantly related to higher scores on four of the five stress factors. Lunenburg and Cadavid (1992) also showed that greater teacher custodialism is significantly related to teacher reports of stress and burnout.

In this context, the purpose of the present study was to determine the relationship of secondary school teachers' pupil control ideology (dependent variable) with gender, types of school and occupational stress (independent variables). In order to establish a relationship between dependent and independent variables, the following questions were posed in the study:

- ❖ Do predictor factors (gender, types of school and occupational stress) explain the differences in mean pupil control ideology score of secondary school teachers'?
- ❖ Does gender explain the differences in the pupil control ideology of secondary school teachers'?
- ❖ Do the types of school influence the pupil control ideology of secondary school teachers'?
- ❖ Does the occupational stress hold an impact on the pupil control ideology of secondary school teachers'?

3. Method

The study presented here is based on a quantitative approach which carries a descriptive study in itself, to explore if teachers' pupil control ideologies differed significantly to a group of variables such as gender, school types and occupational stress. The sample comprised of 608 secondary school teachers' selected from 41 schools of Eastern, Central and Western U. P. of India, in which 281 (46.22%) were male and 327 (53.78%) were female teachers. The schools taken in this study have been demarcated into the categories on the basis of their management, for instance, Christian/ Missionary schools are highly reputed and prestigious convents in terms of its progress, academic output and discipline. That becomes the reason for the pupils in these schools to pay high tuition fees and belong to well to do families with a high socio-cultural background. A.M.U. schools managed by

the world known Aligarh Muslim University are also the English Medium schools, where pupils in VI, IX and X are from high socio-economic strata and are admitted through all India based competitions.

Generally, the schools such as Government and Government Aided schools are the Hindi medium single sex/ co-ed schools run by Government directly or indirectly through aids, and are widely known among general public for their poor management by Government machineries. Since, the pupils in these schools come from the lower socio- economic strata of the society, the tuition fees in these schools are nominal, and such schools deliver poor output in terms of performance. The schools run by Hindu and Muslim trusts through local managements are termed as Hindu or Muslim managed schools, respectively. These schools can be seen as slithering somewhere in between humanistic Christian/ Missionaries and AMU schools on one hand, and custodially oriented Government and Government Aided schools on other hand.

4. Tools Used

4.1 Pupil Control Ideology Scale (PCI)

Pupil Control Ideology Scale designed by Khatoon and Munir (2009), was used to identify teachers control orientation in Indian schools. This scale consists of 20 items of Likert type about schools, teachers and pupils, designed to measure the pupil control ideology of educators. Each statement of the tool is scored on a 5-point, Likert type scale where 5 means strongly agree and 1 denotes strongly disagree for all the statements that were positive to custodial viewpoint. Item responses were coded so that high scores (maximum of 100) signal a custodial orientation and low scores (minimum of 20) a humanistic orientation, with a mean of 60. Thus, a score in the range of 71-100 signifies a custodial pupil control ideology, 51-70 signifies a moderate ideology, and a score range of 20-50 denotes a humanistic pupil control ideology. The reliability of the scale is 0.88 as reported by its authors and calculated by split-half method and corrected by Spearman Brown Profecy Formula. The inner consistency coefficient determined by the general Kuder-Richardson Formula is 0.91.

4.2 Teachers Occupational Stress Scale

This scale was developed by the investigators to measure the stress experienced by the teachers toward their occupation. The occupational stress scale consisted of 20 negatively worded items. The instrument uses a 5 – point Likert scale ranging from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). The teachers occupational stress score is calculated by adding the individual scores of all the items together where possible range can be between 20-100. Low score on the TOSS indicates low level of stress or high satisfaction toward teachers job, and high score on TOSS indicates high level of stress or low satisfaction toward teachers job. Teachers occupational stress levels are categorized into low (20-50), moderate (51-70) and more (71-100) levels of stress in accordance with average stress scores obtained. According to the investigators, this scale has a split-half reliability of 0.83, which when corrected by Spearman Brown Profecy Formula increased to 0.91. The inner consistency coefficient determined by the Cronbach alpha correlation is 0.92. Another consistency test of the scale is performed by item total correlations technique, item total score correlations are between the range of 0.44 – 0.78 of all items with the total test.

İn order to assess the correlation between pupil control ideology and occupational stress scores, Pearson Product Moment Technique is put to use. t-test is utilized for testing the difference between mean scores of pupil control ideology and gender, types of school and occupational stress. While, F-test is applied for determining the significant difference among the groups. For examining the combined effect of independent variables on dependent variable, the authors used multiple regression. Data analysis is performed on computer with SPSS 16 software package and the significance level is taken 0.05 and 0.01 for all statistical tests.

5. Results and Analysis

To understand the effects of gender, school type and occupational stress (independent variables) on teachers' pupil control ideology (dependent variable), step-wise multiple regression analysis was used. Regress results are shown in Table 1 (Part I and II). The prediction equation which contained all independent variables is found to be significant ($R = 0.49$, $R^2 = 0.24$, $F = 63.85$, $P<0.01$). Therefore, the dependent variable is related directly to these independent variables. The coefficient of multiple determinations in table 1 (Part I) indicated that these variables combined together accounted for 24% of the variability in teachers' pupil control ideology. Table 1 (Part II) lists detailed data on the statistical coefficients of the regression model. The standardized beta weights indicate that the relative contributions of these variables in predicting teachers PCI are– the gender contributes 9% (Beta = 0.09, t = 2.66, P< 0.01), school type contributes 4% (Beta = 0.04, t = 0.97, P >0.05), and occupational stress scores contribute 51% (Beta = 0.51, t = 12.63, P<0.01). Thus, occupational stress scores are the best predictor of teachers' PCI, gender stands second in order and school types comes last in sequence.

Table 1: Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis for predicting Pupil Control Ideology using Gender, School Type and Occupational Stress

Multiple Regression Part I

Criterion variable	Multiple R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Standard Error	df	F	P
Pupil Control Ideology	0.49	0.24	0.24	8.44	3, 604	63.85	<0.01

Multiple Regression Part II

S.No.	Predictor variables	B	Standard error	β	t	P
1	Gender	1.84	0.69	0.09	2.66	< 0.01
2	School Types	0.21	0.22	0.04	0.97	N.S.
3	Occupational Stress	0.32	0.03	0.51	12.63	< 0.01

As shown in table 2, data was analyzed to compare the pupil control ideology of male and female teachers. The result yields a non-significant gender difference between the mean scores of male and female teachers on the overall pupil control ideology scale (df= 606, t= 0.84). But, it is still seen that female teachers scored significantly higher (M= 62.98, SD= 9.60) than males (M= 62.31, SD= 9.75).

Table 2: Comparison of mean pupil control ideology scores on the basis of Gender

Gender	N	Mean score	SD	df	t	P
Male	281	62.31	9.75	606	0.84	N.S.
Female	327	62.98	9.60			

t-test is performed to determine whether there is any difference in teacher' pupil control ideology according to their school types (table 3). Results show that teachers' of Government schools have significantly higher mean PCI scores (M= 64.41, SD= 8.79) than those of other five groups. Teachers' of Government-Aided, Muslim Managed and Hindu Managed schools (M= 63.94, SD= 9.10; M= 63.33, SD= 8.53 & M= 63.30, SD= 8.82; respectively) have equal mean scores and have higher mean pupil control ideology scores than Christian/ Missionary and A.M.U. schools. Similarly, A.M.U. and Christian/ Missionary schools (M= 59.82, SD= 10.77 & M= 57.55, SD= 11.98) have significantly lower pupil control ideology scores than all the four groups of schools.

Table 3: Comparison of mean pupil control ideology scores on the basis of six groups of types of school

Types of school	N	Mean score	SD	t					
				(1)	**(2)**	**(3)**	**(4)**	**(5)**	**(6)**
Government **(1)**	138	64.41	8.79	x					
Government-Aided **(2)**	150	63.94	9.10	0.45	x				
Muslim Managed **(3)**	112	63.33	8.53	0.98	0.55	x			
Hindu Managed **(4)**	54	63.30	8.82	0.79	0.45	0.02	x		
Christian/ Missionary **(5)**	44	57.55	11.98	4.11**	3.80**	3.38**	2.73**	x	
A.M.U. **(6)**	110	59.82	10.77	3.70**	3.34**	2.70**	2.06*	1.14	x

*P< 0.05, **P< 0.01

Further, computation of the means for male and female sub-samples of each group of school types (table 4) displays that female teachers have more pupil control ideology score than the male counterparts in the Government, Government-Aided, Hindu Managed and A.M.U. Managed school groups. But, application of t-test indicates that there is a statistically significant gender difference only in the A.M.U. Managed school group (t = 2.11, P <0.05, df = 108).

Table 4: Gender-wise Comparison of the Pupil Control Ideology Scores of Different Types of School

Types of School	Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t
Government	Male	62	63.40	8.48	136	1.22
	Female	76	65.24	9.01		
Government-Aided	Male	107	63.86	9.64	148	0.17
	Female	43	64.14	7.67		
Muslim Managed	Male	26	64.00	9.71	110	0.45
	Female	86	63.13	8.19		
Hindu Managed	Male	16	62.12	8.42	52	0.63
	Female	38	63.79	9.04		
Christian/ Missionary	Male	12	61.33	13.15	42	1.29
	Female	32	56.12	11.40		
A.M.U.	Male	58	57.79	9.76	108	2.11[*]
	Female	52	62.08	11.48		

[*]$P<0.05$

In order to investigate if there is any relationship between the occupational stress levels of the secondary school teachers' and their pupil control ideology, the measure of Teachers Occupational Stress Scale was correlated with the Pupil Control Ideology Scale Score using Pearson Product Moment Correlation, and a significant positive relationship is found between occupational stress scores and pupil control ideology scores (r= 0.48). The positive direction of the correlation suggests that higher occupational stress is associated with higher levels of pupil control ideology, and vice versa. Further, t-test is applied to see that among which occupational stress groups of teachers' the difference exists. As shown in Table 5, teachers with Less stress have significantly lower PCI score (M= 59.44, SD= 10.88) than the other two groups. Similarly those teachers with Moderate stress have significantly lower PCI scores (M= 64.12, SD= 7.15) than More stress group. Further, teachers' with More stress group have significantly higher PCI scores than the other two groups (M= 71.01, SD= 4.69). These results indicate that higher pupil control ideology scores consistently accompany the increase in occupational stress.

Table 5: Comparison of mean pupil control ideology scores on the basis of three groups of occupational stress

Occupational stress groups	N	%	Mean score	SD	t		
					(1)	(2)	(3)
Less Stress (20-50) **(1)**	290	47.70	59.44	10.88	x		
Moderate (51-70) **(2)**	249	40.95	64.12	7.15	5.79[**]	x	
More Stress (71-100) **(3)**	69	11.35	71.01	4.69	8.64[**]	7.57[**]	x

[**]$P<0.01$

Moreover, the computation of the mean and SD for male and female sub samples of each occupational stress group (table 6) shows that female teachers' have more pupil control ideology score than their male colleagues in Less and Moderate stress levels of occupational stress groups. But, application of t-test points to no significant gender difference in less and more stress groups.

Table 6: Gender-wise Comparison of Pupil Control Ideology Scores of three Occupational Stress Groups of Teachers

Occupational Stress Groups	Group	N	%	Mean score	SD	df	t
Less Stress (20-50)	Male	111	18.26	57.98	11.72	288	1.81
	Female	179	29.44	60.35	10.25		
Moderate (51-70)	Male	129	21.22	63.02	6.07	247	2.53[*]
	Female	120	19.74	65.29	8.02		
More Stress (71-100)	Male	41	6.74	71.80	4.82	67	1.72
	Female	28	4.60	69.86	4.30		

[*]$P< 0.05$

6. Discussion

The variables studied by the investigators in the present study are gender, school types and occupational stress. The result pertaining to the combined influence of these three predictor variables revealed that the combination of gender and occupational stress predicted the pupil control ideology of teachers' (24%). Occupational stress

accounts to the greatest influence on their PCI (51%), followed by gender, while school types show no significant influence on PCI. Bas (2011) found that teachers' student control ideologies were significant predictors of their burnout levels and approximately 17% of the total variance for teachers' burnout was explained by their student control ideologies.

In contrast to the findings of previous studies citing gender related differences in pupil control ideology of teachers, the present study statistically prove no significant gender difference. But, the high mean PCI scores of both male and female teachers suggest that the role of the secondary school teachers can be characterized as custodial in nature and one that deal with discipline, coordination behavior. The gender based results obtained for PCI in this study is on the same line as that of Oguz and Kalkan , 2011; Kalkan, 1996; Sewell, 1991; Sparks & Lipka, 1992. Quite opposite to this, earlier studies reported gender related differences in PCI, showing males to be more custodial than females (Barfield & Burlingame, 1974; Richardson & Payne, 1988; Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1973).

Types of school management have greatly emerged as an influencing variable for PCI among teachers. For instance, mean PCI scores vary on a continuum of custodial (Government schools, M= 64.41) to humanistic (A.M.U. & Christian/ Missionary managed, M= 59.82 & 57.55 respectively) with Government-aided, Muslim and Hindu managed schools sliding in between (M= 63.94, 63.33 & 63.30). This disparity among different types of school can be attributed to the disparity of socio economic status, discipline and power in the hands of the management and administrative authorities, which indirectly compel the teachers' to adopt custodial ideologies in order to make their students' attentive and disciplined. Class discipline and student misbehavior has been noted as a main factor contributing to teacher burnout and discontent (Zeidner, 1988).

Schools are organizations in which knowledge is constantly reproduced and both teachers and students play an active role in the learning-teaching process. It does not matter how much a teacher is effective at teaching a subject, the teacher cannot force students to learn, if the class management and control is lacked, he or she could not be successful (Celep, 2002; Demirel, 2009). In this light, Owie (1984) revealed a significant correlation between pupil control ideology and perceived power to influence policy within the school system. As the degree of perceived power increased, Ss control ideology tended to become progressively more humanistic. Also, the analysis of variable- types of school, showed that female teachers of Government, Government-aided, Hindu and A.M.U. managed have more PCI scores and hence, are more custodial than males; while teachers' of only AM.U. managed schools are observed to be significantly different in their PCI. It is widely accepted that Christian/ Missionary schools in India are privately managed, high status English medium schools which attract the attention of students from high socio economic status families. Schools catering to children from families of high SES have teachers whose PCI is less custodial. This finding is corroborated by Gossen (1969) who found that teachers in low SES schools had a more custodial PCI than teachers' in middle or high SES schools. But, there was no significant difference between middle and high SES schools.

Teacher-student relationships are one of the factors that influence teachers' stress, and the stresses developed by teachers are reflected in their behavior towards students (Abidin & Kmetz, 1997). This study further finds a positive correlation between pupil control ideology and occupational stress (r= 0.48), which indicates that as occupational stress score increases, PCI of teachers' increases accordingly. As an increase in the total score on the teachers' control ideology scale represents a more custodial student control ideology, it may be stated that more the custodial teachers' ideology occurs, the more stress is observed. There is significant corresponding relationship seen among the three sub-groups of occupational stress and mean PCI scores (Less= 59.44, Moderate= 64.12, and More= 71.01). This is an indicative of custodial orientation with an increase of occupational stress, while decrease of occupational stress will result into a humanistic orientation among secondary school teachers'. Lunenburg & Mankowski (2000) found out a significant correlation between a high degree of school bureaucratization and custodialism in student control orientation and behavior. So custodialism in student control orientation is related to a high incidence of rules and regulations, hierarchical authority, centralization of control and impersonality.

Moreover, gender based analysis of three groups of teachers is that female teachers of less and moderate stress groups have more PCI scores and are generally more custodial than their male counterparts. The degree of stress which teachers experience is positively related to the degree which he/she perceives as a lack of control over a potentially threatening situation (Hock & Roger, 1996). Lewis (1999) is of the view that teacher stress arises from being unable to discipline pupils in the way they would prefer. Literature supports the evidence of a humanistic orientation associated with increased job satisfaction (Heckert, 1976), while the other reports the opposite relationship (Krohn, 1979).

The study concludes that occupational stress best predicts the pupil control ideology of secondary school teachers'. Further, it is revealed that male and female teachers' do not differ in their PCI. The study also finds that teachers in Government schools are more custodial than teachers in Government-aided, Muslim, Hindu, A.M.U. and Christian/ Missionary managed schools; while A.M.U and Christian/ Missionary managed school

teachers' appear to be the most humanistic of all the schools. Moreover, the result in this study shows that increase in pupil control ideology consistently accompanies with higher occupational stress, and a significant positive correlation is found between occupational stress and pupil control ideology of secondary school teachers' (r= 0.48). Most interestingly, females in the sub groups of types of schools (except females of Muslim and Christian/ Missionary schools) and occupational stress (except female teachers' of More stress group) show more PCI and indicate a custodial nature than their counterparts.

It is strongly recommended that there is a need to have teachers' with more humanistic approach to pupil control in a secondary classroom. In order to promote learning it is suggested that humanistic teachers' should monitor students' understanding by showing patience, encouraging students when they are confused, increasing wait time, and reinforcing the material with outward gestures and expressions. The teacher candidates who have supervisory control ideology can be helped to develop a more positive approach by giving them human relations skills training with the group guidance. In this context, it becomes the duty of Guidance and Psychological Counseling Programs of universities to organize seminars and workshops. From the early years of teacher training, communication with the pupils can be provided in a school atmosphere by having more observation and application-oriented courses.

Although the sample was large enough, but the generalizability of the findings of the present study is restricted because of the fact that this study is exploratory in nature; test was conducted in specific geographical locations of Eastern, Central and Western districts of Uttar Pradesh (India), and only the secondary school teachers' were included in this study. A replication of it with large and more representative sample of teachers' of primary, elementary, secondary and senior secondary from wider regions and with more rigorous design is likely to prove quite rewarding in shielding more light on pupil control ideology in relation to gender, school types and occupational stress.

Acknowledgement

References
Abidin, R. R., & Kmetz, C. A. (1997). *Teacher-student interactions as predicted by teaching stress and the perceived quality of the student-teacher relationship.* Research presented at The Annual Meeting of The National Association of School Psychologists, Anaheim, CA.

Agoglia, J. A. (1998). *Locus of control, pupil control ideology, occupational stress, and teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education*. DAI – A 59/02, 414.

Appleberry, J. B., & Hoy, W. K. (1970). Teacher-principal relationships in humanistic and custodial schools. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 39, 27-31.

Barfield, V., & Burlingame, M. (1974). The pupil control ideology of teachers in selected schools. Journal of Experimental Education, 42, 4, 6-11.

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

Brame, M. M. (2007). *Examining the empirical impact of teacher pupil control ideology on student outcomes: The classroom perspective*. A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the graduate school of the University of Louisville in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Department of Leadership, Foundations and Human Resource Education, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky.

Cadavid, V., & Lunenburg, F. C. (1991). Locus of control, pupil control ideology, and dimensions of teacher burnout. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, Chicago, IL, 3-7 April.

Celep, C. (2002). *Classroom management and discipline*. Memoir Publishing, Ankara.

Cicmanec, K. M. (2001). High school mathematics teachers: grading practice and pupil control ideology. *American Educational Research Association*. Seattle, W. A, April, 10-14, 2001.

Deibert, J. P., & Hoy, W. K. (1977). Custodial high school and self-actualization of students. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 2, 24-31.

Demirel, M. (2009). Implications of lifelong learning on educational institutions. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences,* 4(3), 199-211.

Gossen, H. A. (1969). An investigation of the relationship between socioeconomic status of elementary schools. Ph.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University.

Griepenstrop, G., & Miskel, C.. (1976). Changing the custodial socialization of teachers pupil control ideology. (ERIC NO: ED 127268).

Harris, K. R. (1984). *Teacher characteristics as related to five dimensions of teacher stress, sex and age*. Paper presented at the 68th Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 23-27).

Harris, K. R., Halpin, G., & Halpin, G. (1985). Teacher characteristics and stress. *Journal of Educational Research*, 78(6), 346-350.

Heckert, J. W. (1976). Pupil control ideology-pupil control behavior congruence and the job satisfaction of public school teachers (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1976). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 37, 6871A.

Hock & Roger (1996). Professional burnout among public school teachers. *Public Personnel Management,* 101, 167-189.

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

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

Hoy, W. K., & Henderson, J. E. (1983). Principal authencity, school climate and pupil control orientation. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research,* 29, 123-130.

Kalkan, M. (1996). Lise öğretmenlerinin öğrenci kontrol eğiliminin tükenmişlik ve çeşitli değişkenlerle ilişkisi. Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Samsun.

Khatoon, T., & Munir, S. (2011). Pupil control ideology of Indian school teachers. *Experiments in Education*, 39(1), 21-29.

Kottkamp, R. B., & Mulhern, J. A. (1987). Teacher expectancy motivation, open and closed climate and pupil control ideology in high school. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 20, 9-18.

Krohn, E. W. (1979). Perceived occupational structure and the pupil control ideology and job satisfaction of elementary and secondary school teachers (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1979). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 40, 2555A.

Lewis, R. (1999). Teachers coping with the stress of classroom discipline. *Social Psychology of Education,* 3(3), 155-171.

Lunenburg, F. C. (1983). Pupil control ideology and self-concept as a learner. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 8(3), 33-39.

Lunenburg, F. C. (1990). *Teacher pupil control ideology and behaviour as predictors of classroom environment: Public and Catholic School compared.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of American educational research association (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED. 322115.

Lunenburg, F. C. (1990a). *Educators' pupil control ideology as a predictor of educators' reactions to pupil disruptive behavior.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED321361)

Lunenburg, F. C., & Cadavid, V. (1992). Locus of control, pupil control ideology, and dimensions of teacher burnout. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 19, 13-24.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Mankowski, S. A. (2000).*Bureaucracy and pupil control orientation and behavior in urban secondary schools*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA (24-28 April), ED No 445 154.

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

Lunnenberg, F. C. (2000). *School bureaucratization, pupil control ideology, and pupil control behavior.* American Educational Research Association. New Orleans: LA.

Munir, S., & Khatoon, T. (2008). The pupil control ideology of elementary, secondary and senior secondary school teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education and Research*, 3(2), 1-8.

Oguz, E., & Kalkan, M. (2011). Examining teacher candidates' attitudes towards teaching profession and pupil control ideology. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(3), 903-917.

Oppenlander, L. (1970). Classroom interaction and pupil affect. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.govIPDFSIED038342.pdf

Owie, I. (1984). Perceived power and pupil control ideology among in-service secondary school teachers. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 11(3), 170-172.

Richardson, A. G., & Payne, M. A. (1988). The pupil control ideology of elementary and secondary school teachers: some caribbean findings. *Education*, 108 (3), 409-412.

Rideout, G. W. & Morton, L. L. (2010). Pre-service teachers' beliefs and pupil control ideology: The custodializing practicum. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48, 64-88.

Sari, M. (2011). Exploring gender roles' effects of Turkish women teachers on their teaching practices. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 30.

Sewell, K. C. (1991). A study of the effects of personality type, socialization pressure and contextual factors on the pupil control factors on the pupil control ideology of students teachers. The State University, Unpublished doctoral thesis, Rutgers.

Silberman, C. E. (1970). *Crisis in the classroom*. New York: Random House.

Sparks, R., & Lipka, R. P. (1992). Characteristics of master teachers: personality factors self-concept, locus of control and pupil control ideology. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education,* 5 (3), 303-311.

Uskiewicz, V. D. & Willower, D. J. (1973). Perceived pupil control ideology consensus and teacher job satisfaction. *Urban Education*, 8 (3), 231-238.

Willover, D. J. ,Heckert, J. & Hoy, W. K. (1977). *Teacher pupil control ideology-behavior congruenge and job satisfaction.* Yavuzer, N. (1990). Etkin öğretmen eğitimi uygulamasının öğretmenlerin tutumlarına etkisi. İstanbul Üniversitesi, Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, İstanbul.

Willower, D. J., Eidell, T. L., & Hoy, W. K. (1967). *The school and pupil control.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.

Willower, D. J., Eidell, T. L., & Hoy, W. K. (1973). *The school and pupil control Ideology.* [Penn State Studies Monograph No 24]. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.

Zeidner, M. (1988). The relative severity of common classroom management strategies: The student's perspective. *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 58, 69-77.

CALL FOR PAPERS

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. There's no deadline for submission. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** http://www.iiste.org/Journals/

The IISTE editorial team promises to the review and publish all the qualified submissions in a **fast** manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar