

Locus of Control as Correlate of Decision Making among Adolescents

Nelofar Bashir¹, Syed Najmah Jameel² and Shawkat Ahmad Shah³

^{1,2}Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, University of Kashmir

³Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Kashmir

E-mail: ¹nelofarbashirpsy@gmail.com, ²syednajmah@gmail.com, ³Showkatpsy_rediffmail.com

Abstract—The present study is carried out to study relationship between locus of control and decision making among adolescents. The objectives of the study are to assess locus of control and decision making among adolescents, to study the relationship of locus of control with decision making among adolescents. Besides, this study is also aimed to compare adolescents in locus of control and decision making with respect to domicile and schooling. The sample of the present study comprises of 437 adolescents. The tools used to collect data were decision making Questionnaire by French, west, Elander, and Wilding (1993) and Locus of Control scale prepared by Sanjay Vohra (1992). The collected data was analyzed by various statistical techniques like descriptive analysis, correlational analysis, and comparative analysis. The result of correlational analysis revealed that individual control is positively and significantly correlated with thoroughness, control, hesitancy and Instinctiveness. Further chance control was found positively and significantly correlated with hesitancy. Whereas powerful others was significantly and negatively correlated with thoroughness and optimizing. The result of comparative analysis revealed that control and powerful others was found to be higher in rural adolescents than urban adolescent. However Instinctiveness was found to be higher in urban adolescents than rural adolescents. While comparing adolescents studying in private and government schools it was found that hesitancy, optimizing, Instinctiveness and individual control was found significantly higher in adolescents studying in private schools than adolescents studying in government schools.

Keywords: Adolescents, Decision making, Locus of control.

1. INTRODUCTION

Adolescence is a developmental stage characterized by abrupt physical, cognitive, social and emotional changes. For the majority of adolescents, it is a stage noticed by blistering physiological changes, increased independence, a change in family relationships that is more interdependent, prioritizing peer affiliations, initiation of intimate partner relationships, identity formation, increased apprehension of morals and values, and cognitive and emotional development. The locus of control theory, which originated from Julian Rotter, postulates that “every human being has a “place”- the locus where he/she feels the control of his/her life rests, this place or locus of control can either be internal or external and it is this position that creatively determines how much “in control” individual

feels about his/her life” [1]. There are two types of locus of control, internal (inside) and external (outside). Internal locus of control is the belief that you are in charge of the events that occur in life while external locus of control is the belief that chance, fate, or outside forces determine life events [2]. Adolescence is a developmental stage during which individuals are prone to make bad decisions as it is a part of this very period [3]. The efficiency of the decision-making process depends upon the decision maker, that is why the method individuals follow on decision-making process and their personality traits are important [4]. Research study have highlighted that some individuals believe that the control related to the behaviour of decision-making are on them, some others believe that this control is determined by external factors. Accordingly, type of the locus of control individuals have in their decision-making behaviour is an important factor. Internal audit-oriented individuals are aware of the fact that they are efficient on their own decisions, and they take the responsibility for their behaviour’s. External audit-oriented individuals believe that luck or other people control their life, and therefore are possible not to make a decision [5-6].

2. OBJECTIVES

- To assess locus of control and decision making among adolescents.
- To study the relationship of locus of control with decision making among adolescents.
- To study nature of difference in locus of control and decision making among adolescents with respect to domicile and schooling.

3. METHODOLOGY

Research Instruments: Following research instruments were used for the data collection

- **Decision Making Questionnaire:** Decision Making Questionnaire [7] was used to assess decision making. It is 21 item questionnaire having seven dimensions as control, thoroughness, instinctiveness, social resistance, hesitancy, optimizing, principled and Instinctiveness.
- **Locus of Control Scale:** Locus of Control Scale developed by Sanjay Vohra was used to assess locus of control. It is a modified version of Levenson’s locus of control scale [8]consisting of 24 statements, 8 items in each dimension i.e Powerful others, Chance Control and Individual control.

Sample Description: Purposive Sampling technique was used to collect data from the adolescents of Kashmir division of J&K. with following Inclusion criteria:

- Age range of 16-19 years.
- Free from any disorder or deformity.

Must be enrolled in any educational institutions of Kashmir division of J&K.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of dimensions of decision making among adolescents (N=437).

Variables	Mean	5%TM	ΔMean	SD	SE	Skewness	Kurtosis
Thoroughness	3.97	3.98	-0.01	1.05	.05	-.23	-.422
Control	3.67	3.67	0	.87	.04	-.049	.16
Hesitancy	3.98	4.00	-0.02	1.06	.05	-.22	-.492
Social resistance	3.30	3.29	-0.01	1.02	.04	.05	-.25
Optimizing	3.73	3.75	0	1.19	.05	-.21	-.29
Principled	3.38	3.38	0	1.13	.05	.10	-.24
Instinctiveness	3.68	3.70	-0.02	1.23	.05	-.156	-.601

SD (Standard deviation); SE (Standard error); TM (Trimmed Mean).

Applying the criteria of Garson [9] the sample distribution of the present study is normal as no skewness and kurtosis value falls beyond the Garson’s range of -2.00 to +2.00. Besides, the ΔMean (difference between mean and 5% trimmed mean) is not beyond the criteria of >0.20 suggested by Pallant [10]. The values of standard deviation and standard error are also very small as compared to mean, thereby further improving the scope of data for subsequent analysis.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of dimensions of locus of control (N=437)

Variables	Mean	5%TM	ΔMean	SD	SE	Skewness	Kurtosis
Individual control	3.64	3.65	-0.01	.54	.02	-.41	-.05
Chance control	3.27	3.28	-0.01	.62	.02	-.16	-.10
Powerful others	2.92	2.91	0.01	.64	.03	.15	-.102

SD (Standard deviation); SE (Standard error); TM (Trimmed Mean).

Applying the criteria of Garson [9], the sample distribution of the present study is normal as no skewness and kurtosis value falls beyond the Garson’s range of -2.00 to +2.00. Besides, the ΔMean (difference between mean and 5% trimmed mean) is not beyond the criteria of >0.20 suggested by Pallant [10]. The values of standard deviation and standard error are also very small as compared to mean, thereby further improving the scope of data for subsequent analysis.

Table 3: Range of scores within different levels of dimensions of Decision making.

Dimensions	Mean	SD	LL-UL	Low	Average	High
Thoroughness	3.97	1.05	2.92-5.02	≤2.92	2.92-5.02	>5.02
Control	3.67	.87	2.8-4.54	≤2.8	2.8-4.54	>4.54
Hesitancy	3.98	1.06	2.92-5.04	≤2.92	2.92-5.04	>5.04
Social resistance	3.30	1.02	2.28-4.32	≤2.28	2.28-4.32	>4.32
Optimism	3.73	1.19	2.54-4.92	≤2.54	2.54-4.92	>4.92
Principled	3.38	1.13	2.25-4.51	≤2.25	2.25-4.51	>4.51
Instinctiveness	3.68	1.23	2.45-4.91	≤2.45	2.45-4.91	>4.91

LL= lower limit; UL= upper limit; SD= standard deviation

Table 4: Range of scores within different levels of dimensions of locus of control.

Dimensions	Mean	SD	LL-UL	Low	Average	High
Individualcontrol	3.64	.54	3.09-4.18	≤3.09	3.09-4.18	>4.18
Chance control	3.27	.62	2.65-3.89	≤2.65	2.65-3.89	>3.89
Powerful others	2.92	.64	2.28-3.56	≤2.28	2.28-3.56	>3.56

LL= lower limit; UL= upper limit; SD= standard deviation

Table 5: Frequency distribution of dimensions of Decision making.

Dimensions	Levels		
	Low f %	Average f %	High f %
Thoroughness	77 17.62	305 69.79	55 12.58
Control	73 16.70	291 66.59	73 16.70
Hesitancy	67 15.33	305 69.79	65 14.87
Social resistance	57 13.04	288 65.90	92 21.05
Optimizing	85 19.45	261 59.72	91 20.82
Principled	75 17.16	312 71.39	50 11.44
Instinctiveness	59 13.05	288 65.90	90 20.59

The above table indicates that 17.62% of adolescents were found to have low levels of thoroughness, 69.79% to have average level and 12.58% of adolescents have high level of thoroughness.

16.70% of adolescents were found to have low levels of control, 66.59% to have average level and 16.70% of adolescents have high level of control.

15.33% of adolescents were found to have low levels of hesitancy, 69.79% to have average level and 14.87% of adolescents have high level of hesitancy.

13.04% of adolescents were found to have low levels of social resistance, 65.90% to have average level and 21.05% of adolescents have high level of social resistance.

19.45% of adolescents were found to have low levels of optimizing, 59.72% to have average level and 20.82% of adolescents have high level of optimizing.

17.16% of adolescents were found to have low levels of principled, 71.39% to have average level and 11.44% of adolescents have high level of principled.

13.05% of adolescents were found to have low levels of Instinctiveness, 65.90% to have average level and 20.59% of adolescents have high level of Instinctiveness.

Table 6: Frequency distribution of dimensions of Locus of control.

Dimensions	Levels		
	Low f %	Average f %	High f %
Individual control	68 15.56	294 67.27	75 17.16
Chance control	76 17.39	302 69.10	59 13.50
Powerful others	77 17.62	289 66.13	71 16.24

The above table indicates that 15.56% of adolescents were found to have low level of individual control, 67.27% to have average level and 17.16% of adolescents have high level of individual control.

17.39% adolescents were found to have low level of chance control, 69.10% to have average level and 13.50% adolescents have high level of chance control.

17.62% adolescents were found to have low level of powerful others, 66.13% to have average level and 16.24% of adolescents to high level of powerful others.

Table 7: Summary of Pearson Correlations of dimensions of locus of control with dimensions of decision making

Variables	Decision making
Thoroughness	control .193**
Hesitancy	resistance .118**
Optimising	Principled .147**
Instinctiveness	Instinctiveness .005
Individual control	.070
Chance control	.013
Powerful others	.165**
	-.072
	-.032
	.100*
	.069
	-.007
	-.054
	.036
	-.167**
	.002
	-.028
	.056
	-.107*
	-.015
	-.019

**p ≤ 0.01 level. * p ≤ 0.05 level

The results presented in above table reveals that individual control is positively and significantly correlated with thoroughness (r=.193, p=.001), control (r=.118, p=.01) hesitancy (r=.147, p=.002) and Instinctiveness (r=.165, p=.001). Further chance control was positively and significantly correlated with hesitancy (r=.100, p=.03). Where as powerful others was significantly and negatively correlated with thoroughness (r=-.167, p=.001), and optimizing (r= -.107, p= .02). All other correlation coefficients were insignificant.

Table 8: Mean difference in dimensions of decision making in adolescents with respect to their domicile.

Variable	Domicile	N	M	SD	Df	t-value
Thoroughness	Rural	263	3.96	1.01	435	-0.030 NS
	Urban	174	3.97	1.09		
Control	Rural	263	3.73	.84	435	2.011*
	Urban	174	3.56	.90		
Hesitancy	Rural	263	3.91	1.11	435	1.740 NS
	Urban	174	4.09	.96		
Social resistance	Rural	263	3.28	1.00	435	-.530 NS
	Urban	174	3.33	1.05		
Optimizing	Rural	263	3.64	1.21	435	1.943 NS
	Urban	174	3.86	1.14		
Principled	Rural	263	3.35	1.16	435	-.705 NS
	Urban	174	3.43	1.09		
Instinctiveness	Rural	263	3.55	1.21	435	2.771**
	Urban	174	3.88	1.25		

NS= Not Significant

The result of the above table revealed that there is significant mean difference between rural and urban adolescents in control (t=2.01, p=.04) and instinctiveness (t=2.77, p=.006). Control was found to be higher in rural adolescents (M=3.73,SD=.84) than urban adolescents (M=3.56, SD=.90). However instinctiveness was found to be higher in urban adolescents (M=3.88,SD=1.25) than rural adolescents (M=3.55,SD=1.21)

Table 9: Mean difference in dimensions of locus of control in adolescents with respect to their domicile.

Variable	Domicile	N	M	SD	Df	t-value
Individual control	Rural	263	3.65	.56	435	.714 NS
	Urban	174	3.61	.51		
Chance control	Rural	263	3.29	.60	435	.799 NS
	Urban	174	3.24	.64		
Powerful others	Rural	263	2.99	.63	435	2.915**
	Urban	174	2.81	.64		

NS= Not Significant

The result of the above table revealed that there is significant mean difference between rural and urban adolescents in powerful others (t=2.91, p=.004). Powerful others was found to be higher in rural adolescents (M=2.99, SD=.63) than urban adolescents (M=2.81, SD=.64).

Table 10: Mean difference in dimensions of decision making in adolescents with respect to their schooling.

Variable	Schooling	N	M	SD	Df	t-value
Thoroughness	Government	275	3.98	1.05	435	.403 NS
	Private	162	3.94	1.05		
Control	Government	275	3.75	.86	435	2.493*
	Private	162	3.53	.86		
Hesitancy	Government	275	3.90	1.08	435	2.160*
	Private	162	4.13	1.00		
Social resistance	Government	275	3.33	1.02	435	.849 NS
	Private	162	3.24	1.03		
Optimizing	Government	275	3.60	1.20	435	2.970**
	Private	162	3.95	1.12		
Principled	Government	275	3.39	1.11	435	.100 NS
	Private	162	3.37	1.18		
Instinctiveness	Government	275	3.56	1.26	435	2.830**
	Private	162	3.90	1.15		

The results of the analyses as presented in above table indicate that there is significant mean difference between adolescents of private and government school in control (t=2.49, p=.01), optimizing (t=2.97, p=.003) and Instinctiveness (t=2.83, p=.005). Hesitancy, optimizing and Instinctiveness was found significantly higher in adolescents studying in private schools (M=4.13, SD=1.00, M=3.95, SD=1.12, M=3.90, SD=1.15) respectively than adolescents studying in government schools (M=3.90, SD=1.08, M=3.60, SD=1.20, M=3.56, SD=1.26) respectively.

Table 11: Mean difference in dimensions of locus of control in adolescents with respect to their schooling.

Variable	School	N	M	SD	Df	t-value
Individual control	Government	275	3.59	.57	435	2.165*
	Private	162	3.71	.49		
Chance	Government	275	3.25	.61	435	-.838 NS

control	Private	162	3.31	.63	435	-.071 NS
Powerful others	Government	275	2.91	.60		
	Private	162	2.92	.70		

NS= Not Significant

The results of the analyses as presented in above table indicate that there is significant mean difference between adolescents of private and government school in individual control (t=2.16, p=.03). Individual control was found to be higher in adolescents studying in private schools (M=3.71, SD=.49) than adolescents studying in government schools (M=3.59, SD=.57).

4. CONCLUSION

- The result of correlational analysis revealed that individual control is positively and significantly correlated with thoroughness, control, hesitancy and Instinctiveness. Further chance control was found positively and significantly correlated with hesitancy. Whereas powerful others was significantly and negatively correlated with thoroughness and optimizing.
- The result of comparative analysis revealed that control and powerful others was found to be higher in rural adolescents than urban adolescent. However Instinctiveness was found to be higher in urban adolescents than rural adolescents.

While comparing adolescents studying in private and government schools it was found that hesitancy, optimizing, Instinctiveness and individual control was found significantly higher in adolescents studying in private schools than adolescents studying in government schools.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kabamba, C The locus of control theory. Retrieved from <http://ezinearticles.com/?The-Locus-of-Control-Theory&id=2762525>.2009.
- [2] Northouse, P. G. *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 2013.
- [3] Lowe-Thompson, Brittany J. "Teens and Risky Sexual Behavior: What School Counselors Need to Know." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin--Stout, 2011.
- [4] Shiloh, S., Koren, S., & Zakay, D. Individual differences in compensatory decision-making style and need for closure as correlates of subjective decision complexity and difficulty. *Personality and individual differences*, 2001. 30(4), 699-710.
- [5] Gordon, C. P. Adolescent decision making: A broadly based theory and its application to the prevention of early pregnancy. *Adolescence*, 1996 31(123), 561.
- [6] Kulas, H. Locus of control in adolescence: A longitudinal study. *Adolescence*, 1996. 31(123), 721.
- [7] French, D. J., West, R. J., Elander, J., & Wilding, J. M. Decision-making style, driving style, and self-reported involvement in road traffic accidents. *Ergonomics*, 1993. 36(6), 627-644.

-
- [8] Levenson, H .Differentiating among internality, powerful others and chance. Academic press 1981.
 - [9] Garson, D. (2009). Testing of assumptions, Retrieved Dec. 2018, from <http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/assumpt.html>.
 - [10] Pallant, J. (2007). SPSS survival manual: a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows (version 15)/Julie Pallant. Allen &Unwin.