

# EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCUS OF CONTROL AND SOCIAL CAPITAL LEVELS OF CIVIL SERVANTS IN TERMS OF SOME VARIANCES

**Mehmet Bilgin**  
**Abdullah Işıklar**  
**Mehtap Bilgin**

## ABSTRACT

The aim of this research is to examine civil servants' locus of control and levels of social capital in terms of certain variables. The research sample is consisted of totally 654 civil servants—425 (65%) of them are male and 229 (35%) them are female—who work at public institutions in Kayseri province. The Locus of Control Scale and the Social Capital Scale was used as instruments in the research. As a result of the data analysis, a difference was found between civil servants' locus of control, participation in local committee, neighborhood relations, and sense of belonging to somewhere, tolerance for diversity, membership of non-governmental organizations, trust-human, trust-environment, and social representation according to their terms of employment at their institutions. No difference was found between their initiatives on social topics according to their terms of employment at their institutions. In addition, a difference was found between civil servants' locus of control, participation in local committee, neighborhood relations, sense of belonging to somewhere, tolerance for diversity, membership of non-governmental organizations, trust-human, trust-environment, and initiative on social topics according to their age. No difference was found between civil servants' locus of control and social representation according to their age. A significant relationship was also found between civil servants' locus of control, participation in local committee, neighborhood relations, sense of belonging to somewhere, tolerance for diversity, membership of non-governmental organizations, trust-human, trust-environment according to their status of union membership. No significant difference was found between civil servants' locus of control and initiative on social topics according to their status of union membership. In the sub dimension of locus of control scale and social income scale there was a negative and significant relationship found in local committee, neighborhood relations, and sense of belonging to somewhere, tolerance for diversity, membership of non-governmental organizations, trust-human, trust-environment, and social representation. It is thought that the acquired findings will shed light on social capital studies.

**Keywords:** Social capital, control, civil servant

## INTRODUCTION

Individuals who are the major part of the working life could affect the management process and working organizations importantly by their personal characteristics. Basically different personality type is derived from individuals' different reactions for the coincided issues (Bernardi, 2001). Individuals that think reasons of the issues are under controll of them reach to success; individuals that consider the reasons of the issues on external factors such as; chance, destiny will fail to reach success (Zullig, Pun and Huebner, 2007). Locus of control notion carries value in terms of consisting a society that is with individuals' managing theirselves, being in the conscious of role of the social processes and responsibility (Tümekaya, 2000). Locus of control, according to personality characteristics, is defined as structure of a personality type that trust himself and others less and be passive, resists to the begative effects that are derived from the environment tha individual has (Branholm, Fugl-meyer and Frölunde, 1998; Şeşen, 2010).

Individuals have different characteristic types depend on whether they have inner and external locus of control or not.

Individuals with inner control; are determined to show much more resistance towards negative effects, they are being more effective in social issues, strongly react to the restriction of their personal freedom, perceive themselves more effective, be reliable and independent (Basım and Şeşen, 2006), can burden much more personal responsibility (Şengüder, 2006,) they can make well connection with their environment, they have free behaving types (Yeşilyaprak, 2004), they can deal with environment well (Yaşar, 2006) and they can make good connection with being social (Çoban and Hamamcı, 2006).

Individuals with external locus of control; have the belief that they do not have control on the environment, they have hopelessness emotions (Basım and Şeşen, 2006). They trust other people less and avoid from taking risks (Çoban and Hamamcı, 2006), letting the thing happen in their way (Yesilyaprak, 2004) and in the friendship relations they are being more anxious, passive and suspicious (Ulutaş, 1999; Aydınay, 1996).

Individuals that are with inner control focussed in both professional and social life have high motivation, successful to overcome the stress and their loyalty to the work is high. This situation takes the individual to the success especially the ones that are with inner locus of control in their working and social life (Çetin, 2011; Şengüder, 2006; Yaşar, 2006).

To be successful people see the working environment that will make them happy and the colleagues that will show respect and like them and consider all of these notions inevitable. This kind of integration such as working environment and colleagues are important factors for workers working and social life (Altay, 2007). Workers need to connection and collaboration, support and trust, belonging emotion, fairness and honoring. These are considered as social capital. Social capital are the communities that are the connections workers make with each other and show activity based on collaboration (Cohen and Prusak, 2001; Van der Gaag, 2005). Social capital; is a social content based notion that aims put forward the countries' economical activities and social life's activities forefront (Özdemir, 2008). Social capital is defined as coordinated events (Putnam, Leonardi and Nanetti, 1993) trust that will able to increase the social activity (Anthias and Cederberg 2009; Nooteboom, 2007), organizations that are consisted by norm and social networks (Fukuyama 1995; King and Furrow 2004) and total of the social relations (Kawachi Kennedy, Lochner and Prothrow-Stith 1997).

Trust which is one of the most important notions of social capital is held as the mandatory provision of social capital and the beginning point (Johnston and Soroka, 2001). Thanks to this, trust have lower the duty of transaction cost between organization, providing collaboration among organization members, creating volunteering for special attitudes, over developed role attitudes, making easier obeying the organizational rules and lowering the conflicts (Cohen and Prusak, 2001; Boschma, 2005). Organizations that the people trust each other, identified with each other and depend on each other with strong social connections and this way leads to healthier structuring (Özcan, 2011) and more productivity is expected (Ahuja, 2000). When people feel being trusted their motivation increases, work with enthusiasm and excitement (Maurer and Ebers, 2006; Barchan, 2000).

People can make easier the works that they can do or not with the need of making big effort by themselves through making mutual relations. These relation Networks firstly connect families to each other and characterize neighbors, school, friendships or vocational unities (Kapu, 2008). These communication network that they make will be their social capital savings. Existence of social capital letting people successful, happy and healthy on individual linear; it also consists societies that are with reliable, healthy, cultured and well managed on social linear (Castle, 2002).

Quantity of the acquired social capital effectively depend on social networks' size. In the subject of putting the non governmental organizations or society on the relations level together, existence of organizations with high participations effect the social capital level (Dasgupta and Serageldin 1999; Field, 2006). High amount of participation of the community

means, in that society social capital amount will be much (Şan, 2007). Citizens' participations to the country and local administration, coming together for economical or political unity are the specificative thing for that society's social capital level. (Tüysüz, 2011). Creating of an effective political system and develeompent of it and in the development of a continuous economic prosperity social capital grabs attention (Aydemir, 2011).

They determined that social capital has a permanent effect on every part of human's life and depend on; decrease in the crime rates (Putnam, 1995), state's more productive working (Knack ve Keefer 1997), in lowering of corruptions (Fukuyama, 2000), costs of transactions depend on reliability (Coleman 1998), increasing of success in education (Wilkinson 1996), regulation of income distribution (Whiteley 2000), fastening of the economical expanding `Temple and Johnson 1998` all of these have positive effects. At the same time social capital help to find beter working opportunities (Granovetter, 1995), early promote (Burt, 1997), making collaborative working easier (Bolino, Turnley and Bloodgood, 2002; Schuller, 2000).), helping each other in the organization and changing of inner resources (Field, 2008), creating of intellectual capital and spreading of information in the organization (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998) and increasing of organizational flexibility (Leana and Van Buren, 1999).

Experiencing of the corruption of social unity and trust areas in the society is experienced the same in the organization level and this situation effeects working environment, productivity and decisions (Smith, 1998). Relationships that is seen as reliability and collaboration in the organizations can be power and used for giving service to the profit environments (Hardy, Phillips and Lawrence, 1998). When the power imbalances are specific especially in the structure of social relations, economical utilities which can be acquired thanks to social capital there will be decrease or only one specific group takes opportunity at the risk of whole country's economical passivity (Lin, 2005). A decrease in the non governmental organization foundation or participation, undervelepoling of communication networks, social and economical inequality will lead to national or regional backwardness and it makes the social capital facility difficult. (Tüysüz, 2011; Özcan, 2011; Demirhan and Karagül, 2001).

To have an effective utility from social capital first there should be a nice analysis of effectivity conditions of human capital and social capital that is evaluated as the level of working person's knowledge and skill (Karagül and Masca 2005) . It is because in a society where there is no social capital and underdeveloping of social responsibility human capital can not be used for the good of individual or social profit it can be used to the detriment of them. In the light of these studies, it is thought that relationship of locus control of the civil servants and social capital levels are needed to be examined and it is important for working life, social development and change.

## **METHOD**

Population of this study which was done in accordance with relational scanning model is consisted of civil servants who work in Kayseri. Sample of the research is consisted of 425 male (65%), 229 female (35%) totally 654 civil sevants that were determined with random sampling method.

### **Data Collecting Tools**

**1-Personal Information Form:** Personal Information Forms was used to gather information about workers' personal charactersitics that were included in research and the resource scanning was used, expert thoughts was asked and also it was consisted of questions depend on independent variances related to examination subject. Personal Information For, which was developed by researchers, used in accordance with the independent variances that are suitable for the resarch and suitable for the aim of the study.

### **2-Rotter Inner-Outer Locus of Control Scale**

Locus of Control Scale is a forced-choice survey that is consisted of 29 articles and developed by Rotter (1966) to measure the genereal expectations of the differences of perceptions that are determined with talent, chance and destiny. 6 of these articles are consisted of filling, 23 of them consisted of preferred statements that are belonged to inner and outer

beliefs. In this scale the highest point is 23, the lowest point is 0. Each article included two each choice in the type of forced answering. For example (2.a), unhappinesses of the people are somehow depended on mischances. (2.b) mischances of the people are the result of their mistakes (Dağ, 1991). In the scale while 23 article are taken into account 6 articles are not taken into account for it is used to hide the aim of the scale that is as a filling substance (Filling substances: 1,8,14,19,24,27). Also while (2,6,7,9,16,17,18,20,21,23,25,29) articles' (a) choices taking 1 point (3,4,5,10,11,12,13,15,22,26,28) articles' (b) choices takes 1. Being high of the acquired points indicates to the outer locus of control's belief, and being low indicates that it has the belief of inner locus of control (Savaşır and Şahin, 1997). In Turkey DOÖ's reliability and validity study was done by İhsan Dağ (1991). Reliability validity studies that are done on the university students the test-repeatability reliability coefficient number was found .83, Cronbach Alpha inner consistency coefficient was .70 and the reliability coefficient number that was calculated by Kuder-Richardson 20 formula was found .68 (Dağ, 1991). Scale is also suitable for the group application about individual's own answering. There is no time limitation for the application.

**3- Social Capital Scale:** Validity and reliability study of the Social Capital Scale for the Turkish society which was developed by Onyx and Bullen (2000), and applied by Ardahan (2012). When an explanatory factor analysis was used to the Social Capital Scale that was consisted of 34 articles, articles were grouped in 12 factor and six articles were omitted due to different reasons and rest 28 articles were subjected to explanatory factor analysis again after varimax rotation done factors were gathered in totally nine sub dimensions and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sampling Sufficiency Measuring was found 0.687, Bartlett Globularity test was found as  $p < 0.05$ . Sub dimensions of the Scale "**Participation to the Local Committee**" article numbers; 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7, "**Neighborhood Relationship**", article numbers; 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22. "**Belonging to somewhere**", article numbers; 25, 26, 27 and 28. "**Tolerance to the Dissimilitude**", article numbers; 23 and 24. "**NGO Membership**", article numbers; 3 and 4. "**Trust Human**", article numbers; 14, 15 and 17. "**Trust Environment**", article numbers; 13 and 16. "**Initiative on Social Issues**", article numbers; 9, 10 and 11. "**Social Representation**", article numbers; 8 and 12. New form of the Scale and Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was found as 0.711. This value shows that Scale is statistically at enough reliability. When these findings and results are considered it is possible to be said that it is a reliable scale for the Turkish population.

#### Analysis of the Datum

Datum that was acquired in the research to see the relationship of the variances with each other descriptive statistics, t test and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient techniques used for the analysis.

#### FINDINGS

Table 9. Test results related that if there is a difference or not on the locus of control and social capital levels according to working durations of civil servants' institutions.

	<b>Working Duration</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Ss</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>P</b>
<b>Locus of Control</b>	0-10 years	291	35,33	4,16	-6,470	<b>,001*</b>
	Over 11 years	363	38,00	5,98		
<b>Participation to Local Committee</b>	0-10 years	291	11,54	7,39	-1,077	<b>,000*</b>
	Over 11 years	363	12,17	7,38		
<b>Neighborhood Relationships</b>	0-10 years	291	11,34	7,39	-1,042	<b>,000*</b>

	Over 11 years	363	12,47	7,38		
<b>Belonging to somewhere</b>	0-10 years	291	9,57	5,27	-1,175	<b>,001*</b>
	Over 11 years	363	10,06	5,32		
<b>Tolerance to Dissimilitude</b>	0-10 years	291	5,06	1,61	-,786	<b>,000*</b>
	Over 11 years	363	6,06	1,59		
<b>NGO Membership</b>	0-10 years	291	6,16	1,61	-,761	<b>,000*</b>
	Over 11 years	363	6,76	1,59		
<b>Trust Human</b>	0-10 years	291	7,68	3,30	-3,434	<b>,000*</b>
	Over 11 years	363	7,95	3,30		
<b>Trust Environment</b>	0-10 years	291	6,11	1,61	-1,033	<b>,000*</b>
	Over 11 years	363	6,57	1,59		
<b>Initiative in the Social Issues</b>	0-10 years	291	9,01	2,47	-,586	,831
	Over 11 years	363	9,63	2,46		
<b>Social Representation</b>	0-10 years	291	5,95	2,10	-,213	<b>,000*</b>
	Over 11 years	363	6,13	1,99		

When civil servants' locus of control points were examined according to their working durations, people whose working duration was 0-10 years their locus of control arithmetical average was ( $X = 35,33$ ), ones with 11 years and over working duration their arithmetical average was found ( $X = 38,00$ ). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at ( $t = -6,470$   $p < .005$ ) level.

When civil servants' participation to the local committee points were examined according to their working durations, people whose working duration was 0-10 years their participation to the local committee arithmetical average was ( $X = 11,54$ ), ones with 11 years and over working duration their arithmetical average was found. ( $X = 12,17$ ). Between averages there was a meaningful difference at ( $t = -1,077$   $p < .005$ ) level.

When civil servants' neighborhood relationships points were examined according to their working durations, people whose working durations in the institutions 0-10 years their neighborhood arithmetical average was ( $X = 11,34$ ), ones with 11 years and over working duration their arithmetical average was found ( $X = 12,47$ ). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at ( $t = -1,077$   $p < .005$ ) level.

When civil servants' belonging to somewhere points were examined according to their working durations, people whose working durations in the institutions 0-10 years their belonging to somewhere arithmetical average was ( $X = 9,57$ ), ones with 11 years and over working duration their arithmetical average was found ( $X = 10,06$ ), between averages there was a meaningful difference found at ( $t = -1,175$   $p < .005$ ) level.

When civil servants' tolerance to dissimilitude points were examined according to their working durations, people whose working durations in the institutions 0-10 years their tolerance to dissimilitude arithmetical average was (X =5,06), ones with 11 years and over working duration their arithmetical average was found (X =6,06), Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -,786 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' tolerance to NGO membership points were examined according to their working durations, people whose working durations in the institutions 0-10 years their NGO membership arithmetical average was (X =6,16), ones with 11 years and over working duration their arithmetical average was found (X =6,76) bulunmuştur, between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -,761 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' trust human points were examined according to their working durations, people whose working durations in the institutions 0-10 years their trust human arithmetical average was (X =7,68), ones with 11 years and over working duration their arithmetical average was found (X =7,95), between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -3,434 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' trust environment points were examined according to their working durations, people whose working durations in the institutions 0-10 years their trust environment arithmetical average was (X =6,11), ones with 11 years and over working duration their arithmetical average was found (X =6,57), between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -1,033 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' initiative in social issues points were examined according to their working durations, people whose working durations in the institutions 0-10 years their initiative in social issues arithmetical average was (X =9,01), ones with 11 years and over working duration their arithmetical average was found (X =9,63), between averages there was not a meaningful difference found at (t= -,586 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' social representation points were examined according to their working durations, people whose working durations in the institutions 0-10 years their social representation arithmetical average was (X =5,95), ones with 11 years and over working duration their arithmetical average was found (X =6,13). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -,213 p<.005) level.

Table 10. Test results related that if there is a difference or not on the locus of control and social capital levels according to civil servants' ages

	Age	N	X	Ss	t	P
<b>Locus of control</b>	25-35	233	36,60	5,31	,292	<b>,002*</b>
	36 and over	421	36,77	5,47		
<b>Participation to the Local Committee</b>	25-35	233	10,88	7,26	-2,983	<b>,000*</b>
	36 and over	421	12,68	7,35		
<b>Neighborhood Relationships</b>	25-35	233	09,48	7,26	-3,681	<b>,000*</b>
	36 and over	421	11,68	7,35		
<b>Belonging to somewhere</b>	25-35	233	8,77	5,14	-3,863	<b>,000*</b>
	36 and over	421	10,43	5,30		
<b>Tolerance to Dissimilitude</b>	25-35	233	5,84	1,59	-3,491	<b>,001*</b>
	36 and over	421	6,28	1,59		
<b>NGO Membership</b>	25-35	233	5,44	1,59	-3,376	<b>,001*</b>
	36 and over	421	6,78	1,59		

<b>Trust Human</b>	25-35	233	7,24	3,28	-3,434	<b>,001*</b>
	36 and over	421	8,16	3,27		
<b>Trust Environment</b>	25-35	233	4,03	1,59	-3,201	<b>,001*</b>
	36 and over	421	5,90	1,59		
<b>Initiative in the Social Issues</b>	25-35	233	8,64	2,50	-3,052	<b>,002*</b>
	36 and over	421	9,25	2,41		
<b>Social Representation</b>	25-35	233	5,80	2,02	-2,341	,020
	36 and over	421	6,19	2,04		

\*p< 0.05

When civil servants' locus of control points were examined according to their ages people who are 25-35 their locus of control arithmetical average was (X =36,60), ones that their age is 36 and over their arithmetical average was found (X =36,77). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= ,292 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' participation to the local committee points were examined according to their ages people who are 25-35 their participation to the local committee arithmetical average was (X =10,88), ones that their age is 36 and over their arithmetical average was found (X =12,68). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -2, 983 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' neighborhood relationships points were examined according to their ages people who are 25-35 their neighborhood relationships arithmetical average was (X =09,48), ones that their age is 36 and over their arithmetical average was found (X =11,38). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -3, 681 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' belonging to somewhere points were examined according to their ages people who are 25-35 their belonging to somewhere arithmetical average was (X =8,77), ones that their age is 36 and over their arithmetical average was found (X =10,43). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -3,863 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' tolerance to dissimilitude points were examined according to their ages people who are 25-35 their tolerance to dissimilitude arithmetical average was (X =5,84), ones that their age is 36 and over their arithmetical average was found (X =6,28). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -3,376 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' NGO membership points were examined according to their ages people who are 25-35 their NGO membership arithmetical average was (X =5,44), ones that their age is 36 and over their arithmetical average was found (X =6,78). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -3,491 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' trust human points were examined according to their ages people who are 25-35 their trust human arithmetical average was (X =7,24), ones that their age is 36 and over their arithmetical average was found (X =8,16). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -3,434 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' trust environment points were examined according to their ages people who are 25-35 their trust environment arithmetical average was (X =4,03), ones that their age is 36 and over their arithmetical average was found (X =5,90). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -3,376 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' initiative in social issues points were examined according to their ages people who are 25-35 their initiative in social issues arithmetical average was (X =8,64), ones that their age is 36 and over their arithmetical average was found (X =9,25). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -3,201 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' social representation points were examined according to their ages people who are 25-35 their social representation arithmetical average was (X =5,80), ones that

their age is 36 and over their arithmetical average was found ( $X = 6,19$ ). Between averages there was not a meaningful difference found at ( $t = -2,341$   $p < .005$ ) level.

Table 11. Test results related that if there is a difference or not on the locus of control and social capital levels according to civil servants' union memberships

	Union Membership	N	X	Ss	T	P
Locus of Control	No	278	36,52	5,28	-1,189	,235
	Yes	376	37,03	5,50		
Participation to the Local Committee	No	278	11,02	7,30	-2,596	,000*
	Yes	376	12,53	7,40		
Neighborhood Relationships	No	278	10,30	7,30	-1,469	,000*
	Yes	376	12,53	7,40		
Belonging to somewhere	No	278	9,27	5,29	-2,353	,001*
	Yes	376	10,26	5,27		
Tolerance to Dissimilitude	No	278	5,96	1,60	-2,196	,000*
	Yes	376	6,24	1,59		
NGO Membership	No	278	4,31	1,60	-2,301	,000*
	Yes	376	5,24	1,59		
Trust Human	No	278	7,47	3,28	-2,414	,000*
	Yes	376	8,10	3,30		
Trust Environment	No	278	4,63	1,60	-2,109	,000*
	Yes	376	5,42	1,59		
Initiative in the Social Issues	No	278	8,86	2,45	-1,549	,831
	Yes	376	9,16	2,46		
Social Representation	No	278	5,85	2,05	-2,127	,000*
	Yes	376	6,19	2,03		

\* $p < 0.05$

When civil servants' locus of control points were examined according to their union membership ones who are not member of union their arithmetical average was ( $X = 36,52$ ), and ones who are member of union their arithmetical average was found ( $X = 37,03$ ). Between averages there was not a meaningful difference found at ( $t = -1,189$   $p < .005$ ) level.

When civil servants' participation to the local committee points were examined according to their union membership ones who are not member of union their arithmetical average was ( $X = 11,02$ ), and ones who are member of union their arithmetical average was found ( $X = 12,53$ ). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at ( $t = -2,596$   $p < .005$ ) level.

When civil servants' neighborhood relationship points were examined according to their union membership ones who are not member of union their arithmetical average was ( $X = 10,30$ ), and ones who are member of union their arithmetical average was found ( $X = 11,35$ ). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at ( $t = -1,469$   $p < .005$ ) level.

When civil servants' belonging to somewhere points were examined according to their union membership ones who are not member of union their arithmetical average was ( $X = 9,27$ ), and ones who are member of union their arithmetical average was found ( $X = 10,26$ ). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at ( $t = -2,353$   $p < .005$ ) level.

When civil servants' tolerance to dissimilitude points were examined according to their union membership ones who are not member of union their arithmetical average was ( $X = 5,96$ ), and ones who are member of union their arithmetical average was found ( $X = 6,24$ ). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at ( $t = -2,196$   $p < .005$ ) level.

When civil servants' NGO membership points were examined according to their union membership ones who are not member of union their arithmetical average was ( $X = 4,31$ ), and



ones who are member of union their arithmetical average was found (X =5,24). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -2,301 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' trust human poitns were examined according to their union membership ones who are not member of union their arithmetical average was (X =7,47), and ones who are member of union their arithmetical average was found (X =8,10) bulunmuştur. Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -2,414 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' trust environment poitns were examined according to their union membership ones who are not member of union their arithmetical average was (X =4,63), and ones who are member of union their arithmetical average was found (X =5,42). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -2,109 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' initiative in social issues poitns were examined according to their union membership ones who are not member of union their arithmetical average was (X =8,86), and ones who are member of union their arithmetical average was found (X =9,16). Between averages there was not a meaningful difference found at (t= -1,549 p<.005) level.

When civil servants' social representation poitns were examined according to their union membership ones who are not member of union their arithmetical average was (X =5,85), and ones who are member of union their arithmetical average was found (X =6,19). Between averages there was a meaningful difference found at (t= -2,127 p<.005) level.

Table 12. Corealtion analysis results related to cecil servants' locus of control and social capital levels.

		Locus of Control	Participation to the Local Committee	Neighborhood Relationships	Belonging to somewhere	Tolerance to Dissimilitude	NGO Membership	Trust human	Trust Environment	Initiative in the social Issues	Social Representation
Participation to the Local Committee	R	,100*									
	P	,000									
	N	654									
Neighborhood Relationships	R	-,100	<b>1,000</b>								
	P	,011	,000								
	N	654	654								
Belonging to somewhere	R	<b>-,101*</b>	<b>,861*</b>	<b>,645*</b>							
	P	,001	,000	,000							
	N	654	654	654							
Tolerance to Dissimilitude	R	<b>-,089*</b>	<b>,931*</b>	<b>,832*</b>	<b>,642*</b>						
	P	,002	,000	,000	,000						
	N	654	654	654	654						
NGO Membership	R	<b>,073*</b>	<b>,453*</b>	<b>,391*</b>	<b>,443*</b>	<b>,953*</b>					
	P	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000					
	N	654	654	654	654	654					
Trust human	R	<b>,085*</b>	<b>,979*</b>	<b>,675*</b>	<b>,976*</b>	<b>,925*</b>	<b>,917*</b>				
	P	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000				
	N	654	654	654	654	654	654				

<b>Trust Environment</b>	R	<b>,080*</b>	<b>,843*</b>	<b>,791*</b>	<b>,939*</b>	<b>,983*</b>	<b>,991*</b>	<b>,841*</b>			
	P	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000			
	N	654	654	654	654	654	654	654			
<b>Initiative in the social Issue</b>	R	<b>-,001</b>	<b>,853*</b>	<b>,795*</b>	<b>,831*</b>	<b>,729*</b>	<b>,690*</b>	<b>,931*</b>	<b>,948*</b>		
	P	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		
	N	654	654	654	654	654	654	654	654		
<b>Social Representation</b>	R	<b>-,070*</b>	<b>,765*</b>	<b>,703*</b>	<b>,800*</b>	<b>,601*</b>	<b>,746*</b>	<b>,733*</b>	<b>,786*</b>	<b>,646*</b>	
	P	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	
	N	654	654	654	654	654	654	654	654	654	

\*p< 0.05

When Table4 is examined, locus of control and sub dimensions of social capital of civil servants' the relationship between participation to the local committee, neighborhood relationships, belonging to somewhere, tolerance to dissimilitude, NGO membership, trust human, trust environment, initiative in social issues, and social representation were examined.

There was not a relationship found between locus of control and neighborhood relationships (r -,100 p<.011 ). There was a positive and meaningful relationship found between in locus of control and participation to the local committee (r ,100 p<.000 ), NGO membership, (r ,073 p<.000 ) trust human (r ,085 p<.000 ) and trust environment, (r ,80 p<.000 ).

There was a negative and meaningful relationship found between locus of control and belonging to somewhere (r -,101 p<.001 ) tolerance to dissimilitude, (r -,089 p<.002 ) initiative in social issues (r -,001 p<.000 ) and social representation(r -,070 p<.000 ).

## DISCUSSION AND RESULT

In this study, in the examination of locus of controls and social capital levels that civil servants use and if the civil servants are member of union or not there was not a meaningful difference found. Aktaş (2008) determined that there was a meaningful relationship between locus of controls and organizational citizenship attitude, Çetin (2011) determined that public servants who use inner locus of controls behave effectively in the expanding of their personal networks. Researchers' these studies show similarity with the finding of the research.

When public servants' locus of controls were examined according to age variances it was found that public servants that are 36 and over ages use their inner locus of controls at a meaningful level more than servants that are 35 and under ages. Çinko (2009), Tükel and Gök (1996) in their studies they determined that public servants that are at middle age and over they use their inner locus of control in their relationships. Researchers' these findings likely support the result of research.

When civil servants' locus of controls were examined according to duty year variance, in a same institution it was determined that there was a meaningful difference between servants that work 11 years and over and servants that work 10 years and lesser. It was determined that public servants that work in a same institution 11 years and over, they use inner locus of control at a higher level. In a study that was done by Şençağlar (2009), he determined that servants with higher seniority use inner locus of control in their relationships.

There was not a meaningful relationship found among the sub scale points of 'Neighborhood Relationships' which is used by public servants and the sub dimensions of Social Capital Scale and locus of controls. When the conducted reserchs were examined (Karametou and Apostolopoulos, 2010; Hofferth and Johanne, 1999; Onyx and Bullen, 2000; Aydemir, 2011) determined that there was a meaningful and positive relationship between locus of controls that public servants use and the relationships with the environment that they live with. Researchers determined that individuals who use inner locus of controls in their relationships they live more positive and meaningful life experiences with their social environments.

There was a positive and meaningful relationship found among the sub scale points of `Trust Environment` which is used by public servants and the sub dimensions of Social Capital Scale and locus of controls. In their studies Sabatini (2005) and Woodhouse (2006) determined that inner locus of control centered individuals behave more structural in protecting the environment and making healthy relationship with environment. Research's this finding is supported by the studies in the literature.

There was a positive and meaningful relationship found among the sub scale points of `Participation to the local Committee` which is used by public servants and the sub dimensions of Social Capital Scale and locus of controls. When related researchs were examined; Norris (2002), Devemoğlu (2008), Ergin (2007), Şan (2007), Paxton (2002) and Putnam (2000) determined that individuals with higher social capital level; have inner control and they are active in social issues, have higher citizenship conscious, eager to participate volunteer institutions, take social responsibility and exhibit democratic attitude. Studies in the literature show similarity with the finding of this research.

There was a positive and meaningful relationship found among the sub scale points of `Participation to NGOs` which is used by public servants and the sub dimensions of Social Capital Scale and locus of controls. It is determined that participation to NGOs increase the rate of interaction of the people with their environment and participation to elections and support the social capital (Karagül and Masca, 2005). Research's this finding is supported by the studies in the literature.

There was a positive and meaningful relationship found among the sub scale points of `Trust Human` which is used by public servants and the sub dimensions of Social Capital Scale and locus of controls. In the studies of Temple (2000), Requena (2003), Mishler and Rose (2005) determined that individuals that trust themselves and their environment their social capital levels are high and also eager to participation to volunteer organizations. At the same time it was determined that there is a positive relationship among social capital and trust (Casey, 2004), volunteer activities (Krishna, 2003), membership to groups (Sabatini, 2005), cooperation and participation to organizations (Tabellini, 2007). Research's this finding coincides with the studies in the literature.

There was a negative and meaningful relationship found between locus of controls that public servants use and `Tolerance to Dissimilitude`, which is the sub dimension of Social Capital Scale, and its sub dimensions' points. In his research Newton (2001) determined that individuals have qualities such as `tolerance` and `mildness`.

There was a negative and meaningful relationship found between locus of controls that public servants use and `Belonging to somewhere`, which is the sub dimension of Social Capital Scale, and its sub dimensions' points. It was determined that individuals who use outer locus of control increasing of ethnic diversity trust and belonging levels decrease, relationship networks and social capital levels decrease (Brisson and Usher, 2005; Gesthuizen, Meer and Scheepers; 2009; Fidrmuc and Gerxhani 2005).

There was a negative and meaningful relationship found between locus of controls that public servants use and `Social Representation`, which is the sub dimension of Social Capital Scale, and its sub dimensions' points. In their researchs Narayan and Pritchett, (1997) determined that there is a relationship between participation to social activities and social capital savings.

There was a negative and meaningful relationship found between locus of controls that public servants use and `Initiative in Social Issues`, which is the sub dimension of Social Capital Scale, and its sub dimensions' points. Haug, (2008), Studies of; Tanasescu and Smart, (2010), Portes and Rivas, (2011) coincide with the findings of research's findings.

In the result of the acquired findings from this research there are suggestions made in the following.

1- Social capital subject, which is one of the most important factor of communication, progressively gain importance. There are quite limited studies existed about social capital in Turkey. There are suggestions made for the subject of social capital in different sectors.

2- There should be experimental and qualitative studies applied on the social capital subject for social development, solving of social issues, individual development and for the society's welfare.

## REFERENCES

1. Ahuja, G. (2000) Collaboration networks, structural holes, and innovation: A longitudinal study, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45(3), 425-455.
2. Aktaş, H. G. (2008). Locus of control and organizational citizenship on Teachers, Master Degree Thesis, Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyon.
3. Altay, A. (2007). Capital and Poorness relationship as a public property, *Ege Academic View*, 7(1): 337–362.
4. Anthias, F. and Cederberg, M. (2009). Using ethnic bonds in self-employment and the issue of social capital, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(6), 901-917.
5. Ardahan, F. (2012). Validity and reliablity study of social capital scale, *International Journal of Human Sciences* 9(2), 773-789.
6. Aydemir, M. A.(2011). Social Capital – Community Emotion and Social Capital Research- (1st Press). Konya, Çizgi Bookstore.
7. Aydınay A. (1996). Relationship between work satisfaction and Locus of Control, Unpublished Master Degree Thesis, Marmara University Institute of Education Sciences, İstanbul.
8. Barchan, M.( 2000). Catch up the Knowlede. Executive Excellenee, April.
9. Basım, N. H. and Şeşen, H. (2006). Affect of locus of control on workers' politeness and helping behavior: A research on public sector, *Selçuk University Social Sciences Institute Journal*, 16(2), 159-162.
10. Bernardi, R. A. (2001). A theoretical model for the relationship among stress, locus of control and longevity, *Business Forum*, 26(3), 27-33.
11. Bolino, M. C., W. H Turnley. and J. M. Bloodgood (2002). Citizenship behavior an the creation of social capital in organizations, *Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), 505-522.
12. Boschma, R.A. (2005). Social capital and regional development: An empirical analysis of the third Italy. Boschma, R.A. and Kloosterman, R.C. (Eds.), *Learning from Clusters. A Critical Assessment from An Economic-Geographical Perspective*, Springer Verlag, Dordrecht.
13. Branholm I., Fugl-meyer A. R. & Frölunde A. (1998). Life satisfaction, sense of coherence and locus of control in occupational therapy students, *Scandinavian Journal ofOccupational Therapy*, 5, 39-44.
14. Brisson, S. D. and Usher, C. L. (2005). Bonding social capital in low-income neighborhoods, *Family Relations*, 54(5), 644-653.
15. Burt, R. S. (1997). The contingent value of social capital, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(2), 339-365.
16. Casey, T. (2004). Social capital and regional economies in Britain, *Political Studies*, 52, 96-117.
17. Castle, N. E. (2002). Social capital: An interdisciplinary concept, *Rural Sociology*, 67(3), 331- 349.
18. Cohen, D. and Prusak, L. (2001). In good company, how social capital makes organizations work, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

19. Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital, *American Journal of Sociology Supplement*, 94, 95-120.
20. Çetin, F.(2011). Self competence perception and role of locus of control in the inner organization initiative, *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 2(3), 69-85.
21. Çinko, S. B. (2009). Examination of the affect of locus of control types and locus of control of preschool teachers teaching attitudes, Master Degree Thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul.
22. Çoban, A. E. and Hamamcı, Z. (2006). Examination of adolescents that have different locus of control in terms of decision strategies, *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 14(2), 393-402.
23. Dağ, İ. (1991). Rotter's Inner-Outer Locus of Control's validity and reliability for university students (RIOLOC), *Psychology Journal*. 7(26), 10-16.
24. Dasgupta, P. and Serageldin, I. (1999). *Social Capital: A Multifaceted Perspective*, Washington, DC: World Bank.
25. Demirhan, E. and Karagül, M. (2001). Reasons and effects of Economic corruption, *Tax World*, 243(5), 139-145.
26. Devemoğlu, S. (2008). An evaluation towards democracy culture in Turkey in terms of Social capital theory, Master Degree Thesis, Pamukkale University, S.B.E. Public Administration Department, Denizli.
27. Ekinci, A. ( 2011 ). Social Capital Level's affect on inner organization information share in primary schools, *Education Management on Theory and Application*, 17(4), 527- 553.
28. Ergin, R. A. (2007). A research towards measuring of social capital in the context of managers in Konya institute, Selçuk University Sciences Institute, Master Degree Thesis, Konya.
29. Ersözlü, A. (2008). Social Capital's affect to the work satisfaction of teachers that work in secondary school institutions, Master Degree Thesis, Fırat University Social Sciences Institute Education Sciences Department, Elazığ.
30. F. Requena, (2003). Social capital, satisfaction and quality of life in the workplace, *Social Indicators Research*, 61,( 3), 331-360.
31. Fidrmuc, J. and Gërkhani K. (2005). Formation of social capital in central and eastern europe: Understanding the Gap Vis-a-Vis Developed Countries, April. [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=729324](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=729324).
32. Field, J. (2006). *Social capital*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Publishing.
33. Field, J. (2008). *Social Capital* (2nd Press). (Translators: Bahar Bilgen, Bayram Şen). İstanbul. İstanbul Bilgi University Publishing.
34. Fitch, J. L., and E. C. Ravlin, E. C. (2005). Willpower and perceived behavioral control: influences on the intention behavior relationship and postbehavior attributions, *Social Behavior AndPersonality*, 33(2): 05-124.
35. Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York: Free Press.
36. Fukuyama, F. (2000). Social capital and civil society, IMF Working Paper, 00-74.
37. Gesthuizen, M., Meer, T. and Scheepers, P. (2009). Ethnic diversity and social capital in Europe: Tests of Putnam's thesis in European countries, *Scandinavian PoliticalStudies*, 32(2), 121-142.
38. Granovetter, M. S. (1995). The strength of weak ties, *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360- 1380.
39. Hardy, C., Phillips, N. and Lawrence, T. (1998). Distinguishing trust and power in interorganizational relations; forms and facades of trust. Lane, C. and Bachman, R. (Eds.), *Trust within and between organizations;conceptual issues and empirical applications içinde* (64-87). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

40. Haug, S. (2008). Migration networks and migration decision-making, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(4), 585-605.
41. Hofferth, S. L. and Johanne, B. (1999). The development of social capital, *Rationality & Society*, 11(1), 79-104.
42. Johnston, R. and Soroka, S. N. (2001), *Social capital in a multicultural society: The case of Canada*. P. Dekker and E. M. Uslaner (Der.), *Social capital and participation in everyday life: 30-40*. Florence, KY: Routledge.
43. Kapu, H. (2008). Development power of prediction skill of social capital and organizations, *Atatürk University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Journal, e-journal*, 22(1): 259-288
44. Karagül, M. and Masca, M. (2005). An examination on social capital, *Economic Social Research Journal*, 1(1), 37-52.
45. Karametou, P. and Apostolopoulos, C. (2010). The causal nexus between social capital and local development in mountain rural Greece, *International Journal of Social Inquiry*, 3(1), 29-66.
46. Kawachi, I., Kennedy, B.P., Lochner, K. and Prothrow-Stith, D. (1997). Social capital, income inequality and mortality. *American Journal of Public Health*, 87(9), 1491-1498.
47. King, P. E., and Furrow, J. L. (2004). Religion as a resource for positive youth development: Religion, social capital, and moral outcomes. *Developmental Psychology*, 40(5), 703-713.
48. Knack, S. and Keefer, P. (1997). Does social capital have an economic pay off? *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112 (4) 1251-1288.
49. Krishna, A. (1999). Creating and harnessing social capital, *Social Capital: A Multifaceted Perspective*, ABD.
50. Leana, C. R. and H. J Van Buren (1999). Organizational social capital and employment practices, *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 538-555.
51. Lin, N. (2005). A Network Theory Of Social Capital, To Appear In *Handbook On Social Capital*, (Edited by Dario Castiglione, Jan van Deth and Guglielmo Wolleb). Oxford University Press.
52. Maurer, I. and Ebers, M. (2006), Dynamics of social capital and their performance implications: Lessons from biotechnology start-ups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51:262-292.
53. Mishler, W. and Rose, R. (2005). What are the political consequences of trust? A test of cultural and institutional theories in Russia, *Comparative Political Studies*, 38(9), 1050-1078.
54. Nahapiet, J., and Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage, *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2): 242-266.
55. Narayan, D. and Pritchett, L. (1997). Cents and sociability: Household income and social capital in rural Tanzania, *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*.
56. Newton, K. (2001). Trust, social capital, civil society and democracy, *International Political Science Review*, 22(2), 201-214.
57. Nooteboom, B. (2007). Social capital, institutions and trust. *Review of Social Economy*, (65) 1, 29-53.
58. Norris, P. (2002). Making democracies work: Social capital and civic engagement in 47 Societies, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Paper for Panel 1-10 'Social Capital and Organizations' Thursday 3.30-5.15 April 25th 2002 at the Midwest Political Science Association 60th Annual Meeting, Palmer House Hilton, Chicago.
59. Onyx, J. and Bullen, P. (2000). Measuring Social Capital in Five Communities, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 36(1), 23-42.

60. Özcan, B. (2011). Social capital and economical development, Doctoral Thesis, İstanbul University Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul.
61. Özdemir, A. (2008). Relationship of creating social capital and information in the perspective of social network features: A branch research applied on Academicians, Anadolu University, Journal of Social Sciences, 8(2), 81–102.
62. Portes, A. and Rivas, A. (2011). The adaptation of migrant children, *The Future of Children*, 21(1), 219-246.
63. Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster, New York.
64. Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of democracy*, 6(1), 65-78.
65. Putnam, R.D., Leonardi, R., and Nanetti, R.Y. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
66. Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80(1), 1-28.
67. Sabatini, F. (2005). The role of social capital in economic development, [www.socialcapitalgateway.org/Sabatini\\_2005](http://www.socialcapitalgateway.org/Sabatini_2005).
68. Schuller, T. (2000). *The Complementary Roles of Human and Social Capital, The Contribution of Human and Social Capital to Sustained Economic Growth and Well-being*, Conference Text, OECD, Mart, Quebec.
69. Smith, D. (1998). Are your employees bowling alone? How to build a trusting organization, *Harvard Management Update*, 3(9), 37-43.
70. Şan, M. K. (2007). Importance of Social Capital in transition to information society and Turkey reality, *Information Economy and Administration Journal*, 2(1), 70-104.
71. Şençaylar, C. Ç. (2009). Examination of the relationship between thinking styles of education personnels that work in state and private preschool institutions and locus of controls, Master Degree Thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul
72. Şengüder Ş. (2006). Highschool I-III: Determination of Relationship between locus of control and spiritual problems on students, Master Degree Thesis. Dokuz Eylül University Education Science Institute. İzmir.
73. Şeşen, H. (2010). Affect of locus of control, general self competence, work satisfaction and organizational justice perception to citizenship attitude: A research in public institutions in Ankara. Hacettepe University Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, 28(2), 195-220.
74. Tabellini, G. (2005). Culture and institutions: Economic development in the regions of Europe. CESifo Working Paper, No. 1492. Mart 2009, [http://www.cesifo-group.de/DocCIDL/cesifo1\\_wp1492.pdf](http://www.cesifo-group.de/DocCIDL/cesifo1_wp1492.pdf).
75. Tanasescu, A. and Smart, A. (2010). The limits of social capital: An examination of immigrants' housing challenges in Calgary. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 37(4), 97-122.
76. Temple, J. (2000). Growth Effect of Education and Social Capital in The Oecd Countries, OECD Economic Department Working Paper, No:00/263.
77. Temple, J. and Jonson, P. A. (1998). Social capability and economic growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113(3), 983-998.
78. Tükel, R. and Gök S. (1996). Locus of Control's relationship with Age, Anxiety and Depression. *Turkish Psychiatry Journal*, 7(1), 11-16.
79. Tümkaya, S. (2000). Locus of control on primary school teachers and its relationship with exhaustion. *PAU Education Faculty Journal*, 8 (1), 1-2.
80. Tüysüz, N. (2011). Social Capital's importance in terms of Economical Development and Calculation of Social Capital Index, Dissertation, Ministry of Development, Ankara.

81. Ulutaş İ. (1999). Examination of locus of control and Anxiety Level of primary school 10 year students, Unpublished Master Degree Thesis. AnkaraUniversity Sciences Institute Ankara.
82. Van der Gaag, M.. (2005). The measurement of individual social capital, Ph.D. dissertation, Groningen.
83. Whiteley, P. F. (2000). Economic growth and social capital, *Political Studies*,48, 443-466.
84. Wilkinson, R. (1996). *Unhealthy societies: The afflictions of inequality*, London: Routledge.
85. Woodhouse, A. (2006). Social capital and economic development in regional Australia: A case study,*journal of Rural Studies*, 22.
86. Yaşar V. (2006). Comparison of Locus of Control Levels and Some Personal Characteristics of 16-18 Age Group Students. Master Degree Thesis. Marmara University Education Sciences Institute, İstanbul.
87. Yeşilyaprak B. (2004). *Locus of Control. Individual Differences in Education*, Ankara: Nobel Publish Delivery.
88. Zullig, K. J., Pun, S. M. and Huebner, E. S. (2007). Life satisfaction, dieting behavior, and weight perceptions among college students. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*,2(1), 17–31.



