

## **Predicting Teachers' Locus of Control and Job performance among MA and BA Teachers Senior Secondary Schools**

**Soleiman Yahyazadeh Jeloudar**

Universiti of Mazandaran  
Babolsar-Iran

**Fatemeh Lotfi-Goodarzi**

Ministry of Education  
Babol-Iran

### **Abstract**

*The present study examined associations between teachers' locus of control and their job performance in senior secondary schools relationship in Iran. In this research, 197 teachers were chosen using random sampling. They completed Levinson Locus of Control Questionnaire and Paterson Job Performance Scale. Data were analyzed using Pearson correlation coefficients and Multiple Regression analysis using SPSS, version 17. The findings of the study showed that teachers' job performance had significant and positive relationship with locus of control (internal), low correlation with locus of control (powerful others) and negative relationship with locus of control (chance). Also multiple regressions showed that internal locus of control explains 0.39 of variance in job performance. According to the findings, internal locus of control is a factor that has considerable role in people's job performance. The study also revealed that there were significant difference between teachers' internal locus of control and their academic degree levels.*

**Key Words:** Internal Locus of Control Job Performance, Teachers, Master and Bachelor.

### **Introduction**

The most important factor in achieving the goals of any organization is manpower and doubtlessly the success and progress of any organization depends on its human resources. Educational Organization is one of the organizations in which most of the human resources are hardworking, committed individuals, and providing that working conditions are favorable. They will employ their talent and skill in service of the organization and will grease the wheels of its machinery. One of the driving aspects of this organization is teachers' job performance. A more contemporary definition of Job performance has been defined as "behavior or action that is relevant for the organization's goals and that can be scaled (measured) in terms of the level of proficiency (or contribution to goals) that is represented by a particular action or set of actions" (Campbell, 1999; p. 402). Campbell described job performance as behaviors of an individual employee (single person) that relates to success as defined by an organization.

One of the psychological variables of interest that might contribute to job performance among teachers and has not been adequately examined is locus of control. People who has external locus of control determine their behavior according to other people's wills, needs, perception and interpretations rather than their own. On the other hand, people who has internal locus of control determine their behavior as to their own wills, needs, perception and interpretations. Many researchers have shown that locus of control has an important role on individuals' lives. Locus of control affects both physiological and psychological health to a considerable extent. Locus of control's being subjective can cause psychological problems. Locus of control is another factor found to be related to performance (Spector, 1982; Spector & OConnell, 1994).

Locus of control refers to people's premise on controlling their lives. The concept of "locus of control", was first used by Phares and later organized by Rotter in (1966). To Phares, Locus of control is "the belief regarding whether internal or outside forces have control over their success". If people hold themselves responsible for what they live, their locus of control is internal. If they hold outside events responsible for what they live, it is external (Phares, 1991).

Julian B. Rotter (1954) first used the term internal locus of control and external locus of control. Locus of control is defined as a generalized expectancy that rewards or outcomes in life are controlled either by one's own actions (internality) or by other forces (externality). Domain specific measures of locus of control have subsequently been developed from this initial conceptualization of general locus of control (Rotter, 1966). Rotter believes that people have different degrees of internality and externality. Internals believe that rewards they receive are as a result of their own behavior and confident that he can control their lives. Externals are just the opposite. They think that rewards are not dependent upon their actions and that the events happen to them as a result of external factors such as luck or other influences (Gan, Shang & Zhang, 2007).

Individuals with internal locus of control seem to better adapt to varying situations in a more functional way than do people who have an external locus of control (Judge, Locke, Durham, and Klugar, 1998). Locke (1983) and Spector (1982) found that individuals with an internal locus of control orientation appear more motivated, perform better on the job, and express higher levels than individuals with an external locus of control. Garson and Stanwyck, (1997) stated that locus of control has been found to be positively associated with low-perceived stress and high performance.

The literature provided a summary of the relevant literature related to locus of control and the impact these variables may have on individual's behavior and performance in the work place. The literature provides a foundation for this study which is titled an examination of the relationship between teachers locus of control and job performance.

The present study was designed to assess associations and predicting between teachers' locus of control and their job performance in senior secondary schools in Iran. It seeks to determine whether higher levels of internal locus of control can be related to a higher level of job performance. The specific objectives of the study involve examining the teachers' internal locus of control can prediction their job performance in senior secondary schools in Iran, and possible differences between the levels of teachers' internal locus of control and their different academic groups.

### ***Research Design***

This study utilized quantitative data gathered through the use of self-report surveys. The focus of the study relied on the use of correlational research to determine the relationships between variables of locus of control and job performance. Furthermore, Quantitative research is about identifying relationships between variables through the use of data collection and analysis (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, percentage, t-test and Pearson correlation was used to examine the association between teachers' locus of control and their job performance. Enter method of multiple regression analysis was used in order to predict and explain the variance of job performance.

### ***Sample***

This study employed at senior secondary schools teachers in Iran. The target of population for this study was senior secondary school teachers in Iran. This study employed the random sampling procedures. To have the required number of samples, 11 secondary schools need to be selected for the study. Based on this method of identifying the samples needed, 197 teachers were chosen. Moreover, a sample size of 197 based on Cohen table (1992) is sufficient to answer all the research questions that required the use of mean and standard deviation, Pearson "r" and t-test. The sample was chosen according to secondary school type (public).

### ***Locus of Control Scale***

The orientation of locus of control was assessed using Levenson's Questionnaire (1973), this questionnaire consists of three subscales: locus of control 'powerful others', locus of control 'internal', and locus of control 'chance'. The questionnaire's Alpha was .95 which contains of 24 statements scored on a 1-6 (strongly disagree to strongly agree) scale. High scores indicate internal locus of control and low indicate external locus of control. There have been a number of studies performed to assess the reliability and validity of the IPC scale. Reported internal consistencies using Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficient and Spearman-Brown, split half reliability range from .62 to .67 for the Internal scale, .73 to .82 for the Powerful Others scale, and .64 to .80 for the Chance scale (Levenson, 1974; Lefcourt, 1991).

### Job Performance Scale

The job performance questionnaire was by Peterson (1990), which was adapted and adopted for use by Shokr kon and Arshadi (1990) (in Alizadeh 2004) containing 15 items. Shokr Kon (2002) has reported the final coefficient of the questionnaire to be 0.68 and 0.84 using Cronbach alpha and split-half method among Ahvaz factory staff. The questionnaire was validated against the scores obtained from the job performance of the factory staff and merit scores and the obtained index was 0.43 and 0.36 at  $P \leq 0/001$ . This questionnaire was of 15 items using a four point Likert scale from always to rarely.

### Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics was used to obtain the mean and standard deviation of the variables job performance and locus of control (powerful others, internal and chance). Further statistical analyses were used to mean, standard deviation, percentage, t-test, Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis to examine and measure the association between the variables.

### Results and findings

#### Teachers' degree

An independent samples t-test analysis was conducted to compare the scores of 'internal' locus of control between bachelor and master degree teachers, and to identify whether there was significant differences between the two groups of teacher respondents. Table 1, displays that 80.02% of the teachers in the study were bachelor and 19.08% was master degree. The findings show that the mean score for bachelor is 4.45 (Std .68), and for masters is 5.57 (Std .52).

**Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation of Respondents' Locus of Control Internal**

Variable	Teacher Academic	N	Mean	Percentage	S.D
Locus of Control 'Internal'	Bachelor	158	4.45	80.02	.68
	Master	39	5.57	19.08	.52

Table 2, shows the Levene's test values for the assumption of equality of variances for 'internal' locus of control ( $F = 0.780$ ,  $p = 0.381$ ).

**Table 2: Levene's Test Results for 'Internal' Locus of Control**

Variables	Status of equality of variances assumed	F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Locus of Control 'Internal'	variances assumed	0.780	0.381	4.40	195	0.000

The findings revealed that there were significant differences between bachelor and master teachers of total 'internal' locus of control [ $t(195) = 4.40$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ].

#### Relationship between Teachers' Locus of Control and Job performance

Table 4 displays that the results of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation between teachers' locus of control and job performance. The data revealed that the relationship between locus of control and job performance is significant at the level of  $p < 0.01$ . The strongest and linear relationship was seen between Locus of control (internal) and job performance ( $r = .62$ ). The strength of the relationship is followed by powerful others ( $r = .38$ ). The relationship between job performance and teachers' locus of control (chance) is negative but, not significant ( $r = -.20$ ).

**Table 4: Relationship between Teachers' Locus of Control and Job Performance**

Variables	r	P
Locus of control (internal)	.62	.000
Locus of control (powerful others)	.38	.003
Locus of control (chance)	-.20	.118

Enter method regression analysis was used in order to predict and explain the variance of job performance (table 5). Using the independent variables (Locus of control) to predict job performance yielded a coefficient of multiple regression (R) of 0.62 and a multiple regression square ( $R^2$ ) of 0.39. The means 39% of the variance in job performance is accounted for by the independent variables (Locus of control). Results in Table 5 further reveal that the analysis of variance of the multiple regression data yielded an F-ratio of 11.76 which is significant at 0.05 levels.

**Table 5: Locus of control and attitude toward Job Performance**

Variables	B	<i>B</i>	t	p	$R^2$	F	P
Constant	.41		.65	.518			
Locus of Control (internal)	.47	.58	4.98	0.000	0.39	11.76	0.000
Locus of Control (powerful others)	.11	.09	.82	0.416			
Locus of Control (chance)	-.01	-.01	-.10	0.920			

Notes:  $R=0.62$ ;  $R^2=0.39$ ;  $Adj.R^2=0.35$ ;  $Durbin\ Watson=1.715$

Table 5 shows that this clearly demonstrates among one independent variable taken only internal Locus of control ( $P<0/05$ ,  $B=0.47$ ,  $B=.58$ ), explain 0.39 variance of job performance.

### Discussion

The results above show that there were significant differences between teachers' 'internal' locus of control and their degree levels. This means that teachers with higher degrees had better in 'internal' locus of control.

The results showed that job performance had positive and significant relationship with internal locus of control, low relationship with 'powerful others', and negative relationship with 'chance'. This results supported by (Spector, 1982) stated, Locus of control affects both physiological and psychological health to a considerable extent. Locus of control's being subjective can cause psychological problems. Garson and Stanwyck (1997) stated locus of control has a positive relationship with low-perceived stress and high performance. Spector & OConnell (1994) shown that locus of control has an important role on individuals' lives. Individuals with internal locus of control seem to better adapt to varying situations in a more functional way than do people who have an external locus of control (Judge et al., 1998). The results supported by Locke (1983) revealed that individuals with an internal locus of control orientation appear more motivated, perform better on the job, and express higher levels than individuals with an external locus of control.

### Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, one can conclude that teachers with bachelor and master's degrees were significantly different in their 'internal' locus of control. The results showed that the teachers' job performance was strongly related to internal locus of control and weakly related to 'powerful others' and negative and not significantly related to chance. However prediction of changes in job performance was possible only through internal locus of control. In other words, among the three dimensions of locus of control (powerful others, internal and chance) just internal locus of control can explain 0.39 of variance in job performance. Based on the findings of the study, one can conclude that the ability to effectively deal with internal locus of control in the schools assists teachers in controlling job performance.

## References

- Alizadeh, J. (2004). Cheching the relationship between psycho pressure based role ambiguity with job performance in Maron gas and oil company personnel. Thesis (M.A), Islamic azad university, Ahvaz branch.
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 9–30.
- Campbell, J. P. (1999). The definition and measurement of performance in the new age. In D. R. Ilgen & E. D. Pulakos (Eds.), *The changing nature of performance. Implications for staffing, motivation, and development* (pp. 399–429). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol. 1* (2nd ed.; pp. 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Gan, G., Shang, J. & Zhang, Y. (2007). Coping Flexibility and Locus of Control as Predictors of Burnout among Chinese College Students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 35 (8), 1087-1098.
- Garson, B.E.& Stanwyck, D. J. (1997).‘Locus of control and incentive in self-managing teams. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 8 (3), 247-58
- Judge, T., Locke, E., Durham, C., and Kluger, A. (1998). Dispositional effects on job satisfactions and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of applied psychology*, 83, 17-34.
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2005). *Practical research: Planning and design* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lefcourt, HM. (1991). Locus of Control. In Robinson JP, Shaver PR, Wrightsman LS (Eds.) *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes* (Vol. 1, pp. 413-499). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.
- Levenson, H. (1974). “Activism and powerful others: Distinctions within the concept of internal— external control,” *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 38, 377-383.
- Locke, E. A. (1983). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). NY Wiley.
- Phares, J. E. (1991). Introduction of Personality. New York; Third Edition, p.351.
- Robins, R. W., Fraley, R. C., & Krueger, R. F. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook of research methods in personality psychology*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80 [Whole No. 609].
- Ryckman, R. (2004). *Theories of personality*. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Spector, P.E. (1982). Behavior in organizations as a function of employee’s locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin*, 21, 482-497.
- Spector, P. E., & O’Connell, B. J. (1994). The contribution of individual dispositions to the subsequent perceptions of job stressors and job strains. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 1-11.