

# Investigating the Relationship between Locus of Control and Foreign Language Performance: a Psycholinguistic Study

**Prof. Ala' Hssein Oda, Ph.D.**

**Duaa Basil Jasim (M.A. Student)**

**Department of English-College of Education for Human Sciences**

**University of Basrah**

## **Abstract**

One of the individual differences is locus of control. Individuals fall into two types of locus of control. Individuals with an internal locus of control consider their ability and effort important for achievement, while those with an external locus of control believe that luck, chance, the influence of powerful others, and the difficulty of the task are the main factors which determine success or failure. This study investigates the correlation between locus of control and foreign language performance. For achieving this purpose, 88 third-year students for the academic year 2016-2017 in the Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Basrah, are selected. Trice's Academic Locus of Control Scale (1985) is used as the data collection instrument in this study. Data analysis is done by SPSS software in which the Independent Sample t-test is used as a tool to analyse the research data. The problem of this study is that learners of foreign language differ in many personality traits one of them is locus of control. In addition, a lot of learners believe that success is a matter of luck and put the blame on teachers or other external factors. The hypothesis of this study is that there is a relationship between locus of control and foreign language performance. This relationship could be positive or negative. The results of the study demonstrate that there is no statistical significant relationship between locus of control and foreign language performance in most of courses.

**Key words:** Psycholinguistics, Locus of Control, Trice's Scale, SPSS, T-test.

## **1. Introduction**

Locus of control was developed by Julian Rotter in the 1950s. Individuals are different in the way they consider things happen to them. Some consider what happens to them as an outcome or a result of their behaviour and attributes (internal control). On the other hand, some people believe in the results of luck, fate, chance, or powerful others (external control). As a result, people act differently depending on their belief that whether they can control their life or they are controlled by other factors beyond their control (Kelland, 2015:16).

## **2. Theoretical Background**

### **2.1 Rotter's Social Learning Theory**

Rotter's interest in clinical psychology leads him to tackle the clinical ability to predict behaviour. According to Rotter's social learning theory, the interaction between an individual and his or her environment represents a unit of investigation

for studying personality. In spite of the unity that personality possesses, experiences of an individual affect each other. Therefore, personality is in a continuous change, as each individual is always facing new experiences. From another point of view, personality can be specific and stable in some respects, because previous experiences can affect new learning. Due to the complexity of each personality, Rotter states that it is necessary to examine four types of factors to make logical predictions about behaviour. These factors are as follows: behaviour potential, expectancy, reinforcement value, and the psychological situation (Kelland, 2015:15). Morin (1993:35) states that social learning theory is considered as an attempt to incorporate three directions in psychology represented by: behaviour, cognition and motivation. Expectancy represents cognition while reinforcement value represents motivation. The factors of social learning theory are explained as follows:

Firstly, behaviour potential represents the probability of a particular behaviour to occur in the context of a particular potential reinforcement. To illustrate, a student who wants good grades can depend on any possible behaviour, like studying hard or even cheating. Every potential behaviour can be included as potential behaviours which are psychological reactions like thoughts, emotions, and also defence mechanisms. Secondly, expectancy is the likelihood held by an individual that reinforcement will follow specific behaviour (Kelland, 2015:15-16). Also, Morin (1993:35) explains that “*expectancy for internal versus external control of reinforcement (locus of control) is independent of reinforcement value.*” Thirdly, Beery (1967:2) shows that reinforcement value is the preference for a particular reinforcement to occur when all possible reinforcements have the same probability of occurrence. For example, most individuals having the choice prefer to be paid 10 dollars an hour rather 1 dollar in the same period of time. Lastly, psychological situation refers to a complex set of cues which define an individual’s perception or realization of a specific situation (Kelland, 2015:16). Also Morin (1993:35-36) states that situations act as cues which elicit expectancies for either success or failure of a particular behaviour. That is to say, each individual develops expectancies depending on previous experiences.

## **2.2 Concepts of Locus of Control**

Locus of control was developed by Julian Rotter in the 1950s. Rotter’s social learning theory provides the theoretical background of locus of control (Joy, 2015:29,44). Cui (2013:29) states that the concept of locus of control is related to individuals’ orientation or beliefs in respect to reinforcement which follows a particular behaviour. Kelland (2015:16) mentions that internal versus external control of reinforcement (commonly known as locus of control) is an important generalized expectancy and Rotter’s best known concept. Individuals are different in the way by which they consider things happen to them. Some consider that what happen to them is an outcome or a result of their behaviour and attributes (internal control). On the other hand, some people believe in the results of luck, fate, chance, or powerful others (external control). As a result, people act differently depending on their belief that whether they can control their life or they are controlled by other factors beyond their control. In addition, Curtis and Trice (2013:817) mention that “*Rotter (1966) defined the concept of locus of control as a set of stable beliefs that predict*



*performance in achievement contexts.*”

Also, Joy (2015:29) says that locus of control is generalized expectancy for internal versus external control of reinforcements. On the one hand, internals probably work for achievement and plan for long-term goals more than externals do. On the other hand, externals when they fail in a particular task or work, they make re-evaluation for other performances and decrease their expectations of achievements while internals increase their expectations. In this way, locus of control is considered a personality factor concerning individual's generalized expectancies whether they can or cannot have control reinforcements over events happen in their lives. That is to say, individuals who have expectancies that they can control reinforcements are internals while individuals who have expectancies that forces outside their control, chance and luck control reinforcements are considered external individuals.

### **2.3 Locus of Control and Language Learning**

Recently, more search has shed light on the explanation of the reason beyond the fact that some learners are considered more successful than other learners. When individuals perceive themselves and the world around them differently, this affects their language learning. Therefore, it is beneficial to focus on the way learners conceive themselves as language learners, the influence of learners personal views on learning and the role of teachers in helping learners make sense of learning instead of dealing with the way learners differ or measuring the difference. Locus of control is an influential concept that affects the way learners perceive themselves (Eslami-Rasekh et al. , 2012:35-36). Morin (1993:37) states that learners who have learning disabilities of deficiency are more externals on measures of locus of control than learners who do not show deficiency.

Locus of control is an important concept in educational or academic setting because it can be considered beneficial as a predictor in the determination of how learners respond when they face situations in which they learn new skills (Curtis-Fields, 2010:6). Learners with an internal locus of control are considered responsible for their outcomes. Their abilities and efforts define their actions. Internal learners are seen more curious, speculative and questioning. They are more ready to learn new things and seek for information and knowledge. On the other hand, learners with an external locus of control relate their results to outside forces like fate or teacher. In this way external affects control their performances (Khoshsima and Izadi, 2015:82). Demirkan (2006:36) as cited in Khoshsima and Izadi (2015:82) presents a summary of differences of internal as opposed to external learners. Firstly, learners differ in their ability. Learners with internal locus of control tend to choose activities that make them show their capabilities. While external learners show preference for the sort of activities in which they can display the role of chance and luck on the events in life. Secondly, internal and external learners are different in responsibility, those learners who are internal have a feeling that they have the responsibility for decisions they make. They realize that what is called fate is not influenced by factors which are outside their control, but by their decisions. On the other hand, external learners do their best to increase good conditions or status in their life. They do some effort to decrease bad conditions. Thirdly, internal and external learners show different reactions towards change. Internal learners' belief that they can control their fate

prevents them from suspecting the period of change as they are responsible for their outcomes and actions. While external learners see change as a dangerous and threatening experience because they lack control of outside forces controlling and affecting their lives. Lastly, internal and external learners differ in their relationship with environment, those learners who are internals use more control and show better learning attitude or performance. External learners search for new information when such information deals with their own conditions. When they need to solve a particular problem, they use information better. On the other hand, external learners show fewer cooperative reactions or attitudes than internals do.

## **2.4 Attribution Theory**

Attribution theory is a cognitive theory of motivation. It is originally initiated by Julian Rotter and Fritz Heider's work and it is developed by Weiner. "*Attribution theory seeks to explain how an individual's perceived reasons for past success and failure contribute to their current and future motivation and success*" (Oghojafor et al., 2012:33). Attribution theory is the way people view success or failure of behaviour, whether this behaviour is related to themselves or to other people (Rubenstein and Thoron, 2014:1).

In the 1980s, attribution theory is used widely in research on learner's motivation. Causal attributions make this theory unique by correlating individual's past experiences and future achievement efforts. The way individuals attribute past success or failure affects motivation regarding future action. If individuals associate past failure to their own ability, the result is that they will not try the task again. While associating it with lack of effort, they usually tend to try it again (Dörnyei, 2005:79). This theory is based on four factors or causal attributions which are ability, effort, task difficulty, and luck. Every one of these factors is distinguished as being internal or external, stable or unstable, and controllable or uncontrollable. Weiner centres his attribution theory on achievement. He considers these factors as important ones which can influence attribution for achievement. Attributional style is the degree to which an individual uses a particular combination of these causes over time (Oghojafor et al. 2012:33-34).

According to the attribution theory, individuals try to determine why individuals do what they do, that is to say, attribute or relate causes to behaviour. Attribution theory is a three-stage process. First of all, the individual must realize or notice the behaviour. Secondly, the individual must have the belief that the behaviour was deliberately executed or fulfilled. Thirdly, the individual must decide whether he believes the other individual was forced or obliged to perform the behaviour or not, in other words, whether a particular behaviour is attributed to internal or external causes. If the individual is forced, the cause is attributed to the situation itself while if not, the cause is attributed to the other individual himself (Oghojafor et al. 2012:34).

Individuals' explanation of causes of success or failure is based on three dimensions. That is to say, attributions can be classified according to three causal dimensions of behaviour. Firstly, locus of control which can be internally or externally affected. When an outcome is related to a learner's behaviour internal locus of control occurs. While in the case when a result or an outcome is independent of an individual's behaviour, external locus of control occurs. A learner who believes

in his ability to control his own life or destiny possesses an internal locus of control. While a learner who relates his success or failure to outside powers has an external locus of control. In addition, Internals and externals differ in the factors or causal attributions to which they attribute their success or failure. These factors are: ability, task difficulty, effort, and luck. In the instructional environment, these factors affect outcomes of learners in a variety of ways. Learners with an internal locus of control mostly relate or attribute their outcomes to their own ability and effort. On the other hand, those with an external locus of control attribute their outcomes to task difficulty and luck which are external causers (Rubenstein and Thoron, 2014:1).

Secondly, stability is defined as *“the consistency of the relationship between the causal factor and the outcome of the behaviour”* (Rubenstein and Thoron, 2014:2). Also, Rubenstein and Thoron (2014:2) mention that *“Heider and Rotter described that each contributing factor has consistent stability overtime.”* Ability and task difficulty are related to a stable relationship between the causal factor and the behaviour over time. These two causal factors that differ in that ability are controlled internally while task difficulty is controlled externally. Moreover, effort and luck are unstable. That is to say, the strength of the relationship between the causal factor and the changes of the behaviour is dependent on the actual behaviour. Effort is controlled internally while luck is controlled externally.

Table 1: Determinants of Achievement Behaviour (Rubenstein and Thoron, 2014:2)

Locus of Control	Success or Failure Attributed to Stability Factors	
	Stable	Unstable
Internal	Ability	Effort
External	Task Difficulty	Luck

The third causal dimension is controllability which controls the outcome of a behaviour. When a person has the ability to affect or influence the outcome of a particular behaviour, the behaviour is controllable. Whereas if the person is not able or has limited ability to affect or control the outcome of a behaviour or a task, then, the behaviour is considered to be uncontrollable. The controllability of the behaviour is based on locus of control and the stability of the behaviour (Rubenstein and Thoron, 2014:2).

Table 2: Weiner’s Model of Causal Attributes (Rubenstein and Thoron, 2014:2)

	Internal		External	
	Stable	Unstable	Stable	Unstable
Controllable	Typical effort	Immediate effort	Teacher bias	Help from others
Uncontrollable	Ability	Mood	Task difficulty	Luck

## 2.5 Trice’s Academic Locus of Control Scale (1985)

Ashton Trice (1985) designed this scale which consists of 28 items designed in a true-false format. This scale targets college students. It is associated with other scales and also associated with achievement motivation. This scale has “high test-

retest reliability and non-significant social desirability scores.” (Halpert and Hill, 2011:68). This scale is considered to be better than Rotter’s to predict academic performance. Later on, Trice and colleagues found this scale capable of determining “verbal class participation, study time, and homework completion.” (Halpert and Hill, 2011:68). The score is interpreted as follows: if it is between 0 and 13, then locus of control is internal. If it is between 14 and 28, then locus of control is external. The statements in this scale cover various areas associated with “*academic success and control orientations, such as chance, effort, ability, and influence by other people.*” (Trice, 1985:1044,1046).

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1 The Subjects**

The subjects who participate in this study are 120 third-year students, 32 are excluded because of the missing of some information important for the study such as incomplete answers or students avoidance of writing their names. As a result, 88 student responses and marks are used in the study. Their ages range between 21-22. They are students at the Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Basrah, for the academic year 2016-2017. The Scale was presented to the students during the second term of the academic year on Tue. 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2017.

#### **3.2 Data Analysis for the Independent Sample T-test**

After quantitative data are collected via Trice’s Academic Locus of Control Scale, the computer programme SPSS is used in order to analyse the data collected via Trice’s Academic Locus of Control Scale in addition to the students marks of the first semester . The Independent-Sample t-test is used to compare the mean scores of two different groups represented by internals and externals in the current study. Thus, locus of control whether internal or external is compared with the students’ achievement in each course. The T- test is applied to investigate if the difference in locus of control is significant and has an effect on students’ achievement or not. The test variable is achievement in each course while the grouping variable is the locus of control. The courses are: Grammar, Linguistics, English Language Teaching (ELT), Essay, Poetry, Drama, Novel, Conversation, and Research Method.

##### **3.2.1 Grammar**

The group statistics shows the number of participants, 47 internal and 41 external, see (table 3). The mean represents mean achievement for internal group and external group. The standard deviation value stands for the amount of variation in scores within the groups. There are no missing data.

**Table 3: Group Statistics**

	LOC	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Grammar	Internal	47	12.4468	4.18490	.61043
	External	41	11.5122	4.12384	.64404

In the independent samples test (table 4), the Sig. value is greater than the alpha value (.798 > 0.05), this means that the assumption of equal variances has not been violated and the t-critical value is in the first line. The first value of Sig (2tailed) is

greater than the alpha value (.296 > 0.05), this means that the difference between internal group and external group has no statistical significant value.

**Table 4: Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Grammar	Equal variances assumed	.066	.798	1.052	86	.296	.93461	.88826	-.83119	2.70042
	Equal variances not assumed			1.053	84.706	.295	.93461	.88736	-.82979	2.69901

### 3.2.2 Linguistics

The group statistics shows the number of participants, 47 internal and 41 external, see (table 5). The mean represents mean achievement for internal group and external group. The standard deviation value stands for the amount of variation in scores within the groups. There are no missing data.

**Table 5: Group Statistics**

	LOC	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Linguistics	Internal	47	14.5106	4.66193	.68001
	External	41	12.3659	4.36323	.68142

In the independent samples test (table 6), the Sig. value is greater than the alpha value (.532 > 0.05), this means that the assumption of equal variances has not been violated and the t-critical value is in the first line. The first value of Sig (2tailed) is less than the alpha value (.029 < 0.05), this means that the difference between internal group and external group has a statistical significant value.

**Table 6: Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Linguistics	Equal variances assumed	.393	.532	2.218	86	.029	2.14478	.96708	.22229	4.06728
	Equal variances not assumed			2.228	85.556	.029	2.14478	.96268	.23090	4.05867

### 3.2.3 English Language Teaching (ELT)

The group statistics shows the number of participants, 47 internal and 41 external, see (table 7). The mean represents mean achievement for internal group and external group. The standard deviation value stands for the amount of variation in scores

within the groups. There are no missing data.

**Table 7: Group Statistics**

	LOC	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ELT	Internal	47	13.9362	3.77293	.55034
	External	41	12.5366	3.80196	.59377

In the independent samples test (table 8), the Sig. value is greater than the alpha value (.571 > 0.05), this means that the assumption of equal variances has not been violated and the t-critical value is in the first line. The first value of Sig (2tailed) is greater than the alpha value (.087 > 0.05), this means that the difference between internal group and external group has no statistical significant value.

**Table 8: Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
										Lower	Upper
ELT	Equal variances assumed	.323	.571	1.730	86	.087	1.39958	.80916	-2.20897	3.00814	
	Equal variances not assumed			1.729	84.207	.088	1.39958	.80959	-2.21031	3.00948	

### 3.2.4 Essay

The group statistics shows the number of participants, 47 internal and 41 external, see (table 9). The mean represents mean achievement for internal group and external group. The standard deviation value stands for the amount of variation in scores within the groups. There are no missing data.

**Table 9: Group Statistics**

	LOC	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Essay	Internal	47	9.9362	3.17192	.46267
	External	41	9.8049	3.26511	.50993

In the independent samples test (table 10), the Sig. value is greater than the alpha value (.831 > 0.05), this means that the assumption of equal variances has not been violated and the t-critical value is in the first line. The first value of Sig (2tailed) is greater than the alpha value (.849 > 0.05), this means that the difference between internal group and external group has no statistical significant value.

**Table 10: Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
										Lower	Upper
Essay	Equal variances assumed	.046	.831	.191	86	.849	.13129	.68717	-1.23475	1.49734	

Equal variances not assumed			.191	83.663	.849	.13129	.68854	-1.23803	1.50061
-----------------------------	--	--	------	--------	------	--------	--------	----------	---------

### 3.2.5 Poetry

The group statistics shows the number of participants, 47 internal and 41 external, see (table 11). The mean represents mean achievement for internal group and external group. The standard deviation value stands for the amount of variation in scores within the groups. There are no missing data.

**Table 11: Group Statistics**

	LOC	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Poetry	Internal	47	16.5532	4.72187	.68876
	External	41	15.1220	5.16815	.80713

In the independent samples test table (12), the Sig. value is greater than the alpha value ( $.705 > 0.05$ ), this means that the assumption of equal variances has not been violated and the t-critical value lies in the first line. The first value of Sig (2tailed) is greater than the alpha value ( $.178 > 0.05$ ), this means that the difference between internal group and external group has no statistical significant value.

**Table 12: Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Poetry	Equal variances assumed	.145	.705	1.357	86	.178	1.43124	1.05448	-.66501	3.52749
	Equal variances not assumed			1.349	81.764	.181	1.43124	1.06106	-.67963	3.54211

### 3.2.6 Drama

The group statistics shows the number of participants, 47 internal and 41 external, see (table 13). The mean represents mean achievement for internal group and external group. The standard deviation value stands for the amount of variation in scores within the groups. There are no missing data.

**Table 13: Group Statistics**

	LOC	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Drama	Internal	47	15.0851	3.05621	.44579
	External	41	14.0976	2.21139	.34536

In the independent samples test (table 14), the Sig. value is greater than the alpha value ( $.124 > 0.05$ ), this means that the assumption of equal variances has not been violated and the t-critical value is in the first line. The first value of Sig (2tailed) is greater than the alpha value ( $.090 > 0.05$ ), this means that the difference between internal group and external group has no statistical significant value.

**Table 14: Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Drama	Equal variances assumed	2.414	.124	1.714	86	.090	.98755	.57622	-.15793	2.13302
	Equal variances not assumed			1.751	83.285	.084	.98755	.56392	-.13401	2.10910

### 3.2.7 Novel

The group statistics shows the number of participants, 47 internal and 41 external, see (table 15). The mean represents mean achievement for internal group and external group. The standard deviation value stands for the amount of variation in scores within the groups. There are no missing data.

**Table 15: Group Statistics**

	LOC	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Novel	Internal	47	9.1064	2.45157	.35760
	External	41	8.2195	2.96237	.46264

In the independent samples test (table 16), the Sig. value is greater than the alpha value ( $.109 > 0.05$ ), this means that the assumption of equal variances has not been violated and the t-critical value is in the first line. The first value of Sig (2tailed) is greater than the alpha value ( $.128 > 0.05$ ), this means that the difference between internal group and external group has no statistical significant value.

**Table 16: Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Novel	Equal variances assumed	2.623	.109	1.536	86	.128	.88687	.57724	-.26064	2.03438
	Equal variances not assumed			1.517	77.896	.133	.88687	.58474	-.27727	2.05101

### 3.2.8 Conversation

The group statistics shows the number of participants, 47 internal and 41 external, see (table (17)). The mean represents mean achievement for internal group and external group. The standard deviation value stands for the amount of variation in scores within the groups. There are no missing data.

**Table 17: Group Statistics**

	LOC	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Conversation	Internal	47	17.1915	3.36632	.49103
	External	41	16.4634	2.77577	.43350

In the independent samples test (table 18), the Sig. value is greater than the alpha value (.083 > 0.05), this means that the assumption of equal variances has not been violated and the t-critical value is in the first line. The first value of Sig (2tailed) is greater than the alpha value (.276 > 0.05), this means that the difference between internal group and external group has no statistical significant value.

**Table 18: Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Conversation	Equal variances assumed	3.078	.083	1.097	86	.276	.72807	.66367	-.59126	2.04741
	Equal variances not assumed			1.112	85.747	.269	.72807	.65501	-.57409	2.03024

### 3.2.9 Research Method

The group statistics shows the number of participants, 47 internal and 41 external, see (table 19). The mean represents mean achievement for internal group and external group. The standard deviation value stands for the amount of variation in scores within the groups. There are no missing data.

**Table 19: Group Statistics**

	LOC	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Research	Internal	47	16.9362	3.72655	.54357
	External	41	15.3659	3.26156	.50937

In the independent samples test (table 20), the Sig. value is greater than the alpha value (.277 > 0.05), this means that the assumption of equal variances has not been violated and the t-critical value is in the first line. The first value of Sig (2tailed) is less than the alpha value (.040 < 0.05), this means that the difference between internal group and external group has a statistical significant value.

**Table 20: Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper

Research	Equal variances assumed	1.198	.277	2.089	86	.040	1.57032	.75177	.07584	3.06479
	Equal variances not assumed			2.108	85.998	.038	1.57032	.74494	.08943	3.05120

### 3.3 Discussion

The results of the data analysis demonstrate that the relationship between locus of control and foreign language performance is not that statistically significant in most of the courses taken in the third stage in the department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences. According to the Independent-Sample t-test in Grammar, the Sig. (2-tailed) (.296) which is greater than the alpha value (0.05) shows no significant relationship between locus of control and foreign language performance or achievement. In Linguistics, the Sig. (2-tailed) (.029) shows a significant relationship between locus of control and foreign language achievement. In English Language Teaching (ELT) the Sig. (2-tailed) (.087) shows no significant relation. The same is demonstrated in Essay, the Sig. (2-tailed) (.849), Poetry (.178), Drama (.090), Novel (.128) and Conversation (.276). In Research Method the Sig. (2-tailed) (.040) shows a significant value.

### 4. Conclusions

In the light of the analysis presented in the practical part, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. There is no relationship between locus of control and foreign language achievement. This indicates that locus of control is not a decisive factor in foreign language achievement in the Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Basra.
2. In spite of the variety of courses, there is no relationship between these courses and locus of control. This indicates that students achieve marks that do not reflect the variability of these courses.
3. According to the Independent-Sample t-test the difference between internals and externals has no statistical significant value in the courses except in Linguistics and Research writing. That is to say, the difference in locus of control is not significant and does not have an effect on learner's achievement.
4. According to the Chi-square test for independence, used to determine if the proportion of pass to fail is the same for internals and externals, there is no relationship between locus of control (internal, external) and language achievement (pass, fail) in all courses.

### 5. Recommendations

1. Learners of foreign language should be aware of individual differences and other psychological issues from their early stages.
2. Teachers of foreign language and other people in charge should encourage learners to have internal locus of control to avoid some psychological problems and to stop blaming luck or chance for failure and do their best to be successful.

## References:

- Beery, Virginia Tench. The Effects of Internal/External Locus of Control on Reinforcement on Performance on Several Problem Solving Tasks. MA Thesis. University of Arizona. 1967. Retrieved 12<sup>th</sup>Jan. 2017.
- Cui., Guoqiang. Effects of Students' Characteristics and Locus of Control on Their Satisfaction with Online Distance Education Experience. Diss. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. 2013. Retrieved 12<sup>th</sup>Jan. 2017.
- Curtis-Fields, Frances Ernestine. The Impact of Self-Efficacy, Locus of Control, and Perceived Parental Influence on the Academic Performance of Low and High Achieving African-American High School Students. Diss. Wayne State University. 2010. Retrieved 22<sup>nd</sup>Nov. 2016.
- Curtis, Nicholas A. and Ashton D. Trice. "A Revision of The Academic Locus of Control Scale for College Students." *Perceptual & Motor Skills: Physical Development & Measurement*, vol. 116, no. 3, 2013, pp. 817-829.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005.
- Eslami-Rasekh, Abbas; OmidRezaei; and SajadDavoudi. "The Exploration of the Associations between Locus of Control & High School Students' Language Achievement." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2012, pp. 35-48.
- Halpert, Rita, and Russ Hill. 28 Measures of Locus of Control. UK: Power Press, Beach Haven, NJ, 2011.
- Joy, ObettaEberechukwu. Emotional Intelligence and Locus of Control as Predictors of Teachers' Instructional Leadership in Enugu State, Nigeria. Diss. University Of Nigeria. 2015. Retrieved 28<sup>nd</sup> Jan. 2017.
- Kelland, Mark. "Social Learning Theory and Personality Development." *Open Stax-CNX*, 4<sup>th</sup> Nov. 2015, pp. 1-26.
- Khoshsima, Hooshang, and Mehri Izadi. "Creativity in Writing: A Study of EFL Learners' Locus of Control." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2015, pp. 81-90.
- Morin, Victoria A. Effects of a Complex Cognitive Strategy on Locus of Control for Students with Learning Disabilities. Diss. University of Florida. 1993. Retrieved 13<sup>th</sup>Jan. 2017.
- Oghojafor, Ben E. Akpoyomare; Olufemi Olabode Olayemi; Olukunle. O. Oluwatula; and Patrick Sunday Okonji. "Attribution Theory and Strategic Decisions on Organizational Success Factors." *Journal of Management and Strategy*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2012, pp. 32-39.
- Rubenstein, Eric D. and Andrew C. Thoron. "Attribution Theory: How is it Used?" *IFAS Extension University of Florida*, Sep. 2014, from <http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/pdf/files/WC/WC16200.pdf>.
- Trice, Ashton D. "An Academic Locus of Control Scale for College Students." *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, vol. 61, 1985, pp. 1043-1046.



## استقصاء العلاقة بين مركز التحكم و الأداء في اللغة الأجنبية: دراسة لغوية

### نفسية

### الخلاصة

يمثل مركز التحكم احد الفروق الفردية. حيث ينقسم الافراد من ناحية مركز تحكمهم الى فئتين. الفئة الاولى تتضمن أصحاب مركز التحكم الداخلي الذين يؤمنون بأن قدرتهم ومجهودهم يحددان انجازاتهم. أما الفئة الثانية المتمثلة باصحاب مركز التحكم الخارجي فهؤلاء يعتقدون أن الحظ والفرصة واشخاص اخرين وصعوبة المهمة تحدد نجاحهم او فشلهم. تركز هذه الدراسة على بيان العلاقة بين مركز التحكم وتأثيره على أداء الطلاب في اللغة الاجنبية.