

Instrumentation " Locus of Control " as the Basis of Students' Learning Motivation Development in Primary School

M.Khusnul Ma'arif¹, Punaji Setyosari², Sulton³, Sihkabuden⁴

Universitas Negeri Malang

Abstract: *AS good as a person's Locus of Control is where that person Place the primary causation of events in his or her life. Locus Of Control theory evolved from Bandura's Social Learning Theory, which poists that observed and imitated behaviors are Either reinforced through reward or extinguished through punishment. According to rotter, Locus of Control falls on a continuum, with those who believe that their life is largely controlled by outside forces (externals) falling on one end of the spectrum while those who belive that by and large they control they own lives (internals) falling on the other end. Nevertheless, according to levenson, Locus of Control falls on A continuum internal (I), powerful others (P), and chance (C) factors. The aims of this research is to examined feasibility musing scale Locus of Control both by Rotter and Levenson to measure Locus of Control of elemntary school Students. The result show that, scale IPC-Locus of Control Levenson valid and reliabel than scale of Locus of Control Rotter if it used to measure elementary school students' Locus of Control.*

Keywords: *Locus of control, instrumentation, motivation, attribution Theory.*

I. Introduction

The main theme of the teaching supervision which is often raised is how the teachers continuously raise students' motivation. Motivation is defined as the process where activities oriented targets made happen and maintain continuity (Schunk, 2012), must be constantly on fertilizers. The main argument is the choice of assignments, effort, both physical and mental, perseverance and achievement. They are an act -Action which is based on motivation. Theoretically, motivations have a lot of diversity such as learning motivation, achievement motivation, behavioral motivation, social motivation, and others. At the elementary school, students who are the most fundamental motivation of the relevant note have the motivation to learn

Motivational studies have often found by the experts, especially in relation to a person's learning and increase achievements in various fields. The theory which is the underlying also concludes well in psychology literature. It is ranging from the theory with a long perspective as encouragement, conditioning; and with a new perspective as cognitive consistency theory, humanistic theory, to other theories such as achievement motivation, attribution theory and social cognitive theory. The theory of motivation in relation to education and human learning has been fully summarized well by Schunk, Pintrich, and Meece (2012), also by Pintrich 2000. Empirical evidence that is performed has a significant correlation with academic achievement of middle school students, for example Emmanuel, et al. (2014) and Strobel (2010) ensures that the flow starts consequences of the practice in the classroom affect motivation and then influence the learning achievement. While the influence of parenting style, achievement motivation and self-efficacy on performance and academic evidenced by Turner, Chandler, and Heffer (2009). Ames and Archer (1998) also prove that every achievement of learning objectives in the classroom can not be separated from learning strategies and motivational processes are optimized. In the field of mastering English, Lasaga baster (2011) proves that although the motivation is a construct of complex psychological, in fact motivational effect on achievement or mastery of the English language someone, while Moore, Grabsch, and Rotter (2010) use the theory of achievement motivation as explanatory student participation in the learning community of regional leadership.

There are still many questions in clinical supervision and teaching supervision in accusing the teachers about how to generate and gudgeon motivation. Does everyone have the same form of motivation? Is it effective if the generation and empowerment motivation in doing classical without looking at personality each student?

Those teachers' questions are prompted the authors to browse further for it. As a result, it turns the motivation is simply not present in a person or as a stand-alone variable, but it is influenced by various factors that causes the attribution theory. It is called the perception of the cause (*causal perception*). Theory of attribution applied widely in the study of motivation (Graham & Wiliams; Schunk et al, 2008). Attribution is the cause of the product. Theory of attribution explains how people looked at the causes of their behavior and others' (Weiner, 2004). This theory assumes that people are inclined to look for information to establish attribution. The process is expected to understand the causes governed by rules, and discuss how much research attribution rules in use. From the standpoint of motivation, attribution is important because it affects the beliefs, emotions, and behavior.

On the basis of theoretical arguments, the author as the superintendent of schools (*school superintendent*) considers it is important to conduct a preliminary study (*preliminary study*) with a focus on locus of control as one of the causes of motivation variable is placed on the preliminary. This Study is quasi experimental which focus on the effect of the epitome, summary and locus of control / on learning outcomes field of Social Sciences (social studies) students Class V primary school in Nganjuk, East Java. The main goal of the preliminary study focuses on instrumentation *locus of control* among school. The students can be measured by asking the question, which instrument is valid and reliable, what can be used to measure the *locus of control* of elementary school students? The results are valid and reliable instrument. It is used by teachers as a basis for the generation and empowerment of students' motivation. Based on the theory of perception causes, locus of control will be able to choose the personality of the student as a base generation and empowerment of students' motivation.

In theory of perception, the cause of perception affects the motivation through the classification of the perception of the cause according to the dimensions which are based on an analysis of the causal structure. These dimensions are locus, stability and control capabilities. They have implications for the student expectations regarding beliefs, emotions, and behavior motivated. Analysis of the structure of the perception of the cause has been run by two general ways, namely through logical analysis and empirical analysis (Weiner, 2004). Log analysis involves researchers investigated the perceptions of different causes and then it is placed in Distinct Different categories or in along dimensions (for example, the cause of internal versus external) according to theoretical considerations. Later, it came the empirical analysis in research on the causes of perception, which involves the use of statistical methods (eg, factor analysis, multidimensional scaling measurement) to determine how individuals perform scale assessment of the various perceptions of the causes of clumped together. Through logical analysis, or whether the cause of its internal or external to the individual; (B) dimensional stability, or how stable the cause from time to time; and (c) dimensional control capabilities, or how can control it causes. Although there are certain disagreements about the nature of a sure foundation of these three dimensions, there is agreement that each of these dimensions has implications for the motivation and individual securities Schunk, Pintrick, & Meece (2012).

Dimensions loci that are the focus of this study is pleased with whether a cause perceived as internal or external to the individual. For example, ability and effort, both classified as internal cause, while the difficulty of the task and luck, both of them are classified as external causes. This basic difference between the causes of internal versus external causes, according to the central questions in the theory of perception is concerning the cause of the relative influence of personal factors and environmental factors on individual behavior (Heider, 1958). The main belief from the theory of motivation is people try to control the important aspects of their lives (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2006). This belief reflects the thinking of the locus of control, or a generalized expectations related to whether responses affect the results obtained such success and reward (Rotter, 1966). People believe that the results occurred independently associated with the way they behave (*locus of control*) or the result occurred by accident in their behavior.

Regardless the locus of control is a common tendency giver or special in the situation, it reflects the expectation of results (beliefs about the results to be obtained because of the action). Hope is the result of the determination of the behavior of an important achievement, but according to Bandura (1997) it is not enough. Students do not do the work because they do not expect a competent performance to achieve the desired result (expectations on a negative result), as would be the case if they believe that teachers do not like them and will not appreciate how well they work. Expectations on the positive results do not guarantee a high motivation. Students may believe that hard work will produce good value, but they will not work hard if they are unsure of their ability to demonstrate the business (low self-efficacy).

In addition to these major issues, self-efficacy and outcome expectations normally associated (Bandura, 1997). Students who believe that they are able to work well (high self-efficacy) expect a positive reaction from their teachers for the success shown (expectations of positive results). The results turn, supports self-efficacy because it implies that people are able to succeed (Schunk and Pajares, 2005). The control center (*locus of control*) is a personality trait that was first described by Phares (1957), followed by Rotter (1956), in his theory of social learning. This implies that the *locus of control* was developed based on the social theory of Bandura. This theory suggests a person's beliefs about the degree of a person's ability to control her own life. It is measured as a continuum from the internal to the external through a questionnaire that was made of the above experts. Those internal control centers tend to believe that they are responsibility for their own destiny, while for those external control centers tend to claim that their success and failure caused by others or by events that can not be in control. *Locus of control* is something that is believed to be the individual as the center of the continuum moves from the inside (internal) towards the outside of him (external) (Schunk, 2012). The results of various studies indicate internal orientation more positive impact. Phares said they internally oriented tend to be more confident, optimistic thinking at every step. Sceibe found that individuals with a lotus of internal controls tend to be more active, try hard, accomplished, powerful, independent and effective (Schunk, 2012).

Kreitner & Kinachi (2005) said that the results achieved *internal locus of control* ascribed to the activity itself. While individuals who have an *external locus of control* considers the success achieved is controlled from the surrounding circumstances. Further Rotter stated that the dimensions of locus of control, Rotter focused on strategies both internally and externally for achieving goals regardless of the origin of these objectives. For someone who has an internal locus of control will see the world as something that can be predicted, and the behavior of individuals played a role in it. Individuals who have an external locus of control will see the world as something can not be foreseen, as well as in achieving the objectives that individual behavior will not have a role in it (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2005).

Based on these descriptions can be concluded that individuals who have an external locus of control is identified as more favorable searching and selecting circumstances. Meanwhile, individuals who have an internal locus of control are identified more aware of expectations on themselves and are identified as the favorable skills situation. Both types of locus of control, there are individuals who have a tendency to have one particular type of locus of control. Locus of control is a personality dimensions which form a continuum from the internal to the external, therefore none of the individuals who truly internal or actually it. Besides external locus of control is not only static but also dynamic (unchanged). Individual has been oriented on external locus of control, and vice versa. This happens because the circumstances were accompanying that where he lived and often do activities. Halpert & Hill (2011) has generated at least 28 models locus of control following measurement validity and reliability.

Besides Rotter et al, in 1972, Levenson submit research results with a modified two-factor model of internal-external locus of control Rotter, it become a locus of control with three factors, it is internal factors others powerful and chance factors. Levenson scale has been known as PII-locus of control. The instrument consists of 39 questions (statement) scale 6. Scale Lovenson aims to reveal the tendency of an individual's control center, it is known also as the tendency toward attribution. Internal factors (I) was identified as a person's belief that events in his life is determined primarily by the ability itself. Others powerful factors (P) is identified as a person's belief that events in his life is determined mainly by others. It is more powerful. While the chance factor (C) was identified as a person's belief that events in his life is determined mainly by fate, chance and luck alone. If it is compared, actually factor 1 scale IPC -locus of control Levenson is an internal control center commensurate with the scale of Rotter, while the scale factor of 2 & 3 IPC -locus of control. Levenson is primarily an internal control center that is commensurate with the scale of Rotter. The question is, which instruments are suitable, valid and reliable used to measure the locus of control of primary school students in logical appearance?

II. Method

Instruments locus of control which was essentially a descriptive study was conducted by survey. To ensure the reliability of the study, the respondents (sample) were selected randomly stages (multistage random sampling). At the start of zoning districts in Nganjuk into two groups, namely the districts in urban and rural environments, then randomly, they were selected from two districts. It was followed by a random two villages in each district. In the four elected, re-randomly proceed with the determination of state primary school as a research location. Fifth grade students in elementary school elected to survey respondents, respondents were of primary school A, B, C and D as many as 114 students, comprising 64 male students and 50 female students. The data collection phase 1 using the instrument scale of Rotter's locus of control was consisting of 29 items; while the second stage of data collection used the instrument scale SPJ -locus of control. Levenson total was 39 items. The data collection phase was 1 and 2 three weeks ago. Research was conducted in the second semester of the academic year 2015-2016. Responding to the research instruments, it was a response continuum that moves from highly suitable (STS), is not appropriate (TS), a bit but it does not fit (ATS), is rather appropriate (USA), appropriate (S), to very suitable (SS), until continuum scale move from numbers 1-6.

Construct validity and reliability of instruments locus of control is based on the first phase Cronbach's Alpha method SPSS 20.0 release. Alpha Cronbach's method had two basic provisions. It can be used as a benchmark to determine a valid and reliable instrument items, namely: (1) the significance of the Pearson correlation coefficient of item-total correlation which should be > 0.40 . If the correlation item to the total is less than that, then the item must remove from the analysis. (2) Cronbach's Alpha coefficient (KCA) and Standardized Item Alpha (AIS) as average inter-item correlation where the item has the same variant with provision of an instrument is said to be valid and reliable if KCA and SIA coefficient > 0.60 for exploratory research and > 0.70 for reset konfirmatoris (Ghozali & Fuad) The data analysis of continuous data measurement results locus of control which consists of 29 items and 39 items. One instrument 29 item is latent factors locus of control which theoretically is a reflection of the two main indicators, namely internal and external; while the instrument is 39 grains theoretically is a reflection of the three main indicators, namely internal (I), powerful others (P), and chance (C). The second phase of data analysis is to test the construct validity by exploratory factor analysis (*exploratory factor analysis*) with SPSS 20.0 release.

III. Result

The results of the research which presented in this article were only partly in view of importance to decision-making and related hypothesis or testing purposes of this study. The result of validity and reliability analysis instruments locus of control scale of Rotter was consisting of 29 items with Alpha Cronchbach's method. It can be seen in table 1, while the results of the analysis of the validity and reliability of the instrument scale IPC-locus of control Levenson consisting of 39 items with Alpha Cronbach's method can be seen in table 2 Instrument "locus of control" as a Base Development Elementary Student Motivation

Table 1. Reability Rotter's Instrumen Reability Statistic

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,064	,29

Table 2 . Reability of Levenson's Instrumen KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling Adequacy		,771
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	199,913
	df	55
	Sig	,000

Table 3. Results Round 4 Factor Analysis Levenson's Instrument Rotated Matrix Component

	Component		
	1	2	3
X1	,710	-,125	,278
X3	,510	,043	,176
X7	,260	,658	,219
X14	,312	,512	,173
X15	,400	,047	,282
X16	,396	,295	,539
X18	,736	,198	-,193
X19	-,132	,785	-,070
X24	,612	,302	,077
X35	,046	,003	,868
X36	,129	,396	,496

Extraction Method Principal Comoenent Analysis Rotation Method Varimax with Kaiser Normalization Based on table 1, the instrument of Rotter's locus of control is invalid and unreliable. These results imply that the item analysis and exploratory analyzes fact as continuation item analysis can not be done because of Cronbach's Alpha coefficient (KCA-SIA) which was obtained = 0.06 < 0.60. This result is actually not surprising for several reasons. First, in general scale of Rotter's locus of control is used to measure adult age groups. Second, the differences in culture and language were a factor that should be considered. Thirdly, perhaps because the measurement is only done once, so that the effect of " experience "fill in the questionnaire are not affected in an understanding of integral to a statement in the instrument. Based on the results of the analysis, it could be concluded that the *locus of control* scale of Rotter was not suitable in use to measure the locus of control of elementary school students. Perhaps it would be different results if the scale of *locus of control* of Rotter used to measure the *locus of control* junior and senior high school.

Based on table 2, the instrument IPC-locus of control Levenson which can be said is valid and reliable because coefficient Cronbach's Alpha (KCA-SIA) which was obtained = 0.77 > 0.60. The item analysis and exploratory factor analysis which was as a continuation of item analysis could be done. The results of item analysis table 3 after going through four rotations indicates that a valid and reliable grain consists of 11 items, they were items 1,3,7,14,15,16,18,19,24,35, and 36. Item No. 1,3,15,18 and 24 represent intenal factor (I); Item No. 7,14 and 19 represent a powerful factor of (P) while the item no 16.35 and 36 represents the chance factor (C) The reliability coefficient of reliability in line with those found by Agustomo (1983) who obtained the reliability $r_{xx}^1 = 0.750$; Hendi (1895) $r_{xx}^1 = 0.751$; and Haryanto (1986) yamg obtain raebilitas $r_{xx}^1 = 0.749$ (Aswar, 2013). Based on the results of the analysis, it could be concluded that the IPC -locus of control / Levenson is suitable to measure locus of control but in elementary students. From 39 items, it is only 11 were valid and reliable to be used to measure the locus of control of elementary school students. Although it was only 11 items, a very clear indication that the instrument IPC-locus of control Levenson really represents three factors that are indicators of *locus of control*.

Through IPC-locus of control Levenson scale, elementary students can be classified into 3 groups: group 1 are those who believe that the events in his life is determined primarily by the ability itself; second group are those who believe that the events in their life determined primarily by others more powerful; and the third group are those who believe that the events in his life is determined mainly by fate, chance and luck alone. The personality-based was sorting, and then the teacher will be easier to build and empower the students 'motivation, either individually or in groups, rather than having to build and empower the students' motivation

collectively. The building and empowering learning motivation will be much more effective when based on the personality of the student or the student based on the *locus of control*. This is in line with the attribution theory or the theory of perception of the underlying causes of this study.

IV. Conclusion

Based on the results of the analysis or instrumentation in this study, it can be concluded that the scale IPC-locus of control Levenson is more suitable than the scale locus of control of Rotter if it used to measure the locus of control of elementary school students. Therefore, before teachers build and empower elementary school students' motivation, they should know first the personality of each elementary school students based on the size of the locus of control. When measuring locus of control of primary school students, it is recommended that teachers use a scale of IPC-locus of control Levenson.

References

- [1]. Ames, C., & Archer, J. 1988. Achievement Goals in the Classroom: Student Learning Strategies and Motivation Processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 80 (3): 260-267.
- [2]. Azwar, S. 2013. *Penyusunan Skala Psikologi*. Edisi ke-2. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- [3]. Bandura, A. 1997. *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: Freeman.
- [4]. Corsini, A., & Marsella, A.J. 1983. *Personality Theories: Research and Assessment*. USA: University of Hawaii at Manoa, Peacock Published, Inc.
- [5]. Josephine, B., & Solomon, F.K. 2014. Achievement Motivation, Academic Self-Concept And Academic
- [6]. Graham, S., & Williams, C. 2009. An Attributional Approach to Motivation in School. In K.R. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.). (hlm. 11-33). New York: Routledge.
- [7]. Halpert, R., & Hill, R. 2011. *28 Measure of Locus of Control*. Beach Haven, NJ: Will To Power Press.
- [8]. Heider, F. 1958. *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. New York: Wiley.
- [9]. Kreitner & Kinicki. 2005. *Perilaku organisasi buku, 1*. Jakarta: Penerbit Salemba Empat.
- [10]. Moore, L.L., Grabsch, D.K., & Rotter, C. 2010. Using Achievement Motivation Theory to Explain Student Participation in a Residential Leadership Learning Community. *Journal of Leadership Education*. 9 (2): 22-34
- [11]. Phares, E.J. 1957. Expectancy Change in Skill and Chance Situations. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 54: 457-477
- [12]. Phares, E.J. 1976. *Locus of Control in Personality*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press
- [13]. Rotter, J.B. 1966. Generalized Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs* 80 (1): 1-28
- [14]. Schunk, D.H. & Zimmerman, B.J. 2006. Competence and Control Beliefs: Distinguishing the Means and Ends. In P.A. Alexander & P.H. Winne (Eds.). *Handbook of Educational Psychology*. (hlm. 349-367). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- [15]. Schunk, D.H. 2012. *Learning Theories: An Educational Perspective* 6th Edition. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc
- [16]. Schunk, D.H. et al., 2008. *Attribution and Motivators of Self-Regulated Learning*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- [17]. Schunk, D.H. et al., Pintrich, P.P. & Meece, J.L. 2012. *Motivation in Education: Theory, Research, and Applications*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [18]. Strobel, K. 2010. *Issue Brief: Practices that Promote Middle School Students' Motivation and Achievement*. Jhon W. Gardner Centre.
- [19]. Turner, E.A., Chandler, M., & Heffer, R.W. 2009. The Influence of Parenting Styles, Achievement Motivation, and Self-Efficacy on Academic Performance in College Students. *Journal of College Student Development*. 50(3): 337-346.
- [20]. Weiner, B. 2004. *An Attribution of Achievement Motivation and Emotion*. New York: Springer-Verlag.