RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY DIMENSIONS (SELF-EFFICACY, SELF-CONTROL, AND SELF-ESTEEM) AND PERFORMANCE AND MODERATING ROLE OF CREATIVITY
(Case Study: Hospitals in Lorestan Province, Iran)

Heshmatollah Soroushnia[1], Anahita Salari[2]

Abstract: Several factors affect the performance of employees. However, the most common internal factor that affects employees' performance is their own personality traits and features. Self-efficacy, self-control, self-esteem, and creativity are some of important personality features, playing an important and fundamental role in individuals' progress, growth, effectiveness, and efficiency. This study aims to examine the relationships between personality traits including self-efficacy, self-control, and self-esteem and performance with moderating role of creativity among the employees working in Lorestan hospitals, Iran. A descriptive and correctional study was performed. The study comprises employees working in Lorestan hospitals in the course of 2014-2015. Sample size was chosen 367 employees using random clustering sampling. Questionnaires were administered to collect data. The validity of the questionnaire was performed by experts' opinions and reliability was calculated 936% by Alpha Cronbach. According to the collected data, we gained the following results: self-efficacy, self-control, and self-esteem were found to be associated with performance. Creativity, as moderating variable, declines the relationship between self-efficacy, self-control, and self-esteem and performance; however, it eliminates none of relationships. Creativity, as a moderating variable, eliminates self-control and self-esteem effect on performance; however, it is unaffected on the effect of self-efficacy on performance. Self-efficacy, self-control, and self-esteem were found to be significantly associated with creativity.

Keywords: Self-efficacy, self-control, self-esteem, performance, creativity.

1. INTRODUCTION

The continuation of organization's life is found to be directly associated with creativity, innovation, efficacy, and efficiency of employees. Any correct performance in this regard can lead to growing strength of organization in the sight of public and government. Also, weakness in this regard might cause degeneration

---

[1]. Department of management, Electronic branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

[2]. Ph.D. Tehran west, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

and decline. Therefore, organizations need to have creative, effective, and efficient employees in order to achieve the goals. Several factors affect the performance of employees. However, the most common internal factors that affect employees` performance is their own personality traits and features. Although knowing people and their personality is a difficult task, identification of personality has an impressive window which is behaviors (performance) of people. Self-efficacy, self-control, self-esteem, and creativity are some of important components of personality, playing an important and fundamental role in individuals` progress, growth, effectiveness, and efficiency. Organizations and working places require employees who are able to prepare the growth, progress, and excellence platform. With the sense of worth, the power of control, status and ability to perform various tasks, and use of mental abilities to create a new concept, employees can provide appropriate and effective changes for performance improvement and growth. Based on personality, promotion of employees can be met in recruitment process. Since personality is used as a factor to determine the behavior, identification of these features are used to forecast their behaviors. Also, identification of personality can facilitate the detection of qualified employees for various positions in organization. This, in turn, causes relocation decline, as well as job satisfaction, and, as a result, job performance improvement (Esfandiari, 2008). To this end, the objective outlined here is based on the following question: are personality dimensions (self-efficacy, self-control, and self-esteem) found to have significant relationship with each other?; Does creativity mediate personality dimensions (self-efficacy, self-control, and self-esteem) and performance?

2. THEORETICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Personality

Personality is called *Personalite* in Latin and *Personality* in Anglo-Saxon languages. It is rooted in *Persona*. It is referred to mask theater in which actors used to apply in Ancient Greece. Therefore, the original and main concept of personality is social image and appearance which is based on the role an individual plays in society. It means that individuals offer personality to society so that they are assessed based on such offered personality (Saeed Shamlou). *Personality* is defined as unique and relatively steady pattern of thinking, feeling, and behaving. It refers to a collection of natural and acquired attributes, determining the path of life, social compromise, and public relations. Moorhead and Gar believe that *personality* is a collection of attributes and behaviors which describe the person.

Cambell believes that *personality* means manner, characteristics, and to some extent predictable behavioral response patterns that every individual shows whether consciously or unconsciously as lifestyle. In other words, it refers to a

collection of behavioral and emotional attributes and characteristics which define individual in normal condition and it is relatively fixed and predictable for any single person. He believes that personality consists of two main factors:

1. Inherited properties
2. Life experience, especially the experience of the early years of life (Asadi Noughabi, Ahmad Ali)

Based on the definitions, *personality* is as a collection of person`s behaviors and attitudes in daily life determined by some features such as uniqueness, stability (sustainability), and predictability.

Uniqueness and difference: person`s personality is unique and, despite some similarities, no two similar and identical personalities are found.

Stability (sustainability): although people show contradictory and different behaviors in various circumstances and conditions, they have a relatively stable attitude, reaction, and behavior in the course of time i.e. decades.

Predictability: by paying attention and studying behavior and attitude, we are likely to predict behavioral and intellectual style of people. "Predictability" is found to have a mutual relationship with "behavioral stability".

2.2 Self-efficacy

Bandura defines self-efficacy as the extent to which people believe they are capable of performing specific behaviors in order to attain certain goals. Self-efficacy is "the belief in one's capabilities to organize cognitive, social, and behavioral skills to fulfill various objectives effectively. In his opinion, knowledge, skills, and former gains are not appropriate predictors for future performance. Human`s belief concerning his capabilities is effective in performance. A distinct difference is found between various skills and their combinations with proper methods to perform various tasks in different circumstances. "People are fully aware of the tasks they are supposed to perform and they have the skills to do so; however, they are often are not successful in the implementation of appropriate skills (Bandura, 1997).

2.3 Self-control

Self-control is the quality that allows you to manage yourself. The ability to control yourself and the feeling that you can control yourself is one of features of healthy personalities. Self-control expresses the extent of behavioral feature compatibility with the conditions and circumstances (Etebarian and Pourvali, 2008, quoted from Crinz, 2005). In other words, self-control is the ability to follow logical request, moderate behavior in accordance with current condition, and postpone

the fulfillment of a desire within socially acceptable frame without intervention and direction of somebody else. The basis of self-control is the ability of volitional control of internal processes and behavioral outcomes.

In management, self-control is a state within the individual that makes him inclined to carry out his functions without external monitoring cause (Alvani, 2006). In other words, self-control is internal care by which the assigned duties and illegal and abnormal behaviors are withdrawn. In this point of view, self-control is the process in which individuals show commitment to their organizational duties without obligation, threat, and bribe and use the most of their abilities to promote organizational goals (Zare, 2005).

2.4 Self-esteem

Self-esteem reflects a person's overall subjective emotional evaluation of his or her own worth (Abedi and Baghban, 2009). This feeling might be a judgment of oneself as well as an attitude toward the self. Self-esteem encompasses our thoughts, emotions, feelings, and experiences in the course of life: we think that we are intelligent or stupid; we feel that we are bad or good; we love ourselves or not. Thousands of evaluations and experiences of selves lead to have the sense of worth or unpleasant feeling of incompetence. Cooper Smith considers self-esteem an individual evaluation maintained by self. Cooper Smith states four main factors for self-esteem growth. First and foremost, respect, acceptance, and interest received by an individual. Second factor is our achievement experiences in life. Third is the values and expectations in which we interpret our experiences. The final issue is that how a person responds to a loss of value.

2.5 Performance

Performance means state or the quality of function. The term *performance* covers the concept of activity and results together (Yamani, 1994). According to this definition, performance involves both business-conduct concept and objectives. Robins believes that performance means the measurement of results and the fact that whether or not you did an activity well? (Robins, 2002).

Boyatzis (1982) offered an interesting definition for effective performance. Thus, effective performance of the job is to achieve certain predefined results (such as income), through specific measures so that they are in accordance with organizational policies, procedures, and environment.

2.6 Creativity

It is important to understand creativity. Not only in the sense that there is creativity in a variety of fields but also are a series of social and psychological forces contributing. Psychologists and researchers have proposed different opinions and

definitions for creativity. Such a difference is associated with the complex nature of creativity. Creativity is a mental process that can be seen from a certain person at a certain time. It is a process in which a new creation including either a new idea or a product is generated. New and different product can be verbal or non-verbal as well as objective or subjective. Mac Keenan defines creativity as solving the problem in innovative and new method. Williams believes that creativity is a skill which can link scattered information, mix new information factors in new form, and associate past experiences with new information in order to create unique and unconventional responses (Shahni yeylagh, 1996). Gagnéknows creativity as a particular type of solution (Seif, 2000). *Creativity* means that the individual analyzes their former experiences, select some, and mix them in order to make innovative and new patterns, thoughts, and products. Creativity is a process where ways of learning creativity can be thought. We need to try creative energy from self and satisfy or innermost desires. No limit is assumed for creativity as well as time and place and gender.

3. HYPOTHESIS

1. Self-efficacy is found to have significant relationship with performance of employees in Lorestan hospitals.

2. Self-control is found to have significant relationship with performance of employees in Lorestan hospitals.

3. Self-esteem is found to have significant relationship with performance of employees in Lorestan hospitals.

4. Creativity moderates the relationship between self-efficacy and performance of employees in Lorestan hospitals.

5. Creativity moderates the relationship between self-control and performance of employees in Lorestan hospitals.

6. Creativity moderates the relationship between self-esteem and performance of employees in Lorestan hospitals.

4. METHODOLOGY

An applied, descriptive, and correlational study was performed. A total of 8000 employees working in hospitals in one province were considered the statistical population. The sample size comprises 367 employees chosen by clustering sampling method (type of hospital) and random sampling (within selected hospitals) as well as Cochran formula with 0.05% error. (The exact number was 366.601). Field and library methods were vastly administered. In order to enhance the content validity of questionnaires, we took advantage of:

1. Supervisor`s, advisor`s, and research expert`s opinions
2. Studying magazines, books and similar questionnaires in other studies,
3. Initial distribution of questionnaire among 30 samples.

While studying the questionnaire validity, as many as 30 questionnaires were, after confirmation of related experts, distributed among sample size in order to ensure the comprehensiveness and clarity of questions. The results show valid measurement tool. Alpha Cronbach coefficient was applied to estimate reliability. The reliability taken by the help of SPSS is 0.936. Therefore, the questionnaire enjoys acceptable reliability, meaning that responses were not random. To analyze data as well as hypothesis testing, Pearson correlational test was used. Finally multivariate regression method was used to evaluate research model.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

First Hypothesis: self-efficacy is found to have significant relationship with performance of employees in Lorestan hospitals.

Table 1
Correlational test between self-efficacy and performance

		Self-efficacy	Performance
Self-efficacy	Pearson Correlation	1	0.727**
	Significance level		0.000
	Number	367	367
Performance	Pearson Correlation	0.727**	1
	Significance level	0.000	
	Number	367	367

Since the significance level is 0.000 and less than 0.05, no relationship between self-efficacy and performance is not supported. In other words, self-efficacy is found to have significant relationship with performance. According to correlation test output, the relationship is supported between dependent variable of *self-efficacy* and independent variable of *performance* at confidence level of 95% (Less than 0.05 significance level). The absolute value of the correlation coefficient is 0.727 which is positive. The direction is positive. It means that self-efficacy rise leads to performance enhancement (with coefficient of 0.73).

Second Hypothesis: creativity moderates the relationship between self-efficacy and performance of employees in Lorestan hospitals.

Table 2
Correlational test between self-control and performance

		Self-control	Performance
Self-control	Pearson Correlation	1	0.626**
	Significance level		0.000
	Number	367	367
Performance	Pearson Correlation	0.626**	1
	Significance level	0.000	
	Number	367	367

Since the significance level is 0.000 and less than 0.05, no relationship between self-control and performance is not supported. In other words, self-control is found to have significant relationship with performance. According to correlation test output, the relationship is supported between dependent variable of *self-control* and independent variable of *performance* at confidence level of 95% (Less than 0.05 significance level). The absolute value of the correlation coefficient is 0.626 which is positive. The direction is positive. It means that self-control rise leads to performance enhancement (with coefficient of 0.63).

Third Hypothesis: Self-esteem is found to have significant relationship with performance of employees in Lorestan hospitals.

Table 3
Correlational test between self-esteem and performance

		Self-esteem	Performance
Self-esteem	Pearson Correlation	1	0.662**
	Significance level		0.000
	Number	367	367
Performance	Pearson Correlation	0.662**	1
	Significance level	0.000	
	Number	367	367

Since the significance level is 0.000 and less than 0.05, no relationship between self-esteem and performance is not supported. In other words, self-esteem is found to have significant relationship with performance. According to correlation test output, the relationship is supported between dependent variable of *self-esteem*

and independent variable of *performance* at confidence level of 95% (Less than 0.05 significance level). The absolute value of the correlation coefficient is 0.662 which is positive. The direction is positive. It means that self-esteem rise leads to performance enhancement (with coefficient of 0.66).

Fourth Hypothesis: creativity moderates the relationship between self-efficacy and performance of employees in Lorestan hospitals.

Table 4
Correlational test between self-efficacy and performance with moderation of creativity

Variable control			Performance	Self-efficacy	Creativity
Without control	Performance	Pearson correlation	1.000	0.727	0.695
		Sig. Level	.	0.000	0.000
		Freedom degree	0	365	365
	Self-efficacy	Pearson correlation	0.727	1.000	0.667
		Sig. Level	0.000	.	0.000
		Freedom degree	365	0	365
	Creativity	Pearson correlation	0.695	0.667	1.000
		Sig. Level	0.000	0.000	.
		Freedom degree	365	365	0
With control	Performance	Pearson correlation	1.000	0.492	
		Sig. Level	.	0.000	
		Freedom degree	0	364	
	Self-efficacy	Pearson correlation	0.492	1.000	
		Sig. Level	0.000	.	
		Freedom degree	364	0	

According to partial correlation test, a correlation of 0.727 is reported between self-efficacy and performance without consideration of creativity. If we take creativity into account as moderator variable, significance level of correlation test is 0.000 between self-efficacy and performance and the relationship is significant. However, the correlation coefficient is 0.492 which is less than 0.727. Therefore, creativity leads to relationship decline between self-efficacy and performance but does not eliminate it. A correlation of 0.667 is found between creativity and self-efficacy.

Fifth Hypothesis: creativity moderates the relationship between self-control and performance of employees in Lorestan hospitals.

Table 5
Correlational test between self-control and performance with moderation of creativity

Variable control			Performance	Self-control	Creativity
Without control	Performance	Pearson correlation	1.000	0.626	0.695
		Sig. Level	.	0.000	0.000
		Freedom degree	0	365	365
	Self-control	Pearson correlation	0.626	1.000	0.721
		Sig. Level	0.000	.	0.000
		Freedom degree	365	0	365
	Creativity	Pearson correlation	0.695	0.721	1.000
		Sig. Level	0.000	0.000	.
		Freedom degree	365	365	0
With control	Performance	Pearson correlation	1.000	0.251	
		Sig. Level	.	0.000	
		Freedom degree	0	364	
	Self-control	Pearson correlation	0.251	1.000	
		Sig. Level	0.000	.	
		Freedom degree	364	0	

According to partial correlation test, a correlation of 0.626 is reported between self-control and performance without consideration of creativity. If we take creativity into account as moderator variable, significance level of correlation test is 0.000 between self-efficacy and performance and the relationship is significant. However, the correlation coefficient is 0.251 which is less than 0.626. Therefore, creativity leads to relationship decline between self-control and performance but does not eliminate it. A correlation of 0.695 is found between creativity and self-control.

Sixth Hypothesis: creativity moderates the relationship between self-esteem and performance of employees in Lorestan hospitals.

Table 6
Correlational test between self-esteem and performance with moderation of creativity

Variable control			Performance	Self-esteem	Creativity
Without control	Performance	Pearson correlation	1.000	0.362	0.695
		Sig. Level	.	0.000	0.000
		Freedom degree	0	365	365
	Self-esteem	Pearson correlation	0.662	1.000	0.661
		Sig. Level	0.000	.	0.000
		Freedom degree	365	0	365
	Creativity	Pearson correlation	0.695	0.661	1.000
		Sig. Level	0.000	0.000	.
		Freedom degree	365	365	0
With control	Performance	Pearson correlation	1.000	0.375	
		Sig. Level	.	0.000	
		Freedom degree	0	364	
	Self-esteem	Pearson correlation	0.375	1.000	
		Sig. Level	0.000	.	
		Freedom degree	364	0	

According to partial correlation test, a correlation of 0.662 is reported between self-esteem and performance without consideration of creativity. If we take creativity into account as moderator variable, significance level of correlation test is 0.000 between self-esteem and performance and the relationship is significant. However, the correlation coefficient is 0.375 which is less than 0.662. Therefore, creativity leads to relationship decline between self-control and performance but does not eliminate it. A correlation of 0.661 is found between creativity and self-control.

Regression Model

Here, we study the regression model between independent variables (Self-control, self-efficacy, and self-esteem) with moderator variable of creativity and performance dependent variable. When the number of independent variable is higher than 2, then we are allowed to use multivariate regression. The objective outlined here is to figure out to what extent main research principles (independent variables) are effective in dependent variable or to what extent independent variables are able to determine dependent variable.

Path 1: Regression model between independent and dependent variables without the presence of creativity

Table 7
Independent variable coefficients (Path 1)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	0.691	0.155		4.450	0.000
Self-Control	0.208	0.054	0.195	3.876	0.000
Self- efficacy	0.438	0.068	0.428	6.486	0.000
Self-esteem	0.197	0.058	0.197	3.384	0.001

The significance level is less than 0.05 for independent variables of self-control, self-efficacy, and self-esteem in regression model. Therefore, these variables are able to determine dependent variable of performance and they are within the regression model. The highest impact factor is 0.428 for self-efficacy. Self-esteem and self-control impact factors are 0.197 and 0.195, respectively. Therefore, self-efficacy is more effective in performance than self-control and self-esteem.

Path 2: The impact of self-control, self-efficacy, and self-esteem on performance with presence of creativity as effective factor (moderator)

Table 8
Independent variable coefficients (Path 2)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	0.291	0.159		1.831	0.068
Self-Control	0.035	0.057	0.033	0.616	0.538
Self- efficacy	0.407	0.064	0.398	6.358	0.000
Self-esteem	0.096	0.057	0.096	1.674	0.095
Creativity	0.396	0.059	0.343	6.652	0.000

The significance level is less than 0.05 for self-efficacy and creativity; however, it is higher than 0.05 for self-control and self-esteem. Therefore, self-efficacy and

creativity are effective in performance; while self-control and self-esteem are not. Therefore, with the presence of creativity, self-control and self-esteem are ineffective in performance, while self-efficacy is still effective and the impact factor is 0.398 which is higher than other variables. Creativity ranked the second with impact factor of 0.343. Self-esteem and self-control have impact factors of 0.096 and 0.023, respectively.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study aims to examine the relationship between personality dimensions (self-efficacy, self-control, and self-esteem) and performance and moderating role of creativity (Case study: Lorestan hospitals). The result of hypothesis testing shows that the correlation coefficient is 0.727 between self-efficacy and performance which is significant at 95% confidence level. Therefore, self-efficacy is found to have significant relationship with performance, meaning that self-efficacy rise leads to performance rise. This means that employees with high level of self-efficacy enjoy higher level of performance. For the second hypothesis, the correlation coefficient was reported 0.626 between self-control and performance which is significant at 95% confidence level. Therefore, self-control is found to have significant relationship with performance, meaning that self-control rise leads to performance rise. This means that employees with high level of self-control enjoy higher level of performance. For the third hypothesis, the correlation coefficient was reported 0.662 between self-esteem and performance which is significant at 95% confidence level. Therefore, self-esteem is found to have significant relationship with performance, meaning that self-esteem rise leads to performance rise. This means that employees with high level of self-esteem enjoy higher level of performance. For the fourth hypothesis, correlation was reported 0.727 by the help of partial correlation between self-efficacy and performance without the consideration of creativity variable. However, taking creativity variable into account as moderator variable, the significance level of correlation test between self-efficacy and performance is 0.000 and a significant relationship was found. In this state, correlational coefficient is 0.492 which is less than 0.727. As a result, creativity results in decline between self-efficacy and performance but does not eliminate the relationship. The correlation was reported 0.667 between creativity and self-efficacy which is significant at confidence level of 95%. Since this significance level is less than 0.05, self-efficacy is effective in performance with or without the presence of creativity. The impact factor is Beta=0.428 and Beta=0.398 without moderating variable of creativity and with moderating variable of creativity, respectively. In both cases, impact factor is higher than other variables. As it is seen, creativity is not effective in the self-efficacy impact on performance. For the fifth hypothesis, correlation was reported 0.626 by the help of partial correlation between self-control and performance without the

consideration of creativity variable. However, taking creativity variable into account as moderating variable, the significance level of correlation test between self-control and performance is 0.000 and a significant relationship was found. In this state, correlational coefficient is 0.251 which is less than 0.626. As a result, creativity results in decline between self-control and performance but does not eliminate the relationship. The correlation was reported 0.721 between creativity and self-control which is significant at confidence level of 95%. Since this significance level is less than 0.05, self-control is effective in performance with or without the presence of creativity. The impact factor is Beta=0.195. According to table 12.4 showing the results at presence of creativity moderating variable, self-control significance level is greater than 0.05. Therefore, self-control variable is neutral on performance because creativity eliminates the effect of self-control on performance variable. Finally, for the sixth hypothesis, correlation was reported 0.662 by the help of partial correlation between self-esteem and performance without the consideration of creativity variable. However, taking creativity variable into account as moderating variable, the significance level of correlation test between self-esteem and performance is 0.000 and a significant relationship was found. In this state, correlational coefficient is 0.375 which is less than 0.662. As a result, creativity results in decline between self-esteem and performance but does not eliminate the relationship. The correlation was reported 0.661 between creativity and self-esteem which is significant at confidence level of 95%. Since this significance level is less than 0.05 for self-esteem variable, self-esteem is effective in performance in absence of creativity. The impact factor is Beta=0.197. Therefore, self-esteem is neutral on performance because creativity eliminates the effect of self-esteem variable on performance variable. The following recommendations are made based on the results:

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Paying attention to personality traits and preparing for the capability of improvement of people;
- Providing context for the development of talent and potential capabilities of managers and employees through training courses;
- Providing the context self-control and participation in working places by management in order to promote organization efficiency;
- Holding training courses in order to empower employees;
- Supporting creativity and innovation in tasks, offering plans and creating platforms for employees` growth and excellence;
- Encouraging and providing the context to continue education and promote the level of education.

References

1. Abedi, Mohamamd Reza and Baghban, Iran (2009). The relationship between organizational self-esteem and organizational feedback, job compatibility and different personality styles, *Journal of psychology*, Isfahan University, Year 4, No. 10.

2. Asadi Noughabi, Ahmad Ali, *Psychiatric Nursing (Mental Health 2)*, Tehran, Bashari, 2005, 5th edition, p 191.

3. Alvani, Mahdi (2006), *General Management*, V 26th, Tehran, Nei.

4. Bandura, Albert. (2000) "Cultivate self–efficacy for personal and organizational effectiveness". *Handbook of principles of organization behavior.* Oxford, UK: Blachwell, pp. 120-139.

5. Bandura, Albert. (1997) *Self-efficacy: the exercise of control.* New York: W. H. Freeman

6. Boyatzis, R. E. 1982. *The Competent Manager. A Model for Effective Performance.* John Wiley & Sons. New York.

7. Esfandiari, Sa'adat (1999), *Human Resource Management,* Tehran, Samt, 9th edition.

8. Etebarian, Akbar and Pourvali, Zeinab (2008), The relationship between self-control and problem-solving strategies among employees working in Islamic Azad University, Khorasgan branch, *Quarterly Journal of Navad, Education Management*, Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht branch, 1st year, No. 2, Winter.

9. Robins, Stephen P. (2002), *Theory of Organization (Structure, Design, and Applications)*, translated by Seyed Mahdi Alvani and Hassan Danaee Fard, Shaygan Ganj Pub.

10. Seif, Ali Akbar (2000), *Educational psychology*, Tehran, Agah.

11. Shahni Yeylagh, Manijeh (1996), *Psychology for education.*

12. Shamlou, *Saeed Ideology and theories in personality psychology*, Tehran, Roshd, 2003, 7th edition, p. 15.

13. Sydanmaanlakka, P. (2003). Intelligent leadership and leadership competencies: developing a leadership framework for intelligent organizations. PhD Dissertation, Helsinki University of Technology, Department of Industrial Management, Laboratory of Work Psychology and Leadership, pp. 1-180.

14. Yamani, Mohammad (1993), Systematic approach for the evaluation of educational performance, *Quarterly Journal of Adult Education*, No. 40.

15. Zare, Hamid, *A self-control model in Islamic culture*, (2005), University and Seminary School, No. 45, pp. 44-57.